

## THE ANALYSIS OF ACCEPTABILITY LEVELS OF SOCIAL FEMINATIVES IN SERBIAN IN THE CONTEXT OF AGREEMENT: ATTITUDES OF SERBIAN LANGUAGE, ENGLISH LANGUAGE, AND SOCIOLOGY STUDENTS OF THE FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY IN NIŠ

Ivana Mitić, Aleksandra A. Janić Mitić\*

University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, Niš, Serbia

ORCID iDs: Ivana Mitić

Aleksandra A. Janić Mitić

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2347-6795>

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7168-3089>

### Abstract

This paper analyses the attitudes of Serbian Language, English Language, and Sociology students of the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš, towards the use of morphological and morphosyntactic means in marking that a woman is a performer of a profession. The aim is to present how Serbian native speakers value the acceptability of the three groups of examples: (1) the ones where it is marked that a profession is performed by a woman on the morphosyntactic level by a subject-verb agreement (*Načelnik Ana Antić održala je sednicu* 'The chief Ana Antić held<sub>Fsg</sub> a meeting'), (2) the ones where it is established by morphological means (*Načelnica Ana Antić održaće sednicu* 'The chief<sub>Fsg</sub> Ana Antić will hold a meeting'), and (3) the ones where it is established by combining morphological and morphosyntactic means (*Načelnica Ana Antić održala je sednicu* 'The chief<sub>Fsg</sub> Ana Antić held<sub>Fsg</sub> a meeting'). Firstly, the research indicates that English Language students are not sensitive to the analysed means. Secondly, Serbian Language students do not indicate any differences when valuing the acceptability of the examples from the second and the third condition, but they rate the examples from the first condition significantly higher. In other words, morphosyntactic means are more acceptable to Serbian Language students than morphological means. Finally, the combination of morphological and morphosyntactic means is more acceptable to Sociology students than the use of just one mean, and morphological means are more acceptable to them than morphosyntactic ones. When the acceptability of the combination of morphological and morphosyntactic means in the group of Sociology students is considered, the language economy principle is not activated.

**Key words:** the Serbian language, gender-sensitive language, social femininatives, morphological means, morphosyntactic means.

\* Corresponding author: Aleksandra A. Janić Mitić, University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, Ćirila i Metodija 2, 18105 Niš, Serbia | [aleksandra.janic.mitic@filfak.ni.ac.rs](mailto:aleksandra.janic.mitic@filfak.ni.ac.rs)

## АНАЛИЗА НИВОА ПРИХВАТЉИВОСТИ СОЦИЈАЛНИХ ФЕМИНИНАТИВА У СРПСКОМ ЈЕЗИКУ У КОНТЕКСТУ СЛАГАЊА: СТАВОВИ СТУДЕНАТА СРБИСТИКЕ, АНГЛИСТИКЕ И СОЦИОЛОГИЈЕ ФИЛОЗОФСКОГ ФАКУЛТЕТА У НИШУ

### Апстракт

Предмет рада је анализа ставова студената Србистике, Англистике и Социологије Филозофског факултета у Нишу према употреби морфолошких и морфосинтаксичких средстава којима се упућује на занимања и титуле женских особа. Циљ је да се провери на који начин изворни говорници српског језика преднују прихватљивост следеће три групе примера: (1) оних у којима се на морфосинтаксичком плану кроз образац слагања предиката са субјектом упућује да је носилац занимања/титуле особа женског пола (*Начелник Ана Антић одржала је седницу*), (2) оних у којима се то чини морфолошким средствима (*Начелница Ана Антић одржала седницу*), те (3) оних у којима се то чини морфолошким и морфосинтаксичким средствима (*Начелница Ана Антић одржала је седницу*). Истраживање је указало на то да англисти не показују осетљивост ни на једно од средстава. У групи србиста нема разлике у прихватљивости примера из другог и трећег услова, док су примери из првог услова оцењени значајно вишим оценама прихватљивости. Дакле, србистима су морфосинтаксичка средства прихватљивија него морфолошка. Социозима је пак прихватљивија употреба комбинације морфолошких и морфосинтаксичких средстава него само морфолошких или морфосинтаксичких средстава, а употреба морфолошких средстава прихватљивија од употребе морфосинтаксичких средстава. Када се код социолога посматра прихватљивост комбинације морфолошких и морфосинтаксичких средстава, примећује се да принцип језичке економије код њих није активиран.

**Кључне речи:** српски језик, родно осетљив језик, социјални фемининативи, морфолошка средства, морфосинтаксичка средства.

### INTRODUCTION

There are two opposing views about the use of social femininatives in Serbian. The first one is that the masculine gender is generic and that social femininatives should not be necessarily derived and used (e.g. Ivić, 1995, p. 155; Piper & Klajn, 2013, pp. 54–55; Piper, 2016; Dragičević & Utvić, 2019, Đurović, 2021), and the second view entails the necessity of regular derivation and the use of social femininatives (e.g. Filipović, 2009; Filipović, 2011; Cvetinčanin Knežević & Lalačević, 2019; Bošković Marković, 2019).

Studies on frequency, acceptability, and the use of social femininatives in Serbian independently of the sentence context are frequent (see Piper, 2016; Dragičević & Utvić, 2019; Burić, 2021; Aleksić, 2023). Nevertheless, we will analyse the social femininatives in context, more precisely, next to a female name and surname and from the point of view of the (non-)existence of the subject-predicate gender agreement. Our aim is

to analyse how much the type of context influences the level of acceptability, as well as to show the differences in the acceptability of sentences containing social femininatives from the point of view of Serbian Language, English Language, and Sociology students.

The structure of this paper is the following: the theoretical background and methodology of the experiment are given in the second and the third section respectively. The quantitative results and the results of the t-test are presented and analysed in the fourth section. The last two sections include discussion and conclusion.

### THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Ćorić (1982, p. 19) links the origin of gender-marking derivational suffixes in Serbian to the Proto-Slavic language. The most common gender-marking derivational suffixes in Serbian today are *-ica*, *-ka*, and *-(k)inja*. The derivational suffix *-ica* is used for deriving two types of social femininatives considering their derivational bases (entire or reduced), such as *plesačica* ‘female player’ and *umetnica* ‘female artist’ (see Klajn, 2003, p. 116). Regarding the derivational suffix *-ka*, Klajn (2003, p. 133) concludes that it is used with Slavic and foreign derivational bases that end in *r* and *n*: *bolničarka*, *kurirka*, *muslimanka*, *kleptomanka*, etc., and Klajn (2003, p. 105) illustrates the use of the derivational suffix *-inja* with examples with a derivational base that ends in *k* (e.g. *pesnikinja*, *svedokinja*). Nevertheless, in that case, it is ambiguous whether the derivational suffix is *-inja* or *-kinja*. On the other hand, the cases in which a derivational base ends in *h* or *g* (e.g. *monahinja*, *kneginja*) indicate the existence of *-inja* in a derivational process of deriving a social feminine. Klajn (2003, p. 106) also notices that *-kinja* is used with a foreign derivational base that ends in *t* (e.g. *pacijentkinja*, *turistkinja*). On the basis of their morphophonological and derivational analysis of femininatives ending in *-kinja*, Burić (2021) and Aleksić (2023) have opposing conclusions regarding the necessity of using nouns such as *psihološkinja*, and Aleksić (2023, p. 232) even offers arguments that those nouns are substandard. Comparing femininatives with derivational suffixes *-ica*, *-kinja*, *-ka* in some printed media during 2017, Dragićević and Utvić (2019, p. 191) notice that the formant *-ka* is the most productive and that *-ica* is the most frequent one.

Ćorić (2008, p. 200) illustrates the absence or unusualness of femininatives by examples *gonič*, *kupac*, *borac*, *vodič* and emphasises that nouns ending in *-log* (e.g. *filolog*, *psiholog*) do not have a gender-sensitive form in Serbian. Similar to lexicalised diminutives (see Grickat, 1995; Dragićević, 2016; Janić, 2013; Janić 2017), Ćorić (2008, pp. 204–205) mentions lexicalised meanings of femininatives such as *sekretarica* ‘female secretary’ and *čistacica* ‘cleaning lady.’ Regarding the lexicalisa-

tion, Arsenijević (2018, p. 296) concludes that “only a very limited number of femininatives can be lexicalized – hence there can never be a (Serbo-Croatian) language with both a feminine and a masculine form for each relevant notion.”

Despite the fact that nouns such as *kaluđerica* ‘female monk,’ *kraljica* ‘queen,’ and *monahinja* ‘nun’ have been present in Serbian for a long time, and despite the fact that the necessity for femininatives is even bigger now, Stijović (2021, p. 85) emphasises that “we must not intervene by force, a spontaneous growth of the lexicon must be enabled for this type of lexemes.” On the other hand, Radić (2011, p. 54) highlights that, at the higher functional levels, “it is communicatively inappropriate and, in the context of commitment to social equality of men and women, counterproductive to insist on using gender-marked forms such as *kandidatkinja*, *psihološkinja*, *borkinja*.” For examples such as *doktorka* ‘female doctor,’ *profesorka* ‘female professor,’ and *šefica* ‘female chief,’ Piper and Klajn (2013, p. 55) notice that they are “frequently used in the colloquial language, but that they are more rarely used in other functional styles, especially in scientific and administrative styles.” As a problem of a consistent ‘gender polarisation’ for future generations, Radić (2021, p. 77) emphasises the fact that those speakers would not recognise phrases such as *muškarac i/ili žena* ‘man and/or woman’ as equivalent to *ljudi* ‘people’ or just *čovek* ‘man.’ While analysing consistent feminisation and one type of aphasia, Radić (2013, p. 80) concludes that the implementation of consistent feminisation “would necessarily be an insurmountable obstacle in developing thinking of generations that would live in ideologically imposed language surroundings,” which as a result would have the situation that “7-year-olds stay on a mental stage that does not allow them to see grammaticality of a sentence ‘Naš učitelj je prava đačka majka’ [...] justified by the argument that a teacher is not female.” Therefore, as Miloradović (2021, p. 31) suggests, “gender equality must be seriously, systematically, and for a long time subjected to consideration of institutions of the social community,” and Spasojević (2021, p. 111) mentions that “by the standardization of femininatives as professional names we do not get a new concept,” but just “an excess, which burdens conceptual and logical apparatus.” Methodological issues in contemporary research of femininatives in Serbian done by normativists, on the one hand, and sociolinguists and feminist linguists, on the other, are systematically presented by Tomić (2021).

The official recommendations and attitudes of the Board for Standardization of the Serbian Language include a limited use of femininatives, more precisely, “when their use is in line with the existing norm and with good language praxis,” but in other cases “it is correct to use a masculine/generic form (e.g. *borac* ‘fighter,’ *pilot* ‘pilot,’ *akademik* ‘academician’)” (Miloradović, 2017, p. 121). Based on the analysis of the

material from the printed media, Savić (2004) notices discrimination in using femininatives and other lexemes and phrases that denote women. Piper (2016, pp. 46–47) perceives deriving social femininatives in Slavic languages as “the first and easier step.” Piper (2016, p. 52) considers the use of a proper name as “a sufficient grammatical condition to avoid an agreement conflict with a predicate in the feminine gender form, e.g. *Doktor Ana Pavić je došla*.” On the other hand, Piper (2016, p. 52) considers the cases of using femininatives with a proper name (e.g. *Doktorka Ana Pavić je došla*) acceptable, but he points out that “emphasizing the gender by repeating the information is not necessary.”

The agreement adjusts “grammatical categories of syntactic items in a sentence to grammatical categories or to lexico-grammatical meaning of other syntactical items” (Piper & Klajn, 2013, p. 266). In other words, “by agreeing the existing relations of subordination, coordination, and grammatical categories in those relations are emphasized” (Piper et al., 2005, p. 75). Regarding the fact that agreement in gender exists in Serbian, dependent elements adjust to independent ones in phrases and sentences (e.g. *pametna<sub>FSg</sub>*, *žena<sub>FSg</sub>*, *pametan<sub>MSg</sub>*, *muškarac<sub>MSg</sub>*, ‘smart woman/man’; *Ana<sub>FSg</sub>*, *je došla<sub>FSg</sub>*; *Marko<sub>MSg</sub>*, *je došao<sub>MSg</sub>*, ‘Ana/Marko has come’). To conclude, the agreement is an absolutely equal morphosyntactic means to refer to the agent’s gender as the existing morphological means.

Ignjatović (2017) analysed the use of gender-sensitive language forms in the media and illustrated non-sensitive language with examples in which the feminine gender is marked only by morphosyntactic means (e.g. *Hrvatski advokat za decu Ivana Milas-Klarić izjavila je...* (Ignjatović, 2017, p. 487)), but we disagree with that statement because the feminine grammatical form is given in the predicate through the participle form (*izjavila*). Mitić and Blagojević (2021, p. 804) analysed morphological and morphosyntactic means for accomplishing gender equality in legal documents, and they concluded that morphosyntactic means were used if the morphological form: (1) “was not lexicalized,” (2) “had more meanings,” and (3) “had negatively connoted meaning.”

#### *METHOD AND EXPERIMENT*

The paper analyses the attitudes of Serbian Language, English Language, and Sociology students<sup>1</sup> of the Faculty of Philosophy in Niš

---

<sup>1</sup> Regarding the respondents in the gender ideology research and in the use of language research, Bošković Marković (2019, p. 36) considers that “students of both genders form their identities in the interaction with their colleagues and with their university professors” and that they are suitable respondents for such research. In her research that included students of sports as respondents, she concluded that “both

towards the use of social femininates in Serbian. The aim is to examine acceptability levels considering the presence of morphological means, morphosyntactic means, and the combination of both means (see below the sentences that represent each condition) regarding the field of study of the respondents.

The following assumptions are tested by this experiment that contains grammaticality judgments.

Assumption 1. Regarding the fact that morphological and morphosyntactic means are absolutely grammatically equal, the students of the Serbian language will evaluate the examples from the first and the second group in a similar way, but they will give lower acceptability grades to the examples from the third group, bearing in mind the language economy principle, which is not expected to be the case with other students.

Assumption 2. The students of the Serbian language will be less likely to accept the use of social femininates, and non-philology students are more likely to accept the use of social femininates than philology students.

Assumption 3. The derivational suffix (-ica, -ka, -kinja) will have an effect on the level of acceptability.

The experimental material was organised in three lists (see Appendix A, B, and C). In the first list, social femininates ending in -ica were tested (e.g. *načelnica* ‘female chief’), in the second list, those ending in -kinja (e.g. *docentkinja* ‘female assistant professor’) were tested, and in the third list, those ending in -ka (e.g. *inspektorka* ‘female inspector’) were tested.

Each list contained 36 critical examples, and each of our three conditions were tested via 6 critical examples (see conditions listed below under a, b, c and illustrative examples from the first list) and 36 fillers<sup>2</sup> (see Appendix A, B, and C). In the process of choosing social femininates for the analysis, we used the ones with the most productive derivational suffixes (-ica, -ka, -kinja), bearing in mind that derivational bases in each group end in the same consonant.

a) The first condition: examples in which a woman is marked as the performer of a profession on the morphosyntactic level.

Example: *Načelnik Ana Antić održala je sednicu.*  
 ‘The chief Ana Antić held<sub>Fsg</sub>. a meeting.’

b) The second condition: examples in which a woman is marked as the performer of a profession on the morphological level.

Example: *Načelnica Ana Antić održaće sednicu.*  
 ‘The chief<sub>Fsg</sub>. Ana Antić will hold a meeting.’

---

male and female students are familiar with gender-sensitive language, though female students are more prone to use it’ (Bošković Marković 2023, p. 713).

<sup>2</sup> Fillers did not contain any social femininates.

c) The third condition: examples in which a woman is marked as the performer of a profession on the morphological and morphosyntactic levels.

Example: *Načelnica Ana Antić održala je sednicu.*  
 ‘The chief<sub>FSG</sub>, Ana Antić held<sub>FSG</sub> a meeting.’

The task of the respondents was to rate the acceptability of each example on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (completely unacceptable) to 5 (completely acceptable). The experiment was conducted in March 2024. Each experimental list was anonymously filled in by 30 respondents (10 students from each department). In other words, all three lists were filled in by 90 respondents; therefore, there were 180 observations for each condition.

#### RESEARCH RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' ATTITUDES

The acceptability judgment experiments tested three assumptions (see section 3). The results for all study programs by lists and study programs are presented in Table 1.

If we look at Table 1, at both the second and the third condition (morphological means vs. the combination of morphological and morphosyntactic means), we will notice that Serbian Language students evaluate the acceptability of examples with different grades depending on the type of derivational suffix (see Table 1 and average grades for the second condition (4 : 2.8 : 4.5) and for the third condition (4 : 3 : 4.5)); English Language students had similar evaluations (cf. average grades for the second condition (3.3 : 4.4 : 4.7) and for the third condition (3.4 : 4.4 : 4.6)), which is not the case with Sociology students (cf. grades for the second condition (4.4 : 4.3 : 4.3) and for the third condition (4.5 : 4.5 : 4.7)).

Table 1. Average acceptability grades by study programs and lists

	1st list SERB.	2nd list SERB.	3rd list SERB.	1st list ENG.	2nd list ENG.	3rd list ENG.	1st list SOC.	2nd list SOC.	3rd list SOC.
1st condition	4.2	4.9	4.3	4.3	4.7	3.5	3.9	4	3.4
2nd condition	4	2.8	4.5	3.3	4.4	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.3
3rd condition	4	3	4.5	3.4	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.7

If we ignore the presence of a derivational suffix and consider only how Serbian Language students, English Language students, and Sociology students evaluated the acceptability of morphosyntactic means, morphological means, and combinations of morphological and morphosyntactic means, we will perceive: that Sociology students evaluated the acceptability of morphosyntactic means with lower grades (3.8) compared

to English (4.2) and Serbian students (4.5); that Serbian Language students (3.8) evaluated the use of morphological means with lower grades than English Language students (4.1) and Sociology students (4.3); and that Serbian Language students evaluated the acceptability of a combination of morphological and morphosyntactic means with lower grades (3.8) than English Language students (4.1) and Sociology students (4.6). The results also indicate that Serbian Language students consider the use of morphosyntactic means to be the most acceptable (4.5 : 3.8 : 3.8), and that English Language students do not make a difference in the use of these three possibilities (4.2 : 4.1 : 4.1), while Sociology students find the combination of morphosyntactic and morphological means the most acceptable (4.6), less solely morphological (4.3), and they consider the use of only morphosyntactic means to be the least acceptable (3.8).

*Table 2. Average acceptability grades by study programs*

	Serbian	English	Sociology
1st condition	4.5	4.2	3.8
2nd condition	3.8	4.1	4.3
3rd condition	3.8	4.1	4.6

A t-test was performed to check if there was a statistically significant difference in comparing the results. Serbian Language students evaluated the examples from the first condition with significantly higher grades compared to the examples from the third condition ( $p < 0.0001$ ), while Sociology students did the opposite ( $p < 0.0001$ ), and there was no significant difference among English Language students when comparing the acceptability ratings for the examples from the first and the third condition.

The results of the t-test also indicate that Serbian Language students evaluated the examples from the first condition with higher grades compared to English Language students ( $p < 0.001$ ) and compared to Sociology students ( $p < 0.0001$ ), and English Language students evaluated the examples from the first condition with significantly higher grades compared to Sociology students ( $p < 0.001$ ). Apropos the third condition, Serbian Language students rated those examples significantly lower than English Language students ( $p < 0.02$ ) and Sociology students ( $p < 0.0001$ ), while English Language students rated the acceptability of examples from the third condition lower than Sociology students ( $p < 0.0003$ ). Serbian Language students rated the examples from the first condition significantly higher than the examples from the second condition ( $p < 0.0001$ ), while there is no difference in the assessment of the acceptability of examples from the second and third conditions. Among English language students, there is no significant difference in the assessment of the acceptability of examples from the first and second conditions, and from the second and third conditions. The results of the t-test

also indicate that Sociology students rate examples from the second condition significantly higher than the examples from the first condition ( $p < 0.0001$ ), and that they rate the examples from the third condition higher than the examples from the second condition ( $p < 0.002$ ).

Being a student of a certain study program proved to be an important factor in the analysis of the second condition. A statistically significant difference exists in comparing the first two pairs of study programs, but not in the third pair:

- 1) Serbian and Sociology ( $p < 0.00006$ );
- 2) Serbian and English ( $p < 0.02$ );
- 3) English and Sociology ( $p < 0.09$ ).

There was no statistically significant difference in comparing pairs of examples with different derivational suffixes: *-inja* and *-ka*, *-ka* and *-ica*, *-ica* and *-inja*.

#### DISCUSSION

Based on the results of the t-test, Assumption 1 is rejected. For Serbian Language students, morphosyntactic means are more acceptable than morphological means, which we did not expect, and they are more acceptable than a combination of morphological and morphosyntactic means, which was expected. For Sociology students, morphological means are more acceptable than morphosyntactic ones, but a combination of morphological and morphosyntactic means is more acceptable for them than just the use of morphosyntactic or morphological means, which is expected. There is no significant difference for English Language students, which is contrary to our expectations. The discrepancy that can be noticed for the first condition is significant, because the examples from that condition were the same within each of the lists, so they do not depend on a derivational suffix in any way, and it is precisely this one that indicates that the use of morphosyntactic means also depends on the study program the students belong to.

As for Assumption 2, it has been confirmed. Serbian Language students are the least prone to use social femininatives, and students of philological orientation (Serbian and English Language students) are less prone to use social femininatives than Sociology students. The t-test was used to determine statistical significance in two pairs of respondents according to the study program (Serbian Language and Sociology, Serbian Language and English Language). These results confirm that there is a significant relationship between belonging to a study program and the use of social femininatives.

Assumption 3 was not confirmed by the statistical test, but, in general, there are visible tendencies towards a higher acceptability of femina-

tives with the derivational suffix *-ka* (average 4.4) compared to those with derivational suffixes *-ica* (3.8) and *-kinja* (3.8)<sup>3</sup> (see Table 3).

*Table 3. Average acceptability grades in the second list*

	<i>-ica</i>	<i>-kinja</i>	<i>-ka</i>
Serbian	4	2.8	4.5
English	3.2	4.4	4.7
Sociology	4.4	4.3	4.3

By comparing the mean acceptability scores given by Serbian Language, English Language, and Sociology students for the examples from the second and third conditions, it can be noticed that the presence of a derivational suffix (*-ica*, *-kinja*, *-ka*) does not significantly change the acceptability scores within each study program except in the following two cases:

(1) English Language students rated the acceptability of morphological means significantly higher when a social feminine ends in *-ica* (3.9) than in the cases of the combination of morphological and morphosyntactic means (3.4);

(2) a significant difference in acceptability grades is noticed among Sociology students when a social feminine ends in *-ka* (4.3 vs. 4.7).

### *CONCLUSION*

There is no difference in the acceptability of the examples from the second and third conditions with Serbian Language students, while the examples from the first condition were rated significantly higher, which indicates that they find morphosyntactic means more acceptable than morphological ones. These results are in line with our assumption that Serbian Language students will rather opt for morphosyntactic means, given that they were introduced to different grammatical possibilities of marking the feminine gender. Furthermore, during their studies, they were introduced with the attitudes and recommendations of the Board for the Standardization of the Serbian language regarding social femininities, and therefore, they comprehend the principle of language economy, which is one of the most important language principles.

On the other hand, English Language students were not sensitive to morphosyntactic means, to morphological means, or to a combination of morphosyntactic and morphological means, which is not aligned with our assumptions.

<sup>3</sup> Values given in brackets are average values for all study programs regarding each derivational suffix.

For Sociology students, the use of the combination of morphological and morphosyntactic means is more acceptable than only morphological or morphosyntactic means, and the use of morphological means is more acceptable than the use of morphosyntactic means. The principle of linguistic economy was not activated when combining morphological and morphosyntactic means.

#### REFERENCES

Arsenijević, B. (2018). The Language of Dorian Gray: Why the Social and Cultural Treatment of Genders cannot be Improved by acting on Their Reflections in Language. *BELLS*, 10/1, 283–298. DOI: 10.18485/bells.2018.10.13

Bošković Marković, V. (2019). Rodna ideo logija u diskursu mladih [Gender Ideology in the Discourse of the Youth]. *Glasnik Antropološkog društva Srbije*, 54/1-2, 35–39. DOI: 10.5397/gads54-19197

Bošković Marković, V. (2023). Language and Gender: Attitudes towards the Use of Gender-Sensitive Language among Students of Sports. *Teme*, 47/3, 701–715. DOI: 10.22190/TEME230502044B

Burić, M. (2021). Lingvistička opravdanost upotrebe moviranih feminina s sufiksom -kinja kategorije nomina agentis et professionis [Linguistically Justified Use of Gendered Feminine Nouns of the Category Nomina Agentis et Professionis Created by Suffix -kinja]. *Folia linguistica et litteraria*, 35, 197–213. DOI: 10.31902/fll.35.2021.10

Cvetinčanin Knežević, H., Lalatović, J. (2019). *Priručnik za upotrebu rodno osetljivog jezika* [The Handbook for Using the Gender Sensitive Language]. Beograd: Centar za ženske studije.

Filipović, J. (2009). Rodno osetljive jezičke politike: Teorijske postavke i metodološki postupci [Gender Sensitive Language Policies: Theoretical Perspectives and Methodological Procedures]. *Analji Filološkog fakulteta*, 21, 109–127.

Filipović, J. (2011). Rod i jezik [Gender and Language]. U Ivana Milojević, Slobodanka Markov (Ur.), *Uvod u rodne teorije* (str. 409–423). Novi Sad: Centar za rodne studije, Mediterran Publishing.

Savić, S. (2004). Žena sakrivena jezikom medija: kodeks neseksističke upotrebe jezika [Women Veiled by Language of Media: Codex of Non-Sexist Language Use]. Novi Sad: Futura publikacije.

Tomić, S. (2021). Neki metodološki problemi u savremenom istraživanju socijalnih femininativa u srpskom jeziku [Some Methodological Problems in Contemporary Research of Social Femininatives in the Serbian Language]. *Poznańskie Studia Slawistyczne*, 20, 323–346. DOI: 10.14746/pss.2021.20.17

\*

Алексић, Д. (2023). Неки „родно осетљиви“ деривати на -киња и творбени систем српског језика [Some “Gender-Sensitive” Derivatives Ending in -kinja and the Word-Formation System of the Serbian Language]. *Јужнословенски филолог*, 79/2, 211–238. DOI: 10.2298/JFI2302211A

Грицкат, И. (1995). О неким особеностима деминуције [About Some Aspects of Diminution]. *Јужнословенски филолог*, LI, 1–30.

Драгићевић, Р. (2016). Лексикализација (на примеру именичких деминутива) [Lexicalization (on the Noun Diminutive Examples)]. У Ј. Дражић, И. Бјелаковић,

Д. Средојевић (Ур.), *Теме језикословне у србистици кроз дијахронију и синхронију*, зборник у част Љиљане Суботић (стр. 453–463). Нови Сад: Филозофски факултет у Новом Саду.

Драгићевић, Р., Утвић, М. (2019). Умножавање мовираних фемининума на -*(к)иња* у савременом српском језику [Multiplying of Movirani Femininum Ending in *-(k)inj*a in Serbian Language]. *Српски језик*, 24, 187–200. DOI: 10.18485/sj.2019.24.1.9

Ђуровић, С. (2021). Нормативна (не)прихватљивост мовираних фемининума у оквиру Закона о родној равноправности [The Normrative (Un)acceptability of Social Femininatives in the *Zakon o rodnoj ravnopravnosti*]. У Драган Станић, Срето Танасић (Ур.), *Положај српског језика у савременом друштву: изазови, проблеми, решења* (стр. 135–140). Нови Сад, Београд: Матица српска, Одбор за стандардизацију српског језика.

Ивић, М. (1995). *О зеленом коњу: нови лингвистички огледи* [About the Green Horse: New Linguistic Inquiries]. Београд: ХХ век.

Игњатовић, Н. (2017). Родно осетљив језик у јавном дискурсу [Gender-Sensitive Language in Public Discourse]. *Philologia Mediana*, 9, 479–499.

Јанић, А. (2013). Лексикализација именичних деминутива у српском језику [Lexicalization of Diminutives in the Serbian Language]. *Philologia Mediana*, 5, 367–380.

Јанић, А. (2017). Асоцијативни приступ лексикализованим именичним деминутивима са суфиксом *-ица* код студената Србистике [Associative Approach to Lexicalized Noun Diminutives with the Derivational Suffix *-ica* from the Perspective of the Students of the Serbian Language and Literature]. *Теме*, 41/1, 55–70. DOI: 10.22190/TEME1701055J

Клајн, И. (2003). *Творба речи у савременом српском језику* [The Word Formation in the Serbian Language], 2. део, Београд, Нови Сад: Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, Институт за српски језик САНУ, Матица српска.

Милорадовић, С. (2017). Језик родне равноправности: родно диференцирани језик и граматичка категорија рода у српском језику [The Language of Gender Equality: Gender Sensitive Language and the Grammatical Category of Gender in Serbian]. *Наш језик*, 48/1-2, 119–122.

Милорадовић, С. (2021). Чиме се обезбеђује родна равноправност [By What Means to Establish Gender Equality]. У Драган Станић, Срето Танасић (Ур.), *Положај српског језика у савременом друштву: изазови, проблеми, решења* (стр. 31–32). Нови Сад, Београд: Матица српска, Одбор за стандардизацију српског језика.

Митић, И., Благојевић, А. (2021). Анализа родноосетљивих термина у правним документима [The Analysis of Gender-Sensitive Terms in Legal Documents]. *Philologia Mediana*, 13, 793–806. DOI:10.46630/phm.13.2021.48

Пипер, П., Антонић, И., Ружић, В., Танасић, С., Поповић, Ј., Тошовић, Б. (2005). *Синтакса савременога српског језика: проста реченица* [The Syntax of Contemporary Serbian Language: the Simple Sentence]. Београд, Нови Сад: Институт за српски језик САНУ, Београдска књига, Матица српска.

Пипер, П., Клајн, И. (2013). *Нормативна граматика српског језика* [The Normative Grammar of the Serbian Language]. Нови Сад: Матица српска.

Пипер, П. (2016). О социјалним фемининативима у српском и другим словенским језицима [On Social Femininatives in Serbian and Other Slavic Languages]. *Јужнословенски филолог*, 72/3-4, 35–65. DOI: 10.2298/JFI1604035P

Радић, Ј. (2011). Именички род у језику и равноправност полова у друштву (Логички нивои и мотија рода у српском језику) [Gender of Nouns in Language and Gender Equality in Society: Logical Levels and Gender Motion

in the Serbian Language]. У Милош Ковачевић (Ур.), *Српски језик, књижевност, уметност*: зборник радова са V међународног скупа, *Књижевни (стандартни) језик и језик књижевности*, књ. 1, (стр. 43–56). Крагујевац: Филолошко-уметнички факултет у Крагујевцу.

Радић, Ј. (2013). Доследна „феминизација” и „афазија” [Consistent “Feminization” and “Aphasia”]. *Прилози за књижевност, језик, историју и фолклор*, 79, 73–81.

Радић, Ј. (2021). Сврха и последице „уродњавања” српског језика [The Point and Consequences of a Gender Sensitive Language in Serbian]. У Драган Станић, Срето Танасић (Ур.), *Положај српскога језика у савременом друштву: изазови, проблеми, решења* (стр. 65–79). Нови Сад, Београд: Матица српска, Одбор за стандардизацију српског језика.

Спасојевић, М. (2021). Језик мимо граматике: о тзв. родно сензитивном језику [Language without Grammar: about the Gender Sensitive Language]. У Драган Станић, Срето Танасић (Ур.), *Положај српскога језика у савременом друштву: изазови, проблеми, решења* (стр. 107–112). Нови Сад, Београд: Матица српска, Одбор за стандардизацију српског језика.

Стијовић, Р. (2021). Да ли род именица дисквалификује родну равноправност? [Does the Gender of Nouns Disqualify Gender Equality?]. У Драган Станић, Срето Танасић (Ур.), *Положај српскога језика у савременом друштву: изазови, проблеми, решења* (стр. 81–86). Нови Сад, Београд: Матица српска, Одбор за стандардизацију српског језика.

Ћорић, Б. (1982). *Моциони суфикс у српскохрватском језику* [The Derivational Gender Suffixes in the Serbo-Croatian Language]. Београд: Филолошки факултет у Београду.

Ћорић, Б. (2008). *Творба именица у српском језику* [The Derivation of Nouns in the Serbian Language]. Београд: Друштво за српски језик и књижевност Србије.

**АНАЛИЗА НИВОА ПРИХВАТЉИВОСТИ СОЦИЈАЛНИХ  
ФЕМИНИНАТИВА У СРПСКОМ ЈЕЗИКУ У КОНТЕКСТУ  
СЛАГАЊА: СТАВОВИ СТУДЕНАТА СРБИСТИКЕ,  
АНГЛИСТИКЕ И СОЦИОЛОГИЈЕ ФИЛОЗОФСКОГ  
ФАКУЛТЕТА У НИШУ**

**Ивана Митић, Александра А. Јанић Митић**

Универзитет у Нишу, Филозофски факултет, Ниш, Србија

**Резиме**

У раду се истражују ставови студената Србистике, Англистике и Социологије Филозофског факултета у Нишу према употреби морфолошких и морфосинтаксичких средстава којима се упућује на занимања и титуле женских особа, односно на социјалне фемининативе. Циљ је да се провери на који начин изворни говорници српског језика вреднују прихватљивост следеће три групе примера: (1) у којима се на морфосинтаксичком плану кроз образац слагања предиката са субјектом упућује да је носилац занимања/титуле женског пола (Начелник Ана Антић одржала је седницу); (2) у којима се то чини морфолошким средствима (Начелница Ана Антић одржаће седницу); или пак (3) морфолошким и морфосинтаксичким средствима (Начелница Ана Антић одржала је седницу). Будући да су морфолошка и морфосинтаксичка средства граматички апсолутно равноправна, једна од претпоставки је да

студенти Србијске сличним оценама вреднују примере из прве и друге групе, а знатно нижим оне из треће групе, поштујући принцип језичке економије, за разлику од студената Англистике и Социологије. Закључено је да нема разлике у прихватљивости примера из другог и трећег услова код србиста, док су примери из првог услова оцењени значајно вишим оценама, из чега следи закључак да су србистима морфосинтаксичка средства прихватљивија него морфолошка. Англисти пак нису показали осетљивост ни на једно од средстава. На крају, социологизам је била прихватљивија употреба комбинације морфолошких и морфосинтаксичких средстава него само морфолошких или морфосинтаксичких средстава, а употреба морфолошких средстава прихватљивија од употребе морфосинтаксичких средстава. Што се тиче комбинације морфолошких и морфосинтаксичких средстава код социолога, принцип језичке економије није активиран.

#### *Appendix A*

*Design of the first list in the experiment that contains the derivational suffix -ica*

The first condition – morphosyntactic means

1. *Начелник Ана Антић одржала је седницу.*
2. *Насавник Милена Вукић сазвала је састанак.*
3. *Правник Нина Илић организовала је конференцију.*
4. *Управник Јелисавета Нинић отказала је преглед.*
5. *Сарадник Бранкица Антић предала је записнике.*
6. *Саветник Верица Дугић послала је обавештење.*

The second condition – morphological means

1. *Начелница Ана Антић одржаће седницу.*
2. *Насавница др Милена Вукић сазваће састанак.*
3. *Правница др Нина Илић организоваће конференцију.*
4. *Управница Јелисавета Нинић откажаће преглед.*
5. *Сарадница Бранкица Антић предаће записнике.*
6. *Саветница Верица Дугић послаће обавештење.*

The third condition – morphological and morphosyntactic means

1. *Начелница Ана Антић одржала је седницу.*
2. *Насавница Милена Вукић сазвала је састанак.*
3. *Правница Нина Илић организовала је конференцију.*
4. *Управница Јелисавета Нинић отказала је преглед.*
5. *Сарадница Бранкица Антић предала је записнике.*
6. *Саветница Верица Дугић послала је обавештење.*

### Appendix B

#### Design of the second list in the experiment that contains the derivational suffix -kinja

The first condition – morphosyntactic means

1. Доџент Ана Антић одржала је седницу.
2. Експерти Милена Вукић сазвала је састанак.
3. Продуџент Нина Илић организовала је конференцију.
4. Рецензент Јелисавета Нинић отказала је преглед.
5. Референт Бранкица Антић предала је записнике.
6. Лаборант Верица Дугић послала је обавештење.

The second condition – morphological means

1. Доџенткиња Ана Антић одржала је седницу.
2. Експерткиња др Милена Вукић сазвала је састанак.
3. Продуџенткиња др Нина Илић организовала је конференцију.
4. Рецензенткиња Јелисавета Нинић отказала је преглед.
5. Референткиња Бранкица Антић предала је записнике.
6. Лаборанткиња Верица Дугић послала је обавештење.

The third condition – morphological and morphosyntactic means

1. Доџенткиња Ана Антић одржала је седницу.
2. Експерткиња Милена Вукић сазвала је састанак.
3. Продуџенткиња Нина Илић организовала је конференцију.
4. Рецензенткиња Јелисавета Нинић отказала је преглед.
5. Референткиња Бранкица Антић предала је записнике.
6. Лаборанткиња Верица Дугић послала је обавештење.

### Appendix C

#### Design of the third list in the experiment that contains the derivational suffix -ka

The first condition – morphosyntactic means

1. Инспектор Ана Антић одржала је седницу.
2. Министар Милена Вукић сазвала је састанак.
3. Политичар Нина Илић организовала је конференцију.
4. Аутор Јелисавета Нинић отказала је преглед.
5. Демонстратор Бранкица Антић предала је записнике.
6. Лектор Верица Дугић послала је обавештење.

The second condition – morphological means

1. Инспекторка Ана Антић одржала је седницу.
2. Министарка др Милена Вукић сазвала је састанак.
3. Политичарка др Нина Илић организовала је конференцију.
4. Ауторка Јелисавета Нинић отказала је преглед.
5. Демонстраторка Бранкица Антић предала је записнике.
6. Лекторка Верица Дугић послала је обавештење.

The third condition – morphological and morphosyntactic means

1. Инспекторка Ана Антић одржала је седницу.
2. Министарка Милена Вукић сазвала је састанак.
3. Политичарка Нина Илић организовала је конференцију.
4. Ауторка Јелисавета Нинић отказала је преглед.
5. Демонстраторка Бранкица Антић предала је записнике.
6. Лекторка Верица Дугић послала је обавештење.