

morphemes (*-s in books, -ed walked*). Lexical morphemes are part of derivational morphology that focused on the processes involved in building lexical form. Grammatical morphemes are part of inflectional morphology that concerns with the process involved in building grammatical word forms. In this study, the writer focused on identifying knowledge of English morphology which is knowledge of both inflectional and derivational process. Knowledge of inflectional morpheme plays a key role in grammatical accuracy while knowledge of derivational plays a role in the development of vocabulary size (Rosalina, 2012:11). Thus, Smart course students are taken as the role of knowledge on both inflectional and derivational process in the development of English vocabulary.

2.1.3. Inflectional morphology

According to Fromkin et al., (1988:129), inflectional morphemes are morphemes that never change the syntactic category of the words or morphemes to which they are attached (e.g. *Bella ate an apple and Bella ate three apples*. The suffix *-s* in *apples* indicates the plural form of base word). In addition, targeting awareness of inflectional morphemes should focus on associating the grammatical forms with their meanings. This may involve mapping the concept of “more than one” with the plural *-s (apples)* or the concept of an action occurring in the present with the present progressive-*ing*

vocabulary has important role for people to learn language. In addition, vocabulary brings to the role in communication. Vocabulary is needed in order to communicate with other people. Indeed, people should master a lot of vocabulary in order to understand what someone say and write.

In addition, Burton (1982:98) explained that a large number of vocabularies help you to express the idea precisely, without repetition of words. He also mentioned that the larger our vocabulary is, the better we can perform in all aspects of English language works. As vocabulary is important for learners to study language, many ways are given to master vocabulary and to build vocabulary.

Anglin (1993: 58) as cited in Rosalina (2012), proposed three approaches in the research literature to the development of vocabulary knowledge:

- 1) Direct instruction of vocabulary in school.
- 2) Learning words and their meanings from context, especially during reading activities. In addition, Zimmerman (2005) emphasizes that the primary method for acquiring new vocabulary (breadth) and deepen understanding for existing vocabulary (depth) is through extensive reading. Furthermore, Krashen, (1985, 1989, as cited in Morin, 2003) believes that reading is the most efficient way to learn vocabulary naturally.
- 3) Applying morphological knowledge to infer the meanings of words.

Those aspects are Morpheme Identification and Morphological Structure Test. The results of the tests showed that the morphological structure task was a significant predictor of vocabulary knowledge in the kindergarten, second-grade, and combined samples. In contrast, the morphological identification task was a significant final predictor of vocabulary for the kindergarten and combined samples only. Thus, tasks of morphological awareness were good predictors of children's vocabulary knowledge. The tools in taking the result, Chang et al used two kinds of tests; morphological identification awareness test and morphological structural awareness test. The first test, they served kinds of pictures with two meanings beside the pictures. The children then should listen to the sound and chose the right answer of the picture provided. This test is used to measure the phonological of children have. The second test, morphological structure test is showing pictures of some objects which some of them are daily objects that they see, and some are weird objects that they've never seen before. The test then mention the names for those weird objects based on the names of daily objects. For example, here is a ballpoint pen that is blue in color. We call that blue ballpoint pen. Now here is a ballpoint pen that is red in color, we call that red ballpoint pen. The difference between Chang et al research and this study was the concept the test. In spite of this study used Chang et al test to measure morphological awareness of students in Pare, she modified the test by omitting pictures in both tests. As this study has different subject of population, so the writer omitted the pictures because the population of this study are not children.

In addition, the writer only used the test of morphological structure test as a consideration: Chang et al's morpheme identification test did not appropriate to this study as it is used by Chang et al to measure the children morphological awareness relating to their phonological ability. Meanwhile, in this study, the writer only needed to measure the morphological awareness of Pare students. Thus, this study was different with Chang et al in subject of population and the test used by between the writer and Chang et al.

In the same tests of measuring morphological awareness of students, Nurhemida (2007) investigated the relationship between morphological awareness and vocabulary knowledge in the context of English as Foreign Language (EFL) for senior high school students in Indonesia. She took 2 different area of studies; social science class and natural science. Nation's Vocabulary Level Test (VLT) which tested knowledge of words drawn from level 2000, 3000, and 5000 was taken to measure their vocabulary size. Then, morpheme identification and morphological structural awareness were taken to measure morphological awareness. The VLT result revealed that students performed better at 2000 level than two higher frequency levels. And morpheme identification result showed that both class major did better in this test, whereas Natural Science did better in morphological structure test than social science. For the final result of the study showed that there was significant relationship between the students' performance in the vocabulary level test and the morphological awareness tasks. Both this study and her thesis have the same

subjects; EFL students in Indonesia. However, this study did not take the same area of subjects. The writer did not take the subjects of research in area of high students but in the area of course which focus on English language. In addition, the research instruments of this study was different from previous study, that the writer did not use morpheme identification test that used by Nurhemida.

In addition, Al Farsi (2008) examined his thesis under the title Morphological Awareness and Its Relationship to Vocabulary Knowledge and Morphological Complexity among Omani EFL University Students. He found that the students' overall morphological awareness and vocabulary size were limited and the relationship between the two constructs could not be established, owing to the appearance of floor effect in test scores and task difficulty. This study is different from him as the study was taken in students' course.

Another research is done by Rosalina (2012) in her thesis who examined the correlation between morphological awareness and vocabulary size of students in senior high school in Bandar Lampung. The result showed that morphological awareness contributes 62,3% to their vocabulary size and 37,7%. This means that there is correlation between morphological awareness and vocabulary size of students in SMA Bandar Lampung. Her research instruments used tests adapted from Chang et al and Word Definition Matching as Vocabulary Level Test. This VLT that used by her is different from this study. The writer in this study used Vocabulary Level Test Version 2 adapted by I.S.P Nation. In addition, the subjects of this study were Smart Course students whom study English in focus.

