**VOJKAN B. STOJIČIĆ**[*]
**JOVANA Z. MILOVANOVIĆ**
University of Belgrade
Faculty of Philology

## *HOW CORRECT IS YOUR WRITING*? ORTHOGRAPHIC ERROR ANALYSIS IN SERBIAN AS AN L2

The present article discusses orthographic errors in teaching Serbian as an L2 and constitutes part of a wider ongoing longitudinal study being carried out by the authors with students from the *World in Serbia* project in recent years. It is of great importance for students to master the orthographic system of the Serbian language; therefore, they are presented with both alphabets of our language, characterized by synchronic digraphia, from the early stages of language learning. According to the descriptors of the Center for Serbian as a Foreign Language (Krajišnik et al. 2022), at A2 level foreign students are expected to learn enough about the written language so that they can use both Cyrillic and Latin alphabets, distinguish articulatory differences between phonemes, and write an appropriate grapheme for each phoneme. Our research aims to list, classify, and categorize the most common errors of 201 foreign students with different linguistic backgrounds. In conducting the present research, we used the descriptive method, as well as the methods of theoretical analysis and contrastive analysis. The participants were divided into eight categories, according to the official languages of their respective countries. The errors were extracted based on a task given to the students as part of the final exam for the A2 language course. The authors offer an overview of common errors, compare them to a previous study (Milovanović and Stojičić 2023) and consider pedagogical implications aimed at improving this segment of teaching Serbian as a second language.

**Keywords**: Serbian as an L2, writing, dictation, error analysis, orthographic competence

[*] vojkan.stojicic@fil.bg.ac.rs; vojkans@hotmail.com; jovana-m@hotmail.com

## INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the University of Belgrade has seen a significant increase in mobility, with both foreign students visiting Serbia and local students going abroad. This is in line with the Strategy of Internationalization of the University of Belgrade (2014), which aims to encourage students to be in active contact with different cultures and languages. In addition to the Strategy, through its Ministry of Education, the Republic of Serbia has developed bilateral agreements with numerous European countries regarding different mobility programs for both students and staff (Erasmus Mundus, Erasmus+, Basileus, CEEPUS, etc.). This has resulted in a large number of foreign students who choose to learn Serbian at university centers in Belgrade, Novi Sad, Kragujevac, Niš, and Priština. One program of particular interest in this regard is the *World in Serbia* project, which has been bringing foreign students from Africa, Asia, South America, and Central America to Serbia since 2010 through a scholarship program which incorporates an initial Serbian language course prior to the students commencing their university studies[1].

When learning a new language, students are often faced with challenges at different linguistic levels. One such challenge relates to adopting a new phonetic and graphic system that differs from their L1. In Serbian as an L2/foreign language, students are required from the beginner levels onwards to learn the phonetic specificities of the Serbian language and to master both the Latin and Cyrillic alphabets, since they are usually familiar with some form of Latin alphabet but need the Cyrillic alphabet for everyday life in Serbia (Brborić 2016: 122, in Milovanović and Stojičić 2023). Given the fact that no two languages in the world have an identical phonetic structure (Gussenhoven and Jacobs 1998) and that writing systems vary in terms of the degree of regularity when it comes to sound-symbol correspondences (Hamada and Koda 2008), it is no wonder that students struggle with those sounds and symbols in L2 which do not exist in their L1. Teachers of Serbian as a foreign language encounter a specific challenge when working with a heterogenous group of students, whose L1 linguistic systems exhibit a large degree of variation compared to the Serbian language. Despite the challenging task of teaching Serbian and creating classroom materials, teachers and researchers have access to the written exams of students from different linguistic backgrounds, which are a rich resource. According to Babić (2011: 159), they allow teachers to analyze their own work and results, just as they do with their students' work. Furthermore, this type of material helps teachers systematize the difficulties that foreign students encounter while learning our language and con-

---

[1] For more information on the project, visit: http://learnserbian.fil.bg.ac.rs/cooperation.php and https://mohe.gov.mv/images/resources/schols/the-world-in-serbia-project-scholarship-20222023/Project%20-%20World%20in%20Serbia-%20information%20sheet.pdf

firms certain hypotheses that teachers draw from their own teaching experience (Bogdanović 1984: 74).

Existing research focusing on the phonetic and phonological rules of Serbian involving foreign students is limited in scope and depth. Nevertheless, there are some studies of note. Firstly, Arsenijević (1991) examined orthographic errors, while Dešić (2016) published an article on orthography and orthoepy in Serbian as a foreign language. In their contrastive studies, Zvekić-Dušanović (2016) and Andrić (2010) analyzed, among other topics, the errors of Hungarian-speaking students in Serbian as an L2, Perišić-Arsić (2016) explored errors in Serbian as a foreign language among Italian-speaking students, Novaković (2023) among Arabic-speaking students, and Đorđević (2017), Novaković and Jović (2022) and Milošević (2017) among Slavic students, while Sudimac (2020) conducted research on errors among foreign students at the University of Niš. Still, the most representative research of this sort in terms of its scope is the research carried out in 2022 at the Faculty of Philology (University of Belgrade), involving 193 participants from 38 countries (Milovanović and Stojičić 2023). The present research continues along the same path and represents the second stage of a longitudinal study, which aims to analyze the orthographic errors of students learning Serbian as an L2. Finally, since the students continuously practiced correct writing through dictations and did exercises on the distinction of minimal pairs, the basic hypothesis of our work was that the errors would differ qualitatively from the first stage of the abovementioned longitudinal study. It is hoped that the results obtained in our study can be applied in language teaching to tackle the difficulties identified within the research when teaching Serbian to foreign students in the future.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Research objectives

In order to identify, describe and explain orthographic errors in Serbian as an L2, it is necessary to consider relevant sources on the topic of error analysis in L2 acquisition. It is well known that foreigners learning Serbian as a foreign language face significant challenges while adopting the phonetic and phonological system of our language. As Novaković and Jović (2022: 316) state, the source of these difficulties is the complexity of its grammatical system, the existence of the phonetic principle in its orthography, the system of seven cases, the relatively free word order, and the large number of exceptions. Additionally, L1 interference combined with the aforementioned features of the Serbian language can lead to (a)typical errors when acquiring Serbian as an L2.

In the first stage of our longitudinal study on orthographic errors in Serbian as a foreign language (Milovanović and Stojičić 2023), we discussed the concept of phonetic awareness, which, according to Grgić and Udijer (2012: 211), refers to students' knowledge of phonemes and graphemes and the correspondence between them. While learning Serbian, students are presented with a system whereby one phoneme corresponds to one grapheme. We noted that the simplicity of the orthographic rules when compared to some other languages could lead to the quicker development of phonological, phonetic, and graphic awareness among students of Serbian as a foreign language (Milovanović and Stojičić 2023). As some studies have shown, the degree of similarity between L1 and L2 can contribute in part to decoding efficiency among L2 learners, as well as L2 orthographic regularity (Hamada and Koda 2008). This is in line with the notion of cross-linguistic influence, which implies that the languages spoken by an individual can have an impact on one another either based on their similarities or differences (Talebi 2013: 432). Therefore, if L1 and L2 belong to the same language family, it is likely that their phonetic and orthographic systems will be easier to acquire than languages with significant variations. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that some researchers (Flege 1993, 1995) indicate that phonemes which are different in L1 and L2 will be acquired sooner than phonemes which are similar in both languages. Given the fact that the participants in our research do not come from regions where Slavic languages are spoken and that they often do not speak English, which is the language of instruction in class, they are faced with a great challenge. However, the aforementioned orthographic regularity could be a facilitating factor in acquiring Serbian as an L2.

## Research aims

The main goal of our research was to identify, classify and explain orthographic errors. As Novaković and Jović (2022: 316–317) state in their broader research, there are several important notions in this regard. Firstly, an error is considered as any departure from the standard norm (Babić 2018: 584). Selinker (1969) indicates the importance of linguistic errors as they help highlight improvement in language acquisition, show researchers how language is acquired and help students better understand themselves and the language that they are learning. Errors can be inter-linguistic or inner-linguistic. Inter-linguistic errors are due to trans-linguistic influence (Novaković and Jović 2022: 317). When it comes to their typology, Končarević (2004: 86) distinguishes three categories of interferential errors: 1) non-differentiation, where the student does not differentiate certain linguistic features because such a difference is not present in their L1, 2) super-differentiation, where the student introduces linguistic elements in L2 which are characteristic for their L1, and 3) reinterpretation, where some linguistic features that exist in both L1 and L2 are interpreted only according to their L1. Inner-linguistic errors stem

from specific features of the language being learned when students try to simplify the system, hyper-generalize rules, hyper-correct, adopt incorrect forms, fossilize their errors, or avoid certain patterns (Dulay and Burt 1974; Touchie 1986).

## Sample and methods

The present research was conducted at the Center for Serbian as a Foreign Language, Faculty of Philology (University of Belgrade). In total, 201 students from the *World in Serbia* project participated in the research. All participants had intensive Serbian language lessons in the summer semester of the 2022/2023 academic year. The research took place at the end of the A2-level language course, meaning that participants had between 520 and 720 45-minute classes depending on the time of their arrival. None of the participants had previously learned Serbian and upon their arrival, they all attended the same language course and used the same textbook. We classified the participants based on the official language of their respective countries: 14 French-speaking participants, 14 Spanish-speaking participants, 32 Portuguese-speaking participants, 73 English-speaking participants, 42 Arabic-speaking participants, 12 Farsi-speaking participants, 7 Surinamese-speaking participants, and 7 participants who spoke other languages.

For the purposes of our broader longitudinal study, we created a task which was incorporated into the final A2 exam. The participants were asked to do a dictation where they listened to a text of around 80 words, purposefully prepared so as to include different phonemes characteristic for the Serbian language. We used the same text as in the first stage of our study (Milovanović and Stojičić 2023). The participants' exams were collected and error identification, description, explanation, and evaluation followed.

## Results and discussion

Keeping in mind the total number of errors, below we present specific results and conclusions related to error typology, with a particular focus on affricates, fricatives, the phonemes /ʎ/ and /ɲ/, and the pairs /l/:/r/, /b/:/p/ and /b/:/v/. We have also provided a comment on the consonant in the final position, intervocalic /j/, word segmenting, and vocalic errors in Serbian as an L2. Based on the results, it is clear that certain words proved to be more challenging for our participants. Therefore, this analysis focuses particularly on these examples, provided in the table below.

### French-speaking participants

Given the structure of the phonological system of French, the results among French-speaking participants are somewhat expected. For instance, affricates proved to be the most challenging group of consonants, which can be explained by the fact that the French orthographic system does not have any graphemes for these Serbian phonemes. This was the case with *poslastičarnica* where /t͡ʂ/ was often written as *ć*, *c* or *š* instead of *č*. Fricatives were less of a problem, which can be explained by the existence of both /ʂ/ and /ʐ/ in the French phonetic system. As for other consonants, French-speaking participants had problems identifying /ʎ/ and /ɲ/, probably due to the fact that they are not typical for French. Given the differences between the two systems, French-speaking students were given phonetic exercises in class in order to practice affricates.

### Spanish-speaking participants

Spanish-speaking participants had issues with both affricates and fricatives. For instance, they noted / t͡ʂ/ in *venčali* as *ć*, *t* and *c*. When it comes to other consonants in our research, only /ʎ/ seemed to be a major cause of issues, as in the name *Željko*, where it was transcribed as *i*, *j* or *l* instead of *lj*. This comes as a surprise since Spanish does have /ʎ/ in its phonetic system. On the other hand, the phoneme /ɲ/ did not appear to be challenging for this group, especially as it exists in Spanish, where it is written *ñ*. Compared to the first stage of our study published in Milovanović and Stojičić (2023), it is interesting to note that in this stage of our research participants did not have issues spelling /x/, whereas in our previous research participants wrote it with a *j*, like in Spanish. Additionally, they did not exhibit problems distinguishing between /b/ and /v/, which was a reported issue in the previous research. On the other hand, in some cases they added a prothetic *e* in front of the consonant group /sp/ and wrote *espavaću* instead of *spavaću sobu* and mixed /s/ and /z/ in *muzika*, which is in line with the rules of Spanish, but not Serbian. Still, the number of such errors was lower than in the previous research thanks to tailor-made phonetic activities done in class in order to prevent these errors.

### Portuguese-speaking students

As with the first two groups, affricates and fricatives were the most challenging consonants for our Portuguese-speaking participants. For instance, they wrote *đ* or *dz* instead of *dž* in the word *džez* and *dž,j* and *z* instead of *ž* in the name *Željko*, even though the phoneme /ʐ/ exists in Portuguese. This name proved to be challenging due to the phoneme /ʎ/ as well, which was written *l*, *j*, *k* and *i* instead of *lj*. This could be explained by the lack of a corresponding phoneme in Portuguese. This

group of students also used a final *o* instead of *u* in the word *kuhinju*, which can be explained by the fact that -o is a common suffix in Portuguese.

## English-speaking students

English-speaking students constituted the largest group in our sample. They had issues with both affricates and fricatives. The phoneme /ʂ/ can be taken as an illustrative example as participants from this group wrote the name *Maša* with *č*, *rš*, *s* and *c* instead of *š*. The phonemes /ʎ/ and /ɲ/ were also the root of numerous errors, which comes as no surprise as they are not characteristic for English. One example of such an error is the word *kuhinju*, where participants wrote *kuhinu*, *kuhiju*, *kohju*, *kuhilju* instead of using the grapheme *nj*. It is also worth noting that in some instances, participants from this group had problems distinguishing between the following pairs: /b/:/p/, /b/:/v/ and /l/:/r/.

## Arabic-speaking students

The participants with Arabic as L1 had problems with both consonants and vowels. Affricates and fricatives were often confused by the participants from this group, with /t͡s/ in *Ljubica* being written *tš* and *ć* or with /ʑ/ in *Željko* being written *č*, *z*, *dž* or *đ*. The phonemes /ʎ/ and /ɲ/ and their corresponding graphemes in words such as *Željko* or *kuhinja* also caused issues and resulted in different graphemes being used, as stated in the table below. When it comes to consonants, one specific issue for Arabic-speaking participants was the distinction between /b/ and /p/ in words such as *pored* (written *bored* in their production) or *proleća* (*broleća*) – this distinction does not exist in Arabic. Another major problem in this group was related to vowels. As the pronunciation of vowels and the way they are written in Arabic differs greatly from the Serbian phonetic and orthographic system, it comes as no surprise that numerous participants had issues with vowels. Therefore, they wrote *tirasu* instead of *terasu*, *Donava* instead of *Dunava* or *njehovi* instead of *njihovi*, to name just a few errors. Despite having done phonetic exercises aimed at correcting their use of vowels and differentiating phonetic pairs such as /b/ and /p/, these mistakes persisted.

## Farsi-speaking students

In line with the other groups, Farsi-speaking students also struggled with affricates, whereas fricatives did not appear to be a source of difficulty. One such error related to affricates was the phoneme /t͡ɕ/ in the words *srećni*, *proleća* or *spavaćusobu*, which Farsi-speaking students wrote with *č* instead of *ć*. This type of error can be explained by the lack of distinction between /t͡ʂ/ and /t͡ɕ/ in Farsi. Another common error was the phoneme /t͡s/ written as *s* or *ts* instead of *c*, which can again be explained by its absence in Farsi, where it would have to be written

using a combination of its components /t/ and /s/ and their corresponding graphemes. As one of the authors of this article speaks Farsi, Farsi-speaking students had tailor-made exercises to prevent certain errors occurring based on a contrastive analysis of both languages.

### Surinamese-speaking students

Unlike participants from the previous groups, this group had far fewer problems with both affricates and fricatives. They only had certain errors with /t͡ɕ/ in *srećan*, where they used *č* instead of *ć*. Additionally, they had some issues with /ʎ/, written with *l* instead of *lj* as in the examples *Želko* or *Lubica*. Otherwise, this group exhibited a low error rate. However, it is important to state that compared to the other groups, this group also had fewer participants, which may account for these results. Another possible explanation for such good results may be the fact that, in our experience, Surinamese students participating in the *World in Serbia* project have always been very successful as this country imposes high criteria in the selection process for this project.

### Others

The last group comprised participants from various countries not classified in the previous seven groups. Their results showed issues with different consonants, just as in the other groups, but given the heterogenous nature of this final group, it is not possible to draw any conclusions or focus on similarities.

### Universal errors

Our results indicate that some errors seem to be present regardless of the L1 of the participants whose dictations were analyzed. The first such error is the omission of intervocalic /j/ in the name *Marija*, which was often written by our participants as *Maria*, as can be seen in the table below. This error can be explained by the trans-linguistic influence of the name *Maria*, which is spelled without a *j* in French, Spanish, Portuguese and English and is an internationally known name.

Another interesting error common in all of the groups in this research is related to the erroneous spelling of the final consonant in *ovog* and *nažalost*. These two words were either written without the final consonant, or rarely, with an added vowel at the end of the word. This type of error can be explained by the weak position of the final consonant.

Thirdly, in all the groups, we noticed that our participants wrote toponyms (*Novi Sad*, *Dunav*) and personal names (*Maša*, *Željko*, *Đorđe*) without a capital letter. This could be expected of Arabic and Farsi-speaking students whose graphic systems do not have lowercase and uppercase letters; however, it is a surprise that students whose L1 recognizes this difference did not use capital letters when needed.

Finally, one type of error differs greatly from the errors presented in Milovanović and Stojičić (2023) and it is related to word segmenting. In the present research, students from seven out of the eight groups had segmenting errors in the word *poslastičarnica*, which they wrote as *posle stičarnica* or *posla stičarnica*, with some other additional errors. One possible explanation for this phenomenon lies in the fact that they might have recognized *posle* (after) or *posla* (work, in the genitive case) as a standalone word and therefore split the word *poslastičarnica* into two elements, where the second does not have any comprehensible meaning.

| Affricates | | French | Spanish | Portuguese | English |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $/\widehat{tɕ}/$ | srećni | srečni | srečni | srečani, srečni, srećini, srecne | srečni |
| | proleća spavaću sobu | proleca, proleča spavacu | proleča spavaču | proleča spavaču | proleča, prološa spavaču |
| $/\widehat{tʂ}/$ | venčali | vencali, venčali, venšali | vencali, venčali, ventail | vencali, frenšali, vejicali, venćali | venčali, |
| | poslastičarnici | poslascicarnici, poslatićarnici, poslastišariti | poslastićarnici | poslastići čarnisi, poslasčitarnici, poslatićarnici, poslaćićarnici | poslastićarnisti, poslastićarnici, poseletinatity posla stićarnici poslasticarci |
| $/\widehat{dz}/$ | Đorđe | DŽordže | Dorde, Džorđe, Zorce | Džorđe, Đorge | Džorđe |
| $/\widehat{dʐ}/$ | džez | đez, zaz | Đezz, đes, jez | Đez, đež, dzez | đez, jazz, žez, |
| $/\widehat{ts}/$ | Ljubica meseca | Ljubita, Ljubića mećeta, meseća | Ljubiča, Jukisa meseća, mecesa | Ljubita, Ljubića | Ljubiša, Jubitsa |
| Affricates | | Arabic | Farsi | Surinamese | Other |
| $/\widehat{tɕ}/$ | srećni | srečni, sreče, srešni | srečni | srečan, srečno, srečni | srečni |
| | proleća spavaću sobu | proleča spavaču, spaču | proleča spavaču | / / | proleča spavacu, spavaču |
| $/\widehat{tʂ}/$ | venčali | venćali, venžali, venčnali, maršli | venćali | / | / |
| | poslastičarnici | poslastitčarnici, poslatićarnici, poslastićarnici, poslacšarnci | poslastićarnici | / | posla stinarnici |
| $/\widehat{dz}/$ | Đorđe | Džordže, Žez, Žorđe, Džorde | Džorđe, Đorće, Jarđe | / | Džorže |
| $/\widehat{dʐ}/$ | džez | đez, džez, čes | jazz, đez, jez | / | jez, cez |
| $/\widehat{ts}/$ | Ljubica meseca | Lupitša, Ljubića messetsa | Ljubisa, Labitsa messtsa | / / | / / |

| Fricatives | | French | Spanish | Portuguese | English |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| /ʂ/ | Maša<br><br>slušaju/ šetaju | Mača<br><br>slusaju | Masa, Marša, Mača<br>/ | Majša, Mac, Maća slučaju | Mača, Marša, Masa, Maca<br>slusaju/ četaju |
| /ʐ/ | Željko<br><br>žive/ kažu | DŽerko, Geliko<br><br>zive | Đelko<br><br>/ | DŽelko, Jejko, Jeko zivam/ kazu, kaju | Juko, Jelko, Jelica zive/ kazu, kašu |
| Fricatives | | Arabic | Farsi | Surinamese | Other |
| /ʂ/ | Maša<br>slušaju/ šetaju | Mača<br>setaju | /<br>/ | /<br>/ | /<br>/ |
| /ʐ/ | Željko<br><br>žive/ kažu | Ćenko, Željko, DŽeljko, Đeyko kašu | /<br><br>/ | /<br><br>/ | /<br><br>kašu |

| Other consonants | | French | Spanish | Portuguese | English |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| /ʎ/ | Željko<br><br><br>prijatelji<br>Ljubica | DŽerko, Ženko, Žejko, Žeiko, Žeko, Željko<br>/<br>Lubića | Želgo, Želiko, Žeiko, Žejko<br><br>prijateli<br>/ | Žejko, DŽelko, Jejko, Zeko, Žeiko prijateli<br>/ | Ženko, Žajko, Želko, Želiko, Žeiko<br>prijatel<br>Lubica |
| /ɲ/ | njihovi<br>kuhinju | nihovi, nihkovi<br>kuhinu | /<br>/ | /<br>kuhmju, kuhiju | nihovi<br>kuhinu, kuhiju, kohju, kuhilju |
| /l/:/r/ | poslastičarnici<br>venčali | poslastičalnici<br>/ | /<br>/ | /<br>/ | /<br>venčari |
| /b/:/p/ | proleća<br>kupatilo<br>prijatelj<br>pored<br>pre<br>poslastičarnici | /<br>/<br>/<br>/<br>bre<br>/ | /<br>/<br>/<br>/<br>/<br>/ | /<br>/<br>/<br>/<br>/<br>/ | /<br>/<br>prijateli<br>/<br>/<br>bostastičarnici |
| /b/:/v/ | venčali<br>vikendom<br>dobili | benčali<br>/<br>/ | benčali<br>/<br>/ | /<br>beikom<br>/ | benčali, bečali<br>/<br>dovili |
| Other consonants | | Arabic | Farsi | Surinamese | Other |
| /ʎ/ | Željko<br><br><br>prijatelji<br>Ljubica | Ženko, Žerko, Želiko, Žejko, Đeyko, Žerko<br>priatelij<br>Lubica, Lupitša | Želko, Ženko, Žeiko, Žejko<br><br>prijateli<br> | Želko<br><br><br>/<br>Hjubica, Lubica | Žejko, Ženko, Želiko<br><br>prijateli<br>/ |
| /ɲ/ | njihovi | / | / | / | nihovi |
| | kuhinju | kohiljo, kuhinu | kohino | / | / |
| /l/:/r/ | poslastičarnici<br>venčali | /<br>/ | /<br>/ | /<br>/ | /<br>/ |
| /b/:/p/ | proleća<br>kupatilo<br>prijatelj<br>pored<br>pre<br>poslastičarnici | broleća<br>kubatilo<br>brijatalj, brijateli<br>bored<br>/<br>/ | /<br>/<br>/<br>/<br>/<br>/ | /<br>/<br>/<br>/<br>/<br>/ | /<br>/<br>/<br>/<br>/<br>/ |
| /b/:/v/ | venčali<br>vikendom<br>dobili | benčali<br>/<br>/ | /<br>/<br>/ | /<br>/<br>/ | benčali<br>/<br>/ |

| Final consonant | | French | Spanish | Portuguese | English |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| /g/ | ovog | ovom | ovok | ovo, ovov | ovo, ovok |
| /t/ | nažalost | nažalos | nažalas, nažalos | nažaloste | nažalos |
| Final consonant | | Arabic | Farsi | Surinamese | Other |
| /g/ | ovog | ovo | / | / | / |
| /t/ | nažalost | nažalos | nažalos | nažalos | nažaloš |

| Intervocalic | | French | Spanish | Portuguese | English |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| /j/ | Marija | Maria | Maria | Maria | Maria |
| Intervocalic | | Arabic | Farsi | Surinamese | Other |
| /j/ | Marija | Maria | Maria, Marja | / | / |

| Segmenting | French | Spanish | Portuguese | English |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| zato | za po | / | / | / |
| pre dve | bredve | / | / | / |
| poslastičarnici | posla stičarici, posla stićarnici | poslastići čanisi | pošlasti čarnići | poslasti čarniti, posla stičarnici |
| nažalost | / | nažales | / | na želost |
| Segmenting | Arabic | Farsi | Surinamese | Other |
| zato | / | / | / | / |
| pre dve | / | / | / | / |
| poslastičarnici | posla stičarise, posla stičarnici, posle slečerici | / | posla stačirnica, poslasti čarnici | posla stinarnici |
| nažalost | na žalos | / | / | / |

## CONCLUSION

This research has shown that certain orthographic errors are related to the respective languages of our participants and that they can be expected when teaching Serbian as an L2, especially when it comes to linguistic systems that significantly differ from Slavic languages, Serbian included. Existing research highlights that acquiring a new phonological system can present numerous challenges, which can be overcome to a certain extent through tailor-made didactic materials. Therefore, based on the results, it is possible to adapt language instruction and work on reducing such errors. On the other hand, some errors appear to be universal regardless of the L1.

Our results show that affricates, fricatives and the phonemes /ʎ/ and /ɲ/ are among the most challenging phonemes for students learning Serbian as an L2. Additionally, some linguistic backgrounds lead to significant problems in learning Serbian vowels, which in our research predominantly relates to Arabic-speaking students. Lastly, attention should also be drawn to word segmentation and the use of capital letters as they can have implications on orthographic competence in Serbian as an L2.

Given the scope and the variety of the sample in this research, it represents a valuable contribution to the study of the acquisition of the phonological and orthographic system of Serbian as an L2. We believe that the research in this field could be used in Serbian as an L2 textbooks, which should incorporate tailor-made activities aimed at speakers of different L1s with a comparative view of the Serbian phonological system and the systems of their respective languages. This approach would contribute to the quality of materials used in teaching Serbian, particularly as this is an emerging field with more prospects for the internationalization of Serbia, its institutions, students and teachers alike.

## REFERENCES

**Andrić 2010**: Е. Андрић, Контрастивна истраживања српско(хрватско)г и мађарског језика, у: И. Клајн и П. Пипер (ур.), *Констрастивна проучавања српског језика: правци и резултати*, Београд: САНУ, Одбор за српски језик у поређењу са другим језицима, 9–40.

**Arsenijević 1991**: Н. Арсенијевић, Правописне грешке у српскохрватском као секундарном језику, *Oktatás és nevelés: pedagógiai folyóirat,* 19 (3-4), 91–92, 67–72.

**Babić 2011**: В. Babić, Provera znanja iz gramatike: nivoi A1 i A2 (poređenje – udžbenik *Naučimo srpski 1*: testovi, *Prilozi proučavanju jezika*, 38, 159–186.

**Babić 2018**: Б. Бабић, Унутарјезичке грешке у употреби облика акузатива у српском језику као страном, *Српски језик*, XXII, 583–600.

**Bogdanović 1984**: V. Bogdanović, Analiza grešaka slušalaca pri izradi prvog testa na početnom tečaju srpskohrvatskog jezika za strance, u: P. Vučković (ur.) *Okrugli sto „Srpskohrvatski jezik kao strani"*, Beograd: Institut za strane jezike, 70–74.

**Brborić 2016**: В. Брборић, Настава правописа српског језика у настави за странце, у: В. Крајишник (ур.), *Српски као страни језик у теорији и пракси: тематски зборник радова,* 3, Београд: Филолошки факултет, Центар за српски као страни језик, 115–124.

**Dešić 2016**: М. Дешић, Ортографија и ортоепија у српском као страном језику, у: В. Крајишник (ур.), *Српски као страни језик у теорији и пракси: тематски зборник радова*, 3, Београд: Филолошки факултет, Центар за српски као страни језик, 125–130.

**Dulay/Burt 1974**: Dulay, H. C. & Burt, M. K, Natural sequences in child Second Language Acquisition, *Language Learning*, 24, 23–40.

**Đorđević 2017**: K. Đorđević, Analiza grešaka slovačkih maternjih govornika na početnom nivou učenja srpskog jezika kao stranog, *Studia Balkanica Bohemo-Slovaca*, VII, 691–697.

**Flege 1993**: J. E. Flege, Production and perception of a novel, second language phonetic contrast. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 93(3), 1589–1608.

**Flege: 1995**: J. E. Flege, Second language speech learning: Theory, findings and problems, in: W. Strange (ed.), *Speech perception and linguistic experience: Issues in cross-language speech research*, Timonium MD: York Press, 233–277.

**Grgić/Udier2012**: A. Grgić, S. L. Udier, Pravopisna kompetencija na razini B1 u hrvatskome kao inome jeziku, *LAHOR*, 14(2), 204–220.

**Gussenhoven/Jacobs 1998**: C. Gussenhoven & H. Jacobs, *Understanding Phonology*, London: Edward Arnold.

**Hamada/Koda 2008**: M. Hamada, K. Koda, Influence of First Language Orthographic Experience on Second Language Decoding and Word Learning, *Language Learning*, 58 (1), 1–31.

**Končarević 2004**: К. Кончаревић, *Савремена настава страног језика: садржај, организација, облици*, Београд: Славистичко друштво Србије.

**Krajišnik i dr. 2022**: В. Крајишник, Н. Маринковић, Н. Стрижак, Б. Николић, *Дескриптори за полагање сертификационог испита за ниво А2*, Београд: Филолошки факултет. ‹http://www.learnserbian.fil.bg.ac.rs/files/description/A2%20level%20description%20-%20Serbian.pdf›.5. XII 2023.

**Milošević 2017**: С. Милошевић, Правописне грешке руских говорника при усвајању српског језика, у: М. Ковачевић и Ј. Петковић (ур.), *Савремена проучавања језика и књижевности*, VIII/1, Крагујевац: Филолошко-уметнички факултет,163–170.

**Milovanović/Stojičić 2023**: Ј. Миловановић, В. Стојичић, Ортографске грешке у настави српског као страног, у: В. Крајишник (ур.), *Српски као страни језик у теорији и пракси: тематски зборник радова*, 5, Београд: Филолошки факултет, Центар за српски као страни језик, 147–160.

**Novaković 2023**: А. Новаковић, Анализа грешака ученика из Либије у настави српског као страног језика на Народном универзитету у Крушевцу, *Philologia Mediana*, 15, 537–555.

**Novaković/Jović 2022**: А. Новаковић, Е. Јовић, Анализа и класификација грешака студената из Русије на почетном нивоу учења српског језика као страног, *Philologia Mediana*, 14, 315–340.

**Perišić Arsić 2016**: O. Perišić Arsić, Analiza grešaka u srpskom jeziku kao stranom na primeru italofona, у: В. Крајишник (ур.), *Српски као страни језик у теорији и пракси: тематски зборник радова*, 3, Београд: Филолошки факултет, Центар за српски као страни језик, 155–168.

**Selinker 1969**: L.Selinker, lnterlanguage, *IRAL*, 3, 114–132.

**Sudimac 2020**: N. Sudimac, An analysis of phonetic-phonological and orthographic errors when learning Serbian as a Foreign Language, *Facta Universitatis*, 18(1), 109–118.

**Talebi 2013**: S. H. Talebi, Cross-linguistic Transfer (from L1 to L2, L2 to L1, and L2 to L3) of Reading Strategies in a Multicompetent Mind, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(2), 432–436.

**Touchie 1986**: H. Touchie, Second language learning errors: Their types, causes, and treatment, *JALT Journal*, 8/1, 75–80. ‹https://jalt-publications. org/sites/default/files/pdf-article/art5_8.pdf›.15. XII 2023.

**Zvekić Dušanović 2016**: D. Zvekić-Dušanović, Ortografske greške u srpskom kao nematernjem jeziku, у: В. Крајишник (ур.), *Српски као страни језик у теорији и пракси: тематски зборник радова*, 1, Београд: Филолошки факултет, Центар за српски као страни језик, 131–142.

**Strategic documents**

**2014**: *Стратегија интернационализације Универзитета у Београду*. ‹https:// bg.ac.rs/files/sr/saradnja/Strategija-internacionalizacije.pdf›. 5. XII 2023.

––––––––––––––––

*КОЛИКО ДОБРО ПИШЕШ НА СРПСКОМ?* АНАЛИЗА ОРТОГРАФСКИХ ГРЕШАКА У СРПСКОМ КАО Ј2

Р е з и м е

Када је реч о настави српског као страног језика, од суштинске важности је да страни студенти овладају добро ортографским системом нашега језика што подразумева да још од самога почетка учења морају усвојити оба писма. Због синхроне

диграфије, студенти морају уложити додатни напор како би за релативно кратко вре-ме савладали и ћирилицу и латиницу. Савладавши оба писма, студенти су у стању да прочитају текст написан штампаним словима и могу учествовати у најједноставни-јим комуникативним ситуацијама. На А2 нивоу ЗЕОЈ-а подразумева се да студен-ти странци могу направити дистинкцију међу гласовима српскога језика, као и да их могу написати користећи одговарајуће графеме. Овај рад представља део шире лонгитудиналне студије која се спроводи у раду са студентима из пројекта *Света у Србији* и у њему се анализирају ортографске грешке у настави српског као Ј2. Грешке у усвајању фонетско-фонолошког система српског језика неминовне су код већине говорника који долазе са језичких говорних подручја потпуно различитих од нашег. С тим у вези, овај рад представља покушај да се на једном месту попишу, категоризују и систематизују грешке 201 страног студента, чији су матерњи или језици на којима су се школовали француски, шпански, португалски, енглески, арапски, фарси и сури-намски креолски (таки-таки). Грешке су ексцерпиране из писмених задатка који су студенти полагали након завршеног курса на нивоу А2, а аутори их пореде са онима добијеним у претходној фази истраживања (Миловановић и Стојичић 2023). Резулта-ти указују на то да су неке потешкоће заједничке говорницима различитих језика, док су друге својствене само неким групама. Међутим африкати, фрикативи, фонеме /ʎ/ и /ɲ/, те интервокално /ј/ били су најчешћи узрок ортографских грешака, уз неадекватно сегментирање речи и неконзистентну употребу мајускула.

Закључујући, аутори истичу да је овакав корпус изузетно користан свима онима који се баве наставом српског као страног, а посебно ауторима уџбеника и приручни-ка за учење српског као страног језика будући да пружа увид у потешкоће са којима се суочавају страни студенти приликом усвајања фонетско-фонолошког система нашега језика. Корпус грешака које су категоризоване у овом раду може бити почетна тачка за дидактичке импликације и унапређење овог сегмента наставног процеса.

**Кључне речи:** Српски језик као Ј2, писање, диктат, анализа грешака, ортограф-ска компетенција.

*Војкан Б. Стојичић*
*Јована З. Миловановић*