Crowdsourcing offers the advantage of gathering large quantities of linguistic data from a wide range of localities, without the demanding technical means an equivalent in-person data collection would require. Especially for lesser-spoken minority languages, overcoming geographical and technological barriers to reach speakers is a crucial challenge addressed by crowdsourcing (Leivada et al. 2019). Nevertheless, crowdsourcing comes with the disadvantage of a potentially lower data quality caused by the restricted ability of the researcher to control the data at the source (e.g. noisy or empty recordings, misunderstood instructions...).

Despite the inability to control who exactly is filling an online questionnaire, the question whether crowdsourced data can constitute a reliable and valid source for research on dialects and minority languages has been answered mostly positively in the literature (see e.g. Munro et al. 2010; Braunger et al. 2018; Kruijt 2022; Hilton in press). In this contribution, we aim to compare the realisation of rhotics in South Bavarian dialects spoken in Italy, contrasting two methods (traditional fieldwork vs. crowdsourcing) as well as three moments in time (the late 1960s vs. the late 2000s vs. the 2020s). The former method is represented by the *Tirolischer Sprachatlas* (Klein et al. 1965–1971) and the *Insre Sproch* dialect atlas (Scheutz 2016), the latter by the *VinKo* crowdsourcing project (Rabanus et al. 2014–; Cordin et al. 2018). Since the Tyrolean *VinKo* data predominantly includes contributions from young (female) informants (born around 2000), we can compare the three moments in a diachronic perspective.

The variables compared are:

1. The alveolar vs. uvular realisation of /r/ in onset position, e.g. *learerin*
2. The realisation of /r/ in unstressed coda position after a short vowel, e.g. *wosser*
3. The realisation of /r/ in stressed coda position after a long vowel, e.g. *johr*
4. The realisation of /r/ in stressed coda position before a coronal stop/affricate, e.g. *wirt/wird*

Based on the *Tirolischer Sprachatlas* (Klein et al. 1965–1971), one would expect to find:

1. Uvular /r/ in *Ahrn-, Passeier-, Ulten- and Etschtal* (Plaus ↔ Leifers), alveolar /r/ elsewhere
2./3. Vocalisation to /o/ in *Ahrn- and Pustertal*, audible alveolar/uvular (cf. 1) realisation elsewhere; syllable-bearing devoiced /r̩/ in *Vinschgau*
4. *Idem*, but with rhotic assimilation before coronal stops/affricates in *Wipp- and Pustertal*

If the crowdsourcing method is valid, we expect to find all these previously attested realisations and their geographical distribution reflected faithfully in the crowdsourcing data. A possible ‘invalidity’ of the data is that speakers could tend to ‘standardise’ their dialect input because of ‘standard-German-prompting’ biases (e.g. *VinKo* website in standard German). On the other hand, one could expect data comparable to that of traditional fieldwork methods, to the extent that the prompt words are written in the dialect and the whole purpose of the task is explicitly stated in the instructions to be about dialects.

From a systematic examination of the data, it **results** that the realisations are indeed found where expected in the crowdsourced data. With respect to diachrony, we observe in accordance with Scheutz (2016) that specific linguistic variables have gained/lost ground compared to their 1960s distribution, and we additionally observe the further expansion of some developments he reports:
1. Spread of uvular /r/, with alveolar /r/ only found in 4 VinKo informants out of 76 (Kardaun, Leifers, Graun and Mals), whose average age is 1.4x higher than that of the other informants.

2./3. Vocalisation to /o/ lost ground compared to TSA data but resurfaces as [ɔ] at places in Pustertal where Scheutz reports its disappearance; vocalisation in general extended across the entire East of South Tyrol (Sterzing ↔ Bozen), with VinKo findings overlapping accurately with what Scheutz reports but with additional incursions (e.g. Meran); /r/ as expected in Graun and Mals.

4. In accordance with Scheutz, loss of assimilated rhotics (/rʃt/) in Brenner, Bruneck, Lüsen, Olang, Sand, Ratschings but in contrast with Scheutz, further loss of /rʃt/ in Terenten and complete disappearance of /rʃt/ outside Pustertal (except in Graun).
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