

VULNERABLE AND ENDANGERED LANGUAGES IN EUROPE

Editors:

Annemarie Sorescu-Marinković
Mirjana Ćorković
Mirjana Mirić



Institute for Balkan Studies, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade
Belgrade, 2025



VULNERABLE AND ENDANGERED LANGUAGES IN EUROPE

Publishers:

Institute for Balkan Studies, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Knez Mihailova 35/IV, 11000 Belgrade
Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade
Studentski trg 3, 11000 Belgrade

Editors:

Annemarie Sorescu-Marinković, Institute for Balkan Studies SASA
Mirjana Ćorković, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade
Mirjana Mirić, Institute for Balkan Studies SASA

For the publishers:

Vojislav G. Pavlović, Director of the Institute for Balkan Studies SASA
Iva Draškić Vićanović, Dean of the Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade

ISBN 978-86-7179-127-4

https://doi.org/10.18485/vlings_vele.2025

VULNERABLE AND ENDANGERED LANGUAGES IN EUROPE

Editors:

Annemarie Sorescu-Marinković

Mirjana Ćorković

Mirjana Mirić



Institute for Balkan Studies, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade
Belgrade, 2025

Reviewers:

Ionuț Geană
Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest
Romanian Academy's "Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics

Ljudmila Popović
Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade
Munich Ukrainian Free University
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad

Andrey Sobolev
Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute for Linguistic Research
Philipps University Marburg

Editorial board:

Cosmina-Maria Berindei
Romanian Academy's "Sextil Pușcariu" Institute of Linguistics and Literary History

Alberto Giudici
University of Teacher Education of Grisons / University of Zurich

Thede Kahl
University of Jena, Institute of Slavonic Languages and Caucasus Studies

Giulia Meli
University of Milan, Department of Literary Studies, Philology and Linguistics

Maja Miličević Petrović
University of Bologna, Department of Interpretation and Translation

Motoki Nomachi
Hokkaido University, Slavic-Eurasian Research Center

Antonio Oštarić
University of Zadar, Centre for Foreign Languages

Stefana Paunović Rodić
Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade

Fernando Sanchez Miret
Faculty of Philology, University of Salamanca

Tomasz Wicherkiewicz
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Department of Language Policy and Minority Studies

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The publication of this volume was supported by the Science Fund of the Republic of Serbia through the project “Vulnerable Languages and Linguistic Varieties in Serbia”, grant number 7736100, within the program IDEAS (2022–2024). The funding was provided through the Budget of the Republic of Serbia and the World Bank project – Serbia Accelerating Innovation and Entrepreneurship Project (SAIGE).

This edited volume is the result of the project “Vulnerable Languages and Linguistic Varieties in Serbia” (acronym: VLingS), whose principal investigator is Annemarie Sorescu-Marinković. The core of the present volume consists of papers presented at the International Conference *Vulnerable and Endangered Languages in Europe*, organised by the members of the VLingS project at the University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philology, on October 2–4, 2024. Two chapters are written by authors who did not participate in the conference but were interested in the topic and willing to contribute.

The editors would like to express their gratitude to the Institute for Balkan Studies of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts and the Faculty of Philology of the University of Belgrade for including this volume in their publication plan and for their generous support during the editing process. We are very grateful to the reviewers of the volume and the anonymous peer-reviewers of individual chapters for carefully reading the manuscripts and offering invaluable suggestions, which greatly contributed to the quality of this book.

The editors would also like to extend their gratitude to the contributors to this volume for sharing their original and valuable research, who take legal and moral responsibility for the ideas expressed in the texts.

The editors take sole responsibility for any technical shortcomings of the publication.



CONTENTS

Annemarie Sorescu-Marinković, Mirjana Ćorković, Mirjana Mirić

What the European Vulnerable and Endangered Languages Tell Us. An Editors' Introduction — 9

I. VULNERABLE LANGUAGES WITHIN TRANSNATIONAL FRAMEWORKS

Eva Duran Eppler, Gisela Hagmair, Violeta Heinze, Marie-Therese Sauer

The RISE UP Project with a Focus on Cross-Border Aspects of the Use and Position of Aromanian — 23

Anthony Hoyte-West

Full EU Status for Irish: An Overview of Selected Media Coverage — 61

Giustina Selvelli

Endangered Languages and Environmental Degradation among Minority Communities in Europe: An Ecological Perspective — 83

II. CRITICALLY ENDANGERED VARIETIES WITHIN NATIONAL FRAMEWORKS

Marija Runić, Rossella Montibeler, Pavel Falaleev

Štivoroto: A Lost Story of a Language Loss — 115

Neda Pons

Exploring the Sociolinguistic Landscape of Ladino in Contemporary Serbia — 139

Anđela Babić

The Vulnerability of Banat Bulgarian in Serbia. An Overview — 177

III. SPEAKERS' IDENTITY, DOCUMENTATION AND VARIATION OF VULNERABLE LANGUAGES

Monica Huțanu

Documenting a Vulnerable Language from Within: Dictionaries in Vlach Romanian — 213

Marko Simonović

Stable Variation and Language Change in Written Fiuman — 237

Mirjana Mirić

*When Two Roma Communities Meet: Consequences
for the Vulnerability of Romani in the Belgrade Suburb of Batajnica* — 261

Annemarie Sorescu-Marinković

*A Long-Lasting Asymmetry between
Ethnicity and Mother Tongue: The Vlachs of Eastern Serbia* — 291

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY OF (POTENTIALLY) VULNERABLE LANGUAGES

Dušan Vlajić, Valentina Sokolovska

*Sampling within the Project
“Vulnerable Languages and Linguistic Varieties in Serbia”* — 317

**Mirjana Mirić, Annemarie Sorescu-Marinković, Valentina Sokolovska, Dušan
Vlajić, Anđela Babić, Mirjana Ćorković, Svetlana Ćirković, Stefana Paunović
Rodić, Dalibor Sokolović, Neda Pons, Maja Miličević Petrović, Janko Ramač**
VLingS Questionnaire 1.0 — 337

Mirjana Mirić¹, Annemarie Sorescu-Marinković¹, Valentina Sokolovska², Dušan Vlajić³, Anđela Babić¹, Mirjana Ćorković⁴, Svetlana Ćirković¹, Stefana Paunović Rodić⁴, Dalibor Sokolović⁴, Neda Pons, Maja Miličević Petrović⁵, Janko Ramać^{†2}

¹ Institute for Balkan Studies, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts

² University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Philosophy

³ University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy

⁴ University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philology

⁵ University of Bologna, Department of Interpretation and Translation

VLINGS QUESTIONNAIRE 1.0

Abstract: The chapter describes the process of creating the sociolinguistic *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0*, aimed at assessing the levels of language endangerment or vulnerability of several minority linguistic varieties spoken in Serbia (Aromanian, Banat Bulgarian, Bayash Romanian, Ladino, Megleno-Romanian, Romani, Vlach, Vojvodina Rusyn). We outline the rationale behind developing this sociolinguistic instrument, as well as the criteria for selecting the linguistic varieties to which the questionnaire was applied during fieldwork. The chapter elaborates on the pilot and main versions of the questionnaire and provides details about the fieldwork. It includes the English translation of the questionnaire originally created and administered in Serbian and explains the adjustments made. We also present the research conducted thus far using the data from the questionnaire, as well as its possible applications to assess the levels of language endangerment of various languages spoken worldwide.

Keywords: sociolinguistic questionnaire, Serbia, endangered languages, vulnerable languages, fieldwork

* Corresponding author: Mirjana Mirić. Contact information is given in the Authors' details at the end of the chapter.

1. Introduction

This chapter aims to present the process of creating the sociolinguistic questionnaire titled *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0* and describe the specific context in which it was developed. The questionnaire was designed within the project “Vulnerable Languages and Linguistic Varieties in Serbia” (VLingS) to assess the vulnerability or endangerment of several minority varieties spoken in Serbia (see the Introduction in this volume). Although originally written in Serbian and designed to address the linguistic specificities of particular minority communities in Serbia, the questionnaire was translated into English (see Appendix) and can easily be adapted to assess the levels of vitality or endangerment of numerous other languages spoken worldwide.

In the remainder of the Introduction, we outline the rationale behind creating this kind of sociolinguistic instrument and explain the criteria for selecting the linguistic varieties under study. This is followed by a brief overview of the pilot *VLingS Questionnaire 0.0* and the pilot fieldwork conducted to test it. Section 2 details the process of developing the main version, *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0*, the subsequent field data collection, and the creation of the final database. The adjustments made for the English translation are also described. Section 3 focuses on the application of the questionnaire in assessing language endangerment. In Section 4, we briefly overview the research conducted so far using the data from the pilot and main versions of the questionnaire. The last two sections discuss challenges and outline future desiderata.

1.1. Why do we need another sociolinguistic instrument for assessing language vulnerability?

Several international databases, such as the UNESCO *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* (Moseley 2010), *Ethnologue* (Lewis, Simons & Fenning 2013), and *Endangered Languages Project* (ELP), already offer valuable information on the levels of endangerment of languages spoken worldwide, including those in Serbia. However, with regard to languages spoken in Serbia, these databases differ significantly in several aspects:

- a) The specific languages that are classified as endangered;
- b) The exact levels of endangerment ascribed to particular languages;
- c) The estimated number of speakers;

d) The sources of data.¹

Available before the development of the pilot *VLingS Questionnaire 0.0* began, in 2022, the earlier version of the UNESCO *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* (Moseley 2010) listed five minority languages as endangered in Serbia: Aromanian, Banat Bulgarian, Romani, and Vojvodina Rusyn as “definitely endangered” and Judezmo as “severely endangered” (see Sorescu-Marinković, Mirić & Ćirković 2020 for details). Among these languages, only Romani and Rusyn had the status of minority languages in Serbia, according to the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ratified in 2005). In contrast, the current online version of the UNESCO *World Atlas of Languages*² registers four minority languages spoken in Serbia—Bosnian, Hungarian, Romani, and Slovak—used alongside Serbian, the official country wide language. This information is said to be based on data from the 2011 Census of the Republic of Serbia. Of these languages, Bosnian and Hungarian are classified as “safe”, while Romani and Slovak are classified as “potentially vulnerable”. Except for Romani, whose status changed between the two versions of the database, the previously identified endangered languages are not currently listed as spoken in Serbia. Aromanian is now reported as spoken only in Albania, Bulgaria, and North Macedonia and classified as “definitely endangered” in all three countries. Rusyn is reported as spoken in Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, and Czechia, being classified as “endangered/unsafe”. Ladino is classified as “potentially vulnerable”, but without listing the countries in which it is spoken. Banat Bulgarian is not mentioned at all.

The *Endangered Languages Project*,³ whose findings were also available prior to the development of the pilot *VLingS Questionnaire 0.0*, listed seven endangered languages in Serbia: Aromanian, Balkan Romani, Baltic Romani, Carpathian Romani, Ladino, Sinte Romani, Vlax Romani (see Sorescu-Marinković, Mirić & Ćirković 2020 for details). However, the currently

¹ For a comprehensive overview of the scales of endangerment and existing international inventories, with a particular focus on the problematic classification of languages spoken in Serbia, see Sorescu-Marinković, Mirić & Ćirković (2020).

² The beta version of the UNESCO *Atlas* across countries is available at: <https://en.wal.unesco.org/#countries> and across languages at: <https://en.wal.unesco.org/#languages>. Accessed August 28, 2024.

³ Available at: <https://www.endangeredlanguages.com/lang/country>. Accessed August 28, 2024.

available interactive map features only one language—Balkan Romani—located in the territory of Kosovo and classified as “at risk”.⁴ In addition to erroneously labelling vulnerable or endangered languages actually spoken in Serbia, the ELP list incorrectly places Carpathian and Baltic Romani in Serbia.

The 23rd edition of the *Ethnologue*, released in 2020, listed 24 languages as spoken in Serbia, none of which was classified as endangered (Sorescu-Marinković, Mirić & Ćirković 2020). In contrast, the 27th edition of the *Ethnologue*,⁵ released in 2024, registers “9 living indigenous languages in Serbia”: Serbian as the official language of the state, Bulgarian, Gheg Albanian, Hungarian, and Ruthenian as “institutional” languages, along with Balkan Romani, Romano-Serbian, and Sinte Romani, all classified as “stable”.⁶ It also includes Serbian Sign Language (though erroneously linked to the information on Slovenian Sign Language). An additional 13 non-indigenous languages are mentioned but with no specifics. Many other minority languages spoken in Serbia, officially recognized or not, are not included in this database.

In summary, international databases of endangered languages not only differ in their content, but also fall short of providing precise and comprehensive information on the listed varieties. Despite significant improvements in recent years, the data specific to Serbia remains insufficient or inaccurate, and the sources of this information are often outdated or not listed. Hence, we decided to develop our own instrument to identify which languages are vulnerable or endangered in Serbia and gather relevant data to estimate their endangerment levels. More importantly, we believe that data collected in the field directly from the members of the linguistic communities provide a more accurate image of language endangerment.

It should be highlighted that the existing databases emphasise the number of speakers or intergenerational language transmission as the main criteria for assessing endangerment levels. These databases often rely on widely used methods and scales, such as the Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) (Fishman 1991), the Extended Graded Intergenerational

⁴ Available at: <https://www.endangeredlanguages.com/#/4/43.300/-2.104/0/100000/0/low/mid/high/unknown>. Accessed August 28, 2024.

⁵ Available at: <https://www.ethnologue.com/country/RS/>. Accessed August 28, 2024.

⁶ It is noteworthy that the Romano-Serbian variety does not feature in any of the relevant linguistic classifications of Romani varieties, see Matras 2002, Elšik & Beníšek 2020.

Disruption Scale (EGIDS) (Lewis & Simons 2010), the Language Vitality Index (Brenzinger et al. 2003), Degrees of Language Endangerment (Krauss 2008), or the Language Endangerment Index (LEI) (Lee & van Way 2016). Although these scales aim to be comprehensive, they do not account for the specific sociolinguistic contexts of individual linguistic communities in particular countries.

The *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0* presented in this chapter stands apart from various linguistic questionnaires that address language background, experience, and proficiency. We will overview the most widely used ones.

The Bilingual Language Profile (BLP)⁷ (Birdsong, Gertken & Amengual 2012) is a self-report questionnaire designed to assess language dominance in bilingual speakers. It is available for numerous language pairs, such as English-Arabic, Spanish-Catalan, and French-Portuguese. The BLP considers various linguistic variables, including the language history of the bilingual speaker, language use, language proficiency, and language attitudes. Respondents are asked to provide numeric answers to questions, such as the age when they started learning the two languages, the number of years they spent in environments where the languages are spoken, and the cumulative percentages of language use in different domains across different languages. They also evaluate their proficiency and language attitude statements using scales. While the BLP is a valuable tool for assessing language background and is widely used in studies of bilingualism, it can be challenging for speakers with limited education due to the demanding format and the extensive information required.

The Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q)⁸ (Marian, Blumenfeld & Kaushanskaya 2007, 2020) is an important tool for assessing self-reported proficiency levels in bilingual and multilingual speakers, which has been translated into over 20 languages. It is designed to help researchers provide a comprehensive description of their bilingual participants. The LEAP-Q covers self-reported proficiency, learning milestones, immersion duration, factors contributing to language learning/acquisition, extent of exposure, and self-reported foreign accent.

Further, the Language History Questionnaire (LHQ 2.0) (Li et al. 2014) is a web-based tool intended for researchers to collect data on the language history of participants in different studies. It includes questions about the

⁷ Available at: <https://sites.la.utexas.edu/bilingual/>. Accessed September 7, 2024.

⁸ Available at: <https://bilingualism.northwestern.edu/leapq/>. Accessed September 7, 2024.

participants' language history (e.g. age of second language acquisition and length of second language education), self-rated first and second language proficiency, and language usage in the home environment. It is web-based, so it cannot be used in linguistic communities whose members are illiterate or without internet access.

The Language and Social Background Questionnaire (Anderson et al. 2018) is an instrument developed to assess the degree of bilingualism for young adults who live in diverse communities in which English is the official language. As relevant factors for describing the degree of bilingualism, the authors emphasize the extent of non-English language proficiency and use at home and non-English language use socially. The LSBQ includes three sections: Social Background, containing questions on demographic information; Linguistic Background, containing questions regarding self-rated proficiency across different skills or frequency of use of each language; and Community Language Use Behaviour, exploring language use in different life stages and specific contexts. It is an invaluable tool for research on the cognitive consequences of bilingualism and is especially relevant for research of understudied communities. However, the purpose of this instrument is not to assess the endangerment level or cover various aspects or domains of language usage.

Although valuable, these instruments focus on individual speakers or homogenous bilingual groups and are not intended for assessing the language background of entire communities. Furthermore, they are not specifically designed to address the specificities or needs of minoritised or endangered communities. Overall, their scopes are different, and they cannot be used to investigate language endangerment or vulnerability.

Therefore, we developed our own tool – the sociolinguistic *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0*. While it shares many characteristics with the aforementioned questionnaires and targets the same features as international databases of language endangerment, it also addresses the unique characteristics of several different communities in Serbia and considers various sociolinguistic aspects and domains of language use. In order to identify possibly vulnerable languages and linguistic varieties, we thoroughly explored the literature on officially recognized and unrecognized minority languages in Serbia and drew on our own knowledge and extensive fieldwork experience in working with different minority communities across the country. The questionnaire was applied selectively to the members of

these communities only. It is not designed to single out vulnerable varieties from a pool of languages spoken in a certain territory.

1.2. Selecting the linguistic communities

The latest Evaluation Report on Serbia, from March 17, 2023, by the Committee of Experts of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, which entered into force in Serbia in 2006, applies to 15 minority languages: Albanian, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Bunjevac, Croatian, Czech, German, Hungarian, Macedonian, Romani, Romanian, Ruthenian, Slovak, Ukrainian, and Vlach.⁹ Further, the 2022 Serbian population census registers 17 languages in use in Serbia: Albanian, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Bunjevac, Croatian, Czech, Hungarian, Macedonian, Montenegrin, Romani, Romanian, Russian, Rusyn, Slovak, Slovene, Vlach, and Ukrainian, which are spoken alongside Serbian as the state language.¹⁰ However, given that the census does not allow for flexibility in expressing one's linguistic identity, it cannot be exhaustive. The same holds for the Charter, as it mainly relies on national legislation. Therefore, the selection of target varieties for which the data on language endangerment would be collected through the questionnaire was not based on the lists of languages mentioned above. We decided to focus on the following linguistic varieties in Serbia: Aromanian, Banat Bulgarian, Bayash Romanian, Ladino, Megleno-Romanian, Romani, Vlach, and Vojvodina Rusyn, of which only the last three are officially recognised minority languages.¹¹

In the process of selection, we followed several criteria. First, we relied on the information available in the aforementioned international databases and selected varieties already classified as vulnerable or endangered to a certain extent, aiming to verify the estimated endangerment levels and provide more accurate data. This applied to Aromanian, Banat Bulgarian, Ladino, Romani, and Vojvodina Rusyn communities. Second, we included three Romance varieties (Bayash Romanian, Megleno-Romanian, and

⁹ Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/serbia-ecrml5-en/1680ab8322>. Accessed September 4, 2024.

¹⁰ The Census 2022 also list the category "Other languages". Available at: <https://popis2022.stat.gov.rs/en-US/5-vestisaopstenja/news-events/20230616-st/?a=0&s=0>. Accessed November 21, 2024.

¹¹ For a description of all varieties and the numbers of speakers according to the most recent 2022 Census, see Mirić, Sokolovska & Sorescu-Marinković 2024.

Vlach), mainly based on the direct fieldwork experience and insider knowledge of the linguists involved in the project, which suggested that these varieties could be treated at least as vulnerable. Finally, we aimed to ensure that at least one expert for each of the varieties would be working in the project team.

Our previous interactions with the studied communities showed that their members are predominantly bilingual or multilingual. However, language usage trends vary among them, with some not speaking the minority language at all. Therefore, our project included both fluent speakers of the language and those who have completely shifted to Serbian as their primary language. This allowed us to obtain a more realistic picture of language endangerment in Serbia.

2. VLingS Questionnaire

2.1. The pilot *VLingS Questionnaire 0.0*

Before developing the main version of the questionnaire titled *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0*, we created a pilot version, *VLingS Questionnaire 0.0*. The pilot version included 190 questions and subquestions divided into 16 sections (for more details, see Mirić, Sokolovska & Sorescu-Marinković 2024). Since the sections remained unchanged in the main version, we will describe them, along with the methodology, data storage, and other relevant details, in the next section.

The purpose of the pilot version was to test a subset of questions intended to assess language vulnerability in the studied linguistic communities. Both the pilot and main questionnaires feature original questions developed by the project team, except for the demographic questions found in the final section or those that commonly feature in many sociolinguistic questionnaires, e.g. the age of acquisition or domains of language usage. The pilot questionnaire was administered during fieldwork in 2022 across 26 urban and rural settlements in Serbia, with a total of 158 respondents participating in the pilot study (for details about the pilot sample, see Mirić, Sokolovska & Sorescu-Marinković 2024). The data collected were entered into a database specifically created for the purposes of the project. Based on the data analysis, researchers' experience in administering the questionnaire,

and general feedback from respondents during the pilot fieldwork, the questionnaire was condensed and revised to produce the main version.

2.2. The main *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0*

The main version of the questionnaire includes 151 questions and subquestions divided into the following 16 sections (see Appendix for the English translation of the questionnaire):

I General data about linguonyms and language usage

- Gathering information about each target language (e.g. linguonym(s) in the variety itself and Serbian), all languages that the respondents use, their mother tongue and first language, their self-assessed proficiency in the production and comprehension of the target language, frequency of language usage, and language use in the family.

II Data about language acquisition and intergenerational language transmission

- Collecting data about the age and sociolinguistic conditions of language acquisition of the target language and Serbian, language transmission to younger generations in the family, and the respondents' estimate of the endangerment level of the target variety (based on a given response scale).

III Domains of language usage

- Investigating the frequency of the target language usage across various formal and informal language domains or with particular persons and across different topics or non-communicative uses of target languages, i.e. inner speech.

IV Literacy

- Inquiring whether respondents can read and write in the target language and Serbian and how frequently they employ both languages in reading and writing across various formats.

V Education

- Gathering information on the use of the target language and Serbian in schools, either as the primary language of instruction, as an optional school subject, or as a language taught outside of school.

VI Institutional support and linguistic landscape

- Exploring the possibility of using the target language in the public space and the existence of publicly visible signage and inscriptions.

VII Publications in the given language

- Gathering data on the type/genre and availability of publications in each of the included linguistic varieties.

VIII Media

- Eliciting information on the use of the target language in various types of media and the respondents' personal experience with them.

IX Religious service

- Asking about the use of the target language in the religious services or their parts.

X Cultural events

- Collecting data on the existence of cultural events and manifestations dedicated to a particular community or a target language.

XI Language level self-assessment

- Asking respondents to self-evaluate their linguistic competence in the target language and Serbian on a five-point scale across language comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing skills.

XII Respondents' feelings towards own language

- Exploring the respondents' feelings and attitudes towards their target language and Serbian.

XIII Ethnic and cultural identity

- Focusing on the importance of the target language for each respondent personally and for the (cultural) identity of a given community.

XIV Language maintenance and revitalisation

- Inquiring about the existence of activities that focus on the maintenance or revitalisation of the target language and their relevance for the respondents.

XV Demographic information about the respondent

- Collecting personal information such as age, gender, marital status, national and religious identity, education, employment, and place of birth and residence (the respondents' identity in the database is hidden).

XVI Final remarks

- Offering the respondents an opportunity to add any information they believe may be relevant or give their contact details to the researchers if they want to.

The sections in the questionnaire are numbered continuously using Roman numerals, while questions within each section are numbered with Arabic numerals, starting with question number 1 in each section. The questionnaire predominantly included closed-ended questions (usually multiple-choice questions or rating scales), with a few open-ended questions.

It is important to note that the questionnaire used the appropriate linguonym for the target language in each linguistic community encompassed by the project in every question where it was mentioned. For example, the question was phrased as “When did you start learning Bayash Romanian?” for the Bayash community, while for the Vlach community, it was formulated as “When did you start learning Vlach?” The following linguonyms were used throughout the questionnaire: *cincarski* “Aromanian”, *palčanski* “Banat Bulgarian”, *banjaški rumunski* “Bayash Romanian”, *ladino* “Ladino”, *megleno-rumunski* “Megleno-Romanian”, *romski* “Romani”, *rusinski* “Rusyn”, and *vlaški* “Vlach”. The final versions of the *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0* created for the eight varieties included in the project are available in PDF format in the OSF repository: https://osf.io/dm2pc/?view_only=8a36f0c1b7e74e7a8283c314b43fdee5 and on the project’s website: <https://vlings.rs/materials/assessing-language-vulnerability/>.

The questions are designed to gather information based on respondents’ personal experiences with the linguistic varieties under study. While many of the aforementioned questionnaires cover similar domains, our questions were tailored to also address the specific characteristics of the linguistic communities in question. Additionally, we considered the language policy and planning of the Republic of Serbia, as well as its legislative framework.

For instance, the section “Education” included several specific questions based on the existing information on education in minority languages available through three different modules according to Serbian legislation (for details, see Mandić 2024 and Mirić, forthcoming), including language classes in the form of an optional subject called “Mother tongue with elements of national culture” taught at different education levels. Furthermore, the section “Domains of language usage” underwent significant

revisions after pilot fieldwork. It eliminated questions that proved irrelevant in the Serbian context and incorporated new questions about language use for non-communicative purposes, such as thinking, praying, or dreaming, which were suggested by respondents during the pilot interviews.

In some of the questions, the respondents were asked to compare their experience in their minority language to their experience in Serbian, e.g. “How often do you read in Romani?” vs. “How often do you read in Serbian?” These questions allowed for comparisons important from the perspective of actual language usage. Without including Serbian as a reference, it would have been difficult to determine whether a lower frequency of reading in a minority language is due to the respondents’ generally low reading habits or if it was specific to their usage of the minority language.

Before creating the questionnaire, we knew that education, media, publications, religious services, and various cultural events or official signage exist in many of the varieties under study. Our goal was to gather information on whether individuals from minority communities have witnessed language use in these domains, whether they are aware of it, whether they employ their language in certain domains, and if so, to what extent.

2.2.1. Data collection and storage

The questionnaire was administered during the main fieldwork (2023) in face-to-face interviews conducted in Serbian. We chose this oral in-person methodology in order to include as many respondents as possible from diverse linguistic, literacy, educational, and socioeconomic backgrounds (see also Section 4.1). As for the language choice, we opted for Serbian as the language of the questionnaire for several reasons. First, all respondents speak Serbian as the official language, but not all of them speak the minority language of their community. By choosing Serbian, we ensured methodological consistency in data acquisition. Second, many of the varieties under study lack widely accepted standardised forms and professional translators or proofreaders, which would have made translating the questionnaire into these languages impractical or even impossible. A translation attempt could also potentially lead to misunderstandings, given the dialectal heterogeneity characteristic of some languages encompassed by the study, e.g. Romani.

The questionnaire was administered in the linguistic communities either by researchers, i.e. project members who are experts in specific varieties, or by language consultants who are members of the linguistic communities under study. Before fieldwork began, the project members organised training sessions for the language consultants, as many had little or no prior experience in linguistic fieldwork. Our previous fieldwork experience revealed that without the assistance of language consultants, it would be impossible to collect a substantial amount of data in large or dispersed communities such as Vlach, Romani, or Bayash Romanian.

Before the interviews, all respondents signed a consent form informing them about the aims of the project, the participating institutions, and the anonymity and protection of their identity. There was no remuneration for participation. Respondents could withdraw at any moment during the interviews, and their responses were later discarded. In addition, the respondents could decline to answer any of the questions in the questionnaire, including those in the demographic section. However, this rarely happened during fieldwork.

Each interview lasted approximately 30 minutes, though the duration varied depending on the amount of additional information the respondents wanted to provide. After the completion of the questionnaire, the collected data were anonymised, and each respondent was assigned a unique code that included information on the particular variety they speak, the respondent's age category and gender, the researcher's initials, and the recording number. The answers to the questionnaire were recorded in audio format and stored in the Digital Archive of the Institute for Balkan Studies, in a dedicated VLingS Archive under a unique code.

The questionnaire was administered in 55 rural and urban settlements to 686 respondents (for sample information, see Vlajić & Sokolovska, this volume).¹² Members of all communities encompassed by the project took part in both the pilot and the main phase of the study, except for those from the Megleno-Romanian community. Although the presence of a tiny community of speakers of Megleno-Romanian in Serbia was noted in the 2010s (Sorescu-Marinković & Măran 2016), the pilot phase of the project included only one passive speaker, and the main phase included none. Thus, we determined that there are no living speakers of Megleno-Romanian and that, to the best of our knowledge, this language is now extinct in Serbia.

¹² For the locations covered in the main fieldwork, see the map available on the project's website: <https://vlings.rs/map/>. Accessed August 28, 2024.

2.2.2. VLingS Database

After the data were collected during fieldwork, they were entered into a database specifically created for the project using the SPSS software. In the database, each question from the questionnaire was defined as a separate variable, either nominal or scale, to facilitate future statistical analyses. Following the initial data entry, conducted manually by researchers and consultants, the database was checked multiple times for errors, which were subsequently corrected. The final version of the database is available only to the project members.

2.2.3. The English translation of the *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0*

As previously mentioned, the questionnaire was created and administered in Serbian. An English translation is provided in the Appendix. A few notes are necessary regarding some English equivalents used in the translation.

Firstly, the linguonyms referring to specific varieties (see Section 2.2) in the original versions of the questionnaires have been replaced with the phrases “your language” and “my language” in the English version. This substitution was made to facilitate the adaptation of the questionnaire to other languages. However, for future adaptations, we recommend using the actual linguonym in the questions, as the phrase “your language” could be ambiguous and potentially cover more than one language for some bilingual and multilingual respondents. Moreover, some linguistic varieties may not be officially recognized as languages but are considered dialects or vernaculars, which is another reason to avoid using the term “language” in the questionnaire.

Secondly, in the English version, we chose to retain the term “Serbian” instead of using phrases like “the state/official language” or “the majority language.” This decision was made because some countries may have multiple official or majority languages. Additionally, in multilingual contexts, it may be more appropriate to use other languages for comparisons rather than the official language or majority language. Furthermore, the reference to Serbia as a country was kept in the English version for two reasons. Firstly, using the phrase “in your country” would require more space, which is already limited. Secondly, the questionnaire can be employed in other geographical areas or regions and is not solely applicable to countries.

The technical adaptation of the questionnaire includes using lowercase letters for question formulations, whereas the original version used uppercase. Additionally, the English version is formatted differently from the original to align with the formatting requirements of this volume.

Finally, some questions were adapted to sound more natural in English, which involved not only rephrasing but also omitting certain words from the original questions. Nevertheless, the original meaning was in no way altered.

3. How can the *VLingS Questionnaire* be used to assess language vulnerability or endangerment?

The ongoing studies applying the *VLingS Questionnaire* focus on comparing linguistic varieties within specific language usage domains or exploring a particular variety across these domains (see Section 4). However, only a handful of studies has tried to assess the levels of endangerment for certain languages, such as the paper by Ćirković and Mirić (forthcoming) on the Romani variety spoken in an eastern Serbian town or the chapters in this volume by Pons, Mirić and Babić.

Typically, scales of endangerment aim to establish universal criteria for evaluating languages. For instance, the Language Endangerment Index – LEI (Lee & van Way 2016), a tool for the quantitative assessment of language endangerment, employs a formula to establish the level of endangerment: $\text{Level of endangerment} = \{[(\text{intergenerational transmission score} \times 2) + \text{absolute number of speakers score} + \text{speaker number trends score} + \text{domains of use score}] / \text{total possible score based on number of factors used}\} \times 100$ (Lee & van Way 2016: 285). Each of the four factors in the formula is rated on a scale from 0 to 5, and the aggregate score is calculated as a percentage, resulting in the following levels within each factor and overall: *safe*, *vulnerable*, *threatened*, *endangered*, *severely endangered*, and *critically endangered*. It is noteworthy that none of those factors can be taken separately. This also holds for the Language Vitality Index (Brenzinger et al. 2003), which served as the basis for the UNESCO *Atlas*.

Unlike the LEI, the *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0* is not intended for quantitative measurement of endangerment levels. While various statistical analyses and correlations between different variables in the database can be

performed, the primary goal of the questionnaire is to provide a thorough qualitative assessment of each linguistic community individually. Different varieties can be further compared, but only within particular sections of the questionnaire or across particular domains of language usage. The greatest advantage of our questionnaire is that it covers numerous factors presented across different sections, allowing for their in-depth intersection in the analyses. Nevertheless, one could go a step further and develop a scale of language vulnerability/endangerment based on the questionnaire.

The criterion of intergenerational language transmission, as presented in the second section of the questionnaire, is clearly the most crucial factor in determining levels of endangerment (see also Section 1.1). If no children are acquiring the language, the language is inevitably endangered. If there are no speakers left, the language is considered extinct. However, if responses to questions about language maintenance and revitalisation indicate that the majority of members of a particular minority community are interested in activities to preserve or revive the language, this should be viewed as a potential factor in improving its status. The responses from the questionnaire could also be accompanied by fieldwork in the local communities to explore their actual engagement in language maintenance.

Furthermore, linguistic varieties can have different statuses and be vulnerable to varying degrees depending on whether they are spoken in urban and rural areas or even across different locations. For instance, the Romani language can be transmitted to younger generations in a small town, while the members of the Roma community could have experienced a complete language shift to Serbian in some larger cities. Therefore, assessments should focus on individual linguistic varieties spoken in different regions, such as villages, towns, and municipalities.

In some communities, language use can vary depending on the type of communication (formal or informal) or specific domains. A language might be transmitted to children, used within the family, and employed in informal settings, yet it could be noticeably absent from education, media, or literary works. Conversely, a language might be officially present in formal domains due to legislation, but speakers may be unaware of available opportunities or choose not to use it for various reasons, such as the perception of language prestige. Researchers can only suggest the level of endangerment by integrating responses from all sections of the questionnaire and considering the full range of language use within the community. It is not just a matter

of whether education, media, publications, religious service, or cultural events exist in the given language, but whether the members of minority communities are familiar with them and whether they avail themselves of these opportunities.

Introducing specific labels for endangerment levels has clear advantages, such as enabling the comparison of languages on a universal scale and identifying those that require targeted preservation or revitalisation measures. However, we believe that the scale should be more nuanced than it typically is in databases and should also be adaptable as needed since languages vary across many dimensions beyond those commonly accounted for. Based on our experience with the data from international databases and fieldwork in eight minority communities in Serbia, we do not object to using the following labels for endangerment levels: *safe*, *vulnerable*, *endangered*, *critically endangered*, and *extinct*. However, some of these labels can also be preceded by the adverb “potentially” based on the researcher’s experience with the given community.

4. Ongoing research based on the *VLingS Questionnaire 0.0* and *1.0*

Instead of listing numerous possible applications of the questionnaire, in this section, we provide a brief overview of selected ongoing research within our project based on data offered by the pilot and the main version of the questionnaire. Firstly, several chapters in this volume deal with specific varieties, such as Banat Bulgarian (Babić), Ladino (Pons), Romani (Mirić), and Vlach (Sorescu-Marinković). In addition, several other articles have been published or submitted to date, and numerous conference presentations have been delivered, presenting the results of data analyses based on the questionnaire.

In their paper on the concept of “mother tongue”, Mirić, Sokolovska and Sorescu-Marinković (2024) explore the meanings that bilingual and multilingual speakers from various minority communities in Serbia attach to the term. The authors analyse the responses to the open-ended question “What does the concept ‘mother tongue’ mean to you?” from the pilot version of the questionnaire. The study reveals that members of the linguistic communities under study perceive the concept as more heterogeneous than generally assumed, referring to the language learned first, the language used

most frequently, the language learned from the mother or other family and household members, the language of the community, or the language of culture and identity.

Differences between linguistic communities are also the topic of several conference presentations. In their study based on the pilot questionnaire, Sorescu-Marinković and Vlajić (2024) investigate the respondents' answers to the questions from the section "Language maintenance and revitalisation" and show that speakers of vulnerable languages have mostly positive attitudes towards the preservation of their mother tongue, regardless of their nationality, gender and level of education. Furthermore, two studies analysed the data from the pilot questionnaire administered in four communities—Banat Bulgarian, Romani, Rusyn, and Vlach. The first one shows that language usage trends and frequency vary across the communities: Vojvodina Rusyns use their minority language in communication more extensively than other communities; Roma are typically bilingual in Romani and Serbian in private communication, with Romani being notably absent in official domains; Vlachs and Banat Bulgarians tend to use Serbian more frequently than other communities (Mirić, Redžić & Vlajić 2024). The other study on the same sample explored whether language use is related to the respondents' age and reveals a potential decline in intergenerational language transmission, with younger generations being less likely to actively use minority languages (Vlajić, Redžić & Mirić 2024).

Several studies focus on specific domains of language use or particular varieties. In her research on Romance varieties in Serbia (Vojvodina Romanian, Vlach and Bayash Romanian), Sorescu-Marinković (2024) partly relies on the answers of the Vlach community members to the questions dealing with language attitudes. The study shows that the vast majority of respondents consider their language important and think that Vlach should be transmitted to the younger generation of speakers. However, some of them reveal that they have negative feelings when speaking the language in front of the members of the Serbian majority community, indicating reduced prestige of the language within the community, likely as a result of the long assimilation process and stigmatisation by the majority population. In a different paper, focusing on the answers to only one question from the section "Institutional support and linguistic landscape" in the Vlach community of Eastern Serbia, regarding the private use of the Vlach version of their name, Sorescu-Marinković (2023) points to the importance of the double system of naming, Serbian-Vlach, in this community.

Analysing the questions from the sections “Cultural events” and “Language maintenance and revitalisation” in the main questionnaire, Paunović Rodić (2024) explores the role of folklore events in the process of language maintenance in the Vojvodina Rusyn community. The author concludes that although folklore events are common in the given community and represent an important aspect of identity, they are not crucial for language maintenance, do not expand the functional domains of language usage, and do not directly influence the increase in the number of Rusyn speakers.

The study conducted in the Banat Bulgarian community (Redžić & Sokolović 2024) is based on the section “Domains of language usage” in both versions of the questionnaire, combined due to the small number of participants. The authors show that Banat Bulgarian remains restricted to the domain of private communication with family members and less frequently with friends, while Serbian dominates in conversations on different topics, especially topics of social interest, such as politics, local community problems, etc.

Drawing on data from two Slavic-speaking communities—Banat Bulgarian and Rusyn—the study by Sokolović (2024) aims to identify the social actors involved in the standardisation of these languages and to describe their roles in that process. By examining various social actors—individuals or groups that have impacted and shaped the linguistic situation, ranging from those who advocated for, developed, and promoted the standard language to those who merely used it, as well as those who rejected it—the study aspires to provide insight into their influence on the vitality and preservation of Rusyn and Banat Bulgarian in Vojvodina.

In a paper on the presence of the Romani language in the linguistic landscape of Serbia, Ćirković (2023) analyses the respondents’ answers to questions from the section “Institutional support and linguistic landscape” in the pilot version of the questionnaire. The study reveals that only a few respondents from the Roma community reported seeing official inscriptions in Romani on state buildings or streets, and a relatively small number mentioned seeing such inscriptions on tombstones. These findings suggest that Romani remains largely invisible in Serbia’s public space. Continuing with Romani, Ćirković & Mirić (forthcoming) focus on the Gurbet Roma community in the eastern Serbian town of Knjaževac and analyse responses from the pilot questionnaire. The authors point out that Romani can be

considered vital in this community if the criterion of intergenerational language transmission is taken into account, as the language is transmitted to children and actively spoken in everyday private communication. However, the use of Romani, restricted to informal settings, its absence from the linguistic landscape, and the respondents' lack of awareness of their language rights signals that Romani is, in this domain, potentially vulnerable.

The need to assess the endangerment of Romani varieties based on the status of individual dialects and specific Roma communities is also highlighted in Mirić (2022). This is supported by analyses of responses from the pilot questionnaire administered in several Roma communities across Serbia. The study identifies several factors contributing to language vulnerability, including the geographic area where the language is spoken, the type of community (multilingual or not), the neighbourhood (Roma or not), and marital patterns (in-group or not). When it comes to particular language domains in which Romani is used, Ćirković (2024) explored the section "Media". Her study shows that Roma actively watch and listen to official TV and radio programs in Romani and follow diverse types of content available on social media and the Internet. However, respondents emphasise that the variety used in the media is somewhat different from their own and may not be entirely understandable to the whole audience. Further, Mirić (forthcoming) focused on Romani language education and the questions from the section "Education" in both versions of the questionnaire, showing that Roma are insufficiently aware of the availability of Romani language classes in their surroundings.

Some questions from the questionnaire have already been adapted and used in other research. This is the case of a paper that explored education in Romani in the school subject "Romani language with elements of national culture" (Mirić 2024). Adapting some questions from the *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0*, the author developed a questionnaire for elementary school pupils about their motivation and attitudes towards attending Romani language classes.

In another paper focusing on education, Ćorković (2023) approaches the *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0* from the perspective of less commonly taught languages (LCTLs). The study presents an innovative approach demonstrating how the *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0* results could provide a foundation for teachers to explore local and regional minority language issues and enhance their students' intercultural competence. The paper presents strategies

for addressing various aspects of intercultural competence, including knowledge about endangered languages and appreciation of linguistic and cultural diversity and heritage. Additionally, the results could be employed to promote skills for democratic engagement and critical understanding of identity, culture, power, and related concepts.

In a study on motivation to learn LCTLs in a multilingual context, Ćorković (2024a) draws on two data sets. The initial data set comprises a questionnaire developed by the author and applied over the past eight years to investigate motives for learning LCTLs (Romanian, in this case) as a major subject at the university level. The second data set is based on the results from the *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0*. The initial instrument indicates that students lack motivation to enrol in Romanian classes as LCTLs but during their studies develop positive attitudes and recognise the value of the language in various domains. Similarly, paradoxical issues that emerge in research on LCTLs can be found in the results of the second instrument. Namely, even though fewer parents transmit minority languages to younger generations, they want their children to learn and maintain them. The results of both questionnaires consistently suggest that language teaching and learning are inextricably linked to power, ideology and identity, which must be taken into account in research on LCTLs.

In a study on Romanian language in education in Vojvodina, Ćorković (2024b) further explored models of learning LCTLs present in the multilingual context of Serbia. Although on the margins of the study, the question of the choice to learn Romanian inspired comparisons with data from the *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0* on the language repertoire of Romance-speaking communities, and whether it includes Romanian as a language that could be easily learned. The paper calls for further research on the motivation to learn LCTLs spoken in Serbia and the power of the educational system to change attitudes towards these languages and to promote their social, cultural and professional importance in the multilingual context of Southeastern Europe.

Going beyond the questionnaire, the paper by Radić-Bojanić and Sokolovska (2024) explores various methodological and ethical challenges that emerged during fieldwork within the *VLingS* project. The authors developed a questionnaire for researchers conducting fieldwork interviews and collecting material for language documentation. Among the main challenges identified during the interviews with respondents in the field,

the authors highlight the researchers' personal involvement, establishing contact with interlocutors, and recruiting them.

To summarize, the sociolinguistic questionnaire developed within the framework of the VLingS project has already been employed in a range of studies examining various linguistic varieties and topics. Overall analyses show that multiple factors influence the status of language endangerment, indicating the need for such a tool to capture the unique characteristics of different communities.

5. Challenges

In the process of creating the questionnaire, as well as during fieldwork interviews and subsequent data analyses, numerous challenges emerged. These can be categorised as methodological, terminological, and ethical challenges.

Terminological challenges primarily involve the specific linguonyms used in the questionnaire. While selecting a linguonym was straightforward for some varieties, such as *romski* for Romani or *rusinski* for Rusyn, other varieties presented difficulties when multiple options were available. For example, choices like *arumunski*, *aromunski* or *cincarski* for Aromanian, *banatski bugarski* or *palčanski* for Banat Bulgarian, *ladino* or *jevrejsko-španski* for Ladino, required careful consideration. We selected the linguonym most widely used within each community, and fieldwork interviews indicated that this choice was appropriate. For Vlach and Bayash Romanian, there was also a challenge related to the sociolinguistic status of these varieties due to the ongoing debate about whether to classify them as separate languages or dialects of Romanian (Sorescu-Marinković 2011, Sorescu-Marinković & Huțanu 2023). However, respondents were given the option to add any other names by which their language is known. If they used only one specific name, the researchers adjusted the questionnaire on the spot to reflect that preference.

Furthermore, in two questions in the questionnaire, we used the term *maternji jezik* “mother tongue” when asking respondents what their mother tongue is and what this concept means to them. As elaborated by Mirić, Sokolovska and Sorescu-Marinković (2024), the use of this term in contemporary sociolinguistic literature is controversial. However, the

term is used in the questionnaire as “it is the only term used in the Serbian population censuses and school curricula to refer to what has been otherwise termed first, home or heritage language” and also because “it is (still) the preferred term in the Serbian public space, and therefore, the only one which our respondents have encountered or are familiar with” (Mirić, Sokolovska & Sorescu-Marinković 2024: 2).

The primary methodological challenge was determining the format of the questionnaire. This involved deciding whether to administer it orally or in writing, through face-to-face or remote interviews, and whether to include the option for an online survey. As previously mentioned, we opted for in-person interviews for several reasons. First, we aimed to include both literate and illiterate respondents, as well as those with visual or other impairments who might struggle with extensive reading and writing. Besides, this method proved the most inclusive because not all respondents have computers, internet access, or know how to use online applications for surveys. Second, this approach allowed us to ensure that respondents fully understood each question, as the researchers could provide additional explanations during the interviews when needed. Third, as the pilot fieldwork showed, one significant advantage of this method was the opportunity to gather insights from respondents who, inspired by the questions, offered valuable additional information during the interviews. However, this approach is time-consuming and costly as it requires travelling to the communities and manually entering data into the database, unlike online surveys, which would allow for faster data collection and automatic data storage.

The methodology of data collection posed additional challenges, particularly in recruiting respondents, as detailed in Radić-Bojanić and Sokolovska (2024). Some respondents were reluctant to participate due to a lack of prior experience with such studies. To address this, the researchers sought help from language consultants and leveraged personal contacts within the communities. This experience underscores the need for a structured network to facilitate more effective respondent recruitment.¹³

Regarding ethical challenges, it is important to note that some questions elicited emotional responses from respondents during interviews, particularly those concerning their feelings about language use or experiences of being prohibited from using their language. To address this,

¹³ For other limitations of sociolinguistic questionnaires, see Schleeff 2014.

the respondents were given the option to skip questions or opt out of the interview if they felt uncomfortable. Despite this, the collected responses to these questions provide invaluable insights, highlighting the significance of the language to the individuals involved.

Furthermore, for some communities, certain questions from the questionnaire may be skipped if they are found to be irrelevant. For instance, in the pilot version of the questionnaire, the “Literacy” section did not explicitly ask whether respondents could read and write. Instead, it focused on the frequency and content of reading and writing activities. The pilot fieldwork revealed that some respondents were illiterate or had low levels of reading and writing skills, with some having received no schooling. As a result, questions about reading and writing habits led to respondents repeatedly stating their illiteracy, which was uncomfortable for them. To address this, the specific questions “Can you read/write in your language?” were added to the main questionnaire. However, this change caused discomfort among some well-educated respondents, who found the question nearly offensive. To mitigate this issue, researchers were instructed to skip these questions when it was evident that the respondent was literate.

Given the described challenges, we recommend that each linguistic community is approached carefully, accounting for its unique characteristics. Researchers and language consultants should be given the flexibility to adapt their methods to individual respondents and specific circumstances.

6. Future desiderata

With the data collection process for the *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0* now complete, the next step is to conduct quantitative and qualitative analyses based on the extensive data at our disposal. Future analyses may involve comparing the linguistic varieties under study or focusing on specific varieties to assess their vulnerability or endangerment levels. These analyses could consider responses across the entire questionnaire or concentrate on particular domains. By carefully examining responses to open-ended questions, researchers may recommend measures to be taken for language promotion, maintenance, and revitalisation. Overall, the data obtained from this questionnaire could be valuable to policymakers, as it highlights language usage trends and reveals that many members of the researched

minority communities may be unaware of their language rights or the opportunities provided by legislation and language policy.

Although the questionnaire was specifically designed to address the sociolinguistic context of selected linguistic communities in Serbia, it can be adapted to include other minority varieties spoken in the country. Despite the official recognition of some minority languages, such as Albanian, Hungarian, or Slovak, which have relatively high numbers of speakers or are considered “safe” in Serbia, the *VLingS Questionnaire 1.0* can still be used to identify specific domains of language use that may require intervention to prevent these languages from becoming vulnerable. Nevertheless, it might be difficult to apply it in person in larger communities, which require larger samples, so an electronic version and remote surveys may be a better option.

Finally, adapting the questionnaire to evaluate the levels and domains of language endangerment for other linguistic varieties worldwide would add to its value and provide deeper insights into the diverse challenges faced by minority languages globally.

References

- Anderson, J. A., L. Mak, A. Keyvani Chahi and E. Bialystok. 2018. “The language and social background questionnaire: Assessing degree of bilingualism in a diverse population”. *Behavior Research Methods* 50, 250–263.
- Birdsong, D., L. M. Gertken and M. Amengual. 2012. “Bilingual Language Profile: An Easy-to-Use Instrument to Assess Bilingualism”. COERLL, University of Texas at Austin. Available at: <https://sites.la.utexas.edu/bilingual/>. Accessed August 29, 2024.
- Brenzinger, M., A. M. Dwyer, T. de Graaf, C. Grinevald, M. Krauss, O. Miyaoka, N. Ostler, O. Sakiyama, M. E. Villalón, A. Y. Yamamoto and O. Zapeda. 2003. “Language vitality and endangerment”. Document submitted to *the International Expert Meeting on UNESCO Programme Safeguarding of Endangered Languages*, Paris, 10–12 March 2003. Available at: <https://ich.unesco.org/doc/src/00120-EN.pdf>. Accessed August 29, 2024.
- Ćirković, S. 2023. “The Romani language in the linguistic landscape of Serbia: a (non)visible minority language”. *Balkanica* LIV, 21–63.

- Ćirković, S. 2024. “The Media in Romani in Serbia: Analysis of the Applied Sociolinguistic Questionnaire in Romani Communities”. *Vulnerable and Endangered Languages in Europe (VELE2024)*. Book of abstracts. Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, Serbia, October 2–4, 2024.
- Ćirković, S. and M. Mirić. Forthcoming. “Language vulnerability of Romani in Eastern Serbia: a pilot study”. In *Language endangerment, documentation and revitalization in Southeast Europe*, eds. Z. Vrzić and M. Crnić Novosel. Leiden: Brill.
- Ćorković, M. 2023. “Podcasts in Teaching Romanian: Developing Listening Comprehension, Digital, Media and Intercultural Competences”. In *Limba, literatura și cultura română: provocări și perspective* [Romanian Language, Literature, and Culture: Challenges and Perspectives.], eds. M. Ćorković, M. Huțanu, M. Dan and M. Trajlović-Kondan, 415–446. Belgrad: Facultatea de Filologie.
- Ćorković, M. 2024a. “Motivation and attitudes towards learning LCTLs: neighbouring, minority and endangered languages at university level in Serbia”. *Language, Identity and Education in Multilingual Contexts 4 (LIEMC4)*. Faculty of Philology, University of Cyprus, Republic of Cyprus, October 19–20, 2024.
- Ćorković, M. 2024b. “Rumunski jezik u obrazovanju u Vojvodini: istorijski pregled i aktuelna situacija” [Romanian Language Education in Vojvodina: Historical Overview and Current Situation]. In *Manjinski jezici u Vojvodini: Jezička obrazovna politika, ideologija i praksa* [Minority Languages in Vojvodina: Language Education Policy, Ideology, and Practice], ed. M. Mandić, 259–295. Novi Sad: Akademska knjiga.
- Elšík, V. and M. Beníšek. 2020. “Romani Dialectology”. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Romani Language and Linguistics*, eds. Y. Matras and A. Tenser, 389–427. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fishman, J. A. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift. Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Krauss, M. 2006. “Chapter 1. Classification and Terminology for Degrees of Language Endangerment”. In *Language Diversity Endangered*, ed. M. Brenzinger, 1–8. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110905694-003>

- Lee, N. H. and J. van Way. 2016. "Assessing levels of endangerment in the Catalogue of Endangered Languages (ELCat) using the Language Endangerment Index (LEI)". *Language in Society* 45, 271–292.
- Lewis, M. P. and G. F. Simons 2010. "Assessing endangerment: Expanding Fishman's GIDS". *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 55 (2), 103–120.
- Lewis, M. P., G. F. Simons and C. D. Fennig, eds. 2013. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*, 17th ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International.
- Li, P., F. Zhang, E. Tsai and B. Puls. 2014. "Language history questionnaire (LHQ 2.0): A new dynamic web-based research tool". *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 17 (3), 673–680.
- Mandić, M., ed. 2024. *Manjinski jezici u Vojvodini: Jezička obrazovna politika, ideologija i praksa* [Minority Languages in Vojvodina: Language Education Policy, Ideology, and Practice]. Novi Sad: Akademska knjiga.
- Marian, V., H. K. Blumenfeld and M. Kaushanskaya. 2007. "The Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire (LEAP-Q): Assessing language profiles in bilinguals and multilinguals". *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 50 (4), 940–967.
- Marian, V., H. K. Blumenfeld and M. Kaushanskaya. 2020. "The LEAP-Q Language Experience and Proficiency Questionnaire: Ten years later". *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 23 (5), 945–950.
- Matras, Y. 2002. *Romani. A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mirić, M. 2022. "On the vulnerability of Romani in Serbia with regard to the type of the community". *Minority and Endangered Languages in the Multilingual Context of the Balkans* (MELMUB). Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy, December 12–13, 2022. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7578950>. Accessed November 23, 2024.
- Mirić, M. 2024. "Stavovi učenika o nastavi romskog jezika u opštini Knjaževac: pilot istraživanje" [Students' Attitudes toward Romani Language Instruction in the Municipality of Knjaževac: Pilot Study]. In *Knjaževački kraj – potencijali, stanje i perspektive razvoja 2* [Knjaževac Region – Potentials, Current Situation and Development Perspectives], eds. M. Sibinović and V. Stojadinović, 232–257. Knjaževac: Narodna biblioteka "Njegoš", Beograd: Srpsko geografsko društvo. (Cyrillic)
- Mirić, M. forthcoming. "Romani language education in Serbia: Unveiling the discrepancy between opportunities and implementation". In

- Semiotic Landscapes in Multilingual Border Regions – Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives on Southeast Europe*, eds. S. Ćirković and V. Bopp-Filimonov. Lausanne: Peter Lang.
- Mirić, M., V. Sokolovska and A. Sorescu-Marinković. 2024. “Mother tongue in Serbia: A speakers’ perspective on the meaning of the concept”. *Open Linguistics* 10 (1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2024-0016>
- Mirić, M., A. Redžić and D. Vlajić. 2024. “Language usage trends among linguistic minority communities in Serbia: A comparative analysis”. *Minority Languages in European Societies (MiLES)*. University of Torino, Italy. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12701732>. Accessed November 23, 2024.
- Moseley, C., ed. 2010. *Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger*, 3rd ed. Paris: UNESCO Publishing. Available at: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000187026>. Accessed: August 29, 2024.
- Paunović Rodić, S. 2024. “Uloga folkloru u očuvanju i revitalizaciji rusinskog jezika u Vojvodini” [The Role of Folklore in the Preservation and Revitalisation of the Rusyn Language in Vojvodina]. *Šestnadeseti slavistichni cheteniya: Pamet i istoriya v slavyanskite ezitsi i literature* [Sixteenth Slavic Readings: Memory and History in Slavic Languages and Literatures]. Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, Faculty of Slavic Studies, Sofia, Bulgaria, May 30–31, 2024. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13304826> (Cyrillic). Accessed November 23, 2024.
- Radić-Bojanić, B. and V. Sokolovska. 2024. “Izazovi u istraživanju ugroženih i ranjivih jezika u Srbiji u okviru projekta ‘Ranjivi jezici i jezički varijeteti u Srbiji’: Metodološka i etička pitanja” [Challenges in Researching Endangered and Vulnerable Languages in Serbia within the Project “Vulnerable Languages and Linguistic Varieties in Serbia”: Methodological and Ethical Issues]. *Etnoantropološki problemi* 19 (1), 279–308.
- Redžić, A. and D. Sokolović. 2024. “Domeni upotrebe banatskog bugarskog jezika u Srbiji” [Domains of Use of the Banat Bulgarian Language in Serbia]. *Banatskite balgari – kulturno nasledstvo, ezik i literature*. [The Banat Bulgarians – Cultural Heritage, Language and Literature]. Institutat za balgarski ezik “Prof. d-r Lyubomir Andreychin” pri BAN, Institutat za literatura pri BAN, Institutat za etnologiya i folkloristika s Etnografski muzey pri BAN, Druzhestvoto na banatskite balgari v

- Balgariya “Falmis”. Sofia, Bulgaria, January 26, 2024. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10590707> (Cyrillic). Accessed November 23, 2024.
- Schleef, E. 2014. “Written Surveys and Questionnaires in Sociolinguistics”. In *Research Methods in Sociolinguistics: A Practical Guide*, eds. J. Holmes and K. Hazen, 42–57. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sokolović, D. 2024. “Identification of Social Actors in Minority Language Standardisation – Rusyn and Banat Bulgarian in Vojvodina”. *Vulnerable and Endangered Languages in Europe* (VELE2024). Book of abstracts. Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, Serbia, October 2–4, 2024.
- Sorescu-Marinković, A. 2011. “Strategies for creating an explanatory Bayash dictionary in Serbia”. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* LVI (1), 17–34.
- Sorescu-Marinković, A. 2023. “What’s in a Vlach Name? Patronyms, Double Naming and Ethnic Identity of the Vlachs of Eastern Serbia”. *Onomastica* LXVII, 183–203. <https://doi.org/10.17651/ONOMAST.67.11>
- Sorescu-Marinković, A. 2024. “Romanian in Serbia: From Contested Varieties to Standard Languages”. *Contested Languages in the Old World* (CLOW4). Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences and Arts, Warsaw, Poland, May 24–25, 2024. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12760989>. Accessed November 23, 2024.
- Sorescu-Marinković, A. and M. Măran. 2016. “The Meglen Vlachs (Megleno-Romanians) of Serbia: A Community on the Verge of Extinction”. *Res Historica* 41, 197–212.
- Sorescu-Marinković, A., M. Mirić and S. Ćirković. 2020. “Assessing Linguistic Vulnerability and Endangerment in Serbia: A Critical Survey of Methodologies and Outcomes”. *Balkanica* LI, 65–104.
- Sorescu-Marinković, A. and M. Huțanu. 2023. “Standardizing Vlach Romanian in Eastern Serbia: A Remissive Issue”. In *Languages and Nationalism Instead of Empires*, eds. T. Kamusella and M. Nomachi, 244–263. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.
- Sorescu-Marinković, A. and D. Vlajić. 2024. “Navigating Vulnerability: Language Attitudes through an Intersectional Lens”. *Language, Literature, Intersectionality* (LLC), Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš, Serbia, April 27, 2024. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11177568>. Accessed November 23, 2024.

Vlajić, D., A. Redžić and M. Mirić. 2024. “Do Younger Speakers Use Minority Languages Less Frequently? The Pilot Study of Language Use among Linguistic Minority Communities in Serbia”. *Vulnerable and Endangered Languages in Europe* (VELE2024). Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, Serbia, October 2–4, 2024. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14013293>. Accessed November 23, 2024.

Acknowledgement

The manuscript is the result of the project “Vulnerable Languages and Linguistic Varieties in Serbia” (VLingS), funded by the Science Fund of the Republic of Serbia (grant number: 7736100) within the program IDEAS (2022–2024). The funding was provided through the Budget of the Republic of Serbia, and the World Bank project – the Serbia Accelerating Innovation and Entrepreneurship Project (SAIGE).

Authors’ details:

Mirjana Mirić (corresponding author)

mirjana.miric@bi.sanu.ac.rs
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6125-0562>

Annemarie Sorescu-Marinković

annemarie.sorescu@bi.sanu.ac.rs
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8389-9976>

Valentina Sokolovska

valentina@ff.uns.ac.rs
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4106-6212>

Dušan Vlajić

dusan.vlajic@filfak.ni.ac.rs
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0084-365X>

Andela Babić

andjela.redzic@bi.sanu.ac.rs
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7472-8198>

Mirjana Ćorković

corkovic.mirjana@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8678-2346>

Svetlana Ćirković

svetlana.cirkovic@bi.sanu.ac.rs
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8757-2340>

Stefana Paunović Rodić

stefanapaunrodic@fil.bg.ac.rs
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6802-0348>

Dalibor Sokolović

dalibor.sokolovic@fil.bg.ac.rs
<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1525-7078>

Neda Pons

nedapons@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-3120-5702>

Maja Miličević Petrović

maja.milicevic2@unibo.it
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4137-1898>

APPENDIX

<p>Mirjana Mirić, Annemarie Sorescu-Marinković, Valentina Sokolovska, Dušan Vlajić, Anđela Babić, Mirjana Ćorković, Svetlana Ćirković, Stefana Paunović Rodić, Dalibor Sokolović, Neda Pons, Maja Miličević Petrović, Janko Ramač. 2025. "VLingS Questionnaire 1.0 – English translation". In <i>Vulnerable and Endangered Languages in Europe</i>, eds. Annemarie Sorescu-Marinković, Mirjana Ćorković and Mirjana Mirić, 337–379. Belgrade: Institute for Balkan Studies SASA, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade.</p>					
PROTOCOL					
RESEARCHER / CONSULTANT →		DATE OF THE INTERVIEW →		PLACE OF THE INTERVIEW →	
COMMENTS ↓					

I GENERAL DATA ABOUT LINGUONYMS AND LANGUAGE USAGE		
<p>1. What is the language of the community (ethnic group or nation) in which the research is conducted?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">circle a number → (filled by the researcher)</p>	<p>1. Serbian 2. Aromanian 3. Megleno-Romanian 4. Bayash Romanian 5. Vlach</p>	<p>6. Romani 7. Rusyn 8. Banat Bulgarian 9. Ladino 10. (An)other language(s): _____</p>
<p>2. Which language(s) do you use?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">write the number(s) from (1) →</p>		
<p>3. Are there other names for your language (in Serbian)?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">circle a number, write →</p>	<p>1. YES, the following name(s): _____</p> <p>2. NO</p> <p>3. I don't know.</p>	
<p>4. How is your language called in your language?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">write the name(s) →</p>		
<p>5. What is/are your mother tongue(s)?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">write → (pay attention to the order of listing)</p>		
<p>6. What does the concept “mother tongue” mean to you?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">write →</p>		
<p>7. What was the first language you acquired as a child?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">write the number(s) from (1) →</p>		
<p>8. Which language/languages do you use most frequently today?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">write the number(s) from (1) →</p>		
<p>9. If you use your language, do you use it more frequently, less frequently, or equally frequently now compared to when you were a child (up to age 7)?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">circle a number →</p>	<p>1. I use it more frequently. 2. I use it equally frequently. 3. I use it less frequently. 4. I don't know.</p>	

10. If you have a partner, in which language do you communicate with each other? write the number(s) from (1) →	
11. Did the people with whom you spent the most time during your childhood speak your language? circle a number →	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No, they didn't speak the language. 2. Yes, they were able to use some words. 3. Yes, they were able to use simple sentences. 4. Yes, they spoke the language fluently. 5. I don't know.
12. Which language(s) do/did your parents speak? write the number(s) from (1) →	MOTHER: FATHER:
13. Which language(s) do/did your grandparents speak? write the number(s) from (1) →	MATERNAL: PATERNAL:
14. What other family members do you remember or know to have spoken/speak your language? write →	
II DATA ABOUT LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND INTERGENERATIONAL LANGUAGE TRANSMISSION	
1. When did you start learning your language? circle a number →	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As a child, before the age of 7 2. As a child, after the age of 7 3. As an adult 4. I didn't acquire the language.
2. If you learned your language, from whom did you learn it the most? circle a number → (choose one answer)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. From parents 2. From grandparents 3. From members of the extended family 4. From speakers outside the family 5. At work 6. Independently (books, TV) 7. At school (or preschool) 8. In language workshops/classes 9. Other: _____ 10. I didn't learn the language.
3. When did you start learning Serbian? circle a number →	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As a child, before the age of 7 2. As a child, after the age of 7 3. As an adult
4. How did you learn Serbian the most? write a number from (2) →	
5. If you have children, do they speak your language? circle a number → (referring to the majority of children)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No, they don't speak the language. 2. Yes, they can use some words. 3. Yes, they can use simple sentences. 4. Yes, they speak the language fluently. 5. I don't know if they speak the language.

6. If you have children, in which language do you communicate with them? write the number(s) from (1), section I →							
7. If you have grandchildren, do they speak your language? circle a number → (referring to the majority of grandchildren)		1. No, they don't speak the language. 2. Yes, they can use some words. 3. Yes, they can use simple sentences. 4. Yes, they speak the language fluently. 5. I don't know if they speak the language.					
8. Which generations in Serbia use your language? circle a number →		1. Mainly all generations, including children 2. Mainly the generation of parents and older 3. Mainly the generation of grandparents and older 4. Mainly only the generation of great-grandparents 5. Nobody					
III DOMAINS OF LANGUAGE USAGE							
1. How often do you use your language in conversations with the following persons or in the following situations? mark the field with an X		1. Always	2. Often	3. Sometimes	4. Rarely	5. Never	6. N/A
1. With family members							
2. With friends							
3. With neighbours							
4. With colleagues at work							
5. With members of the clergy							
6. With public officials (e.g. at the municipality/local community/post office/ police).							
2. Do you use your language as a “secret language” when you don't want others to understand you? circle a number →			1. YES 2. NO				
3. If you do, in what situations? write →							
4. Do you listen to music in your language? circle a number →		1. YES 2. NO					
5. In which language do you more frequently discuss private topics (e.g. family, health, daily life)? circle a number →		1. In my language 2. In Serbian 3. Equally frequently in my language and in Serbian 4. I don't know.					

6. In which language do you more frequently discuss social topics (e.g. topics related to politics, village/city)? circle a number →		1. In my language 2. In Serbian 3. Equally frequently in my language and in Serbian 4. I don't know.				
7. In which language do you think? circle a number →		1. In my language 2. In Serbian 3. In both my language and Serbian 4. In some other language 5. I don't know.				
8. In which language do you count (to yourself)? circle a number →		1. In my language 2. In Serbian 3. In both my language and Serbian 4. In some other language 5. I don't know.				
9. In which language do you pray? circle a number →		1. In my language 2. In Serbian 3. In both my language and Serbian 4. In some other language 5. I don't know.				
10. In which language do you dream? circle a number →		1. In my language 2. In Serbian 3. In both my language and Serbian 4. In some other language 5. I don't know.				
IV LITERACY						
1. Can you read? circle a number →	1. YES 2. NO	If the answer is yes, please answer the following questions. mark the field with an X ↓				
2. How often do you...	1. Always	2. Often	3. Sometimes	4. Rarely	5. Never	
1. read in your language?						
2. read in Serbian?						
3. Can you write? circle a number →	1. YES 2. NO	If the answer is yes, please answer the following questions. mark the field with an X ↓				
4. How often do you...	1. Always	2. Often	3. Sometimes	4. Rarely	5. Never	
1. write in your language?						
2. write in Serbian?						
5. Did you learn to read and write in your language at school? circle a number →	1. YES 2. NO 3. I didn't go to school.					
6. Did you learn to read and write in Serbian at school? circle a number →	1. YES 2. NO 3. I didn't go to school.					

	7. Do you write in your language...	8. Do you read in your language...	9. Do you write in Serbian...	10. Do you read in Serbian...
1. SMS, Viber messages, etc.?	1. YES 2. NO	1. YES 2. NO	1. YES 2. NO	1. YES 2. NO
2. information on social networks?	1. YES 2. NO	1. YES 2. NO	1. YES 2. NO	1. YES 2. NO
3. letters/ emails?	1. YES 2. NO	1. YES 2. NO	1. YES 2. NO	1. YES 2. NO
4. other? _____	1. YES 2. NO	1. YES 2. NO	1. YES 2. NO	1. YES 2. NO
V EDUCATION				
1. Is there a dedicated subject at school that teaches your language in Serbia? circle a number →		1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.		
2. Did you learn your language as a separate subject at school in Serbia? circle a number →		1. YES 2. NO 3. I didn't go to school.		
3. If yes, how long did you study your language in school? write the number of years →				
4. If yes, at which levels of education? circle a number →		1. In preschool 2. From 1st to 4th grade 3. From 5th to 8th grade 4. In high school 5. At university 6. At different levels 7. I don't know.		
5. Has anyone in your family studied your language as a separate subject at school (in Serbia)? circle number(s) →		1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.	Who? (circle if the answer was YES) 1. Parents 4. Grandchildren 2. Grandparents 5. Other family members 3. Children 6. I don't know	
6. If you studied Serbian at school, how long did you study it? write the number of years →				
7. Is there an opportunity to learn your language outside of school (e.g. language schools, private lessons, language workshops)? circle number(s) →				1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.
Where? _____		Who in your family has learned your language outside of school? (circle if the answer was YES) 1. Parents 3. Children 5. Other family members 2. Grandparents 4. Grandchildren 6. I don't know.		
(write if the answer was YES)				

VI INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE		
1. Do you know of any institution in Serbia that supports the realisation of minority rights of your community? circle a number →	1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.	
2. Do you (privately) use a version of your name in your language? circle a number →	1. YES 2. NO 3. There isn't a version of my name in my language.	
3. Are there official signs in your language on/inside buildings of state institutions (health centres, municipalities, schools, etc.) or street names and names of places? circle a number →	1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.	
4. If yes, what kind of signs and on what kind of buildings have you seen them? write →	What signs?	Where?
5. Have you ever seen any signs in your language (e.g. inscriptions on monuments, gravestones, graffiti)? circle a number →	1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.	
6. If yes, what kind of signs and where have you seen them? write →	What signs?	Where?
VII PUBLICATIONS IN THE GIVEN LANGUAGE		
1. Do you know of any libraries in Serbia where books in your language are available? circle a number →	1. YES 2. NO	
2. Is literature in your language available in Serbia? circle a number →	1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.	
3. Are any of the following types of publications available in your language in Serbia? circle number(s) →	1. Dictionaries 2. Grammar books 3. Language textbooks 4. Scientific articles about your language 5. Religious publications 6. I don't know.	
4. Have you ever used any publications in your language? circle a number, write →	1. YES 2. NO	What? (write if the answer was YES)

VIII MEDIA	
1. Do the following media exist in your language in Serbia? circle a number ↓	
1. Radio shows	1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.
2. TV shows	1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.
3. Newspapers	1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.
4. Websites	1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.
5. Social networks (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.)	1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.
2. Do you follow or use the following media in your language? circle a number ↓	
1. Radio shows	1. YES 2. NO
2. TV shows	1. YES 2. NO
3. Newspapers	1. YES 2. NO
4. Websites	1. YES 2. NO
5. Social networks (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.)	1. YES 2. NO
3. If yes, what kind? write →	
4. How many hours a day can you follow radio or television programs in your language? circle a number →	1. There is no program 2. Up to one hour a day 3. Several hours a day 4. Throughout the entire day 5. I don't know.
IX RELIGIOUS SERVICE	
1. Does religious service or any of its parts exist in your language in Serbia? circle a number →	1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.
2. Have you ever attended a religious service (or sermon) in your language in Serbia? circle a number, write →	1. YES 2. NO Where? _____ When? _____ (if the answer was YES)
X CULTURAL EVENTS	
1. Do you know of any cultural events dedicated to your community in Serbia (e.g. music festivals, gatherings, folklore events)? circle a number →	1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.

<p>2. If yes, what types of events are involved?</p> <p>circle number(s), write →</p>	<p>1. Music festivals 2. Theatre festivals 3. Film festivals 4. Exhibitions 5. Lectures</p>	<p>6. Folklore events 7. Religious events 8. Linguistic workshops 9. Culinary events 10. Other: _____</p> <p>Give example(s):</p>			
<p>3. Have you ever attended any of them? circle a number →</p>	<p>1. YES 2. NO</p>				
<p>4. If yes, what type of events have you attended?</p> <p>circle number(s), write →</p>	<p>1. Music festivals 2. Theatre festivals 3. Film festivals 4. Exhibitions 5. Lectures</p>	<p>6. Folklore events 7. Religious events 8. Linguistic workshops 9. Culinary events 10. Other: _____</p> <p>Give example(s):</p>			
<p>5. Are there associations or cultural centres in Serbia where you have access to your culture and language?</p> <p>circle a number, write →</p>	<p>1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.</p>	<p>Please name them (if the answer was YES):</p>			
<p>XI LANGUAGE LEVEL SELF-ASSESSMENT</p>					
<p>1. Please rate on a scale from 1 to 5 how proficient you are in your language and Serbian according to the skills listed in the table. We are not assessing your proficiency level but the extent to which you use the languages. 1 – not at all, 2 – poorly, 3 – well, 4 – very well, 5 – excellent mark the field with an X ↓</p>					
	1	2	3	4	5
<p>1. How well do you understand your language?</p>					
<p>2. How well do you understand Serbian?</p>					
<p>3. How well do you speak your language?</p>					

4. How well do you speak Serbian?					
5. How well do you read in your language (any kind of content)?					
6. How well do you read in Serbian (any kind of content)?					
7. How well do you write in your language (any kind of content)?					
8. How well do you write in Serbian (any kind of content)?					
XII RESPONDENTS' FEELINGS TOWARDS OWN LANGUAGE					
1. How do you feel when you speak your language in the presence of other speakers? circle a number →	1. I am proud. 2. I feel comfortable. 3. I feel as usual.		4. I feel uncomfortable. 5. I am ashamed. 6. I don't know, I don't think about it.		
2. How do you feel when you speak your language in the presence of Serbian speakers? circle a number →	1. I am proud. 2. I feel comfortable. 3. I feel as usual.		4. I feel uncomfortable. 5. I am ashamed. 6. I don't know, I don't think about it.		
3. How does your language sound to you? write →					
4. Has anyone ever prohibited you from speaking your language? circle a number, write →	1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.		In what situations? (write if the answer was YES)		
5. Has anyone ever prohibited members of your family from speaking your language? circle a number, write →	1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.		In what situations? (write if the answer was YES)		
XIII ETHNIC AND CULTURAL IDENTITY					
1. Do you think your language is important? circle a number →	1. YES 2. Partially 3. NO				
2. Does your language represent your community and the culture of your community? circle a number →	1. YES 2. Partially 3. NO				

XIV LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE AND REVITALISATION	
<p>1. Are there any activities in your surroundings related to maintaining or revitalising your language (official or private initiatives)?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">circle a number →</p>	<p>1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.</p>
<p>2. If yes, what kind of activities (e.g. language workshops, publishing materials, translating works into your language, introducing your language into schools)?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">write →</p>	
<p>3. If not, would you like such activities to be introduced?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">circle a number →</p>	<p>1. YES 2. NO 3. It doesn't matter to me.</p>
<p>4. Is it important to you to preserve/revitalise (or learn) your language?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">circle a number →</p>	<p>1. YES 2. NO 3. It doesn't matter to me.</p>
<p>5. Why is it important?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">write →</p>	
<p>6. Is it important to you that your language is passed on to younger generations?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">circle a number →</p>	<p>1. YES 2. NO 3. It doesn't matter to me.</p>
<p>7. Is it important to you that your language is introduced or maintained in schools in Serbia?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">circle a number →</p>	<p>1. YES 2. NO 3. It doesn't matter to me.</p>
<p>8. Is your language disappearing?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">circle a number →</p>	<p>1. YES 2. NO 3. I don't know.</p>
<p>9. What do you think should be done to preserve or revitalise your language?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">write →</p>	

XV DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESPONDENT			
1. SIGNED INFORMED CONSENT	Researcher's / Consultant's name: _____	2. RESPONDENT'S UNIQUE CODE (the same as in the recording)	
3. Gender circle a number →	1. Male 2. Female 3. Other	4. How old are you? ↓	

5. Marital status circle a number →	1. Single 2. Married 3. In a common law marriage	4. Divorced 5. Widower/Widow	
6. Nationality circle a number →	1. Serbian 2. Montenegrin 3. Croatian 4. Yugoslav 5. Slovak 6. Romanian 7. Rusyn 8. Romani	9. Albanian 10. Bulgarian 11. Hungarian 12. Vlach 13. Aromanian 14. Other: _____ 15. Dual nationality (Serbian and minority)	
7. Religion circle a number →	1. Orthodox Christian 2. Catholic 3. Muslim	4. Jewish 5. Other: _____ 6. I'm not religious.	
8. Education level circle a number →	1. No schooling 2. Unfinished elementary school 3. Elementary school 4. Vocational school 5. High school/gymnasium	6. Higher vocational school 7. University/academy 8. Postgraduate or PhD studies 9. Other (e.g. evening school): _____	
9. Employment circle a number →	1. Employed full-time 2. Employed in temporary jobs 3. Self-employed	4. Unemployed 5. Dependent (children, students, homemakers, disabled persons) 6. Retired	
10. Place of upbringing →	1. Rural 2. Urban	Name: _____	
11. Place of residence →	1. Rural 2. Urban	Name: _____	

<p>12. Living in the place of residence</p> <p>circle, write →</p>	<p>1. From birth</p> <p>2. Settled or resettled, reason:</p>	<p>1. Schooling</p> <p>2. Marriage</p> <p>3. Family</p> <p>4. Work</p> <p>5. Refugee status</p> <p>6. Other: _____</p>
<p>XVI FINAL REMARKS</p>		
<p>1. May we contact you later regarding your responses?</p> <p>circle a number →</p>	<p>1. YES, contact me at: _____</p> <p>2. NO</p>	
<p>2. Would you like to add anything else?</p> <p>write →</p>		
<p>THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN OUR RESEARCH!</p>		

Proofreading:
Miljana Protić

Layout:
Predrag Žižović

Cover design:
Predrag Žižović

Cover illustration:
Nina Marinković, *The Beginning and the End*

Print run:
300

Printed by:
MAB, Belgrade

CIP - Каталогизација у публикацији
Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

81'246(4)(082)

81'246(497.11)(082)

81'272(082)

VULNERABLE and endangered languages in Europe / editors Annemarie Sorescu-Marinković, Mirjana Ćorković, Mirjana Mirić. - Belgrade : Institute for Balkan Studies, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts : University, Faculty of Philology, 2025 (Belgrade : MAB). - 379 str. : ilustr. ; 24 cm

“The core of the present volume consists of papers presented at the International Conference Vulnerable and Endangered Languages in Europe, organised by the members of the VLingS project at the University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philology, on October 2–4, 2024. “ --> Acknowledgements. - Tiraž 300. - Bibliografija uz svaki rad.

ISBN 978-86-7179-127-4 (IBSSASA)

- а) Вишејезичност -- Европа -- Зборници
- б) Вишејезичност -- Србија -- Зборници
- в) Социолингвистика -- Зборници

COBISS.SR-ID 161272073