Ethics in language documentation and revitalization[1]

Jeff Good

jcgood@buffalo.edu

1 Ethical encounters in language documentation

The increasing emphasis that linguistics has placed on the documentation and revitalization of the world's endangered languages has brought more and more scholars of language into contact with communities whose cultures, needs, and interests diverge greatly from their own. Moreover, in many countries, research involving so-called "human subjects" has become the subject of heightened scrutiny, and the rise of cheap, digital means of information collection and exchange that has made contemporary documentary linguistics possible has foregrounded issues of rights and access to language resources. These contexts of "culture clash" have prompted serious considerations of ethical practices in documentation and revitalization.

In this chapter, I take as a given that essentially all scholars choosing to work on endangered languages seek to "do no harm" as well as to "do some good" (Dwyer 2006:38–39) in the course of their research. The challenge, then, is not to change attitudes but to increase awareness of strategies of interaction that minimize the potential for harm and maximize the chances of positive benefit. However, there is an immediate obstacle to addressing issues of ethics in this domain in any general way. The primary concern that gave rise to the emergence of the contemporary documentary linguistic approaches—language endangerment at a global scale—emphasizes their particularity, and scholars have further sought to engage these communities in diverse ways. The result is that there can be no general ethical "formula." Instead, one must try to separate out different strands of ethical consideration in documentary and revitalization work

so that the parameters of ethical engagement can be made clearer, even if the specifics must be worked out on a case-by-case basis.

This chapter has the advantage of building on significant previous work on ethics in documentation and revitalization, such as Dwyer (2006), Grinevald (2006), Rice (2006, 2012), Thieberger and Musgrave (2007), and Austin (2010). General fieldwork guides also discuss this topic (Crowley 2007:23–56, Bowern 2015:167–89, Chelliah and De Reuse 2011:139–59, and Sakel and Everett 2012:67–78). While not explicitly focused on ethics, Grenoble and Whaley (2005) contains relevant consideration of key issues. There is significant agreement in the content of this chapter and earlier work, though the advice given across them is not always the same, and, given the complexity of this topic, consulting multiple sources is ideal. This survey most notably differs from earlier work in its emphasis on the broader ideological and cultural context in which documentary and revitalization activities take place, as opposed to the enumeration of specific steps one might take in order to conduct more ethical fieldwork, since these points are covered well elsewhere.

Section 2 of this chapter begins by presenting a series of case studies that illustrate a range of issues in the ethics of documentation and revitalization. These are intended to provide context for a more general consideration of the importance of understanding the ideologies that underpin documentary and revitalization work in Section 3. Section 4 then considers the complexities involved in maintaining the different relationships required for success in this area, Section 5 covers ethical issues in the creation and handling of endangered language resources, and Section 6 relates broader ethical concerns to systems of legal and ethical compliance that govern data collection and research. Section 7 offers brief concluding remarks.

2 Case studies in ethical interaction

2.1   Considering five different documentary contexts

In this section, five case studies of ethical issues raised over the course of work on language documentation and revitalization are reviewed. They are chosen both to illustrate a diverse range of concerns and to exemplify the kinds of ethical dilemmas that can arise in different parts of the world. Additional relevant case studies can be found in Warner et al. (2007), Holton (2009), Robinson (2010), and Brooks (2015), among others. The discussion below is mostly oriented towards summarizing the facts of these case studies. Their connection to broader issues is considered more directly in subsequent parts of the chapter.

2.2   Wilkins (1992): Research under community control

Wilkins (1992) is an early publication emphasizing the social contexts in which documentary research takes place. It is especially noteworthy for its description of the conduct of research which was, to a much greater extent than is usually the case, under the control of a specific community. The research took place in collaboration with the Yipirinya School Council, where a majority of the community members identified as Western Arrernte. However, Mparntwe Arrernte was chosen by the group to be the focus of the work as the language traditionally associated with Alice Springs, where the school is located.

Wilkins' choice to conduct research under community control was in part driven by high-level ethical considerations embedded within an ideology placing importance on conducting linguistics in a more "responsible" manner (Wilkins 1992:173). Having made that choice, many of the issues he dealt with were more logistical in nature than ethical. For instance, there was the

question of how one could simultaneously satisfy the demands associated with earning an academic degree while also fulfilling obligations to the community (Wilkins 1992:181–82).

However, two other aspects of his work also intersected directly with ethical concerns. The first relates to Australia's status as a country dominated by a settler society, of which Wilkins is a member. While his work at the Yipirinya School eventually led to mutual appreciation between him and the community, the earliest stages of his interaction were governed by a lack of trust (Wilkins 1992:176). This kind of tension is not unusual in language documentation projects, and linguists working in parts of the world dominated by settler societies (including the Americas) are generally very sensitive to this dynamic (see, e.g., Czaykowska-Higgins (2009) for discussion in a Canadian context). More generally, Wilkins' experiences are indicative of the extent to which the relationships that researchers must build in order to take part in documentation and revitalization will, at least in part, be governed not only by who they are as individuals but also more general sociopolitical and sociocultural factors. This will be discussed further in Section 4.

A second ethical issue raised by Wilkins (1992:182–83) relates to the presence of a community outside of Alice Springs where a number of other Arrernte speakers lived. Representatives of this community contacted him for assistance doing language research, and, from his perspective, offering such assistance would have been completely natural since linguistic work on a "language" need not be bound to any one group of individuals. However, the Yipirinya School Council saw things differently and barred him from working with any organization not based in Alice Springs. The central ethical question raised by this is what the social unit is—i.e., "community"—that documentary linguists should be engaging with in their work. Wilkins' assumption was that the community of interaction and responsibility should be

defined by linguistic identity, but the actual individuals whose heritages were partly defined by language had a different view. Wilkins' experience here is both relevant to how different ideologies held by actors in a documentation or revitalization project must be taken into account as well as how problematic the notion of "community" is for ethical practice, topics to be considered in Section 3 and Section 4.

2.3   Debenport (2010a): Language ideologies and restricted access

Debenport (2010a) (see also Debenport (2015)) describes her research on the Tiwa language in New Mexico in ways that are broadly similar to that of Wilkins (1992). In particular, the community that she works with has maintained tight control over her research, and even being able to access the community as a researcher was an unusual privilege (Debenport 2010a:229–30). This desire for control is part of a larger set of patterns regulating "circulation of cultural knowledge" among the Tiwa (Debenport 2010b:205). These restrictions extend to the publication of written representations of the language, requiring her to obscure key aspects of linguistic data, for instance by blacking out any line representing Tiwa in an interlinear glossed text while allowing the glossing and English translation to remain visible (Debenport 2010a:236).

These restrictions are not due to specific negative experiences working with linguists but, rather, emanate from a language ideology that is strongly conservative and purist in nature (see, e.g., Kroskrity 1992)). They, thus, are part of a larger cultural complex in which the "ancestral code" (Woodbury 2011:177) of these groups is embedded, and, presumably, this Tiwa language ideology should be understood as a significant target of documentation, even if documentary linguistics tends to emphasize the collection of lexical and textual data over data relevant to understanding ideological aspects of language use (Debenport 2010b:236).

Most documentary or revitalization projects do not find themselves operating under restrictions of the sort that Debenport describes. However, her work would have been simply disallowed had she not been willing to respect the community's wishes. So, there was no ethical "choice" in the matter, beyond, perhaps, the ever-present choice to simply not do research with a community that imposes such restrictions.[2] Moreover, the fact that the community had the primary agency over the ways that she could present her research relieved her of some of the burden that is faced by linguists working in parts of the world where it is problematic to assume that community members will have a clear understanding of different modes of data presentation, in particular web-based dissemination (see, e.g., Robinson 2010).

However, three other ethical issues arose during her fieldwork, which merit consideration here. The first two of these relate to a change in the political situation within the community. From 2003 through 2009, work was done under the guidance of the director of the local language program. However, in 2009 a tribal leader decided that the language should no longer be written, and language materials were confiscated (Debenport 2010:237–38). Debenport ultimately saw this as an opportunity to explore local language politics and ideologies, though examining the issue for research purposes would mean "mining the painful experiences of dear friends" (Debenport 2010:238). This raises the fraught question of what it means to "do harm". Is it harmful to ask individuals to discuss something painful to them for the purposes of research? There can be no general answer to such a question beyond the fact that much of the answer depends on the wishes of all of those involved.

The change in attitude of one of the tribal leaders raises another set of concerns around the question of who gets to speak for a "community." In the case Debenport discusses, it appears that those working on the language program accepted the fact that their own preferences could be

overridden by tribal leadership (Debenport 2010:238). However, lines of control will often not be well-established among the group of individuals who have a heritage association with a language, making it difficult to know what the right response is in cases of disagreement. This issue was also considered above in Section 2.1, and general concerns surrounding the notion of "community" will be discussed in Section 3 and Section 4.

A final ethical concern raised by Debenport (2010a) relates to how the work of scholars may impact the perception of "language" within a community. The work of the language program resulted in a kind of new institutionalization of the Tiwa language, and those closely involved came to be seen as the "experts" on the language when, previously, any fluent speaker was considered an expert. The knowledge of Debenport herself was even called upon when it came to writing the language (Debenport 2010:232–33). While the fact that the act of language documentation may "change" a language should not necessarily stop the work from being done—particularly if speakers are supportive—this example speaks to the importance of being aware of how documentary activities, as well as the ways that those activities are framed, may have unintended consequences for the linguistic culture of a community, a topic that will be returned to in Section 3.

2.4   Dobrin (2008): Local notions of exchange in language documentation

Dobrin (2008) is a critical examination of commonly held attitudes about language documentation and development. Much of the discussion centers around her experiences working in a village in Papua New Guinea associated with the Arapesh language. These serve as a concrete example of how a broader Melanesian system of exchange relations can interact with well-intentioned approaches of Western scholars in ways that would be unanticipated without an

understanding "the culturally particular local systems of meaning in which language loss itself is taking place" (Dobrin 2008:317).

Dobrin's central observation rests on recognition of the importance of gift exchange in Melanesian cultures as the primary means through which relationships are developed. By contrast, talk is not a significant means of strengthening relationships since it "comes so cheaply" (Dobrin 2008:308). Moreover, exchange relationships operating over a long distance are considered especially valuable as representations of one's influence. Patterns of exchange with outsiders can, therefore, motivate collective action via a cycle through which anticipated exchange motivates community-level cooperation as depicted in Figure 1.

[Insert Good-Fig1 here]

Since language documentation and revitalization always involve patterns of exchange of some kind, understanding how these are perceived in a given cultural context is clearly a prerequisite to ethical behavior. Dobrin (2008:301) is especially concerned with how Western notions of "empowerment," which emphasize autonomy and self-determination, interact with a Melanesian cultural system that values ongoing exchange. As an example of the way in which these two value systems can interact in unproductive ways, she describes the difficulties involved in maintaining activity around a local vernacular language preschool (Dobrin 2008:310–15). Its establishment was seen by outsiders as a sign of the village's "virtue" (Dobrin 2008:311), but, because it was associated with political developments in Papua New Guinea emphasizing local autonomy, the community never received the anticipated exchange with outsiders that would have provided the social impetus for continued communal investment.[3] More broadly, Dobrin's observations have clear implications for how any documentary or revitalization project should construct the ways it chooses to "give something back" (Dwyer 2006:57) in this part of the world.

Dobrin's study illustrates the ethical difficulties that arise due to cultural particularities of the groups that are brought together over the course of documentary work, as will be discussed further in Section 3 and Section 4.

2.5   Di Carlo and Good (2014): What should we be "preserving"?

The case study described in this section is based on Di Carlo and Good (2014), which examines the language dynamics of a rural region of Cameroon known as Lower Fungom. At issue is the interplay of local language ideologies and the "preservationist" ideology associated with most linguistic work on endangered languages.

Popular depictions of the loss associated with the extinction of a language often treat this as comparable to "dropping a bomb on the Louvre".[4] Such characterizations are clearly linked to essentialist notions of language that assume a close link between a "language" and a "culture" (see, e.g., Hymes (1968) and Foley (2005)). However, while this association may hold in certain contexts, it does not appear to in Lower Fungom. There, languages are used to index affiliation with political units (e.g., villages) which are locally conceptualized as dynamic entities that come into and out of existence as sociopolitical circumstances warrant. Speaking a language is, therefore, the primary overt signal of one's membership in a given political unit in this part of Cameroon. This ideology is clearly expressed in this quotation from Buo Makpa Amos, who is from the village of Missong in Lower Fungom, which is associated a variety of the Mungbam language (Di Carlo and Good 2014:245).

> When you people are cooperating you speak one language. If you speak one language, you cooperate. As a group of relatives moves, the brothers may decide to split, each choosing a different place to stay. This is what happened to us. We left the early place in Fang side as a whole and arrived in Abar. From here we scattered. Now, we Bambiam

from Missong have relatives in Abar, in Buu, in Ngun. Each family attached itself to a village and therefore had to speak the general language used there. For example, we Bambiam attached ourselves to Bikwom and hence had to adopt their language; Bikwom people are attached to Bidjumbi and Biandzəəm to form the village of Missong, and this is why they all had to use the same language, that is, Missong.

This speaker is very clear in not portraying the Missong variety as an integral part of his identity. Rather, it has a more utilitarian role as a tool to facilitate cooperation. By implication, if the families that together form the village of Missong were to choose to disband, the Missong "language" should also fall into disuse. This would not be due to the global sociopolitical dynamics leading to language loss generally, but, rather, forces endogenous to the local linguistic culture. On the one hand, this suggests that it would be a foreign cultural imposition for an outside linguist to come to a region like Lower Fungom and promote the maintenance of each of its languages under the assumption that this is necessary to "save" a local culture. On the other hand, it points to the idea that the target of "preservation" in the region should not be any one specific lexicogrammatical code but, rather, the ecology that allows different languages to develop or dissipate as the political units that they are associated with rise and fall (see Di Carlo and Good 2014:254–56).

This case study underscores the importance of understanding how ideologies of language and linguistics shape documentary and revitalization projects if one wants to achieve ethical outcomes (Section 3).

2.6   Innes (2010): Context for archival materials

The final case study that will be considered here is focused on issues arising from the use of archival materials and derives from the work of Innes (2010) on the North American language

Mvskoke, spoken by the Muskogee and Seminole Nations of Oklahoma and the Seminole Tribe of Florida. The Americanist linguist Mary Haas collected a significant number of texts in the language, and Innes began working with archived versions of these texts to prepare them for wider publication.

She chose to examine an initial set of narratives on the basis of the amount of analysis that Haas had already done on them. However, her consultants identified some of them as inappropriate for certain audiences, though there had been no indication of this in the materials themselves. Two of them were not merely unsuitable for men who lacked the right background and all women, but were also indicated as being dangerous for those individuals to either read or hear. Work on them ended as soon as this concern had been identified.[5]

In contemporary terms, we might describe the ethical issue that arose from the work on these Mvskoke texts as a failure of metadata. That is, the materials did not contain sufficient information about the restrictions on their content for a later user to know how to work with them responsibly. Given the very different time in which they were collected, we should expect lapses in the collection of important contextual information in legacy materials of the sort that Innes was working with (see also O'Meara and Good (2010)). However, as Innes (2010:200) points out, even contemporary discussions of metadata do not place a strong emphasis on collecting ethnographic detail of the sort that is needed to avoid the situation that she found herself in.[6]

Existing work emphasizes the importance of archiving materials so that they can be accessed by appropriate audiences (see, e.g., Dwyer (2006:40) and Thieberger and Musgrave (2007:30)). What Innes (2010) shows us is that archiving ethically requires us to not simply enter metadata

in "checklist" form but to also consider sensitivities that may be culturally quite specific. This will be further discussed in Section 5.

2.7   From case studies to generalizations

The most important general theme of these case studies is the extent to which, even if we agree on broad ethical principles like "do no harm", the particularities of each situation make it difficult to know what steps are required to apply them. The next section tries to build on this observation by considering the ideologies that inform the actions of participants in documentary and revitalization projects. The logic behind this is that a better understanding of these ideologies is a crucial step in knowing how to concretely detect potential ethical problems and respond to them effectively.

3   Ideologies in language documentation

3.1   The interplay of different ideologies

Most work on language ideologies has been done within the context of linguistic anthropology, though there has been increasing discussion of the topic in the linguistic literature on documentation and revitalization (see Austin and Sallabank (2014)). Here, two topics will be considered: (i) ideologies held be linguists as they engage in documentary and revitalization work and (ii) ideologies held by speaker communities with respect to their languages. These are both large topics in their own right, and the discussion here is necessarily selective.

For those drawn to the study of language because of an interest in grammatical analysis, work on ideologies may seem somewhat foreign. Nevertheless, this body of literature can be enormously helpful in achieving more ethical outcomes because of the tools it offers to reveal the hidden assumptions that guide the actions and responses of the different stakeholders in

documentation and revitalization projects. Becquelin et al. (2008) stands out in this context for its careful elucidation of how complex the interaction can be between the ideologies held by researchers and those held by speaker communities.

3.2   Linguists' ideologies

The topic of linguists' ideologies was raised above in the case studies discussed in Section 2.2 and Section 2.5, specifically regarding the linkage between language and identity. As discussed in Section 2.2, Wilkins (1992) discovered a dissociation between linguistic identity and other kinds of identity when one Arrernte community prevented him from collaborating with another. In Section 2.5, Di Carlo and Good (2014) encountered a situation where languages were not considered by speakers to reflect "deep" aspects of identity, meaning that language loss is locally construed as a "natural" political event.

Each of these cases is, in some sense, surprising due to at least two deeply embedded aspects of the ideology of contemporary linguistics. The first is the conceptualization of languages as discrete and countable entities. While linguists are well aware of the difficulties surrounding any definition of "language" (see, e.g., Cysouw and Good 2013), the idea that we can even speak of a class of "endangered languages" presupposes that we can identify its members (see also Whaley (2011:342–43)). In a broader discussion of the rhetoric of endangered language linguistics, Hill (2002:127–28) characterizes this under the heading of *enumeration*, and Dobrin, Austin, and Nathan (2009) further elaborate on how documentary linguistics has inadvertently taken this process of enumeration one step further by reducing languages to the form of archivable objects, such as recordings and annotated texts.

The urge to "standardize" languages and language data is perfectly understandable in an academic and political environment where it is necessary to justify the allocation of scarce

resources to documentary and revitalization activities. Ethical issues arise, however, when we accidentally carry over the assumptions embedded within these models of endangerment to work with speaker communities. For instance, we may privilege an idealized native speaker as the only "true" holder of knowledge of a "language", and, in so doing, fail to appreciate the diverse ways that people can be speakers in their local context (see, e.g., Evans (2001), Grinevald (2007), and Dobrin and Berson (2011:191)), or we may fail to engage the complexities involved with determining what the "speaker community" is of a language in regions characterized by pervasive multilingualism (see, e.g., Lüpke and Storch (2013:13–47)).

A second important feature of the ideology of contemporary linguistics related to notions of language and identity is the romantic association of each "endangered" language to the "unique local knowledge of the cultures and natural systems in the region in which it is spoken".[7] Once this association is made, an emphasis on the "preservation" of these languages naturally arises, both for the sake of universal human knowledge (see Hill (2002:121–23)) and as a means of ensuring that the groups associated with these languages can maintain their rights to a collective identity (see Errington (2003:727–29)).[8] This ideological linkage is hardly unique to linguists—it is, after all, deeply connected to the "Herderian equation" (Foley 2005:158) of language, culture, and nation that is a fundamental part of the language ideology of the European nation-state. However, it is by no means universal. In Lower Fungom, as discussed in Section 2.5, languages are linked to units of "cooperation" which are not necessarily stable. Other kinds of linkages are also described in the literature, such as one between language and land described for Papua New Guinea (see, e.g., Slotta (2012:5) and Dobrin (2014:129–30)).

A lack of awareness of the ways that researcher ideologies can shape encounters with speaker communities has the potential to lead to unethical outcomes.[9] For instance, it could result in the

imposition of a Western ideology on a community lacking a strong language–culture linkage in a way that decreases the potential for cultural self-determination. Reiman (2010:127) writes of his work on the endangered Kasanga language of Guinea-Bissau that speakers, "agree and appreciate it when told that their language and culture are valuable and worthwhile." However, rather than *telling* speakers about the value of their language, it would be more in line with the current documentary ethos to try to discover what they value about their language and find ways to incorporate those values into the structure of documentary or revitalization projects.

Similarly, as discussed in detail by Dobrin (2011:191–94), preservationist ideologies lead to an emphasis on documenting a "pure" ancestral code—i.e., of uses of language where instances of borrowing and codeswitching are minimized. This will often run counter to the way a language is actually used and result in the creation of documentary records which do not clearly reflect the speech practices of a community. This may not be as obviously problematic as, say, recording someone without their consent (see Section 6), but, it clearly runs counter to a core value of documentary linguistics that the records that we help produce of a language should record the actual practices of speakers as faithfully as possible (see also Childs et al. 2014).

A final ideological view increasingly articulated by linguists is the idea that work on endangered languages should involve significant collaboration with speaker communities. This topic is considered briefly in Section 4.

3.3   Local language ideologies

Within the vast range of work that has been done on language ideologies (see Woolard (1998)), the topic of most interest here is the way in which they intersect with efforts at language documentation and revitalization.[10] The case studies considered in Section 2 already illustrate the importance of understanding this in a number of ways. For instance, in Section 2.3, Debenport

(2010a) found that her work was inadvertently transforming local language ideologies, in particular creating a new class of language "experts" that had not previously existed. In Section 2.6, Innes (2010) encountered a case where community conceptualizations of the power associated with certain texts made them inappropriate for her to work on.

There will be as much diversity of language ideologies as there is of languages and speaker communities, making this a difficult topic to consider in a general way here. However, some further examples can be given for the purposes of illustration. Terrill (2002), for instance, examines the desire of the Lavukaleve community of the Solomon Islands for a dictionary that would be of little practical value. What turned out to be of most importance for them was not for an outside linguist to produce resources which would directly support language maintenance, as might normally be expected, but, rather, to create an object which would add to the language's prestige. In this case, local ideas about how to "support" a language differed from those typically adopted by linguists.

More generally, the reception of written materials in a community will necessarily be linked to local language ideologies. This means that, before embarking on what may seem to be a relatively neutral activity involving writing, such as the development of an orthography—an activity which is commonly proposed as a way to "give back" to a community—it is important to understand the potential ethical implications of such work. [11] Rehg's (2004) examination of language development projects in Micronesia is especially instructive in this regard. Among other things, he evaluates the problems that arise due to the standardizing "impulse" typically associated with orthography development, which, by implication, creates "non-standard" varieties when, previously, variation was conceptualized in different terms (Rehg 2004:509). More strikingly, Rehg (2004:512–15) suggests that attempts to develop Micronesian languages

by making them more like "English" (i.e., by being associated with a written standard, dictionaries, etc.) may hasten their demise by not focusing on the actual concerns of speaker communities, an interesting contrast to what was found by Terrill (2002) who was also working in the Pacific.[12]

This discussion can only scratch the surface of the complexities that can arise when different ideologies of language come into contact. However, a general point emerging from it should hopefully be clear: Greater understanding of the ideologies at play in documentation and revitalization projects can help researchers achieve more ethical outcomes.[13]

4   The maintenance relationships in documentary work

Standard presentations of language documentation emphasize a dichotomy between "outside researchers" and members of a "speech community", as well exemplified by the various collaboration diagrams given in Leonard and Haynes (2010).[14] A result of this is that extensive attention has been paid to the ethics of collaboration among these idealized groups in documentary and revitalization work (see, e.g., Czaykowska-Higgins (2009) for detailed development and Dobrin and Schwartz (2016) for a recent synthesis).[15] Rather than further develop that topic here, the focus will be on the other sorts of relationships that one builds up in the field that have received less attention.

Presentations such as Dwyer (2006:37) and Holton (2009:169) are helpful in this regard by clarifying how many different groups may be involved in a successful project. Dwyer (2006) enumerates, for instance: different levels of government, funding organizations, research institutions, and archives, as well as the ultimate users of documentary products.[16] Holton (2009) presents a more particularized set of groupings for a research context in Indonesia which makes clear the complexities lying behind the idea of understanding who can represent a "community"

in a documentary context. The case studies in Section 2.2 and Section 2.3 also revealed the problems that can arise when groups that look like coherent "communities" to the researcher may, in fact, be characterized by significant internal divisions (see also Whaley (2011:340–42)). In a somewhat different vein, Grinevald's (2007) discussion of the variety of different kinds of "speakers" one may encounter within a community also clarifies the variety of relationships required for successful documentary and revitalization work.

A strength of the existing literature is that it orients scholars away from a researcher-oriented perspective towards one that incorporates the needs and aspirations of the different community members and other stakeholders who play a central role in the work. At the same time, one area that has not been well-developed, but which is central to ethical practice, is how the relationships that a researcher takes part in while in the "field" are perceived in the context of the norms of the communities that they work with. Dobrin (2008), discussed in Section 2.4, is an exception here in its treatment of the outsider's role in a local system of exchange (see Figure 1).

Other work on this topic can be found in the cultural anthropological literature. A useful notion is that of *enclicage*, as developed by Oliver de Sardan (1995:81), which refers to a "double-edged" problem arising from fieldwork due to the necessity of developing personal relationships with specific members of a community. On the one hand, the researcher's association with some individuals, but not others, will embed them within local social networks in ways that an outsider will have difficulty understanding, and, inevitably, result in other individuals feeling, and being, excluded. On the other hand, researchers will naturally tend to adopt the perspective of their closest associates, again to the exclusion of other points of view.

While ethnographically, rather than linguistically, oriented Beereman (1962) presents a relevant cautionary tale based on research in India. At one point, he had to switch his interpreter

from a member of the high-status Hindu Brahmin caste to one who was a Muslim (Beereman 1962:15). This had an unexpected impact on his relationship with members of the community which was the focus of his research, largely due to the special social constraints governing interaction with and among Brahmins in this part of the world. Not only had Beereman become associated with this group when working with his first interpreter, the interpreter's view of the local world also significantly structured that of the researcher.

It is also important to consider how one's identity may cause them to quickly be placed into pre-existing "templates" of interaction. In some contexts, such as aboriginal Australia and native North America, outside researchers know from the outset that they will enter as individuals who need to dedicate substantial efforts to building up trust with community members (see, e.g., Leonard and Haynes (2010:275–76), as well as the case studies in Section 2.2 and Section 2.3). In others, they may instead find themselves immediately treated as having a very high status which entails special obligations, as indicated in Section 2.4 (see also Mc Laughlin and Sall (2001:196–200)). Aspects of identity beyond being a "researcher" will matter as well, of course, with gender, age, family status, and nationality standing out in particular. In addition, the insider status of community members who are also researchers makes their own role in a project quite distinctive from an outside researcher (see Cruz and Woodbury (2014) for a work written from both insider and outsider perspectives).

5 Responsible handling of language resources

Much of the discussion here has focused on relationships in documentary and revitalization work since this is where the greatest ethical pitfalls emerge. However, the goals of these efforts typically involve the creation of language resources of one kind or another. Dwyer (2006:40–50), Musgrave and Thieberger (2007), and Chelliah and De Reuse (2011:151) discuss the obligation

of the researcher to pay careful attention to issues of rights and access of language resources, as well as to help community members fully understand the different kinds of access to materials that digital technologies provide. This includes ensuring community members are able to access collected materials in a way that is appropriate to their needs and interests.

Existing guides to data management and archiving such as Thieberger and Berez (2012) effectively present key steps in the responsible management of documentary data, and work done on documentation and archiving, such as Nathan (2010), considers ways that access restrictions required by stakeholders in documentary resources can be implemented (see also Christen (2008)). On the whole, the field has a decent understanding of how to ethically process resources assuming there is a clear awareness of any sensitivities associated with them. More difficult is ensuring that all parties contributing to the creation of a resource have adequate knowledge of the cataloging and dissemination practices of contemporary documentation. Robinson (2010) considers the issue of "informed consent" (see Section 6) for material dissemination when working with speakers with little awareness of modern technology.

It is also hard to anticipate cases where there may be very different cultural understandings of linguistic products between researchers and community members, such as what was seen in Section 2.6, where Innes (2010) inadvertently exposed her consultants to texts that they viewed as dangerous. One proposed response to problems like these has been to expand the norms for collecting metadata for documentary resources to the level of a "meta-documentation" which would, among other things, "document the goals, processes, methods, and structures of language documentation projects" (Austin 2013:14–15). Meta-documentation itself would not guarantee more ethical outcomes, but, by providing more context to documentary resources, it would facilitate the kind of evaluation required for their more ethical use. Henderson (2013) provides a

case study of developing community-driven meta-documentation for legacy materials of the Noongar language of Australia which resulted in a more ethical protocol for use of the materials than could have been developed by researchers alone.

6 Ethics versus compliance in endangered language work

A final set of topics that are generally discussed under the broad heading of ethics are issues connected to the systems of institutional and legal compliance that researchers are subject to.[17] Of these, regulations on research involving so-called human subjects as implemented by university ethics review boards—e.g., Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) in the United States— have received the most attention (see, e.g., Bowern 2010). Intellectual property laws and the application of copyright to documentary resources are also frequently addressed (Dwyer 2006:45–48, Austin 2010:41–46, Newman 2012). Discussion of these topics has been backgrounded here because of their sometimes tenuous connection to ethics itself. At heart, the problem involves a tension between "ethics" and "compliance" (see Dobrin and Lederman 2012). The latter of these notions emphasizes the adoption of practices which adhere to standards set by outside authorities, rather than emanating from the dynamics of any specific project.

The nature of ethics review as conducted by IRBs in the U.S. exemplifies this tension. While the presence of a systematic means to ensure that research is conducted ethically has clear benefits (see, e.g., Bowern 2010:901), the fact that this system of review is based on a medical model of research limits its efficacy at evaluating much of what is involved in language documentation and revitalization. The result is that the review process can, on the one hand, accidentally guide the researcher towards unethical outcomes and, on the other hand, fail to consider where the real ethical tensions of certain research activities lie.

A well-known problem relates to the handling of data which, in medical research is rightfully treated as requiring strong protections to maintain the confidentiality of research participants. Anonymity is, therefore, adopted as a kind of default stance for data storage, while documentary work favors explicit recognition of everyone involved in the research (Bowern 2010:903). A focus on harm to "human subjects" can further make these boards ineffective at evaluating what harm a researcher's activities might pose to a community at large, a frequent concern in documentary and revitalization work. Finally, it should be emphasized that this system of review is simply not designed to monitor the sorts of "culture clashes" discussed above since the "controlled" nature of idealized medical research does not foreground these kinds of ethical problems.

What this means is that, while it is certainly too strong to accuse ethics protocols generally of "moral depravity" (van Driem 2016), one cannot assume that having institutional ethics approval means that one is necessarily conducting "ethical" linguistic research. The goal of documentary linguists should be to work with review boards and educate them about the nature of their research so that research protocols can be devised that are both compliant *and* ethical. Despite horror stories, such as one presented by van Driem (2016:44) where a researcher was ostracized by a community because of culturally inappropriate requirements imposed by a review board, at least in the U.S., these boards can generally be persuaded to deviate from their established norms when provided with reasonable justification. This could involve appealing to disciplinary ethics statements or by providing examples of how similar research was approved at other institutions. Students, in particular, may benefit from reaching out to scholars with more experience in this area when trying to navigate the review process.

One key concept that work on ethics in documentary linguistics has adopted from the medical domain is the notion of informed consent (see, e.g., Dwyer (2006:43–45), Grinevald (2006:353–63), Thieberger and Musgrave (2007:30–32), and Austin (2010:39–40)). If "informed consent" is understood broadly to mean that researchers engage in ongoing processes of discussion with other stakeholders to ensure that there is a mutual understanding of the nature and goals of a project, it is clear that this aligns well with the general ethical stance of contemporary documentary and revitalization work. However, informed consent is an area where ethics review boards often recommend the use of culturally inappropriate written forms whose content is organized so as to minimize legal liability rather than to be genuinely informative (see, e.g., Bowern (2010:900)). This is, then, an area where the distinction between ethics and compliance in research is especially clear, and where special attention is needed in order to ensure ethical outcomes (see also Robinson (2010)).

Similar issues are raised with respect to intellectual property rights, though they are generally only especially contentious when documentary materials have commercial value. Problems can be found, in particular, if a speaker community's notions of intellectual property do not align with those of existing legal regimes in a way which could result in a loss to the community. This could happen, for instance, if documentary materials revealed Traditional Ecological Knowledge, which may be quite valuable, but is not subject to copyright (see Austin (2010:46), Newman (2012:448)). In such a case, the information would have to be protected by access restrictions (see Section 5) rather than by the law.

7   Achieving ethical relationships in diverse contexts

If there is one overriding theme that ties together the points made in this chapter, it is that the foundation for ethical language documentation and revitalization is ethical relationships, and

these, in turn, are best developed in a context of mutual understanding. This can be difficult to achieve, however, because this kind of work so often involves a researcher working in an unfamiliar cultural context and because of the complicated ways that the culture of research may interact with local moral values. Realizing ethical outcomes, therefore, requires expertise not only in general aspects of documentary practice, but also knowledge of the cultural assumptions that inform both one's own approach to a given project and those of its other stakeholders.

In practical terms, there are various concrete ways of arriving at an improved understanding of the complexities involved. First, it is important that those engaging in documentation and revitalization appreciate the ideological assumptions about language, speakers, and communities that underpin the work. Second, especially when working in parts of the world with which one has had little previous cultural contact, much can be gained by turning to the existing ethnographic literature on the region, in particular work on systems of social organization, exchange, and, if available, language ideologies. Finally, one can reach out to people with experience working in a given region and with the communities where the work will take place, whether these are people from the region or those who have learned about it in other ways. As with anything as complex as "culture", the more viewpoints one can gather, the better.

Finally, it should be said that the nature of the subject matter of this chapter has caused it to accentuate ethical problems over ethical successes. This is largely because following the core ethical precept of "do no harm" requires us to consider just what harms can come about in the first place. However, it would be wrong to assume that ethical dilemmas are a defining feature of documentation and revitalization. Most scholars will gladly talk about the many positive relationships and beneficial outcomes that developed over the course of their work. Learning

how to orient one's behavior in more ethical directions is not only about "doing no harm" but also about making good relationships even stronger.

References

Austin, Peter K. 2010. "Communities, ethics and rights in language documentation." In *Language Documentation and Description*, volume 7, edited by Peter K. Austin, 34–54. London: Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project.

__. 2013. "Language documentation and meta-documentation." In Jones and Ogilvie 2013, 3–15.

__. 2014. "Going, going, gone? The ideologies and politics of Gamilaraay-Yuwaalaray endangerment and revitalization." In Austin and Sallabank 2014, 109–24.

Austin, Peter K., and Julia Sallabank, eds. 2011. *The Cambridge Handbook of Endangered Languages*. Cambridge: CUP.

__, eds. 2014. *Endangered Languages: Beliefs and Ideologies in Language Documentation and Revitalization*. Oxford: OUP.

Becquelin, Aurore Monod, Emmanuel de Vienne, and Raquel Guirardello-Damian. 2008. "Working together: The interface between research and native people: The Trumai case." In *Lessons from Documented Endangered Languages*, edited by K. David Harrison, David S. Rood, and Arienne M. Dwyer, 43–66. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Beereman, Gerald D. 1962. *Behind Many Masks: Ethnography and Impression Management in a Himalayan Village*. Ithaca, NY: Society for Applied Anthropology.

Bowern, Claire. 2010. "Fieldwork and the IRB: A snapshot." *Language* 86:897–905.

__. 2015. *Linguistic Fieldwork: A Practical Guide (Second Edition)*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bowern, Claire, and Natasha Warner. 2015. "'Lone wolves' and collaboration: A reply to Crippen and Robinson (2013)." *Language Documentation and Conservation* 9:59–85.

Brooks, Joseph D. 2015. "On training in language documentation and capacity building in Papua New Guinea: A response to Bird et al." *Language Documentation and Conservation* 9:1–9.

Chelliah, Shobhana L., and Willem J. de Reuse. 2011. *Handbook of Descriptive Linguistic Fieldwork*, 139–59. Dordrecht: Springer.

Childs, G. Tucker, Jeff Good, and Alice Mitchell. 2014. "Beyond the ancestral code: Towards a model for sociolinguistic language documentation." *Language Documentation and Conservation* 8:168–91.

Christen, Kimberly. 2008. "Archival challenges and digital solutions in Aboriginal Australia," *SAA Archeological Recorder* 8:21–24.

Crippen, James A., and Laura C. Robinson. 2013. "In defense of the lone wolf: Collaboration in language documentation." *Language Documentation and Conservation* 7:123–35.

Crowley, Terry. 2007. *Field Linguistics: A Beginner's Guide*. Oxford: OUP.

Cruz, Emiliana, and Anthony C. Woodbury. 2013. "Collaboration in the context of teaching, scholarship, and language revitalization: Experience from the Chatino Language Documentation Project." *Language Documentation and Conservation* 8:262–86.

Cysouw, Michael, and Jeff Good. 2013. "Languoid, doculect and glossonym: Formalizing the notion 'language'." *Language Documentation and Conservation* 7:331–59.

Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa. 2009. "Research models, community engagement, and linguistic fieldwork: Reflections on working within Canadian indigenous communities." *Language Documentation and Conservation* 3:15–50.

Debenport, Erin. 2010a. "Comparative accounts of linguistic fieldwork as ethical exercises." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 206:227–44.

__. 2010b. "The potential complexity of 'universal ownership': Cultural property, textual circulation, and linguistic fieldwork." *Language and Communication* 30:204–10.

__. 2015. *Fixing the Books: Secrecy, Literacy, and Perfectibility in Indigenous New Mexico*. Santa Fe, NM: School for Advanced Research Press.

Di Carlo, Pierpaolo, and Jeff Good. 2014. "What are we trying to preserve? Diversity, change, and ideology at the edge of the Cameroonian Grassfields." In Austin and Sallabank 2014, 229–62.

Dobrin, Lise M. 2009. "SIL International and the disciplinary culture of linguistics." *Language* 85:618–19.

__. 2014. "Language shift in an 'importing culture': The cultural logic of Arapesh roads." In Austin and Sallabank 2014.

Dobrin, Lise M., Peter K. Austin, and David Nathan. 2009. "Dying to be counted: The commodification of endangered languages in documentary linguistics." In *Language Documentation and Description*, volume 6, edited by Peter K. Austin, 37–52. London: Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project.

Dobrin, Lise M., and Josh Berson. 2011. "Speakers and language documentation." In Austin and Sallabank 2011, 188–211.

Dobrin, Lise M., and Rena Lederman. 2012. "Imagine ethics without IRBs." *Anthropology News* 53:20.

Dobrin, Lise M., and Saul Schwartz. 2016. "Collaboration or participant observation? Rethinking models of 'linguistic social work'." *Language Documentation and Conservation* 10:253–77.

Dwyer, Arienne M. 2006. "Ethics and practicalities of cooperative fieldwork and analysis." In *Essentials of Language Documentation*, edited by Jost Gippert, Nikolaus Himmelmann, and Ulrike Mosel, 31–66. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Errington, Joseph. 2003. "Getting language rights: The rhetorics of language endangerment and loss." *American Anthropologist* 105:723–32.

Evans, Nicholas. 2001. "The last speaker is dead—long live the last speaker!" In Newman and Ratliff 2001, 250–81.

Foley, William A. 2005. "Personhood and linguistic identity, purism and variation." In *Language Documentation and Description*, volume 3, edited by Peter K. Austin, 157–80. London: Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project.

Good, Jeff. 2011. "Data and language documentation." In Austin and Sallabank 2011, 212–34.

__. 2012. "'Community' collaboration in Africa: Experiences from Northwest Cameroon." In *Language Documentation and Description*, volume 11, edited by Peter K. Austin and Stuart McGill, 28–58. London: SOAS.

Grenoble, Lenore A., and Lindsay J. Whaley. 2005. "Review of *Language Endangerment and Language Maintenance*, ed. by David Bradley and Maya Bradley, and *Language Death and Language Maintenance*, ed. by Mark Janse and Sijmen Tol." *Language* 81:965–74.

Grinevald, Colette. 2003. "Speakers and documentation of endangered languages." In *Language Documentation and Description*, volume 1, edited by Peter K. Austin, 52–72. London: Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project.

__. 2006. "Worrying about ethics and wondering about 'informed consent': Fieldwork from an Americanist perspective." In *Lesser-Known Languages of South Asia: Status and Policies,*

Case studies and Applications of information technology, edited by Anju Saxena and Lars Borin, 339–70. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

__. 2007. "Encounters at the brink: Linguistic fieldwork among speakers of endangered languages." In *The Vanishing Languages of the Pacific Rim*, edited by Osamu Sakiyama Osahito Miyaoka and Michael E. Krauss, 35–76. Oxford: OUP.

Hale, Ken, Michael Krauss, Lucille J. Watahomigie, Akira Y. Yamamoto, Colette Craig, LaVerne Masayesva Jeanne, and Nora C. England. 1992. "Endangered languages." *Language* 68:1–42.

Henderson, John. 2013. "Language documentation and community interests." In Jones and Ogilvie 2013, 56–68.

Hill, Jane H. 2002. "'Expert Rhetorics' in advocacy for endangered languages: Who Is listening, and what do they hear?" *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 12:119–33.

Holton, Gary. 2009. "Relatively ethical: A comparison of linguistic research paradigms in Alaska and Indonesia." *Language Documentation and Conservation* 3:161–75.

Hymes, Dell H. 1968. "Linguistic problems in defining the concept of 'tribe'." In *Essays on the Problem of Tribe: Proceedings of the 1967 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society*, edited by June Helm, 65–90. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Innes, Pamela. 2010. "Ethical problems in archival research: Beyond accessibility." *Language and Communication* 30:198–203.

Jones, Mari C., and Sarah Ogilvie, eds. 2013. *Keeping Language Alive: Documentation, Pedagogy, and Revitalization.* Cambridge: CUP.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 1992. "Arizona Tewa kiva speech as a manifestation of linguistic ideology." *Pragmatics* 2:297–309.

Leonard, Wesley Y., and Erin Haynes. 2010. "Making 'collaboration' collaborative: An examination of perspectives that frame linguistic field research." *Language Documentation and Conservation* 4:268–93.

Lüpke, Friederike. 2011. "Orthography development." In Austin and Sallabank 2011, 312–36.

Lüpke, Friederike, and Anne Storch. 2013. *Repertoires and Choices in African Languages*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Mc Laughlin, Fiona, and Thierno Seydou Sall. 2001. "The give and take of fieldwork: Noun classes and other concerns in Fatick, Senegal." In Newman and Ratliff 2001, 189–210.

Meek, Barbra. 2010. *We are our Language: An Ethnography of Language Revitalization in a Northern Athabascan Community*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Nathan, David. 2010. "Archives 2.0 for endangered languages: From disk space to MySpace." *International Journal of Humanities and Arts Computing* 4:111–24.

Nevins, M. Eleanor. 2013. *Lessons from Fort Apache: Beyond Language Endangerment and Maintenance*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley.

Newman, Paul. 2012. "Copyright and other legal concerns." In Thieberger 2012, 430–56.

Newman, Paul, and Martha Ratliff, eds. 2001. *Linguistic Fieldwork*. Cambridge: CUP.

Olivier de Sardan, Jean-Pierre. 1995. "La politique du terrain: sur la production des données en anthropologie." *Enquête: anthropologie, histoire, sociologie* 1:71–109.

O'Meara, Carolyn, and Jeff Good. 2010. "Ethical issues in legacy language resources." *Language and Communication* 30:162–70.

Rehg, Kenneth L. 2004. "Linguists, literacy, and the law of unintended consequences." *Oceanic Linguistics* 43:498–518.

Reiman, D. Will. 2010. "Basic oral language documentation." *Language Documentation and Conservation* 4:254–68.

Rice, Keren. 2006. "Ethical issues in linguistic fieldwork: An overview." *Journal of Academic Ethics* 4:123–55.

__. 2012. "Ethical issues in linguistics fieldwork." In Thieberger 2012, 407–29.

Robinson, Laura C. 2010. "Informed consent among analog people in a digital world." *Language and Communication* 30:186–91.

Sakel, Jeanette, and Daniel L. Everett. 2012. *Linguistic Fieldwork*. Cambridge: CUP.

Slotta, James. 2012. "Dialect, trope, and enregisterment in a Melanesian speech community." *Language and Communication* 32:1–13.

Terrill, Angela. 2002. "Why make books for people who don't read? A perspective on documentation of an endangered language from Solomon Islands." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 155/156:205–19.

Thieberger, Nicholas, ed. 2012. *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Fieldwork*. Oxford: OUP.

Thieberger, Nicholas, and Andrea Berez. 2012. "Linguistic data management." In Thieberger 2012, 90–118.

Thieberger, Nicholas, and Simon Musgrave. 2007. "Documentary linguistics and ethical issues." In *Language Documentation and Description*, volume 4, edited by Peter K. Austin, 26–37. London: Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project.

Toelken, Barre. 1996. "From entertainment to realization in Navajo fieldwork." In *The World Observed: Reflections on the Fieldwork Process*, edited by Bruce Jackson and Edward D. Ives, 1–17. Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

van Driem, George. 2016. "Endangered language research and the moral depravity of ethics protocols." *Language Documentation and Conservation* 10:243–52.

Warner, Natasha, Quirina Luna, and Lynnika Butler. 2007. "Ethics and revitalization of dormant languages: The Mutsun language." *Language Documentation and Conservation* 1:58–76.

Whaley, Lindsay J. 2011. "Some ways to endanger an endangered language project." *Language and Education* 25:339–48.

Wilkins, David P. 1992. "Linguistic research under aboriginal control: A personal account of fieldwork in Central Australia." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 12:171–200.

Woodbury, Anthony C. 2011. "Language documentation." In Austin and Sallabank 2011, 159–86.

Woolard, Kathryn. 1998. "Language ideology as a field of inquiry". *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*, edited by Bambi Schieffelin, Kathryn Woolard, and Paul Kroskrity, 3–49. Oxford: OUP.

[1] I am grateful to Lyle Campbell and Lise Dobrin for their comments on an earlier version of this chapter.

[2] There does not appear to be extensive consideration in the literature of the ethics involved in the choice of working with one community over another. For instance, Chelliah and De Reuse's (2011:79–92) chapter on "choosing a language" does not include discussion of ethical concerns. See, however, Grinevald (2003:60–62).

[3] See Mc Laughlin and Sall (2001:196–200) for another instance where noteworthy differences in the social meaning of exchange are considered in a documentary context.

[4] This quotation is widely attributed to Ken Hale in publications dating back at least to the late 1990s, for instance in an article by Wade Davis in the August 1999 issue of *National Geographic*.

[5] For a striking account of the dangers involved when not taking appropriate care to work with sensitive texts, see Toelken (1996).

[6] Innes (2010) cites various papers discussing metadata in her rightful critique of existing sources of advice. To them, I might add a work of my own (Good 2011:229–32), published after Innes (2010), but which suffers from the same issue.

[7] The quotation in this sentence is taken from the program solicitation for the National Science Foundation's Documenting Endangered Languages program (http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2016/nsf16576/nsf16576.htm).

[8] These themes can already be found in Hale et al. (1992:8–9).

[9] Though not couched in terms of ethics or ideologies, Ladefoged's (1992) response to Hale et al. (1992) partly anticipates the points made here.

[10] Meek (2010) and Nevins (2013) are recent detailed studies of this topic in a Native American context.

[11] Seifart's (2006) discussion of orthography development is of note here. While he covers important issues relevant to the ethics of orthography development with respect to, for instance, aligning orthographic choices with a community's goals for the representation of their language in visual form (see, e.g., Seifart (2006:284–85)), he explicitly avoids the broader ethical issues involved in developing a writing system of a language in the first place (Seifart 2006:275–76).

[12] Lüpke's (2011) discussion of orthography development is helpful in clarifying many of the complex social factors involved in working on the development of writing systems for languages lacking a significant written tradition.

[13] The nature of the topic under consideration here results in an orientation towards potential problems that might arise. See, however, Austin (2014) for a case where language ideologies and existing documentation aligned in a way that resulted in a positive outcome.

[14] See Good (2012) for consideration of other kinds of collaboration.

[15] See also Crippen & Robinson (2013) and Bowern & Warner (2015) for debate around ethical issues emanating from the field's current emphasis on collaborative models.

[16] See the collection introduced by Dobrin (2009) for consideration of the role of one prominent institution, SIL International, in documentary work.

[17] Included among these are codes adopted by relevant scholarly societies, such as the Ethics Statement of the Linguistic Society of America (http://www.linguisticsociety.org/sites/default/files/Ethics_Statement.pdf). The Australian Linguistic Society also has adopted a set of policies on ethical conduct (http://www.als.asn.au/activities.html). Of particular note in the present context is their explicit articulation of the linguistic rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.

Caption

[Good-Fig1:] Schematization of meaning of exchange relations in Melanesia (Dobrin 2008:309)

Abstract

The increasing emphasis that linguistics has placed on the documentation and revitalization of the world's endangered languages has brought more scholars of language into contact with communities whose cultures, needs, and interests diverge greatly from their own. Moreover, in many countries, research involving human subjects has become the subject of increasing scrutiny,

and the rise of digital means of information dissemination that has made contemporary

documentary linguistics possible has foregrounded issues of rights and access to language

resources. These contexts of "culture clash" have prompted serious considerations of ethical

practices in documentation and revitalization. This chapter looks at these issues through the

examination of five case studies which clarify the ideological underpinnings of key ethical

concerns in language documentation and revitalization. Insights from the previous literature are

incorporated into the discussion, and additional topics such as archiving and compliance with

institutional regulations are also discussed.

Keywords: documentation, revitalization, ethics, ideologies, case studies

Anticipation of
exchange with outsiders

Basis for securing
community cooperation

People cooperate in
communal activity

Sense of unity and positive
community identity

Community's value is
acknowledged with material
generosity by outsiders