

TEACHING LINGUISTICS

Reimagining the current praxis of field linguistics training: Decolonial considerations

ADRIENNE TSIKEWA

University of California, Santa Barbara

Drawing from decolonizing and Indigenous research methodologies, I examine field linguistic training in US linguistics programs and how it approaches collaborative language research. I argue that the current praxis still reflects a linguist-focused model resulting in linguistic extraction (Davis 2017). I provide three recommendations for transforming linguistic field methods training: (i) the recognition of linguistics as a discipline rooted in colonization and the implications of this for speakers/community members, (ii) the incorporation and explicit discussion of language research frameworks that include Indigenous research methodologies, and (iii) the recognition and valorization of Indigenous epistemologies via decolonizing ‘language’ (Leonard 2017).*

Keywords: field linguistics, training, colonialism, Indigenous research methodologies, language research frameworks, ethics, inclusive education

1. INTRODUCTION. Because I am a Native American scholar, my graduate-level training in linguistics has always engaged in interdisciplinary fields. Individuals who participate in their respective heritage language revitalization and reclamation efforts can attest that this work involves more than acquiring theoretical linguistic knowledge.¹ Not only do these scholars involve related fields such as applied linguistics and education in their language work, but many also engage with Native American/Indigenous studies, which takes an ‘endogenous approach to history, language, politics, culture, literature, and traditions’ (Moreton-Robinson 2016:8). This endogenous approach evolved into critiquing Western hegemonic research conventions and arguing for the inclusion of Indigenous perspectives into research, resulting in decolonial scholarship (e.g. Brayboy 2005, Chilisa 2012, Smith 2012, Leonard 2017, 2018, Gaby & Woods 2020). INDIGENOUS RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES (IRMs) have been developed to assist scholars with implementing decolonial strategies into their research agendas (e.g. Kovach 2010, Brayboy et al. 2012, Chilisa 2012, Wilson 2008, Smith 2012). Within linguistics, IRMs are not typically included in any curriculum. My experience has shown me that many linguists, especially those working on Indigenous languages, are generally unaware of IRMs, to their own detriment.

A larger discussion on the examination of race in linguistics is currently taking place within the discipline, in large part due to the Linguistic Society of America’s Statement on Race (2019b) and recent article by Charity Hudley et al. (2020).² As a Native American linguist, my feelings when reading the aforementioned article were similar to those of DeGraff: that the ‘authors were talking to me directly’ (DeGraff 2020:e292). This is important, as many Native Americans feel invisible not only in higher-educational set-

* I thank this paper’s referees for their constructive feedback. I also acknowledge the numerous Indigenous language warriors working to maintain, reclaim, and revitalize their languages. Their work inspires me to advocate for Indigenous representation in the linguistics discipline.

¹ I use Leonard’s (2011, 2012, 2017) characterization of reclamation and revitalization, where reclamation is the assertion of someone’s ‘right to claim, learn, and speak their language’ (2011:141) and revitalization speaks to larger efforts aimed at producing more speakers, increasing language usage opportunities, and developing language competencies.

² Prominent Native American scholar Vine Deloria Jr. discusses the lasting effects of racism toward Native Americans in academia in his 2004 contribution, ‘Marginal and submarginal’.

tings, but also within mainstream contexts (Leavitt et al. 2015, Connolly et al. 2019, Marroquín 2020). Within linguistics, this feeling of invisibility and underrepresentation is also present for many Native American/Indigenous students and faculty, even though their respective languages ‘provide a disproportionate amount of data that advance linguistic knowledge’ (Charity Hudley et al. 2020:e221).

Charity Hudley et al. (2020) also called on the discipline to include diverse research perspectives and frameworks in linguistic research, implying that current theoretical and methodological approaches are inadequate. Questioning and critiquing research methods and frameworks is not new to linguistics; this has been essential to both the growth and development of the discipline. However, many of these developments continue to reflect a Eurocentric approach to the study of language, indicative of methodological and academic imperialism (Chilisa 2012). The former speaks to a predisposition toward establishing methods and techniques that privilege the dominant culture, with the latter referring to an inclination to depreciate and reject alternative theoretical and methodological approaches. By applying a decolonizing lens (Kovach 2010) to the history of field linguistics and the current praxis of training students to conduct fieldwork and linguistic data analysis on endangered or minimally documented languages, I illustrate how linguistics can be a more ‘equitable and inclusive place for students and scholars of all backgrounds’ (Charity Hudley et al. 2020:e221) by reimagining a field methods curriculum that is guided by decolonial scholarship.

I begin with my positionality in §2, followed by a brief discussion of field linguistics, language documentation and description, and language research frameworks (Cameron et al. 1992, Grinevald 2003, Czaykowska-Higgins 2009) in §3, then an overview of field methods courses and related literature in §4. My current examination of field linguistic training is discussed in §5. In §6, I conclude by offering suggestions that can be incorporated into a field methods curriculum: the recognition of linguistics as a discipline rooted in colonization and its implications for speakers/community members, the incorporation and explicit discussion of community-based language research frameworks that include IRMs, and the recognition and valorization of Indigenous epistemologies via decolonizing ‘language’ (Leonard 2017).

2. POSITIONALITY. As a heritage language learner of Shiwi’ma (Zuni) who was raised away from the reservation where the language is primarily spoken,³ I sought advanced linguistics training in order to decipher the documentation on my language created by non-Indigenous linguists (e.g. Newman 1965). This training fell under the language description and documentation subfield of linguistics, in which an important component is the completion of a linguistics field methods course. These courses are designed to teach students, both undergraduate and graduate, how to do linguistic analysis on an unfamiliar language and to conduct linguistic fieldwork for documentation and description purposes.

I have two experiences with field methods courses: a month-long course offered by the Linguistic Society of America’s biennial summer Linguistic Institute in 2017, and the biennial (2017–18) year-long graduate-level course offered to linguistics students at the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB). My first course, at the Institute, focused on learning abstract linguistic concepts, with minimal time for the students to develop a relationship with the speaker-collaborators or learn about their specific epistemologies, though their knowledge systems were briefly discussed. In the graduate

³ In the US context, Indian reservations are established tracts of land that are ‘understood under federal law as land “reserved” by the U.S. government for usage by Indians’ (Teves et al. 2015:61).

course at UCSB, it was similarly apparent how Western approaches to research and collaboration are the norm for linguistic fieldwork training, which was distressing to me as a Native American woman. My positionality is shaped by the ‘contradictory personal experiences of the Indigenous researcher that arise from dual accountability to the Indigenous community and to the mainstream Western research site’ (Kovach 2010:85), experiences I have felt in both field methods courses. As a COMMUNITY-SCHOLAR LINGUIST, defined as an Indigenous professional linguist whose work brings Indigenous perspectives into linguistic research, the mindset of prioritizing Indigenous communities’ needs, values, and ways of knowing shapes my views as a researcher. These experiences revealed to me a need to explore on a larger scale how students of linguistics are trained to conduct linguistic fieldwork in order to appraise what the discipline considers appropriate preparation for this type of work.

The term ‘community-scholar linguist’ developed out of the Expanding Linguistic Science by Broadening Native American Participation project, of which I was a core project member.⁴ This project aims to expand and improve the field of linguistics by identifying, valorizing, and better integrating Native American needs and epistemologies of language into linguistics research. The motivation for this project stems from the fact that within linguistics, Native American and Indigenous scholars are underrepresented even though there is a large focus on Indigenous languages—particularly in documentary linguistics, but also in linguistic theory (e.g. Bloomfield 1925, Woodbury 1987, Nordlinger & Sadler 2004, Whalen et al. 2011, Tucker & Wright 2020). Another project rationale is that there are differing views between many Indigenous peoples and linguists regarding how language is defined, best practices for working with Indigenous sovereign nations,⁵ and the Western research framework that is applied to the study of Indigenous languages by many linguists. My involvement as an ongoing project member, my own experiences in fieldwork training, and my experiences as a linguistics educator informed the study of field methods training in linguistics that is presented here.

3. LANGUAGE DOCUMENTATION, FIELD LINGUISTICS, AND LANGUAGE RESEARCH FRAMEWORKS. In his seminal article, Himmelmann (1998) argued that descriptive linguistics was already well established within the discipline and that documentary linguistics, while coupled with descriptive linguistics, is a separate domain of linguistic inquiry. Language documentation, which encompasses a descriptive linguistic analysis, specifically focuses on ‘the creation, annotation, preservation and dissemination of transparent records of a language’ (Woodbury 2011:159; see also McDonnell et al. 2018). Both domains rely heavily on linguistic fieldwork to obtain a collection of primary language data.

The traditional view of linguistic fieldwork is that it is the optimal way to acquire data for the purposes of studying linguistic phenomena (Samarin 1967), especially for minority, understudied languages. More than fifty years after Samarin’s publication of the first major instructional reference for linguistic fieldwork, this traditional view remains the same and represents the main concern of language documentarians and de-

⁴ Funding for the project was provided by the National Science Foundation, BCS grant #1743743. The project has evolved into a Linguistic Society of America special interest group called Natives4Linguistics (N4L).

⁵ A referee notes that sovereignty may be specific to particular geopolitical contexts. Academics need to be knowledgeable of the difference and of the connection between sovereignty and self-determination, and must note that self-determination is present in many Indigenous communities. Academics should respect this self-determination (see Mateo-Toledo 2003).

scriptivists, who collectively strive to record as many living languages as possible for the sake of linguistic science, emphasizing the loss of human knowledge. Newman and Ratliff, in the first edited volume on field linguistics of the twenty-first century, emphasize this point:

While acknowledging the difficulties in collecting reliable and comprehensive basic field data, we want to stress the vital importance of doing so, not just as an end in itself, but for the advancement of the linguist's various goals, including the elucidation of Universal Grammar, the discovery of principled variation across different types of languages, and the reconstruction of earlier forms of languages. (2001:1)

Chelliah and de Reuse (2011) define fieldwork as data collection specifically for language documentation and description purposes and argue for the primacy of data collected through interaction with speakers in natural settings.

The aforementioned linguists present fieldwork as part of a process of doing research on a language, one framework discussed by Cameron et al. (1992). The primary purpose of this framework, also called the linguist-focused model (Czaykowska-Higgins 2009), is to advance science. Cameron et al. (1992) also recognize two other language research frameworks: fieldwork FOR the language community, also known as the 'advocacy' framework, and fieldwork WITH speakers of the language community, emphasizing 'equal' partnership between linguists and communities (also known as the 'empowering research framework'). While Cameron and her colleagues focus on sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, field linguists acknowledge these frameworks as applicable across the subdisciplines (Rice 2006, Czaykowska-Higgins 2009). Grinevald (2003:58) contributes an additional framework: fieldwork BY speakers of the language community, or the COMMUNITY-BASED LANGUAGE RESEARCH MODEL (see also Czaykowska-Higgins 2009). This framework recognizes native speakers as co-researchers and strives to incorporate community needs and goals into research outcomes, often including training for community members. These seminal publications introduce new frameworks for thinking about research; however, for linguists working with Indigenous language communities, a specifically Indigenous framework is important, as I discuss in §6.

Since the last three frameworks listed above were developed only in the late twentieth century, many currently practicing field linguists and field methods instructors were likely trained under the traditional model of linguistic fieldwork involving research ON the language under study (Czaykowska-Higgins 2009).

4. FIELD METHODS COURSES AND PREVIOUS PERSPECTIVES ON FIELD LINGUISTIC TRAINING. Field methods courses are designed to replicate a fieldwork situation 'that promotes the (either explicit or implicit) goal of training students to gather and analyze linguistic data' (Ahlers 2009:232). In my experience, the work required in both field methods courses I have taken has been double the amount of a typical course as it requires class meetings, an additional lab session, an individual meeting with the course consultant, course readings, language analysis, and assignments.

Newman (2009 [1992]) evaluated the linguistic fieldwork training that graduate students receive in field methods courses by conducting an informal survey of forty-four Ph.D.-granting linguistics programs within the US. The purpose of this survey was to determine how many departments offered a field methods course, how often it was offered, the length of the course, if the course was required for degree completion, enrollment numbers, and the specialization of the field methods instructor. Based on the number of responses received (42/44) and participants' qualitative feedback, Newman arrived at two conclusions: (i) that other linguists share his belief that a field methods course is an essential component of graduate linguistic training, but that due to the

prominence of generative approaches in many graduate linguistics programs this value will likely remain marginalized, and (ii) that 'linguists receive inadequate field methods training as part of their graduate education' (2009 [1992]:124).

In addition to the survey, Newman (2009 [1992]) critiqued the training that is provided in graduate field methods courses, focusing on human factors as they relate to both personal and practical matters as well as community relations. These factors include health (e.g. local health conditions, high rate of car accidents, and underdeveloped emergency services), children in the field and the lack of discussion regarding the effects fieldwork has on them, and possible gender discrimination and sexual relations. Newman also critiques the lack of discussion of ethics in the discipline, noting that 'linguists rarely mention or even acknowledge that it could be a problem' (2009 [1992]: 118), due to that fact that the ethical cases 'that we know most about are those that we've been involved in firsthand and which are thus an embarrassment to us. These are the things we would prefer not to talk about' (2009 [1992]:120).

Macaulay (2004), Ahlers (2009), and Grenoble (2009) also critique the training provided in field methods courses by reflecting on their personal experiences in fieldwork. Macaulay states that her experience of being unprepared for her first fieldwork venture was due to two factors: (i) that 'there is no place in [our] curriculum for training students in the practical aspects of doing fieldwork' (2004:203), and (ii) the lack of literature regarding personal and practical issues one may encounter in the field. She calls for the inclusion of the following topics in field methods courses.

- (1) Topics to include in field methods courses (Macaulay 2004)
 - a. Mechanics
 - Community entrance
 - Consultants and compensation
 - b. Going alone vs. going with company
 - c. Practical matters
 - Health and safety
 - Food
 - d. Gender and sex
 - e. Emotional reactions and culture shock
 - f. Prior visitors to the community
 - Missionaries and possible negative associations

Similarly, Rehg (2007:15, cited in Brickell 2018:186) discerned that field methods courses are unlikely to assist in practical skills that help the fieldworker 'to maintain their health, happiness, and emotional stability'. Grenoble's (2009) and Ahlers's (2009) critiques of field methods courses move away from those given by Newman and by Macaulay, which do not explicitly address community-based relationships. They asserted that field methods do not train students in areas that a community working toward language revitalization may need and want, such as lexicography and applied linguistics. Other crucial critiques are the fact that field methods courses do not train their students how to work in communities and establish authentic relationships that emphasize collaboration, and that the products developed in field methods are generally inaccessible to the speaker and/or community.

One examination of field linguistic training outside of the United States is by Brickell (2018), who conducted an informal survey to determine whether eight linguistic programs in Australian universities offer a field methods course. These programs were chosen because they offer both undergraduate and graduate degree programs in which some of the students will engage in linguistic fieldwork. He found that only three offer

a field methods course, offered biennially in each case, and two used to offer a course but have discontinued this offering. All eight offer informal training on an ad hoc basis. Brickell describes his own training as minimal and ad hoc through various workshops (e.g. using FLEX, ELAN), since a field methods course was not offered as part of his graduate studies.

As the preceding discussion has detailed, field methods courses, within the US and abroad, are generally considered an optional part of linguistic training and remain marginalized within the linguistics discipline. Furthermore, even where fieldwork training does exist, community-based perspectives and approaches tend to not be included.

5. FIELD LINGUISTIC TRAINING: CONTEMPORARY NORMS. In order to elucidate the current praxis of linguistic fieldwork training, I analyzed field methods course descriptions and texts that reflect linguistics departments' stance on language documentation/description and linguistic fieldwork. I utilized a critical discourse-analytic lens, which is characterized by being problem- or issue-oriented and taking an explicit 'critical approach, position, or stance of studying text and talk ... in an attempt to uncover, reveal, or disclose what is implicit, hidden, or otherwise not immediately obvious' (van Dijk 1995:17). Incorporating an Indigenous research approach, my critical discourse analysis entails examining all of these texts for inclusion of human factors, such as ethics and relationships. If human factors are included, I examined where these occur and how much discussion is involved.

As a starting point, I used the forty-two American Ph.D.-granting linguistics programs that responded to Newman's 1992 survey and conducted an internet search to visit their institution's department websites and course catalogs to collect course descriptions and departmental research foci texts. In addition, I also used the Linguistic Society of America's Directory of Linguistic Programs and Departments⁶ and Linguist List's searchable databases for graduate-degree-granting linguistic programs that specialize in language documentation,⁷ focusing only on American universities.

The search yielded an additional nineteen programs that offer a field methods course but do not necessarily have an explicit focus on language documentation. I found that forty of the forty-two original respondents still offered a field methods course, although only eighteen of these programs listed an offering that was recent or upcoming at the time of this investigation (Winter–Fall 2019). Together, this made for fifty-nine programs that list a linguistic field methods course, fifty-eight of which have publicly available course descriptions. Twenty of the fifty-nine programs have an explicit research focus or research lab for language documentation or a similar field (endangered or Indigenous languages). See Table 1 for a summary.

PROGRAMS INVESTIGATED	
Respondents to Newman (1992)	42
Programs from Newman (1992) still offering a field methods course	40
Additional programs from LSA/Linguist List that offer a field methods course	19
Programs with a documentation or related specialization/focus	20

TABLE 1. Numerical summary of programs investigated.

For a mixed-methods analysis of field methods course materials, I created an anonymous survey using Google Forms to gauge the current training students receive for conducting fieldwork for field language documentation and description. The intended

⁶ <https://www.linguisticsociety.org/programs>

⁷ <https://linguistlist.org/programs/>

respondents were professional, senior linguists who have experience teaching field methods. The survey was disseminated in the summer of 2018 through various outlets (email listservs, social media venues, and direct emails to primary instructors) and was composed of the five sections listed in 2 (see the supplementary materials at <http://muse.jhu.edu/resolve/138> for the full survey). Twenty-one completed surveys were submitted.

(2) Sections of survey for field methods instructors

- a. Teaching field methods (experience and training of instructor, field methods course objectives, student demographics, literature selection, length of course)
- b. Ethics in field linguistics (ethical topics addressed in the course)
- c. Language speaker(s) (term used for language speaker(s) in course, language background of speaker)
- d. Cultural/community considerations (inclusion of language speaker(s) cultural traditions and values, products responsive to community's needs)
- e. Community-based research frameworks (solicit examples and suggestions on incorporating a speech community's needs and ways of knowing into the research process)

The following sections present my analysis of the current praxis of field linguistic training, with the survey results woven into the discussion of the analyzed texts.

5.1. RESEARCH EMPHASSES AND COURSE DESCRIPTIONS. Eleven of the twenty-one survey respondents reported teaching a field methods course over a span of six to fourteen years, with four indicating they have been teaching field methods for over twenty years and another for over forty years. In regard to their own training, six reported never taking a formal field methods course, with one commenting 'I know many who had no such course', and another comment reflecting that they received training through summer schools, but not within their program coursework. Eleven reported that completion of a field methods course is not required for degree completion in the programs where they teach, and almost all reported that their students are primarily graduate students. The length of field methods courses offered in these departments varies from one term to a full academic year.

The linguist-focused research model is the basis for many of the field methods course descriptions, with only eleven programs of the fifty-nine surveyed (19%) including a reference to human factors (e.g. ethics, best practices for community relationship building, collaborative research, interpersonal and cultural issues). Even within the twenty programs that have a documentation or related focus, only five acknowledge those critical human factors in their course descriptions. The survey responses reaffirmed my field methods experiences, as they emphasized the linguist-focused model by highlighting data collection, elicitation techniques, and linguistic analysis in response questions about course goals and student learning objectives. Goals, when listed in course descriptions, primarily consisted of the development of grammatical sketches, annotated text corpora, and documentation of the lexicon, which aligns with the outcomes that survey respondents provided.

Eleven programs included language that reflected training on collaborative research projects and community-oriented applications of linguistic research, such as developing language materials and other resources for language revitalization efforts, and these are prominently highlighted in their research foci or lab descriptions. All eleven of these programs have a documentation or related focus, but only two simultaneously address

human factors in their field methods course descriptions and address collaborative research training and community-oriented applications of linguistic research in their research focus or lab descriptions. What is also concerning is the lack of language regarding other practical matters of fieldwork in course descriptions even in these cases. For instance, only one description mentioned cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity as a component of their fieldwork training. Similarly, the majority of the survey respondents marked 'unsure' when asked if the outcomes of their field methods courses meet the needs of the speaker and/or language community. For those that marked 'yes', an additional follow-up question asked how they assess that these are indeed meeting the needs of the speaker and/or language community. Some responded that they consulted with the speaker before the course, during the course, and when continuing the work. Some noted that these concerns may not be applicable to a speaker living away from their own community and that it depends entirely on the speaker. Two engaged responses remarked that creating assignments applicable to this goal has been challenging, that learning is done by trial and error, and that some well-intentioned projects are too ambitious for unknowing students.

While few course descriptions include any mention of human factors in general, even fewer explicitly mention ethics in linguistic fieldwork. 'Ethics' and its various forms were the most frequent term used in the few (five) survey responses that mentioned human factors for their course goals/student learning objectives. Section two of my survey began by asking, through a list with various options, what ethical topics are addressed in the respondents' field methods courses. While one just commented that 'the university invests in workshops re IRB, I refuse to take time in class', the other four reported including ethical topics such as informed consent, responsibility to the community, and linguistic data and language speaker acknowledgment in their field methods courses. Other topics added by respondents include Ph.D. training for speakers of community languages, speaker compensation, IRB and various levels of research permissions, different ethical codes and research models, impact of the researcher's presence in the community, conflicts of interest, special concerns working with minority communities, and strengths and weaknesses of institutional ethical approval and its history. The majority of respondents reported encountering ethical dilemmas in their own fieldwork experience and explicitly discussing these experiences with their students. Others revealed that they had not put as much thought into these aspects of training, as in the case of one survey respondent who wrote that 'the first question has raised issues that I'd not thought about for my course, but that I should think about and include in the class in some way'.

Opportunities to learn about the speaker-collaborator's cultural traditions were not included in any course or focus description analyzed in this study, and a third of the survey respondents (seven), when asked how they address learning about the community's cultural traditions, values, and local norms, indicated that they do not discuss these issues in their courses. The three most common ways that respondents reported including cultural traditions in their courses are through readings discussed in class with the speaker-collaborator, discussions on how the language speaker defines and connects to their respective language (not in the context of an autonym elicitation), and presentations by the speaker-collaborator. These discussions tend to take place sporadically throughout the course. Other responses provided in the 'additional comments' section of the survey mentioned activities like sharing food and participating in cultural activities with the speaker-collaborator. Few acknowledged that this depends on the speaker-collaborator; for instance, the language consultant could be a student at the university with various responsibilities. As with any interpersonal relationship, personality is also

a factor, and planning and participating in cultural activities may not interest the speaker-collaborator. Representation can also be a concern with regard to what and how much of their culture they should share, according to one respondent who remarked that ‘as single individuals outside their community, they can surely not represent their entire community’.

5.2. FIELD LINGUISTIC HANDBOOKS. While numerous articles discuss topics such as how to do fieldwork (e.g. Aikhenvald 2007, Dixon 2007) and ethical considerations (Rosenblum & Berez 2010, Aikhenvald 2013), there are only a few comprehensive handbooks for learning how to conduct linguistic fieldwork. The handbooks that do exist are designed for both professional linguists and linguistics students and can be used to supplement a field methods course. The survey results determined the majority of field linguistic volumes and handbooks examined here, with each one identified by at least one respondent as a book used in their field methods classes: Samarin 1967, Vaux & Cooper 1999, Newman & Ratliff 2001, Vaux et al. 2007, Chelliah & de Reuse 2011, Sakel & Everett 2012, Thieberger 2012, Bowern 2015, and Meakins et al. 2018. Five of these are specifically designed for students and/or field methods courses (Vaux & Cooper 1999, Vaux et al. 2007, Sakel & Everett 2012, Bowern 2015, Meakins et al. 2018). In addition, I also reviewed Crowley 2007. I examined all ten of the handbooks’ contents for the following areas.

(3) Topics searched for in fieldwork handbooks

- definition of linguistic fieldwork
- research frameworks and methodologies
- discussions of consultants/speakers
- ethics and community considerations
- community-relevant language products
- other human factors (psychological, practical, etc.)

The publication timespan of these handbooks is worth noting. Samarin’s 1967 linguist-focused handbook was the only available text on the subject for over thirty years, until Vaux and Cooper’s book was published in 1999. The majority of linguistic fieldwork guidebooks were published in the past decade, which substantiates Czaykowska-Higgins’s (2009:21) claim that ‘almost all currently practicing linguists have been trained within’ a linguist-focused model.

LINGUISTIC FIELDWORK DEFINED. All of the comprehensive linguistic fieldwork handbooks I examined reinforce the linguist-focused research model in various ways, with the most commonly shared element being that their primary objective is to train fieldworkers to collect language data for the advancement of knowledge. This is most evident in their definitions of linguistic fieldwork (see discussion in §3). Meakins et al. (2018:6) do not provide their own definition of fieldwork but cite Sakel and Everett’s (2012:5), which states it is ‘the activity of a researcher systematically analyzing parts of a language, usually other than one’s native language and usually in a community of speakers of that language’. They also emphasize the spatial aspect of fieldwork (e.g. what constitutes the field includes being away from ‘home’). Crowley (2007) neither provides his own definition nor cites another scholar.

RESEARCH FRAMEWORKS AND METHODOLOGIES ARE NOT INDIGENOUS. Research frameworks are not always explicitly discussed in the handbooks. Sakel and Everett’s (2012) is the only handbook that includes a brief section on different research methods (e.g. quantitative, qualitative, cross-sectional, and longitudinal), rather than assuming that traditional elicitation is the primary fieldwork technique. Bowern (2015) includes a

small discussion on fieldwork and ‘theory’, and notes that there is a distinction between theoretical and empirical research within linguistics, with descriptive linguistic fieldwork falling under the empirical realm. She also notes that the distinction between the two correlates with formalist and functionalist approaches (also mentioned in Newman 2009 [1992]), with the implication that theoretical linguistics refers to the former and descriptive linguistics to the latter. Crowley (2007) depicts this dichotomy with the labels ‘armchair linguists and dirty feet linguists’ (2007:12). He heavily critiques ‘armchair linguists’ as having extensive publication records without ‘putting in any effort to conduct original research on any language’ (2007:12), and as depending on the linguistic data collected and provided by ‘dirty feet linguists’. Chelliah and de Reuse (2011: 358) approach this contrast by posing the question, ‘Should data gathering be theory-driven or data-driven?’. Their discussion is similar to Bowern’s, concluding that data gathering should be simultaneously theory- and data-driven. Vaux and Cooper (1999:5) acknowledge their positionality as theoretical linguists and the contentious divide between theoretical and descriptive linguistics. Their aim is ‘an attempt to mediate between these two linguistic camps’: ‘we endeavor to make it possible for theoretical linguists to conduct research in the field, and for field linguists to organize their efforts in a theoretically enlightened manner’. They therefore base their presented topics and questions in a ‘general framework of modern (generative) linguistic theory’ (Vaux & Cooper 1999:5). Meakins et al. (2018:12) state that ‘theorizing, data gathering, and interpretation go hand-in-hand’ and also include research methods in sections describing less-discussed areas of language documentation (e.g. signs and gestures, child language acquisition, contact languages, and verbal art). The contributors in Newman & Ratliff 2001 and in Thieberger 2012 discuss the various techniques they employ for data collection and analysis.

When asked how linguists can incorporate a speech community’s needs and ways of knowing into graduate student training, fifteen survey responses gave concrete suggestions, such as explicit and ongoing discussion with both the community and students, making students aware that this incorporation may be a priority for some communities, and emphasizing active listening (in which interlocutors demonstrate focus on what others are saying and display their understanding of what was said by paraphrasing or asking clarifying questions). Other suggestions from survey takers about how to train linguists to address community needs include offering a separate course, such as an introduction to participatory action or community-based research, inclusion of research frameworks within the entire degree program, prioritizing speakers’ goals and needs by integrating these aspects into course requirements, and assigning relevant literature on ethical issues of fieldwork. I would also add that having an explicit discussion about the assigned literature needs to occur. My experience has shown me that these discussions can easily be overlooked due to perceived time constraints in a field methods course.

MORE THAN SOURCES OF INFORMATION: LABELS MATTER. For field linguistics, the linguist-focused model is characterized by viewing the speakers ‘as sources of information, and in this sense [they] are of interest to the linguist first and foremost as means to a linguistic end and as objects of study’ (Czaykowska-Higgins 2009:20). One survey question presented four terms used to refer to language speakers in the course: ‘informant’, ‘consultant’, ‘collaborator’, or ‘speaker’, and the results show that survey respondents prefer the term ‘consultant’. Other labels provided were ‘elder’, ‘expert’, ‘colleague’, and ‘language teacher’, which show awareness of the negative associations with the term ‘informant’ and suggest a relationship based on respect, as opposed to ‘means to a linguistic end and as objects of study’ (Czaykowska-Higgins 2009:20). Fur-

thermore, the majority of survey respondents stated that they explicitly discuss terminology for referring to the speaker in class.

Of particular importance to the current study is the term ‘informant’ when referring to language speakers.⁸ Merriam-Webster defines ‘informant’ as ‘one who supplies cultural or linguistics data in response to interrogation by an investigator’. While this definition may seem somewhat neutral, it is necessary to highlight the semantic shift this term has undergone, specifically within the US context. Most community members and speaker-collaborators are likely to be less familiar with Merriam-Webster’s non-academic-affiliated definition of a person simply giving information and more likely to be familiar with the definition of an informant as someone associated with law enforcement (Chelliah & de Reuse 2011, citing Udell 1972, and Bowern 2015), or, in other words, as an ‘undercover agent’ who ‘informs about illegal activities’.⁹ In this stereotypical scenario, the informant is in a quid pro quo relationship with law enforcement or government officials and provides coveted information in exchange for personal benefits (e.g. protection, reduced sentences, monetary payment).

‘Informant’ was the term frequently used in twentieth-century linguistics, appearing in the handbooks by Samarin (1967), Vaux and Cooper (1999), and Vaux et al. (2007). Samarin (1967:1) even refers to the approach of the ‘speaker being a source of information and evaluator of utterances put to him by the investigator’ as the ‘informant method’. Interestingly enough, Samarin displays awareness of the problematic nature of ‘informant’ when he notes that linguists should use caution when using this term outside of linguistic circles, and that ‘educated people have been known to become embarrassed when referred to by the phrase “my informant”’ (1967:20–21), associating this term with ‘informer’—a role and label that may carry explosive political implications in many cultural contexts. Newman and Ratliff (2001:3) consider this term in the introduction to their edited volume, noting the various labels used by the contributing authors (‘informant’, ‘consultant’, ‘speaker’, ‘teacher’, ‘interlocutor’, ‘source’, ‘subject’, ‘assistant’), and emphasize that the term used is dependent on the local context and level of involvement of the language speaker in the linguistic research. Vaux et al. (2007:6) also remark that this term insinuates ‘espionage and skullduggery’. Chelliah and de Reuse (2011:165–66), discussing various labels that reference a language speaker, also note that ‘informant’ is viewed negatively.

Bowern (2015) devotes an entire subsection to addressing this term, observing that this term connotes ‘police informer’ and minimizes the role of the speaker-collaborator

⁸ A referee commented that they feel that this term has not been used for some time now, which may be true in some contexts. However, in my experiences, this term is still in use and there has been no explicit literature discussing its impact. One experience was at the LSA Institute in 2017, where a female graduate student from the UK used it when referring to the speakers she worked with in South America. Informal discussions with some UCSB international student colleagues support the idea that ‘informant’ does not have the same connotation in European contexts as it does in the US. Another experience is when a community scholar who participated in the Natives4Linguistics 2018 workshop took offense when I expressed my contempt for the word ‘informant’ and commented that I hoped the participants did not use the term ‘informant’ to refer to the speakers they work with. In this case, it was used to refer to a community member whose documentation materials the community scholar was using for their language work. It was later relayed to me that they were offended by what I said and that they should be able to call them whatever they want. Indeed, there are contemporary Native American scholars who frequently employ this term in their research (e.g. Mihesuah 1998 and Bruchac 2018). It was/is not my intention to diminish anyone’s self-determination, but it is my intention to highlight both the complex and problematic nature of this word, particularly regarding Native Americans.

⁹ Urban Dictionary: <https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=informants>, accessed November 24, 2019.

in the language project, rather than presenting them as an agent of language reclamation. Crowley (2007) also devotes a subsection to this label, describing an ‘informant’ as one who shares information that should not be public knowledge, and he instead uses the term ‘language-helper’. He additionally notes that ‘consultant’ can also be perceived negatively in ‘many parts of the developing world where self-appointed experts are often contracted on highly paid short-term “consultancies” to write reports that show little real awareness of the situation on the ground’ (2007:86).

Some Indigenous perspectives regarding the term ‘informant’ come from Cruz (2020) and from Deloria (2004). Cruz discusses how the various terms used when referring to Indigenous language speakers (e.g. ‘informant’, ‘consultant’, ‘collaborator’, or ‘trusted friend’) are a reflection of the separation that an outsider linguist feels from the language and cultures they work on, and how this separation reflects a colonized and paternalistic mentality typical of Western research. Deloria, discussing the advent of American Indian Studies in US institutions, details how he ‘once made [anthropologist] Margaret Mead back away from referring to the Indians she interviewed as “informants”’ (2004:18). He viewed her later claim that she considered those she interviewed to be ‘colleagues’, as opposed to ‘tattletales’, as a publicity stunt for anthropology, ‘designed to change the image of the noisy intruding scholar to that of benign friendship and collaboration’ (2004:18). Nevertheless, he considered Mead’s claim to be a leading example for other scholars to follow in treating American Indian scholars as colleagues and not simply sources of information.

ETHICS AND COMMUNITY-RELEVANT LANGUAGE PRODUCTS, OR THE ‘MYTHICAL DICTIONARY’ DILEMMA.¹⁰ As a Native American woman, I am familiar with the stories of previous researchers who focused on my community and behaved poorly. Because of this, I have always paid significant attention to how ethics and working with communities have been approached within linguistics.

Samarin (1967:16), observing that engaging with a community sometimes entails doing valid community work that usually is not central to the research project, begins his discussion on ethics with regard to researchers assuming a role and stating a purpose within a community. He does this by presenting two profound questions: (i) ‘is it deceitful to assume a role which is in conformity to the local role expectations even when these are far removed from the explicit purpose of the research?’—that is, is it wrong to assume a role when it is motivated by expediency for the research (e.g. community entry and acceptance) and when it detracts time from academic work?—and (ii) ‘how can a linguistic investigator take from the people of a community a vast amount of data—much of it given free, all of it given in good will, with the hope, perhaps, that it will do them or their children some good—and use it exclusively in scientific publications which in themselves can serve no practical purpose?’ In response to the first question he states that it is not unethical to conform to local role expectations and engage in community work, such as working on a fishing boat, obtaining water, and planting. This question reveals that reciprocity in a fieldwork setting is likely to occur but also that researchers at the time questioned this expectation because ‘participation exacts a great deal from the fieldworker’ (1967:14).

The lack of in-depth attention paid to ethical concerns within linguistics is mentioned by Newman and Ratliff (2001:9), who consider it ironic when compared to related disciplines such as anthropology and sociology. They also observe that there was minimal discussion about ethics by most of the contributors to their volume. Where ethical con-

¹⁰ In reference to Manatowa-Bailey 2008.

cerns are hinted at, the contributors focused on the researcher's relationship to the speaker-collaborator and the practice of covert audio recording. Newman and Ratliff do present a list of many valid ethical concerns, such as intellectual property rights, compensation, working in an area surrounded by political conflict, and encouraging future fieldworkers to consult relevant anthropological literature on the topic. The other edited handbook analyzed here (Thieberger 2012) has a final section titled 'Collaborating with the community'. Rice's (2012) contribution to this section focuses on ethical models of fieldwork, and Macaulay's contribution (a republication of Macaulay 2004) centers on training of graduate students for conducting linguistic fieldwork. Three of the student-focused handbooks have explicit sections on ethics (Sakel & Everett 2012, Bowern 2015, Meakins et al. 2018), as does Crowley's handbook (2007).

Crowley (2007:23–56) details the ethical obligations a linguist has based on their relationships with others. Regarding speakers, a linguist's responsibilities revolve around institutional review board requirements, whereas with regard to communities, the obligation is to 'give back' with pedagogical materials. Regarding other linguists, he says, one has the onus to consider another's fieldwork 'territory' and attempt to consult with those already working in an area or on a language before conducting one's own project. Linguists also have the obligation to make their data publicly available. He critiques those who keep linguistic data to themselves, deeming it 'selfish' and 'risky'. The final matter he touches upon in this section is unique as it addresses the lack of influence of Indigenous linguists, specifically native speakers, in descriptive linguistics. He notes that these usually private commentaries are often framed as 'white western academics consciously or subconsciously excluding indigenous linguists from working on their own languages' (2007:55). He emphasizes the importance of conference organizers intentionally trying to include native-speaker linguists in programming, usually by including sessions concerning applied issues. Vaux et al. (2007) discuss various 'delicate matters' in their introduction, which include awareness of issues surrounding speaker-collaborators' ethnicity and how these factor into their identity and awareness of cultural differences as well as speaker-consultant collaboration, consultation with speakers before publication, and training community members to carry out their own linguistic research. Chelliah and de Reuse (2011) emphasize that the ethical problems one may encounter in linguistic fieldwork depend on the region where fieldwork is being conducted, and they include a section on fieldwork ethics.

Samarin's second question, relating to linguistic data and community desires, is of primary concern to current language research frameworks. He concludes that it ultimately rests on the personal decision of the linguist, and he provides examples of community members being distrustful of outsider researchers and resentful of academic exploitation. He also raises the notion of 'giving back' to a community that one has worked with, citing an instance where a linguist working with a Klamath community, which had expressed their desire numerous times for a resource that would help the children learn and preserve their language, later apologized in an academic publication for failing to provide any. Indeed, community-based materials as outcomes of fieldwork are rarely mentioned in any of the handbooks, though Crowley (2007) specifically recommends that linguists provide a grammar, dictionary, and reading materials. Bowern (2015) is the only one who includes a more thorough discussion, with entire subsections on various community-based outcomes (e.g. language revitalization, training community members, and a learner's guide). For Vaux et al. (2007), community-based products can be viewed as bringing personal enrichment to the fieldworker and possible validation of a minority language. Meakins et al. (2018:13) advocate 'being open to the

linguistic aspirations of the community' and considering 'the ways that the needs of endangered speech communities may be recognized, articulated, and supported' in order to incorporate these suggestions into long-term practices.

Strikingly, some authors actually warn AGAINST the supposed dangers of community-based work. Chelliah and de Reuse (2011) categorize these products as secondary instructional goals and highlight the need for linguists to ask themselves if they are doing too much when it comes to creating community-based materials, noting that most linguists have no training in applied linguistics. They argue that it 'would be unethical to waste precious time producing second-rate materials that are ineffective in revitalization or stabilization efforts' (2011:143–44).

As mentioned earlier, community-based products are rarely mentioned in the handbooks. Therefore, it was not surprising that many of the handbooks (two thirds) do not mention language research frameworks as discussed by Cameron et al. (1992) and/or Czaykowska-Higgins (2009).¹¹ The references to these two seminal texts in three handbooks (Chelliah & de Reuse 2011, Thieberger 2012, Bowern 2015) are listed in Appendix C.

HOLISTIC CONCERNs. Other human factors, such as psychological hardships that a fieldworker may experience (e.g. loneliness, depression, homesickness), are commonly expected to occur in the field (Newman & Ratliff 2001:7, Chelliah & de Reuse 2011:118). Nevertheless, Brickell (2018) noted a lack of explicit, formal discussions of these expected hardships in fieldwork handbooks and related publications, and my analysis confirms his findings. Bowern 2015 is the only handbook that has sections dealing with living in and returning from the field, which discuss various practical matters (e.g. health, culture shock and reverse culture shock, personal safety). Chelliah and de Reuse (2011) similarly include a comprehensive chapter that addresses preparing for fieldwork via three different areas: philological, practical, and psychological. It is worth noting that these concerns revolve around the fieldworker and THEIR well-being, rather than that of the community.

6. STEPS TOWARD DECOLONIZING FIELD METHODS IN LINGUISTICS. My examination of linguistics departments' publicly available course descriptions, fieldwork-focused handbooks and volumes, and the anonymous survey of linguistics field methods instructors has revealed that modern training in field linguistics is inadequate when it comes to preparing students to appropriately include community-based perspectives and participation in their own research. This lack of training has resulted in the discipline's continuation of the colonial, linguist-focused model that has been so widely critiqued. I offer the following as some suggested initial steps toward decolonizing linguistic fieldwork training, and discuss each one at greater length in the subsections below.

- (i) Recognition of linguistics as a discipline rooted in colonization and the implications of this for speakers/community members (Errington 2008, Leonard 2018)
- (ii) Incorporation and explicit discussion of language research frameworks that include Indigenous research methodologies (Kovach 2010, Chilisa 2012)
- (iii) Recognition and valorization of Indigenous epistemologies via decolonizing 'language' (Leonard 2017)

¹¹ I also searched indexes for 'community-based research' and 'participatory action research', with no findings.

6.1. RECOGNITION OF LINGUISTICS AS A DISCIPLINE ROOTED IN COLONIZATION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR SPEAKERS/COMMUNITY MEMBERS. Field linguistics has historically operated under colonial models of research. Errington (2008:3) discerned that the texts produced from colonial first encounters—word lists, grammars, dictionaries—rendered languages as ‘objects of knowledge, so that their speakers could be made subjects of power’. Linguistics played a crucial role in the conversion of numerous Indigenous peoples to Catholicism and other Christian sects through the translation of the Bible into Indigenous languages. Ethnocentric views on Indigenous languages, exemplified by labels such as ‘primitive’ (see Sapir 1929), have also played a significant role in language loss through educational systems (e.g. boarding/residential schools). Errington questions whether linguistics can claim to be ‘postcolonial’, citing the current trend of language documentation on endangered languages as a continuation of colonial interactions between researcher and the chosen language. Colonial linguistics was also noted three decades before by prominent field linguist Ken Hale (1972:384), who stated that ‘anthropology and anthropological linguistics became disciplines in which Westerners studied, published, and built teaching and research careers around the cultural and linguistic wealth of non-Western peoples’. Indigenous scholar Chilisa (2012:8) notes that ‘one of the shortfalls of Euro-Western research paradigms is that they ignore the role of imperialism, colonization, and globalization in the construction of knowledge’. Linguistics is no exception, and many linguists remain ignorant of the field’s contribution to colonization.

My current examination of field linguistic training demonstrates that the history of field linguistics is rarely discussed. One exception is Chelliah and de Reuse (2011), whose chapter on the history of linguistic fieldwork should be required reading in any field methods or introduction to linguistics course. They note that studying this history ‘helps us to understand why potential linguistic consultants, in many areas of the world, have negative perceptions of outside researchers’ (Chelliah & de Reuse 2011:35). Without an understanding of that history, we cannot hope to decolonize field linguistics (see also DeGraff (2020), who details and critiques the history of the comparative method in historical linguistics).

Recognition of the legacy of colonial linguistics leads the way for linguists to examine their positionality (Leonard 2018) and how their status as an academic implies power relations. Thus, their role as such is a privileged one (Errington 2008), resulting in unequal power relations (see also Eira 2007). These power relations are exemplified with the term ‘informant’, discussed in §4.2, which entails a subordinate relationship with an authoritative entity who can choose not to honor the quid pro quo agreement but still utilize the information provided. Power relations are also exemplified through the ideology that speakers are not qualified to self-analyze their language (i.e. via native-speaker introspection).

Reflexivity regarding one’s positionality is an approach that is rarely discussed in linguistics. Wertheim (2009), discussing reflexive ethnography, notes that there is minimal work in this area within linguistic anthropology (with notable exceptions such as Jacobs-Huey 2002), although cultural anthropologists have devoted much attention to theorizing researcher positionality (Clifford & Marcus 1986). Leonard (2018, 2021) calls attention to how linguists’ positionality influences their analysis, leading to prescriptive, rather than descriptive, results.

This can reinforce already unequal power relations, with analyses being viewed as fixed truths instead of what they really are: accounts by specific people with specific backgrounds. Reflexivity and positionality are ethnographic concepts essential to In-

digenous research frameworks (discussed below) and have been explored in community-based research in other social sciences (see Muhammad et al. 2015 for sociology, Castleden et al. 2012 for geography).

6.2. INCORPORATION AND EXPLICIT DISCUSSION OF LANGUAGE RESEARCH FRAMEWORKS. Power relations and colonial linguistics are intensified by some research frameworks and attenuated by others. Therefore, scholars have a responsibility to learn about these connections in order to understand how they affect research. A linguistic field methods curriculum should include a general discussion of language research frameworks (Cameron et al. 1992, Czaykowska-Higgins 2009)—a recommendation echoed by some survey respondents. In addition, IRMs also need to be included, explicitly discussed, and connected to the established frameworks as they ‘should stand on an equal footing with Western research paradigms and should be an essential and integral part of any research methodology course’ (Chilisa 2012:7).

Chilisa (2012) describes four research paradigms: POSITIVIST, INTERPRETIVE, TRANSFORMATIVE, and INDIGENOUS. These paradigms correlate with the language research frameworks proposed by Cameron et al. (1992) and Czaykowska-Higgins (2009), with the latter aligning more with an Indigenous research paradigm. However, one way that Chilisa deviates from previous authors is her emphasis on recognizing the colonial impacts on past and present research and on decolonizing research processes. In order to illustrate that this model will strengthen current standards, I first provide a very general overview of the paradigms and language research frameworks, emphasizing the commonalities between them. I then use current concepts familiar within linguistics (e.g. collaboration, the notion of expertise) to illustrate misalignment with an Indigenous research paradigm, and provide feasible suggestions that both scholars and Indigenous communities can incorporate into research practices.

Under the POSITIVIST PARADIGM, the motivation for doing research is to ascertain generalizable laws and universals. Analyses should not include values, but rather strive for objectivity. This paradigm best matches the ETHICAL research model proposed by Cameron et al. (1992) and the LINGUIST-FOCUSED model proposed by Czaykowska-Higgins (2009; see also Kibrik 1977). Research under the INTERPRETIVE PARADIGM aims to understand and describe humanity and includes qualitative and ethnographic research designs. Values are seen as an integral part of social life, and values other than one’s own are viewed as different, not wrong. Therefore, values are inevitably a factor in the research process, which correlates with Czaykowska-Higgins’s (2009:23) ADVOCACY research model, characterized by requiring ‘the researcher to understand and be sympathetic to the linguistic and social contexts of the language users and to work for them’. An example of advocacy research within language documentation is researching place names, which can then be used by the language community to support their land claim efforts (Czaykowska-Higgins 2009).¹² TRANSFORMATIVE researchers seek social change, also resembling the advocacy research model. As such, a primary goal of their research is to empower others. Cameron et al.’s (1992:23) empowering research model also matches this paradigm, as it emphasizes that researchers try to address the ‘agendas researched persons may have’. It encompasses working with language users (community members) on their language for their specific needs and developing language products for pedagogical purposes or other desired interventions (see also Grinevald 2007, Yamada 2007, 2010, Dobrin & Schwartz 2016, Shulist & Rice 2019).

¹² This example may be specific to North American communities. A referee noted that land claims might be used against other Indigenous communities.

TOWARD AN INDIGENOUS RESEARCH PARADIGM FOR LINGUISTIC FIELDWORK. As a Native American researcher, I found the language research frameworks proposed by Cameron et al. (1992) insufficient because they do not prioritize a community's needs, values, and ways of knowing. An Indigenous research paradigm has no equivalent in such frameworks. Research under the INDIGENOUS RESEARCH PARADIGM seeks 'to challenge deficit thinking and pathological descriptions of the formerly colonized and reconstruct a body of knowledge that ... promotes transformation and social change among the historically oppressed' (Chilisa 2012:40; see also Wilson 2008, Kovach 2010, Brayboy et al. 2012, Davis 2017, Leonard 2017, 2018). Research designs encompass participatory and transformative approaches and are derived from Indigenous knowledge systems. Data-gathering techniques are based on these systems (e.g. talk stories and talk circles) and/or can be adapted from the other three paradigms. Values in the research process are informed by 'the four Rs': relational accountability, respectful representation, reciprocal appropriation, and rights and regulations (Louis 2007). Czaykowska-Higgins's community-based language research framework, influenced by IRMs, is distinct from those proposed by Cameron et al. (1992) in that the former recognizes 'that the linguist is only one of the *experts* in the research process, and that community members as well as linguists should be directors of and active partners in the research' (2009:24, emphasis in original; see also Mellow 2015).

Czaykowska-Higgins addresses two features of IRMs with her definition of the community-based language research framework: (i) community members are viewed as co-directors and are actively involved with all aspects of the research process, and (ii) community members have their own expertise that they contribute to the research process. The first feature highlights collaboration, a current buzzword within the linguistics discipline, but goes beyond many linguists' concept of collaboration as 'giving back', discussed with regard to Samarin's (1967) contemplation of ethics in §5.2. Two critiques of this notion of 'giving back' are raised by Leonard (2021:23–24) and Sapién (2018). Leonard points out a different model that he calls 'the camouflaged linguist-focused model' within supposedly collaborative language documentation projects, where the linguist develops two sets of materials, one for an academic audience and the other for the community. For Leonard, the problem with this model is that the community-based materials tend to follow the linguist-oriented organizational schema for linguistic categories (e.g. curriculum for a field methods course starting with phonetics/phonology, morphology, syntax, etc.). For Sapién, the belief that 'giving back' via pedagogical resources is equivalent to collaboration is a widely perpetuated misconception. This belief is not representative of 'true collaboration [that] seeks to "work together" to set goals and undertake projects that are of balanced mutual benefit and depend on contributions from all stakeholders' (2018:208; see also Leonard & Haynes 2010).

The second feature of Czaykowska-Higgins's community-based research framework concerns who counts as the expert. This question has a long tradition within field linguistics and can be seen in the discussions of native-speaker introspection in the field linguistic handbooks. Samarin (1967:38) notes that terms such as 'naïve' and 'unso- phisticated' speak to the lack of skills a speaker has in 'dealing objectively with his language'. Vaux et al. (2007:30) demonstrate this ideology in their section titled 'What to believe', noting that slogans such as 'accept everything a native speaker says in his language and nothing he says about it' were commonplace in the late structuralist period. Chelliah and de Reuse (2011:375) also argue that when it comes to providing grammaticality analyses of constructed phrases, 'the insights and intuitions of native speakers are simply not reliable'. They also provide numerous reasons why native speakers' in-

tui¹²tions can be problematic as well as cite literature references speaking on this matter, and they caution against disregarding a ‘speaker’s contributions on the basis of a perceived or even tested lack of fluency’ (Chelliah & de Reuse 2011:178). Regardless of what previous research says about native speakers’ intuitions, this language ideology does not align with the community-based language or Indigenous research frameworks, as they emphasize equality, respect for people and their respective knowledge systems, and mutual trust (see Hale 1972, Rice 2006).

Also related to the notion of experts is the training of community members. Sapién (2018:207) notes the lack of discussion regarding training for outsider researchers and calls for ‘balance in who needs what sorts of training’. An example of training that linguists already undertake pre-fieldwork is consulting historical and cultural texts of the area and of the peoples they will most likely be working with. Indigenous research with decolonization methodologies entails consulting these texts with a critical lens and exploring the possible biases within them, which Chilisa refers to as ‘researching back’ (2012:14; see also Smith 2012). This involves questioning how linguistics and its related disciplines ‘through an ideology of Othering have described and theorized about the colonized Other, and refused to let the colonized Other name and know from their frame of reference’ (Chilisa 2012:14). In addition to critically reading relevant texts, researchers also need to challenge misinformation and colonizing interpretation. Learning from decolonizing sources about the cultural traditions and protocols of the community one wishes to work with are also important steps in the research process. For this training, I call on communities and speaker-collaborators to develop a ‘cultural boot-camp’ (Madrigal & Huaute 2018) for outsider researchers. For a field methods class, this would involve class presentations and discussions, facilitated by the speaker-collaborator and other knowledgeable sources, and trips, both physical and virtual (if possible), to the speaker’s community that would occur throughout the entire course.

As an example, if a researcher desired to work with my community, Zuni Pueblo, I would recommend the cultural boot camp to include the following excursions:¹³ our Visitor Center, our tribal museum, and the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center. The Visitor Center provides information on locally relevant places, such as our sacred Dowa Yalanne (Corn Mountain), ancestral village (Hawikku), and Ojo Caliente, a now historical farming area where my maternal grandmother was raised. It also highlights our Zuni artisans, known for their skilled craftsmanship, and how this contributes to the local economy. Our creation and migration stories, which also tell of our clan and kinship system, can be heard at our tribal museum. The Indian Pueblo Cultural Center is where one can learn about all nineteen Pueblo communities in New Mexico and our history alongside them, such as the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. I would recommend giving gifts of a big bag of Blue Bird® flour to Pueblo communities, as bread baking is a significant tradition. These experiences would provide the minimal grounding necessary for collaborating with the Zuni community while demonstrating humility and respect on the part of the researcher.

6.3. RECOGNITION AND VALORIZATION OF INDIGENOUS EPISTEMOLOGIES VIA DECOLONIZING ‘LANGUAGE’. A defining feature of an Indigenous research paradigm is that it is based on Indigenous knowledge. There is no prescribed definition for Indigenous epistemologies (Kovach 2010), but rather shared features, such as relational, holistic, inclusive, metaphysical, and spiritual priorities. Grenier (1998) provides the following characteristics of Indigenous knowledge (cited in Chilisa 2012:99).

¹³ This is not an exhaustive list.

(4) Characteristics of Indigenous knowledge (Grenier 1998, cited in Chilisa 2012:99)

- a. Indigenous knowledge is cumulative and represents generations of experiences, careful observations, and trial-and-error experiments.
- b. Indigenous knowledge is dynamic, with new knowledge continuously added and external knowledge adapted to suit local situations.
- c. All members of the community, that is, elders, women, men, and children, have Indigenous knowledge.
- d. The quantity and quality of Indigenous knowledge that an individual possesses will vary according to age, gender, socioeconomic status, daily experiences, roles and responsibilities in the home and the community, and so on.
- e. Indigenous knowledge is stored in people's memories and activities and is expressed in stories, songs, folklore, proverbs, dances, myths, cultural values, beliefs, rituals, cultural community, laws, local language, artifacts, forms of communication, and organization.
- f. Indigenous knowledge is shared and communicated orally and by specific examples and through cultural practices such as dance and rituals.

The inclusion of Indigenous epistemologies in a field methods course is a structural change and requires the 'critical rereading of Western history and the Indigenous presence in the making of that history' (Smith 2012:150). Indigenous epistemologies can be incorporated into a linguistics field methods course, or linguistics in general, by decolonizing 'language' (Leonard 2017), achieved by asking the speaker-collaborator(s) how they define language. The goal is 'to elevate Indigenous "ideologies" to definitional status and examine language work from this perspective' (Leonard 2017:21). I argue that the inclusion of the speaker-collaborator's definition of their language is fundamentally different from eliciting the autonym for the name of the language and should happen before ANY elicitation occurs. Before the LSA's 2018 annual meeting, the Natives4Linguistics project participants met and explored different definitions of language and the implications of these definitions for linguistic science. Key conclusions of workshop participants include the following:

- 'Current definitions of language are missing the spiritual aspect and spirit is everywhere.'
- 'Languages help us stay centered and connected to the land.'
- 'Language is our vehicle to connect with the wisdom of our ancestors.'

Exploring the speaker-collaborator's definition of language, how they connect to their language, and how their language connects to their spirituality is vital, as it is usually the motivation for the speaker-collaborator to participate in language documentation, revitalization, and reclamation efforts. This definition should then be acknowledged as valid and kept at the forefront of the course, especially when eliciting oral narratives/texts. A way to acknowledge these connections is by incorporating the SPEAKING heuristic, initially described by Hymes (1962).

The SPEAKING heuristic refers to the components of a speech event: SETTING and SCENE, PARTICIPANTS, ENDS, ACT SEQUENCE, KEY, INSTRUMENTALITIES, NORMS, and GENRE. Floyd (2018) expands on this notion for documentary linguistics, and I would emphasize the ends dimension and amend the key dimension. The ends dimension originally concerned the purposes and goals of a speech event, but Floyd stresses balancing the concerns of all involved, observing that continual consideration of this area will help current researchers avoid 'the mistakes of salvage anthropology' (Floyd 2018:377). The

key dimension involves documenting contextualization clues, and I would amend this to include the effect the speaker-collaborator has on the narrative/text. Including these connections will help speech community members in distinguishing significant documentation that can aid in their cultural/language revitalization and reclamation efforts. In addition, as language names are also a reflection of power relations, a general discussion on language names should occur as well, incorporating relevant literature such as Haspelmath 2017 and Mateo-Toledo 2003. Course participants should critically engage with questions such as: Who decides which language name to use in publications, especially if there are multiple variants? Are there best practices regarding language names? What are the (sociohistorical) contexts for these variations? How does a person's particular name choice reflect their positionality? How should academics acknowledge these variations in their teaching and research? These inclusions should also be used to inform research outcomes, such as the sociolinguistic portion of a reference grammar. This emphasis on the context of the data collection specifically calls for addressing the researcher's presence and positionality in the speech community.

7. CONCLUSION. The critical analysis of field methods course descriptions, linguistics fieldwork handbooks and edited volumes, and the survey responses of field methods instructors have revealed that many US linguistics programs are still training their students in a linguist-focused model, despite collaboration being a current 'hot topic' within the discipline. My findings echo those of Newman (2009 [1992]) and Brickell (2018) regarding the inadequate training graduate students receive for conducting linguistic fieldwork, but our concerns vary and are informed by our respective positionality. As a Native American linguist, my concern is related to the colonial methods typically used in field methods courses, and not necessarily the position of field linguistics within the discipline (Newman 2009 [1992]) or the effects of insufficient training in conducting linguistic fieldwork (Brickell 2018).

Another prominent finding revealed in my examination is the minimal attention directed at ethics in field linguistic training. Gal and Irvine (1995:986) detail how 'ideologies of language are implicated in the methodologies by which scholars claim special means of knowing their objects of study'. Not explicitly including ethical considerations in a methods course or related literature exposes a residual language ideology that disconnects language from the humans who speak it. This separation can also be seen when linguists venerate 'linguistic data over the speakers from whom it comes, and the communities and contexts in which it is produced', a leading example of linguistic extraction (Davis 2017:40).

I have also demonstrated the significance of examining methodological approaches deemed inherent to a discipline. Within field linguistic training, traditional elicitation methods of elucidating the core grammatical areas of a language are privileged, resulting in linguistic extraction (Davis 2017). While they refer to integrating linguistic methods within anthropology, Gal and Irvine (1995) demonstrate the need to rethink a discipline's boundaries that are created through the methods employed. Though overwhelmingly linguist-focused, Crowley (2007:56) explicitly calls on the discipline to 'accord greater recognition to the value of applied—as against purely theoretical and descriptive—activities in order for the contributions of indigenous linguists to be fully recognized'. This can be achieved by incorporating usage-based language prompts (see Appendix A) in field linguistic training, designing assessments/assignments that produce language-learning materials, and educating oneself about language revitalization and reclamation movements.

I have provided three recommendations for transforming linguistic field methods training: (i) the recognition of linguistics as a discipline rooted in colonization and the

implications of this for speakers/community members, (ii) the incorporation and explicit discussion of language research frameworks that includes Indigenous research methodologies, and (iii) the recognition and valorization of Indigenous epistemologies via decolonizing ‘language’. These recommendations, along with the additional ways to implement them provided in Appendix A, are necessary inclusions in any field methods course for any student level (undergraduate, graduate, community member, speaker-collaborator, etc.). These inclusions are one way that faculty can ensure ‘that students are appropriately instructed in ethical practices’, a recommended obligation of the Linguistic Society of America’s (2019a) revised ethics statement. By including IRMs in field methods courses, instructors not only will better prepare students to work with Indigenous communities, but will also be providing a more complete overview of the field. I also argue that engaging with language research frameworks and their related ethical concerns be made a priority throughout linguistics curricula. This intervention is a structural change informed by decolonial principles (Smith 2012, Leonard 2018) and is a step toward a more inclusive discipline.

APPENDIX A: PROPOSED DECOLONIAL STRATEGIES

COURSE INTRODUCTION/GENERAL

- Acknowledgment of diverse research methodologies (e.g. quantitative, qualitative, Indigenous research, participatory action)
 - Begin again (Smith 2014) and language research frameworks. Articulate your positionality.
 - Acknowledge the speaker-collaborator as the expert by noting their role as such on the syllabus (i.e. teacher/primary facilitator with instructor of record as co-facilitator).
- History of fieldwork (Chelliah & de Reuse 2011)
- Leonard 2017 and discussion on naming languages in linguistics (Mateo-Toledo 2003, Haspelmath 2017)
- Refrain from using ‘discovery’ when referring to language structure. This term, especially in the context of working with minority/Indigenous communities, indexes colonial encounters with the exotic ‘other’ (i.e. it indexes Christopher Columbus), which further indexes ideologies of claiming.

COMMUNITY/CULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Assign/read applicable sociohistorical literature.
 - Research and question the author’s positionality.
 - Look for and include resources created by community members.
- Have presentations on topics such as food preparation, cooking food, mealtime customs, agricultural, hunting, fishing practices, dress/clothing, and kinship.
- If publicly available, use relevant videos about speaker-collaborator community and/or culture for presentational aids and/or elicitation prompts.
- Engage with community-based language, health, and/or environmental groups, programs, or organizations. They can (usually) provide insight into a community’s self-determination.

USAGE-BASED LANGUAGE PROMPTS

- Focus on language-learning topics (e.g. self-introductions, describing self and others, describing physical characteristics, common daily activities, seasons, weather, directions, and topics included in community/cultural considerations) to elucidate traditional grammar topics.
- Use culturally appropriate basic vocabulary for elicitation.
- Avoid language and cognition tasks as they generally do not reflect actual language use.
- Go beyond the classroom (e.g. move class outside).

PHONETICS/HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS

- History of comparative method (critique by DeGraff 2020)

RECOMMENDING READINGS FOR INDIGENOUS RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES: I encourage readers to read literature such as Wilson 2008, Kovach 2010, Chilisa 2012, and Smith 2012, and I also recommend these brief primers:

LOUIS, RENEE PUALANI. 2007. Can you hear us now? Voices from the margin: Using Indigenous methodologies in geographic research. *Aboriginal Policy Research Consortium International* 45(2).130–39. DOI: 10.1111/j.1745-5871.2007.00443.x.

SMITH, LINDA TUHIWAI. 2014. Social justice, transformation and indigenous methodologies. *Ethnographic worldviews: Transformations and social justice*, ed. by Robert E. Rinehart, Karen N. Barbour, and Clive C. Pope, 15–20. Dordrecht: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-007-6916-8_2.

WALTER, MAGGIE, and MICHELE SUINA. 2019. Indigenous data, indigenous methodologies and indigenous data sovereignty. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 22(3).233–43. DOI: 10.1080/13645579.2018.1531228.

APPENDIX B: HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS THAT LIST A FIELD METHODS COURSE IN CURRICULUM

Universities included in Newman's original list are in *italics*. * indicates universities from Newman's original list that no longer offer a field methods course.

Biola University	<i>University of California, Santa Barbara</i>
Boston University	<i>University of Chicago</i>
<i>Brown University</i>	<i>University of Colorado</i>
College of William & Mary	<i>University of Connecticut</i>
<i>Cornell University</i>	<i>University of Delaware</i>
<i>City University of New York</i>	<i>University of Florida</i>
Dartmouth College	<i>University of Hawai'i-Mānoa</i>
Florida International University	<i>University of Illinois</i>
Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics—Dallas International University	<i>University of Iowa</i>
<i>Harvard University</i>	<i>University of Kansas</i>
<i>Indiana University</i>	<i>University of Maryland</i>
<i>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</i>	<i>University of Massachusetts</i>
<i>Michigan State University*</i>	<i>University of Michigan</i>
<i>New York University</i>	<i>University of Minnesota</i>
Northeastern Illinois University	<i>University of Montana</i>
<i>Northwestern University</i>	<i>University of New Mexico</i>
<i>Ohio State University</i>	<i>University of North Carolina</i>
Pennsylvania State University	<i>University of North Dakota</i>
Purdue University	<i>University of Oklahoma</i>
<i>Rice University</i>	<i>University of Oregon</i>
Southern Illinois University—Carbondale	<i>University of Pennsylvania</i>
<i>Stanford University</i>	<i>University of Pittsburgh</i>
<i>SUNY Buffalo</i>	<i>University of Rochester</i>
Syracuse University	<i>University of Southern California</i>
University of Alaska—Fairbanks	<i>University of South Carolina*</i>
University of Albany	<i>University of Texas—Arlington</i>
<i>University of Arizona</i>	<i>University of Texas—Austin</i>
<i>University of California, Los Angeles</i>	<i>University of Virginia</i>
<i>University of California, Berkeley</i>	<i>University of Washington</i>
<i>University of California, San Diego</i>	<i>University of Wisconsin</i>
	<i>Yale University</i>

APPENDIX C: REFERENCES TO LANGUAGE RESEARCH FRAMEWORKS WITHIN FIELD LINGUISTICS HANDBOOKS

Partial citations for the two principal texts for language research frameworks, Cameron et al. 1992 and Czaykowska-Higgins 2009, are provided in the first row. The field linguistic handbooks that cite either one of these two principal texts are in the left column. The other columns provide the chapter title, number of chapters, and page numbers of these references.

	CAMERON ET AL. 1992	CZAYKOWSKA-HIGGINS 2009
CHELLIAH & DE REUSE 2011	Fieldwork and ethics (Ch. 6: pp. 141, 157) Native speakers & fieldworkers (Ch. 7: pp. 164, 192)	Fieldwork and ethics (Ch. 6: pp. 141, 157) Native speakers & fieldworkers (Ch. 7: pp. 164, 192)
THIEBERGER 2012	Sociolinguistic fieldwork (Meyerhoff et al. 2012) (Ch. 5: pp. 124, 126) Ethical issues in linguistic fieldwork (Rice 2012) (Ch. 18: pp. 412, 429)	Ethical issues in linguistic fieldwork (Rice 2012) (Ch. 18: pp. 412, 429)
BOWERN 2015	—	Fieldwork results (Ch. 14: p. 233)

TABLE A1. References to language research frameworks within field linguistic handbooks.

REFERENCES

AHLERS, JOCELYN C. 2009. The many meanings of collaboration: Fieldwork with the Elem Pomo. *Language & Communication* 29(3).230–43. DOI: 10.1016/j.langcom.2009.02.005.

AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA Y. 2007. Linguistic fieldwork: Setting the scene. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 60(1).3–11. DOI: 10.1524/stuf.2007.60.1.3.

AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA Y. 2013. A story of love and debt: The give and the take of linguistic fieldwork. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 14(2).172–82. DOI: 10.1080/14442213.2013.769118.

BLOOMFIELD, LEONARD. 1925. On the sound-system of Central Algonquian. *Language* 1(4).130–56. DOI: 10.2307/409540.

BOWERN, CLAIRE. 2015. *Linguistic fieldwork: A practical guide*. 2nd edn. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

BRAYBOY, BRYAN. 2005. Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review* 37(5).425–46. DOI: 10.1007/s11256-005-0018-y.

BRAYBOY, BRYAN; HEATHER R. GOUGH; BETH LEONARD; ROY F. ROEHL II; and JESSICA A. SOLYOM. 2012. Reclaiming scholarship: Critical Indigenous research methodologies. *Qualitative research: An introduction to methods and designs*, ed. by Stephan D. Lapan, Marylynn T. Quartaroli, and France J. Riemer, 423–50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

BRICKELL, TIMOTHY C. 2018. Linguistic fieldwork: Perception, preparation, and practice. *Language Documentation and Description* 15.179–207. Online: <http://www.elpublishing.org/PID/165>.

BRUCHAC, MARGARET M. 2018. *Savage kin: Indigenous informants and American anthropologists*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press. DOI: 10.2307/j.ctt2050vr4.

CAMERON, DEBORAH; ELIZABETH FRAZER; PENELOPE HARVEY; M. B. H. RAMPTON; and KAY RICHARDSON (eds.) 1992. *Researching language: Issues of power and method*. London: Taylor & Francis.

CASTLEDEN, HEATHER; VANESSA S. MORGAN; and CHRISTOPHER LAMB. 2012. ‘I spent the first year drinking tea’: Exploring Canadian university researchers’ perspectives on community-based participatory research involving Indigenous peoples. *The Canadian Geographer* 56.160–79. DOI: 10.1111/j.1541-0064.2012.00432.x.

CHARITY HUDLEY, ANNE H.; CHRISTINE MALLINSON; and MARY BUCHOLTZ. 2020. Toward racial justice in linguistics: Interdisciplinary insights into theorizing race in the discipline and diversifying the profession. *Language* 96.e200–e235. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2020.0074.

CHELLIAH, SHOBHANA L., and WILLEM J. DE REUSE. 2011. *Handbook of descriptive linguistic fieldwork*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media. DOI: 10.1007/978-90-481-9026-3.

CHILISA, BAGELE. 2012. *Indigenous research methodologies*. London: Sage.

CLIFFORD, JAMES, and GEORGE E. MARCUS (eds.) 1986. *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography: A School of American Research advanced seminar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

CONNOLLY, MICHELE; MEHGAN GALLAGHER; FELICIA HODGE; MARY CWIK; VICTORIA O’KEEFE; BETTE JACOBS; and AMY ADLER. 2019. Identification in a time of invisibility for American Indians and Alaska Natives in the United States. *Statistical Journal of the International Association for Official Statistics* 35.71–89. DOI: 10.3233/SJI-190495.

CROWLEY, TERRY. 2007. *Field linguistics: A beginner’s guide*. New York: Oxford University Press.

CRUZ, HILARIA. 2020. Entre propios y extraños: Cuando una investigadora indígena realiza estudios en su propia comunidad. *Reflexiones teóricas en torno a la función del trabajo de campo en lingüística-antropológica: Contribuciones de investigadores indígenas del sur de México* (LD&C special publication 22), ed. by Emiliana Cruz, 37–57. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.

CZAYKOWSKA-HIGGINS, EWA. 2009. Research models, community engagement, and linguistic fieldwork: Reflections on working within Canadian Indigenous communities. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 3.15–50. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4423>.

DAVIS, JENNY L. 2017. Resisting rhetorics of language endangerment: Reclamation through Indigenous language survivance. *Language Documentation and Description* 14.37–58. Online: <http://www.elpublishing.org/PID/151>.

DEGRAFF, MICHEL. 2020. Toward racial justice in linguistics: The case of Creole studies (Response to Charity Hudley et al.). *Language* 96.e292–e306. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2020.0080.

DELORIA, VINE, JR. 2004. Marginal and submarginal. *Indigenizing the academy: Transformation scholarship and empowering communities*, ed. by Devon Abbott Mihesuah and Angela Cavendar Wilson, 16–30. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. Online: <https://muse.jhu.edu/book/11697>.

DIXON, R. M. W. 2007. Field linguistics: A minor manual. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 60.12–31. DOI: 10.1524/stuf.2007.60.1.12.

DOBRIN, LISE M., and SAUL SCHWARTZ. 2016. Collaboration or participant observation? Rethinking models of ‘linguistic social work’. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 10.253–77. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24694>.

EIRA, CHRISTINA. 2007. Addressing the ground of language endangerment. *Working together for endangered languages: Research challenges and social impacts (Proceedings of Foundation for Endangered Languages Conference XI, Kuala Lumpur, October 26–28, 2007)*, ed. by Maya Khemlani David, Nicholas Ostler, and Caesar Dealwis, 82–90.

ERRINGTON, JOSEPH. 2008. *Linguistics in a colonial world: A story of language, meaning, and power*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

FLOYD, SIMEON. 2018. Tools from the ethnography of communication for language documentation. *Oxford handbook of endangered languages*, ed. by Kenneth L. Rehg and Lyle Campbell, 370–98. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190610029.013.19.

GABY, ALICE, and LESLEY WOODS. 2020. Toward linguistic justice for Indigenous people: A response to Charity Hudley, Mallinson, and Bucholtz. *Language* 96.e268–e280. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2020.0078.

GAL, SUSAN, and JUDITH T. IRVINE. 1995. The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research* 62.967–1001. Online: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40971131>.

GRENIER, LOUISE. 1998. *Working with Indigenous knowledge: A guide for researchers*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

GRENOBLE, LENORE. 2009. Linguistic cages and the limits of linguists. *Indigenous language revitalization: Encouragement, guidance, and lessons learned*, ed. by Jon Reyhner and L. Lockard, 61–69. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

GRINEVALD, COLETTE. 2003. Speakers and documentation of endangered languages. *Language documentation and description*, vol. 1, ed. by Peter K. Austin, 52–72. London: SOAS.

GRINEVALD, COLETTE. 2007. Linguistic fieldwork among speakers of endangered languages. *The vanishing languages of the Pacific Rim*, ed. by Osahito Miyaoka, Osamu Sakiyama, and Michael E. Krauss, 35–76. New York: Oxford University Press.

HALE, KENNETH. 1972. Some questions about anthropological linguistics: The role of Native knowledge. *Reinventing anthropology*, ed. by Dell Hymes, 382–400. New York: Pantheon.

HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 2017. Some principles for language names. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 11.81–93. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24725>.

HIMMELMANN, NIKOLAUS P. 1998. Documentary and descriptive linguistics. *Linguistics* 36. 161–95. DOI: 10.1515/ling.1998.36.1.161.

HYMES, DELL. 1962. The ethnography of speaking. *Anthropology and human behavior*, ed. by Thomas Gladwin and William C. Sturtevant, 13–53. Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.

JACOBS-HUEY, LANITA. 2002. The natives are gazing and talking back: Reviewing the problematics of positionality, voice, and accountability among ‘native’ anthropologists. *American Anthropologist* 104.791–804. DOI: 10.1525/aa.2002.104.3.791.

KIBRIK, A. E. 1977. *The methodology of field investigations in linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton.

KOVACH, MARGARET. 2010. *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

LEAVITT, PETER A.; REBECCA COVARRUBIAS; YVONNE A. PEREZ; and STEPHANIE A. FRYBERG. 2015. ‘Frozen in time’: The impact of Native American media representations on

identity and self-understanding. *Journal of Social Issues* 71.39–53. DOI: 10.1111/josi.12095.

LEONARD, WESLEY Y. 2011. Challenging ‘extinction’ through modern Miami language practices. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 35.135–60. DOI: 10.17953/aiacr.35.2.f3r173r46m261844.

LEONARD, WESLEY Y. 2012. Framing language reclamation programmes for everybody’s empowerment. *Gender and Language* 6.339–67. DOI: 10.1558/genl.v6i2.339.

LEONARD, WESLEY Y. 2017. Producing language reclamation by decolonising ‘language’. *Language Documentation and Description* 14.15–36. Online: <http://www.elpublishing.org/PID/150>.

LEONARD, WESLEY Y. 2018. Reflections on (de)colonialism in language documentation. In McDonnell et al., 55–65. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24808>.

LEONARD, WESLEY Y. 2021. Centering Indigenous ways of knowing in collaborative language work. *Sustaining Indigenous languages: Connecting communities, teachers, and scholars*, ed. by Lisa Crowshaw, Inge Genee, Mahaliah Peddle, Joslin Smith, and Conor Snoek, 21–33. Athabasca: Athabasca University Press. Online: <https://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/SILL/SILL3.pdf>.

LEONARD, WESLEY Y., and ERIN HAYNES. 2010. Making ‘collaboration’ collaborative: An examination of perspectives that frame linguistic field research. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 4.268–93. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4482>.

LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA. 2019a. LSA revised ethics statement, final version (approved July 2019). Online: <https://www.linguisticsociety.org/content/lsa-revised-ethics-statement-approved-july-2019>.

LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA. 2019b. LSA statement on race. Online: <https://www.linguisticsociety.org/content/lsa-statement-race>.

LOUIS, RENEE P. 2007. Can you hear us now? Voices from the margin: Using Indigenous methodologies in geographic research. *Geographical Research* 45.130–39. DOI: 10.1111/j.1745-5871.2007.00443.x.

MACAULAY, MONICA. 2004. Training linguistics students for the realities of fieldwork. *Anthropological Linguistics* 46.194–209. Online: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30029028>.

MADRIGAL, WILLIAM, JR., and RAYMOND HUAUTE. 2018. Chemenankatem: Re-culturating Cahuilla language revitalization and elucidating the role of allyship with linguists. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Salt Lake City.

MANATOWA-BAILEY, JACOB. 2008. Waiting for the mythical dictionary: The language researcher within Native communities. Paper presented at the Native American Languages in Crisis conference, Philadelphia.

MARROQUÍN, CRAIG. 2020. Indigenous research: A paradigm shift from statistically insignificant to statistically underpowered. Blog, May 21, 2020. Online: <https://www.cmarroquinconsulting.com/post/underpowered>.

MATEO-TOLEDO, B’ALAM. 2003. The use of languages’ names: The Mayan case. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 69.151–53. DOI: 10.1086/379682.

MCDONNELL, BRADLEY; ANDREA L. BEREZ-KROEKER; and GARY HOLTON (eds.) 2018. *Reflections on language documentation 20 years after Himmelmann 1998*. (LD&C special publication 15.) Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24800>.

MEAKINS, FELICITY; JENNIFER GREEN; and MYFANY TURPIN. 2018. *Understanding linguistic fieldwork*. New York: Routledge.

MELLOW, J. DEAN. 2015. Decolonizing Western science, research, and education: Valuing linguistic diversity. *Honoring our elders: Culturally appropriate approaches for teaching Indigenous students*, ed. by Jon Allen Reyhner, Joseph Martin, Louise Lockard, and Willard Sakiestewa Gilbert, 45–60. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

MEYERHOFF, MIRIAM; CHIE ADACHI; GOLNAZ NANBAKHSH; and ANNA STRYCHARZ. 2012. Sociolinguistic fieldwork. In Thieberger, 121–46. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199571888.013.0006.

MIHESUAH, DEVON A. (ed.) 1998. *Natives and academics: Researching and writing about American Indians*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

MORETON-ROBINSON, AILEEN. 2016. Introduction: Locations of engagement in the first world. *Critical indigenous studies: Engagements in first world locations*, ed. by Aileen Moreton-Robinson, 3–16. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

MUHAMMAD, MICHAEL; NINA WALLERSTEIN; ANDREW L. SUSSMAN; MAGDALENA AVILA; LORENDA BELONE; and BONNIE DURAN. 2015. Reflections on researcher identity and power: The impact of positionality on Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) processes and outcomes. *Critical Sociology* 41.1045–63. DOI: 10.1177/0896920513516025.

NEWMAN, STANLEY. 1965. *Zuni grammar*. (University of New Mexico publications in anthropology 14.) Albuquerque: University of New Mexico.

NEWMAN, PAUL. 2009 [1992]. Fieldwork and field methods in linguistics. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 3.113–25. [Reprinted from *California Linguistic Notes* 23.3–8, 1992.] Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4428>.

NEWMAN, PAUL, and MARTHA RATLIFF (eds.) 2001. *Linguistic fieldwork*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

NORDLINGER, RACHEL, and LOUISA SADLER. 2004. Nominal tense in crosslinguistic perspective. *Language* 80.776–806. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2004.0219.

REHG, KENNETH. 2007. The language documentation and conservation initiative at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. *Documenting and revitalizing Austronesian languages* (LD&C special publication 1), ed. by Virginia Rau and Margaret Florey, 13–24. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/1350>.

RICE, KEREN. 2006. Ethical issues in linguistic fieldwork: An overview. *Journal of Academic Ethics* 4.123–55. DOI: 10.1007/s10805-006-9016-2.

RICE, KEREN. 2012. Ethical issues in linguistic fieldwork. In Thieberger, 407–29. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199571888.013.0019.

ROSENBLUM, DAISY, and ANDREA L. BEREZ. 2010. Introduction: The Boasian tradition and contemporary practice in linguistic fieldwork in the Americas. *Fieldwork and linguistic analysis in Indigenous languages of the Americas*, ed. by Andrea L. Berez, Jean Mulder, and Daisy Rosenblum, 1–8. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4448>.

SAKEL, JEANETTE, and DANIEL L. EVERETT. 2012. *Linguistic fieldwork: A student guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SAMARIN, WILLIAM J. 1967. *Field linguistics: A guide to linguistic field work*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

SAPIÉN, RACQUEL-MARÍA. 2018. Design and implementation of collaborative language documentation projects. *The Oxford handbook of endangered languages*, ed. by Kenneth L. Rehg and Lyle Campbell, 203–24. New York: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190610029.013.12.

SAPIR, EDWARD. 1929. The status of linguistics as a science. *Language* 5.207–14. DOI: 10.2307/409588.

SHULIST, SARAH, and FAUN RICE. 2019. Towards an interdisciplinary bridge between documentation and revitalization: Bringing ethnographic methods into endangered-language projects and programming. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 13.36–62. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24798>.

SMITH, LINDA T. 2012. *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. 2nd edn. New York: Zed Books.

SMITH, LINDA T. 2014. Social justice, transformation, and Indigenous methodologies. *Ethnographic worldviews: Transformations and social justice*, ed. by Robert E. Rinehart, Karen N. Barbour, and Clive C. Pope, 15–20. New York: Springer.

TEVES, STEPHANIE NOHELAN; ANDREA SMITH; and MICHELLE RAHEJA (eds.) 2015. *Native studies keywords*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press. DOI: 10.2307/j.ctt183gxzb.

THIEBERGER, NICHOLAS (ed.) 2012. *The Oxford handbook of linguistic fieldwork*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199571888.001.0001.

TUCKER, BENJAMIN V., and RICHARD WRIGHT. 2020. Introduction to the special issue on the phonetics of under-documented languages. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 147.2741–44. DOI: 10.1121/10.0001107.

UDELL, GERALD. 1972. Responses of co-workers to the word informant. *Studies in linguistics in honor of Raven I. McDavid*, ed. by Lawrence M. Davis, 441–54. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

VAN DIJK, TEUN A. 1995. Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese Discourse* 1.17–28.

VAUX, BERT, and JUSTIN COOPER. 1999. *Introduction to linguistic field methods*. Munich: LINCOM Europa.

VAUX, BERT; JUSTIN COOPER; and EMILY TUCKER. 2007. *Linguistic field methods*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock.

WERTHEIM, SUZANNE A. 2009. Who's using who? The fieldworker as documenter and tool of language revalorization. *Language & Communication* 29.271–85. DOI: 10.1016/j.langcom.2009.02.008.

WHALEN, DOUG H.; CHRISTIAN T. DiCANIO; and PATRICIA A. SHAW. 2011. Phonetics of endangered languages. *Acoustics Today* 7.35–42. Online: <https://acousticstoday.org/phonetics-of-endangered-languages-d-h-whalen/>.

WILSON, SHAWN. 2008. *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Winnipeg: Fernwood.

WOODBURY, ANTHONY C. 1987. Meaningful phonological processes: A consideration of Central Alaskan Eskimo prosody. *Language* 63.685–740. DOI: 10.2307/415716.

WOODBURY, ANTHONY C. 2011. Language documentation. *The Cambridge handbook of endangered languages*, ed. by Peter K. Austin and Julia Sallabank, 159–86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

YAMADA, RACQUEL-MARÍA. 2007. Collaborative linguistic fieldwork: Practical application of the empowerment model. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 1.257–82. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/1717>.

YAMADA, RACQUEL-MARÍA. 2010. *Speech community based documentation, description, and revitalization: Kari'nja in Konomerume*. Eugene: University of Oregon dissertation. Online: <http://hdl.handle.net/1794/11304>.

[atsikewa@ucsb.edu]

[Received 20 August 2020;
revision invited 14 November 2020;
revision received 1 April 2021;
accepted pending revisions 7 June 2021;
revision received 8 July 2021;
accepted 9 July 2021]