In Defense of the Lone Wolf:
Collaboration in Language Documentation

James A. Crippen
University of British Columbia

Laura C. Robinson
University of California, Santa Barbara

Collaboration has become a hot topic in the field of language documentation, with many authors insisting that lone wolf research is unethical research. We take issue with the viewpoints that documentary linguists must collaborate with the community, that the linguist's goals should be subordinate to the goals of community members, and that solo research is necessarily unethical research. Collaborating with community members in language documentation projects is not the only method of treating the community fairly and reciprocating their generosity. There will not always be community members interested in language documentation, nor will there always be community members capable of participation. Even in cases where community members are interested, capable, and willing, both the researcher and the community should be allowed to decide when, where, how, and whether to collaborate. Moreover, we suggest that the insistence on collaboration can cause guilt when collaboration is difficult, or can lead researchers into unproductive or even dangerous situations. On the other hand, we welcome collaboration if both parties retain autonomy in decision-making and both truly want to work collaboratively. There is nothing unethical about setting one's own research agenda and conducting linguistic fieldwork alone. Lone wolf linguistics isn't necessarily unethical linguistics.

1. INTRODUCTION.[1] Collaboration has become a hot topic in the field of language documentation (Himmelmann 1998), as a glance through the indices of this journal will show. More than half (35 of 60) of the articles published in LD&C to date contain some form of the word 'collaboration'[2], and Grenoble (2010: 295) notes that "[t]here is widespread agreement among linguists engaged in language documentation today that they must engage in collaborative work with the communities of native speakers whose languages they document." We argue that this discourse has become too extreme and that there are many situations in which a documentary linguist working alone can produce important

---

[2] This is the result of a full text search for the string [collab*] on articles (excluding reviews and notes from the field) published in volumes 1-6, between 2007 and 2012.

results in an ethical manner. In this paper, we will approach this discourse on collaboration from our own perspectives, addressing how these implied expectations are incompatible with our own research situations. Robinson is currently analyzing survey data from field linguists to encompass world-wide perspectives on collaborative fieldwork.

The term 'collaboration' has been used in various senses in language documentation, primarily to refer to collaboration with speakers of the language living in situ (cf. Dwyer 2006, Dwyer 2010, Yamada 2007) or collaboration with other academics (cf. Glenn 2009). It is the former meaning that is more widespread, and it is this kind of collaboration that we discuss in this paper. Collaboration of this type may also entail working with local authorities or political figures in addition to or instead of language speakers, particularly in situations where the language is highly endangered and the group of speakers (primarily older) does not overlap with the group of community leaders (typically middle-aged).

We take issue not with collaboration per se, but with the viewpoints that linguists practicing language documentation *must* collaborate with the community, that the linguist's goals *should* be subordinate to the goals of community members, or that solo research is *necessarily* unethical research. The field of linguistics is generally described as the scientific study of human language. If the primary goal of documentary linguistics is the documentation of particular human languages in a principled scientific manner, then documentary linguists must generally have scientific goals in their work. These strictly scientific goals are often quite foreign to non-linguists, including most members of the communities where we, the authors, have conducted fieldwork. In projects attempting to pursue such scientific goals, then, collaboration with community members may not be realistic if the community members are uninterested in these scientific goals.

In language revitalization, on the other hand, projects can and should be practiced collaboratively if indeed they involve any non-community members at all. But, the two contexts have been conflated to the point that rhetoric pertaining to one has bled into the other, and we argue that this is harmful to our field. The idea that documentary linguists must always collaborate is most harmful to graduate students and other would-be field linguists who have yet to undertake any serious field research or are conducting field research for the first time. We argue that advocating collaboration as a moral imperative can lead young researchers astray by implying that the outcomes of attempted collaboration are always positive and always beneficial to all parties.

While participation in language revitalization and maintenance may be one of the most common kinds of collaborative undertaking among documentary linguists, this is one area where documentary linguists are particularly unprepared to contribute successfully. Most lack training in second language teaching and educational practices. Rather than harming a situation by producing well-intentioned but unprofessional products, documentary linguists can often better serve communities interested in revitalization by putting them in contact with education specialists and other people skilled in language conservation methods.

It is quite common that a language community requests linguistic outputs such as dictionaries and grammars, but community members may not use these materials once they are produced, and indeed may never have even had the intention of using the materials (Terrill 2002). Language materials can be purely symbolic, elevating the status of the language and/or the speakers just by virtue of being on the shelf, but this value alone does

not justify the enormous amount of effort that a linguist must exert to produce community-oriented language materials. Even language revitalization programs themselves are often purely symbolic, or 'phatic' in the Dauenhauers' terms (Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer 1998), with no real goal of reviving a community of speakers. If language materials are not going to be used by speakers, a linguist's time is better spent writing materials for an academic audience that will read them. A reference grammar can be just as powerful a symbol as a collection of kindergarten primers if neither is going to ever circulate beyond a community leader's bookshelf, and the reference grammar has the advantage of being useful to the worldwide community of linguists.

Even when linguists are able to produce useful materials for language revitalization, these materials tend to focus on *simple* language that can be easily molded into pedagogical materials for teaching beginning language students. In contrast, linguists intending to thoroughly document an endangered language for posterity need to be researching more complicated aspects of the language as well. This is especially true if the language is highly endangered, as the most complicated aspects of the language are likely to die out first (Tsunoda 2005).

2. BACKGROUND. The term *lone wolf linguist*, on which we based the title of this paper, comes from Austin (2007: 27; see also Austin and Grenoble 2007):

> I take the core of a language documentation project to be the creation of a corpus of audio and/or video materials with time-aligned transcription, multi-tier annotation, translation into a language of wider communication, and relevant metadata on context and use of the materials. Woodbury (2003) argues that the corpus will ideally be large, cover a diverse range of genres and contexts, be expandable, opportunistic, portable, transparent, ethical and preservable. As a result, documentation is increasingly done by teams, including community members, rather than 'lone wolf linguists;' both the technical skills and the amount of time required to create this corpus make it difficult for a single linguist, working alone in the field, to achieve.

Austin does not make an explicit value judgment on *lone wolf linguists*, but simply says that he believes good documentation projects are too large to undertake alone. Dwyer (2006: 54, emphasis original), in contrast, takes a much more negative view of what she calls *lone ranger linguistics*:

> What I term *lone ranger linguistics* (with a nod to America's colonial past) represent [sic] the old go-at-it-alone model of research: go in, get the data, get out, publish. It had its advantages: no negotiation was necessary, and it seemed that the one researcher was alone capable of wonders. Its disadvantages, however, are chiefly that it is inefficient and tends to promote ill-will. It is an inefficient use of time, money, and other resources for an outsider to travel long distances and learn a language poorly; it promotes ill-will by giving the researcher no incentive to treat contacts in an egalitarian manner, to maintain relationships, nor to reciprocate the community's generosity.

Dwyer's rhetoric here is problematic. Conducting research alone does not necessarily entail any of the negatives that Dwyer suggests. A lone researcher does not necessarily learn the language poorly. In fact, the *lone ranger* tradition that Dwyer is attacking has a long history of promoting language learning as a primary means of doing linguistic research, going back to the foundation of linguistics in North America and Europe. Second, conducting research alone does not and should not imply treating contacts in an inegalitarian manner, nor does it imply failure to reciprocate a community's generosity. Certainly, there have been situations in which solo researchers exploit community members, but one can also imagine a collaborative project in which an outsider linguist and a group of community members take advantage of the rest of the community. That is, there is nothing inherently exploitative about solo research, just as collaborative research is not automatically ethical. Collaborating with community members in language documentation projects is not the only method of treating the community fairly and reciprocating their generosity, as we discuss in section 6 below.

Finally, the view expressed by Gerdts (2010: 191) is perhaps the most troubling to us.

> A linguist working on an endangered language must submit to the authority of the community administrators. At every turn, the linguist will have to compromise long-range scholarly goals to meet the community's immediate needs.

This is unrealistic in a world where academic linguists need scholarly publications to advance their careers. It is also unfair to the linguist and is decidedly inegalitarian. The pendulum has swung too far in the shift against inequality between linguist and community; now we are told that the linguist must be subservient in the relationship.

The quote from Gerdts captures what Leonard and Haynes (2010) have termed a 'new age' view of collaboration. In this situation, the linguist's goals are essentially subordinated to the community's goals, with the assumption that the community can and should be the sole deciders of the direction of the research. The new age view of collaboration loses sight of the scientific value of linguistic research, and for the linguist, the endeavor can become what Newman (2003: 6) calls 'linguistic social work'. That is, in cases where the community is exclusively interested in applied work such as language revitalization, linguists who subordinate their research goals to these applied goals will be working solely for the benefit of the community, without being able to use any of their work for the benefit of their own careers. In contrast, Leonard and Haynes (2010) argue for a balanced approach where both community and linguist goals are equally important in shaping the research program and both are able to benefit from the outcomes. We would like to take this a step further and assert that there is nothing inherently unethical about a research program that is shaped primarily or even exclusively by the goals of the linguist.

The 'empowerment model', in which the community is actively engaged in designing the research (Cameron et al. 1992), is explicitly (Czaykowska-Higgins 2009, Dwyer 2006, Gerdts 2010, Grinevald 2003, Rice 2006, Rice 2010, Yamada 2007) or implicitly (Dwyer 2010) followed in recent works on collaboration in language documentation. The current emphasis on the empowerment model assumes that every community will want to collaborate with the researcher. But it is not the case that there will always be community members interested in language documentation (Sato 2009, Guérin & Lacrampe 2010), nor

will there always be community members capable of aiding in language documentation projects (see section 4 below). This will be especially true when the linguist is working on a particularly esoteric aspect of language that may not hold interest for the average speaker—e.g. relative clause formation or reconstruction of initial consonants—but it also pertains to more descriptive projects like grammar-writing and lexicography. Under such circumstances—lack of community interest, ability, or time—we believe it is entirely appropriate for the linguist to be the sole decider of the direction of research. Furthermore, we question the implicit assumption that community members are universally interested in collaboration. Assuming that communities always want and can use the help of outsiders reinforces the stereotype that indigenous people are helpless and require the assistance of an outsider.

Researchers emphasizing the empowerment model of 'research on, for, and with a people' or the advocacy model of 'research on and for a people' have neglected the accompanying *ethical* model of 'research on a people' which is, as its name implies, still entirely ethical (Cameron *et al.* 1992). In cases where the community is not interested in research 'for' them or research 'with' them, we believe there is nothing wrong with the linguist conducting research 'on' them if they are willing to accept the researcher's work. Cameron *et al.* explicitly state that "we do not think of empowerment as an absolute requirement on all research projects" (1992: 22), yet this is what the current discourse on community collaboration in language documentation would have us believe. We are not asked to determine when 'research with' or 'research for' would be more appropriate than 'research on'; instead the literature insists on the former without exception. The ethical model has been discarded as unethical!

We believe that the discourse on community collaboration in language documentation has been tilted to the extreme because the field is dominated by researchers working on languages spoken in the United States and Canada (though see Dobrin 2008 for a discussion of very different ethical expectations in Melanesia). We have found very few case studies of recent linguistic fieldwork outside of these areas where collaboration has been discussed, and only rarely do linguists point out that their experience is limited to these countries (Rice 2006 is one exception). In general, indigenous communities in North America have clear community leaders (whether elected or appointed), active political engagement with governments, higher levels of literacy and education, more resources, and less focus on mere subsistence, in addition to a long and sordid history of official oppression. All these factors allow and inspire individuals in these regions to become actively involved in research projects, and to insist on shaping the direction of research. But these factors are by no means universal among endangered language communities world-wide. The discussion of collaboration in our field has been generalized from a small, self-selected subset of documentation situations that are not representative of the whole world. In the following sections, we discuss a few case studies where collaboration has either failed or been difficult to initiate.

3. THE CASE OF TLINGIT IN ALASKA. The perspectives of the authors in this article are shaped in large part by our own fieldwork situations. The Tlingit people of Southeast Alaska,

of which author Crippen is a member,[3] are represented nationally by the Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska (CCTHITA). As the name implies, this nation consists of both Tlingit and Haida people, as well as a number of Coast Tsimshians in the region.[4] It would be easy to assume that this national entity is the appropriate representative of the Tlingit people with which an incoming linguist should communicate and work. But, in fact, there are several other organizations that could easily claim jurisdiction over the linguist's work, and their existence usually comes as a surprise to anyone not versed in the unique political arrangements between Alaska Natives and the United States government.

Each Tlingit village has its own governing body that is likely to assert priority over research done in the community. In some cases there are both tribal governments specific to Tlingit people, and local municipal governments representative of the entire local population, including the Tlingit people. In these sorts of dual-government communities, the responsibilities and administrative capacities of each government often overlap but are managed through locally specific arrangements. Since each arrangement is unique, a linguist cannot reliably anticipate how a local collaborative project should proceed even with experience in one of the other communities. Instead, one must learn how each individual Tlingit community is governed.

The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) of 1971 established a corporate entity called Sealaska Inc. for Alaska Natives in the region, as well as smaller corporate entities for each village. Sealaska established the Sealaska Heritage Institute (SHI), a non-profit dedicated to research and preservation of Tlingit language and culture, and this might also seem to be a suitable collaborator for the visiting linguist. ANCSA also established individual corporations for most Alaska Native villages. Some of these village corporations have spun off their own non-profit organizations with similar goals to SHI, and members of these organizations may assert their priority over linguistic research in the village. Beyond this maze, revitalization projects involving classroom teaching would need to be coordinated with the local school district. The school district may be an arm of either the local village government, or of the municipal or borough government. In some cases, such as in Wrangell, where Crippen is from, the municipal government administers the school district, but the tribal government usually administers educational projects specifically involving Tlingit people.

A linguist interested in starting on a collaborative research project would need to consider at least *ten* different entities: the national government (CCTHITA), the regional corporation (Sealaska Inc.) and/or its non-profit (SHI), the village corporation and/or its non-profit, the village tribal government, the local municipal government, the local school district, or the village tribal government's school program. Even for a community member linguist with a decade of experience in Tlingit language research, communicating with this

---

[3] *Dzéiwsh* (name), *Ḵaḵáak'w Hít Deisheetaan* (house and clan), *S'iknax̱.ádi yádi* (paternal lineage), *Shtax'héen Ḵwáan* (regional group)

[4] The Metlakatla Indian Community (MIC) on Annette Island is Alaska's sole reservation and is primarily Coast Tsimshian. It is an independent nation apart from the CCTHITA, and Coast Tsimshians living elsewhere in Alaska may or may not be citizens of MIC, and may or may not be citizens of CCTHITA.

array of political entities is a daunting task. For a researcher without extensive experience in the community, embarking on a collaborative project across such a complex governmental patchwork would be all but impossible.

In addition to all the modern political infrastructure, the traditional social structure of moieties and clans is still actively functioning. This means that the linguist working with a member of one clan still needs to be sensitive to the histories, claims, and traditions of other clans. Naive linguists walking into this situation and intent on quickly establishing some collaborative project could easily find themselves on the wrong side of various long-running disputes, and thus alienate themselves from work with many otherwise helpful native speakers. Without years of experience in this culture, jumping into a collaborative project is tantamount to a sentence of exile. *Lone wolf* linguists who do not collaborate and therefore do not take political sides can, in contrast, do quite well for themselves and their consultants. If they choose to continue work on the language they can find long-term support and excellent colleagues, with future collaboration projects still a possibility once they are firmly established in the community.

4. THE CASE OF THE AGTA IN THE PHILIPPINES. Author Robinson has conducted linguistic fieldwork in both the Philippines and Indonesia. The fieldwork in the northern Philippines was for her dissertation (Robinson 2008, published as Robinson 2011). She spent a year living with a group of semi-nomadic foragers while writing a descriptive grammar of their language. There are about 1,400 speakers of the language in some 35 communities scattered across approximately 3,000 square miles along the northeastern coast of Luzon Island, Philippines. The Dupaningan Agta are members of the Negrito ethnic and racial minority, which consists of some 33,000 people throughout the Philippines (Headland 2003), in contrast to a total population of approximately 90 million in the country. Negritos, including the Dupaningan Agta, are often discriminated against in terms of health care, jobs, land titles, and other basic human rights. The Dupaningan Agta have a subsistence economy based on fishing, gathering, horticulture, and hunting, and they often move camps for reasons of both subsistence and interpersonal relations. Very few Dupaningan Agta go to school, and the majority of the language community is not literate. As a result, they were not ideal partners for the language documentation project. Despite their obvious competence in the language, they lacked the basic skills required for documentary work, such as literacy and familiarity with computers.

In addition, the entire documentary agenda was unfamiliar to them. Although their language is threatened and beginning to lose child speakers, there is virtually no awareness of the imminence of language loss in the community, and language issues in general are of low priority. Understandably, everyday survival and subsistence take precedence. Moreover, most Dupaningan Agta found the presence of an outsider to be much more interesting than language work *per se*, and would see little reason to become involved in language projects (see also Sato 2009, Guérin & Lacrampe 2010). Urging such uninterested individuals to become involved certainly does not seem like a good way to engage in collaborative work. In contrast, an employment model seemed to work just fine. Robinson was able to pay consultants for their time with generous wages, and the consultants seemed content to let Robinson shape the direction of the research.

Finally, long-term presence in the community did not seem like a viable option for Robinson. Although the vast majority of the people she encountered in her fieldwork were friendly and displayed an extremely generous hospitality, the situation ultimately turned out to be dangerous for a single woman, and Robinson chose to discontinue fieldwork in the region (see Robinson 2013).

5. OTHER CASE STUDIES. The following stories of our (anonymous) friends and colleagues are also relevant. Linguist A was working on a particular language and was interested in contributing to the community through collaborative work. His consultant recommended that he contact a major community organization known for its work in linguistic and cultural revitalization. He went to the organization and was welcomed. The organization paired him with employees and teachers to develop language curricula for primary school classrooms. The linguist attended meetings and put together materials in accordance with the desires of the group. The results were enthusiastically accepted, and the linguist returned home thinking that he had done something helpful and planed more such work for the future. On his return, people complained to him directly about the shoddy and useless nature of his work. He finally saw the results and discovered that his careful preparation had been mangled. The people preparing the curriculum, who had little knowledge of the language, had simply mined his materials for words and threw them together in a poorly prepared elementary school curriculum. Words were taken out of context, misspellings were rampant, and ungrammatical sentences had been constructed. The linguist tried to explain to community members, his language consultants in particular, that it was not his fault and that he would have tried to correct the mistakes if he had had a chance to review them. In response, he was accused of trying to blame community members for his failings. The linguist was told he was incompetent, and his consultant and other people in the community were disgusted with his terrible results and refused to work with him any longer. He found another community where the language is spoken, but the situation continued to haunt him for years.

Linguist B had been interested in working on a particular endangered language for several years. An opportunity suddenly arose where she was able to meet with an elderly native speaker. The speaker was enthusiastic about doing documentary work with her, so the linguist prepared a grant to do documentary research in the community, contacting the local elementary school to arrange for some collaborative work with the school's revitalization program. The teachers at the school were enthusiastic as well. The grant was submitted with letters of support from the elder and the schoolteachers. The grant was reviewed positively, awarded, and the linguist went to the community for an initial visit. During this visit, she met with a major political figure associated with the community. The politician was at first positive about the project, but became incensed when he discovered that the work involved the local school. Apparently the schoolteachers and the politician had a prior history of fighting. The politician publicly accused the linguist of trying to "steal our language", profiting from selling books and tapes, and various other dishonest activities. The politician prevented the local government from approving any linguistic work in the community, despite all prior commitments. Even the hotel refused to allow her to book a room. Disturbed by the political commotion, the elder's family adamantly refused to let the linguist work with her. With no way to fulfill the terms of the grant, the linguist was forced

to apologize to the granting agency and return the funds. This became an unfortunate stain on the linguist's grant record, making it difficult to obtain further grants from the agency. She never worked with the community again, having become *persona non grata* for trying to collaborate with the wrong people.

6. DISCUSSION. While such negative outcomes are not universal, they are more common than has been reported in the literature, and it is important to highlight negative outcomes so that inexperienced field linguists do not get the false impression that collaboration is always easy and fruitful. Misconceptions about collaboration are supposed to be solved through our field's oral tradition, with students consulting their professors on difficulties in local politics, but we should not rely on unofficial transmission of 'unfortunate incidents' and assume that every practitioner will be appropriately informed.

The biggest problem with a discourse that urges collaboration in all situations is that it creates a sense of guilt, particularly in young linguists. First-time documentary linguists entering a new field situation may try to force collaboration where it is not appropriate, such as the case with Linguist B discussed above, who attempted to set up a collaborative project before ever visiting the field situation. Feelings of guilt are also apparent in a recent article by two early-career linguists (Guérin & Lacrampe 2010: 28-29), who suggest that "the linguist and the community must establish a collaborative project, the outcomes of which will be beneficial to both parties". The authors, both of whom were PhD students at the time of the fieldwork, sketch a situation in which speakers in the community (in Vanuatu in the south Pacific) were not interested in collaborative work, yet the authors continued to push the issue and eventually established collaborative projects. It is not at all clear, however, that they, their work, or the community actually benefited from this collaboration, and traditional *lone wolf* linguistics might have been more productive and beneficial to all involved. The main factors they identify as aiding their project are social ones: learning the language, involving more speakers, and spending time in the community. These are important aspects of linguistic fieldwork, but the linguist does not need to engage in collaborative language work or compromise the direction of the research in order to achieve such social integration.

For students and other early-career field linguists, there are additional obstacles to collaboration. First, students often *must* do 'lone wolf' projects. PhD dissertations and master's theses must be sole-authored, and highly collaborative work can therefore create authorship problems. Second, early-career researchers do not always have access to generous funding sources, which are necessary for large collaborative projects employing community members. Moreover, documentary grants, such as those provided by the Documenting Endangered Languages program at the National Science Foundation or the Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project, often *explicitly* require that funds be used for academic research and not for education and revitalization, thus creating problems for linguists involved in collaborative projects which include a revitalization component. Third, academic linguists need research publications for their careers. This does not apply only to students, but to all academics, as publications are a requirement for graduation, attaining a job, and applying for tenure and promotion.

Some authors further assert that researchers should make long-term or even lifetime commitments to a language and a community in order to avoid the neo-colonialist, get-in,

get-out, publish attitude derided by Dwyer (2006). While we agree that long-term field situations are much more likely to lead to productive collaboration, we also recognize that lifetime commitments can be extremely intimidating for a researcher who has not yet spent much or any time in a community. We argue that fieldworkers should retain the flexibility to remove themselves from a situation that is dangerous (such as the one Robinson encountered in the Philippines), unproductive (such as the one encountered by Linguist B), or simply uncomfortable (such as field situations encountered by researchers all over the world who discover they would rather work closer to home). Moreover, certain linguistic research goals are not amenable to long-term fieldwork. Author Robinson has been conducting linguistic survey work in eastern Indonesia, where she typically spends only a few hours collecting an extended word list in each village. Based on this data, Robinson and colleagues have been able to reconstruct the immediate proto-language and demonstrate that the family of about 25 languages is a linguistic isolate (Holton *et al* 2012, Robinson & Holton 2012, Holton & Robinson to appear). This research would not have been possible if she had remained long-term in a single community. Meaningful collaboration is not a likely outcome of such work, but the work makes a significant contribution to our knowledge about a particular language family, and the consultants involved all gladly gave their consent to participate.

On the other hand, collaborating with speakers and community members can be quite productive if both parties have similar or complementary goals. Indeed, we welcome collaboration provided that both parties truly want to work collaboratively. Field researchers should never take advantage of community members, but appropriate, ethical treatment of community members does not necessarily mean involving the latter in shaping the course or outcome of research. Depending on the context, paying people for their time may be all that is needed, or even welcome. Researchers should attempt to make their research available to community members, but this does not necessarily entail translating highly technical work into a local lingua franca, nor working on aspects of language that are not of interest to the linguist. Instead, more moderated forms of collaboration may be appropriate. When considering language revitalization or teaching goals, for example, the best approach may be for linguists to put communities in touch with more appropriate collaborators such as education specialists (see Nathan and Fang 2009). Conversely, instead of trying to involve community members in the analysis of data or the direction of research, it may be more appropriate to train them to do data gathering and processing.

7. CONCLUSION. While most authors discussing language documentation ethics note that it is difficult to generalize across field situations (Dwyer 2006, Thieberger & Musgrave 2007, Bowern 2008), the same authors often go on to lay down a set of ethical requirements, and these usually include collaboration with the language community. Not only is it difficult to generalize across field situations, it is probably unwise. What is unethical in one location may be exactly what is called for in another, and vice versa; see Holton (2009) on contrasting ethical requirements in Alaska and Indonesia. We hope we have raised awareness about the pitfalls of collaboration. Statements suggesting that collaboration is a moral imperative are discouraging to would-be fieldworkers and may lead first-time fieldworkers into potentially harmful situations. There is nothing unethical about setting one's own research agenda and conducting linguistic fieldwork alone. Lone wolf linguistics isn't necessarily unethical linguistics.

References

Austin, Peter K. 2007. Training for language documentation: Experiences at the School of Oriental and African Studies. In D. Victoria Rau and Margaret Florey (eds.), *Documenting and Revitalizing Austronesian Languages*, 25-41. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/1372

Austin, Peter and Lenore Grenoble. 2007. Current trends in language documentation. In Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language Documentation and Description Vol. 4*, 12-25. London: SOAS.

Bowern, Claire. 2008. *Linguistic Fieldwork: A Practical Guide*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cameron, Deborah, Elizabeth Frazer, Penelope Harvey, M.B.H Rampton, and Kay Richardson. 1992. Introduction. In Deborah Cameron, Elizabeth Frazer, Penelope Harvey, M.B.H Rampton, and Kay Richardson (eds.), *Researching Language: Issues of Power and Method*, 1-28. Routledge, London.

Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa. 2009. Research models, community engagement, and linguistic fieldwork: Reflections on working within Canadian indigenous communities. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 3(1). 15-50. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4423

Dauenhauer, Nora Marks, and Richard Dauenhauer. 1998. Technical, emotional, and ideological issues in reversing language shift: Examples from Southeast Alaska. In Lenore A. Grenoble and Lindsay J. Whaley (eds.), *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response*, 57–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dobrin, Lise. 2008. From linguistic elicitation to eliciting the linguist: Lessons in community empowerment from Melanesia. *Language* 84(2). 300-324.

Dwyer, Arienne M. 2006. Ethics and practicalities of cooperative fieldwork and analysis. In Jost Gippert, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann and Ulrike Mosel (eds.), *Essentials of language documentation*, 31-66. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dwyer, Arienne M. 2010. Models of successful collaboration. In Lenore A. Grenoble and N. Louanna Furbee (eds.) *Language documentation: Practice and values*, 193-212. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gerdts, Donna B. 2010. Beyond expertise: The role of the linguist in language revitalization programs. In Lenore A. Grenoble and N. Louanna Furbee (eds.) *Language documentation: Practice and values*, 173-192. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Glenn, Akiemi. 2009. Five dimensions of collaboration: Toward a critical theory of coordination and interoperability in language documentation. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 3(2). 149-160. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4437

Grenoble, Lenore A. 2010. Language documentation and field linguistics: The state of the field. In Lenore A. Grenoble and N. Louanna Furbee (eds.) *Language documentation: Practice and values*, 289-309. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Grinevald, Colette. 2003. Speakers and documentation of endangered languages. In Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language Documentation and Description Vol. 1*, 52-72. London: SOAS.

Guérin, Valérie and Sébastian Lacrampe. 2010. Trust me, I am a linguist! Building partnerships in the field. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 4. 22-33. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4465

Headland, Thomas N. 2003. Thirty endangered languages of the Philippines. *Working papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session 47*. 1-12.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 1998. Documentary and descriptive linguistics. *Linguistics* 36. 161-95.

Holton, Gary. 2009. Relatively ethical: A comparison of linguistic research paradigms in Alaska and Indonesia. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 3(2). 161-75. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4424

Holton, Gary, Marian Klamer, František Kratochvíl, Laura C. Robinson, and Antoinette Schapper. 2012. The historical relations of the Papuan languages of Alor and Pantar. *Oceanic Linguistics* 51(1): 86-122.

Holton, Gary, and Laura C. Robinson. To appear. The linguistic position of the Timor-Alor-Pantar languages. In Marian Klamer (ed.) *The Alor-Pantar languages: History and typology*. Leiden: Brill.

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. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4482

Nathan, David and Meili Fang. 2009. Language documentation and pedagogy for endangered languages: a mutual revitalisation. In Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language Documentation and Description Vol. 6*, 132-160. London: SOAS.

Newman, Paul. 2003. The endangered languages issue as a hopeless cause. In Mark Janse and Sijmen Tol (eds.) *Language death and language maintenance: Theoretical, practical, and descriptive approaches*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rice, Keren. 2006. Ethical issues in linguistic fieldwork: An overview. *Journal of Academic Ethics* 4. 123-155.

Rice, Keren. 2010. The linguist's responsibilities to the community of speakers. In Lenore A. Grenoble and N. Louanna Furbee (eds.) *Language documentation: Practice and values*, 25-36. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Robinson, Laura C. 2008. *Dupaningan Agta: Grammar, Vocabulary, and texts*. University of Hawai'i. PhD Thesis.

Robinson, Laura C. 2011. *Dupaningan Agta: Grammar, Vocabulary, and texts*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Robinson, Laura C., and Gary Holton. 2012. Reassessing the wider genealogical affiliations of the Timor-Alor-Pantar languages. In Hammerström, Harald and Wilco van den Huevel (eds.), *History, contact, and classification of Papuan languages: Language and Linguistics in Melanesia Special Issue Part 1*, 59-87.

Robinson, Laura C., with Gary Robinson. 2013. *Microphone in the mud*. Language Documentation & Conservation Special Publication 6. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4578

Sato, Hiroko. 2009. *When collaboration is not an option: Fieldwork in Kove, Papua New Guinea*. Paper presented at the First International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation, Honolulu, Hawai'i. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/5085.

Terrill, Angela. 2002. Why make books for people who don't read: A perspective on documentation of an endangered language from Solomon Islands. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 155/156. 205-219.

Thieberger, Nick, and Simon Musgrave. 2007. Documentary linguistics and ethical issues. In Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language Documentation and Description, Vol 4*. 26-37. London: SOAS.

Tsunoda, Tasaku. 2005. *Language endangerment and language revitalization*. (Trends in linguistics: Studies and monographs 148). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Woodbury, Tony. 2003. Defining documentary linguistics. In Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language Documentation and Description Vol. 1*, 35-51. London: SOAS.

Yamada, Racquel-María. 2007. Collaborative linguistic fieldwork: Practical application of the empowerment model. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 1(2). 257-282. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/1717

James Crippen
jcrippen@gmail.com

Laura C. Robinson
lrobinson@linguistics.ucsb.edu