Language documentation, also known as documentary linguistics, is the subfield of linguistics that deals with creating multipurpose records of languages through audio and video recording of speakers and signers and with annotation, translation, preservation, and distribution of the resulting materials. It shows by its nature multidisciplinarity and draws on theoretical concepts and methods from linguistics, ethnography, folklore studies, psychology, information and library science, archiving and museum studies, digital humanities, media and recording arts, pedagogy, ethics, and other research areas. Its major goal is the creation of well-organized, long-lasting corpora that can be used for a variety of purposes, including theoretical research and practical needs such as language and cultural revitalization (see Mobilization and Revitalization). Another prominent feature is attention to the rights and desires of language speakers and communities and collaboration with them (see Speakers and Collaboration) in the recording, analysis, archiving, dissemination, and support of their own languages. The term “language documentation” historically has been used in linguistics to refer to the creation of grammars, dictionaries, and text collections for previously undescribed languages; however, works defining language documentation as a distinct subfield of linguistics emerged around 1995 as a response to the crisis facing the world’s endangered languages, about half of which could disappear in the 21st century, and the urgent need to record and analyze languages and speakers’ linguistic knowledge while they continue to be spoken, and to work with communities on supporting threatened languages before opportunities to do so become reduced. It was also prompted by developments in information, media, communication, and archiving technologies, which make possible the collection, analysis, preservation, and dissemination of documentary records in ways that were not feasible previously. It was also facilitated by high levels of research funding support from three main sources: the Documentation of Endangered Languages (DOBES) program sponsored by Volkswagen Foundation in Germany (2000–2013), the Endangered Languages Documentation Programme (ELDP) supported by Arcadia Trust in the United Kingdom (2002–2016), and the Documenting Endangered Languages (DEL) interagency initiative of the US National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Endowment of the Humanities (2005–). Language documentation concerns itself with principles and Methods for the recording and analysis of primary language and cultural materials, and Metadata about them, in ways that are transparent and accountable, and that can be archived and disseminated for current and future generations to use. Some researchers have emphasized standardization of data and analysis and “best practices,” while others have argued for a diversity of approaches that recognize the unique and particular social, cultural, and linguistic contexts within which individual languages are used. Methods and practices for training in language documentation have also been explored.

Reference Works

Because the development of language documentation as a separate subfield of linguistics is relatively new, there are only a few reference works that deal with theoretical and practical issues. Gippert, et al. 2006 covers definitional concepts and the practicalities of data collection, analysis, and archiving. Many of the authors are researchers associated with the Documentation of Endangered Languages (DOBES) program funded by the Volkswagen Foundation. Chapters vary in complexity, but most will be useful for beginning researchers. Gippert, et al. 2006 is critically reviewed in Evans 2008, which argues that the approach it takes, which excludes grammar writing, is detrimental to the field. Austin 2010 publishes a series of lectures from the 3L Summer School 2009 and is aimed at beginning students. Grenoble and Furbee 2010 originated in discussions at a series of meetings of concerned researchers in 2004–2006 and a conference at Harvard University in 2005. It addresses praxis and values in documentation, measures of documentary adequacy, technologies, collaboration models, and training needs. Its audience is more advanced practitioners. Austin and Sallabank 2011 deals with a wide range of endangered languages issues and is intended for students; Part 2 and Part 4 of the book have seven chapters on language documentation. The edited working papers series Language Documentation and Description, published since 2003 by the Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), contains articles on language documentation theory and practice, mostly arising from workshops organized by the project.

Contains chapters on documentation issues and methods, archiving, audio recording, sign languages, ethics, language policy, typology, linguistic theory, and applying for a research grant.


Contains chapters on defining documentation, the roles of speakers, data types and structures, archiving, and digital archiving, as well as training and project management.


A critical review arguing for more attention to grammar writing within language documentation.


An essential reference for principles and practices in documentation, highly influenced by the models developed in the DOBES program. A Spanish translation has been published as *Bases de la documentación lingüística*, edited by John B. Haviland and José Antonio Flores Farfán (Mexico City: INALI, 2007).


A collection of position papers and case studies on practices and values, measures of adequacy, technology, collaboration, and training.


Annual or semiannual volumes of peer-reviewed articles on language documentation (edited by Peter K. Austin and guest editors), mostly arising from workshops held at SOAS. Further information and purchase details may be found at the Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project website.

**Anthologies and Collections**

The four-volume collection of reprinted journal articles and book chapters in Austin and McGill 2011 is intended to cover the essential published articles on endangered languages and includes material on language documentation (Volumes 1 and 2). Harrison, et al. 2008 is a collection written by members of research teams within the Volkswagen Foundation–funded Documentation of Endangered Languages (DOBES) Project covering linguistic, ethical, and social outcomes of their documentation research, and is quite technical in content. Lameen Souag of the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) has curated an excellent collection of up-to-date weblinks to relevant materials, OREL: Online Resources for Endangered Languages.


Volume 2 contains fourteen chapters on defining documentation, data and metadata, archiving, and documentation methods. The introduction to this volume discusses the significance of each chapter. The general introduction (Volume 1) offers a detailed discussion of issues and challenges in endangered languages documentation.
Lessons from documented endangered languages.


A collection of research papers by scholars working within the DOBES Project model covering various outcomes of their work from linguistic, social, and ethical perspectives.

OREL: Online Resources for Endangered Languages.

A set of annotated links to online resource materials; the section on Technology and Techniques contains many useful links for language documenters.

Conference and Workshop Proceedings

The National Science Foundation (NSF)-funded Electronic Metastructure for Endangered Languages Documentation (E-MELD) Project held a series of seven workshops between 2001 and 2007. Proceedings of the E-MELD Workshops 2001–2007 are available online. The Language Documentation and Linguistic Theory (LDLT) conference has been held biennially since 2007; the conference aims to bring together researchers working on linguistic theory and language documentation and description, with a particular focus on innovative work on under-described or endangered languages. The Proceedings of Language Documentation and Linguistic Theory Conference are published in book form for conference attendees and online. The International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation (ICLDC) has been held biennially since 2009 with a particular focus on communities, linguists, and other academics working in close collaboration. Audio recordings and PowerPoint slides from the Proceedings of International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation are available online for download. Although not proceedings as such, the handouts and course slides from InField 2008 Workshops and InField 2010 Workshops contain much valuable material.

InField 2008 Workshops. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Training materials on many practical aspects of language documentation.

InField 2010 Workshops. University of Oregon.

Course materials from InField training course.


Position papers and presentations at these annual workshops.


Recordings and PowerPoint slides from the annual ICLDC conference.


The edited proceedings of the biennial LDLT conference.

Journals

Language Documentation and Conservation is a free online journal published by the University of Hawai‘i Press beginning in 2007. Linguistic Discovery is a free online journal published by Dartmouth College since 2002 that occasionally contains articles related to language documentation.
Language documentation is a relatively new field in terms of its formalization, and there have been a number of publications aimed at defining its scope and establishing theoretical principles (see Definition), research methods (see Methods), and the tools to be used in data collection and analysis, including computer software (see Technologies). Also discussed are the nature and organization of the data and corpus collected (see Data). Another continuing concern is with metadata, data about the documentary data, such as the identity of speakers, recorders, locations, equipment used, languages/dialects, and genres. Metadata are important because they enable the management, identification, retrieval, and understanding of the documentary material. Two standardized sets of metadata have been developed for documentary linguistics: the very general Open Language Archives Community (OLAC) and the ISLE Metadata Initiative (IMDI), which is a more complex and expressive set of metadata terms designed specifically for language-engineering research (see Metadata). The Documentation of Endangered Languages (DOBES) Project funded by Volkswagen Foundation uses the IMDI set. Language archives use IMDI, OLAC, or their own particular metadata categorizations. A further recent concern has been meta-documentation, that is, documentation of the goals, processes, and outcomes of language documentation projects in order to understand the particular histories, biographies, relationships, commitments, and results achieved by researchers and communities as they go about this work.

DEFINITION


The authors discuss what it means to make a comprehensive record of a language, determining the quality of language documentation, the boundaries between documentation and description, and interdisciplinarity and cross-discipline collaboration.

Discusses language documentation as a practice-based field, developing principles that could lead to theory construction in the future.

Critical assessment of the current state of the art in documentary linguistics, including identification of challenges for the future concerning scope and outcomes of documentation, collaboration and teamwork, and technical expectations of documentary corpora.
A foundational article defining documentary linguistics and emphasizing its distinction from language description.

A fuller version of Himmelmann 1998.

Lehmann’s seminal paper on language documentation and description argues that the primary purpose of language documentation is to represent the language for those who do not have direct access to it.

A seminal article setting out a view of language documentation as a subfield of linguistics.

Critical analysis of defining issues. Argues for a broad and inclusive approach to language documentation and more attention to corpus theorization and its implications for overall project design.

**DATA**

From the beginning, language documentation has been concerned with the nature of the language data collected and the kinds and structures of the analysis applied to them in corpus creation, as discussed in Lehmann 2004, Austin 2006, and Good 2011. Nathan 2010 argues that linguists’ approaches to the collection of audio data have paid insufficient attention to recording methodology and goals. Dobrin, et al. 2009 takes a critical view of counting and quantification in documentary linguistics, arguing that they fail to recognize the particular social, cultural, and linguistic contexts within which individual projects are carried out. The distinction between data and Metadata is challenged by Nathan and Austin 2004, which argues that all value adding to original recordings is metadata. Bird and Simons 2003 is a seminal discussion of issues such as transparency, transferability, and preservation of documentary records.

An introductory overview of the different kinds of data documenters collect, how they process them, the contexts of data analysis and use, and examples of tools used in data manipulation and presentation.

Seminal article on issues in the transparency, transferability, identification, and preservation of digital language data.

A critical analysis of “archivism,” the inclination to treat quantifiable properties such as recording hours, data volume, and file parameters, and technical desiderata like “archival quality” and “portability” as primary criteria for assessing the aims and outcomes of language documentation.


Overview of the main data types and representations of data structures employed in documentary linguistics.


Seminal paper exploring the kinds of data linguists employ and how they attempt to analyze them.


A critical discussion of the role of sound recordings in language documentation and the importance of attention to equipment choice, environmental factors, recording methodology, and research goals in capturing and representing sound.


Argues that metadata should be understood as all knowledge representations added to audio and video recordings, not just information about participants and contexts.

ANALYSIS

Language documentation involves the collection of primary data via audio and video recording, and analysis of them by adding information of various types, including summaries, indexes, transcriptions (Himmelmann 2006), translations (Woodbury 2007, Evans and Sasse 2006), and annotations (Bickel, et al. 2008; Lehmann 2004; Schultze-Bernd 2006).


A set of recommendations about the format of interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glossing and a list of abbreviated category labels.


Wide-ranging discussion of the role of translation and exegesis in language documentation, arguing for a multilayered hypertextual approach to commentary on recorded materials.


Discusses transcription of spoken language data and issues raised by determining units at the word and higher levels (intonation units, clauses, sentences, and paragraphs). Complements Schultze-Bernd 2006.

Presentation of a model of morpheme-by-morpheme glossing for use in documentation research.


Detailed discussion of the principles and practices for the transcription and notation of translation and the addition of morphosyntactic information to recordings of speech events.


Problematizes translation within language documentation, arguing for different types—word-for-word, simultaneous, free, literary—and multiple layers of linked translations serving different functions.

METADATA

Documentary linguists must attend not only to Data and Analysis but also to metadata, the data about the data that enable them to be managed, identified, retrieved, and understood. Austin 2006 includes introductory discussion of types of metadata, and Good 2002 presents an introduction to metadata for documentary linguists, while details of the ISLE Meta Data Initiative (IMDI) and Open Language Archives Community OLAC Metadata sets are available on the Internet. Nathan and Austin 2004 argues that all value adding in documentary research is a kind of metadata. Farrar and Lewis 2007 presents a proposal to standardize morpheme glosses to a Generalized Ontology for Language Documentation (GOLD).


An introductory overview of the different kinds of data and metadata documenters collect.


Proposal to establish a standardized ontology for morpheme-by-morpheme glossing in annotations for language documentation materials.


Elementary overview of metadata and their use in language documentation.

ISLE Meta Data Initiative.

Offers reference materials for the IMDI metadata set.

Argues for a broad conception of metadata encompassing all additions of knowledge representations to original audio and video recordings of speech events.

**OLAC Metadata.**
Reference materials for the OLAC metadata set.

**TECHNOLOGIES**

Language documentation has been influenced and assisted by the development of powerful software tools that enable and support data manipulation and analysis. Good 2010 argues for the importance to linguists of understanding this technology, while Boynton, et al. 2010 discusses good practices. Albright and Hatton 2007 presents an innovative tool that enables native speakers to document their language with minimal outside support. Bowe, et al. 2003 surveys published materials to establish a generalized format for interlinear glossing. Drude 2002 presents the implementation of a complex multitiered model for interlinear glossing using the Shoebox software tool. A comprehensive list of software used by linguists to annotate recordings can be found at Annotation Tools.

Albright, Eric, and John Hatton. 2007. WeSay, a tool for engaging communities in dictionary building. In *Documenting and revitalizing Austronesian languages*. Edited by D. Victoria Rau and Margaret Fiorey, 189–201. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai’i Press. An innovative software tool designed for community members to document their own languages, with minimal input from outside linguists.

**Annotation Tools.**
A comprehensive list of computer software that can be used for linguistic annotation.


Good, Jeff. 2010. Valuing technology: Finding the linguist’s place in a new technological universe. In *Language documentation: Practice and values*. Edited by Lenore A. Grenoble and N. Louanna Furbee, 111–131. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. A position paper on the role of technology in language documentation, arguing for greater technological literacy on the part of linguists and attention to broad issues rather than technical details such as file formats or software tools.
METHODS

Language documentation research has involved discussion of the methodological aspects of data collection, analysis, archiving, and dissemination. Lüpke 2010 is an overview of different documentary methods, evaluating their strengths and weaknesses. Reiman 2010 presents an alternative documentation method that does not use text or symbolic representations but relies on second-order oral annotation. Hill 2006 discusses how responding to a researcher does not produce a “normal” type of speech event, a fact that has consequences for the nature of the data collected and the interaction itself. Haviland 2006 discusses documentation of lexical knowledge, while Lehmann 2004 focuses on grammar. Ashmore 2008 explores the role of video in documentation, while Nathan 2010 looks at sound recording; both argue that the use and recording of media by linguists are unscientific. Schembri 2010 covers the challenges unique to the documentation of sign languages.


Discusses the place of digital video in language documentation, for recording, capturing visual and spatial aspects of interaction, assisting with transcription, and community use. It argues that researchers need to develop appropriate goals, methods, and evaluative criteria for using video.


A thorough and richly illustrated discussion about documenting the meanings and uses of words.


Calls for an ethnographic approach to the documentation of speech that proceeds in light of both culture and language structure. Emphasizes the peculiar nature of the linguistic fieldwork encounter and its consequent impact on the data produced.


Detailed discussion of how grammatical information should be represented in a documentary corpus.


Outlines and illustrates methods that can be used for data collection (e.g., participant observation, use of stimuli, experiments, games, elicitation), evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each.


Critical discussion of the role of sound recordings in language documentation and the need for linguists to pay more attention to equipment choice, environmental factors, recording methodology, and research goals so that their approach to sound is more systematic and effective.

Presents a novel approach to documentation that involves recording materials in their social and cultural context and then recording under laboratory conditions the respeaking of them slowly or their translation, to provide a second-order oral representation.


Discusses the challenges involved in creating a language documentation corpus for British Sign Language, some of which differ from those found for spoken languages in kind or degree.

**MULTIDISCIPLINARITY**

The value of multidisciplinary perspectives for creating multipurpose records of speech events in their social and cultural contexts has long been recognized in language documentation. Coelho 2005 discusses the mutually beneficial nature of ecological and linguistic documentation; Harrison 2005 shows why linguistic documentation must be ethnographically informed. Barwick 2005 urges linguistic researchers to document basic aspects of musical forms and expression. The methods and challenges of multidisciplinary research are presented in Franchetto 2006 for ethnography, Kendon 2004 for gesture (though it is not specifically targeted at language documentation), Gaenszle 2010 for oral literature, Eisenbeiss 2005 for psycholinguistics, and Roche, et al. 2010 for cultural documentation.


Argues that most language documentation includes some musical material and presents an overview of what a musicologist would like to see recorded and documented.


Discusses ways in which linguists and ecologists can collaborate in documenting traditional ecological knowledge.


Discusses how concepts from psycholinguistic research, including child language acquisition, can be applied in documentary linguistics.


Examines what kinds of information ethnographers might look for in a language corpus and illustrates one method of recording such information as applied to research in Brazil.


Discusses the advantages and disadvantages of documenting staged performances versus “naturally occurring” events, arguing that both can provide a starting point for creating ethnographic text.

Argues for the need to pay attention to cultural factors in language documentation, with examples from Siberian languages showing how phonology, verb semantics, color terminology, and noun phrase structure can be better understood by collecting data in an ethnographically informed way.


Comprehensive treatment of the study of gesture from historical, linguistic, and cultural perspectives. Recommendations on transcriptional conventions and analytical methods will be of use to language documenters.


Examines the benefits of participatory approaches to cultural documentation in the context of fieldwork on the Tibetan plateau.

**CORPUS ADEQUACY AND REPRESENTATIVENESS**

Language documentation is intended to create a corpus representing the range of ways language is used within a community, but ensuring the adequacy and representativeness of such a corpus is challenging. Foley 2003 identifies genre as an important variable that can have unexpected effects on the validity of data included. Berge 2010 proposes parameters for adequacy of documentation, while Seifart 2008 approaches representativeness in terms of sampling.


Proposes general principles to be followed in language documentation concerning description, diversity, and the roles played by different participants.


Argues for the need to pay attention to genre in documentation, and notes that using stimuli, such as picture books, can result in language forms and use that differ greatly from naturally occurring narrative text.


Addresses what a “representative sample” might mean for a documentary corpus and how sampling procedures can serve the goal of achieving representativeness.

**Ethics, Speakers, and Collaboration**

The rights and needs of the language speakers who participate in documentation projects are of primary importance. As a result, there is an increasing emphasis on collaborative models in documentary linguistics. Issues of research ethics, the roles of speakers in recording and documenting languages, and the relationships between researchers and communities have been particularly prominent in the language documentation literature.

**ETHICS**
Overviews of ethical issues in language documentation can be found in Austin 2010, Dwyer 2006, Rice 2006, Thieberger and Musgrave 2006, and Macri 2010, all intended for researchers beginning a documentation project. Dobrin 2008 argues for understanding, analyzing, and responding to the different values and moral positions adopted by researchers and by the people with whom they work. A range of issues in linguistic fieldwork is covered in Newman and Ratliff 2001.

---


Elementary introduction to ethical issues, intellectual property rights, copyright, moral rights, and community views for students.

**Dobrin, Lise M. 2008.** From linguistic elicitation to eliciting the linguist: Lessons in community empowerment from Melanesia. *Language* 84.2: 300–324.

Argues that linguists working on endangered languages need to understand and respond to the different values and moral positions adopted by communities, especially those that are different from a Western perspective.


Inventory of the major ethical issues to be addressed in language documentation, including ethical principles, rights, and legal responsibilities, and the practical problems associated with fieldwork.


Argues that an ethical approach to documenting a language should be aimed at not only recording language but also supporting continued use within heritage communities.


A collection of personal reflections on fieldwork from some of the leading practitioners in the discipline.


Exploration of ethical models for fieldwork and the responsibilities of researchers.


Review of some of the most pressing ethical issues and challenges linguistic researchers face in carrying out language documentation.

---

**SPEAKERS AND COLLABORATION**

The kinds of speakers that exist in communities where languages are being documented, and the roles they can play in documentation projects have been discussed in Grinevald 2003 and Dobrin and Berson 2011. Czaykowska-Higgins 2009 and Mosel 2006 examine collaboration between researchers and communities; Wilkins 1992 is a seminal account of collaborative research under the control of community members. Glenn 2009 focuses on collaboration between different kinds of researchers. Leonard and Hayes 2010 is a recent critical discussion of collaboration as a research approach.

Reflections on research models in linguistic fieldwork and on different levels of engagement in and with language-speaking communities, focusing on the Canadian context.


Critical overview of the practical, moral, and cultural issues surrounding speakers in language documentation, and how these follow from recognizing speakers as fellow humans and collaborators, rather than as mere sources of data.


Discusses differences across disciplinary cultures and their implications for collaborative language documentation projects.


Presents a typology of language speakers and research approaches in documentary linguistics.


A critical study of “collaboration” in recent linguistic literature, arguing that true collaboration necessitates a collaborative approach in the initial project stages of establishing research roles and goals. Case studies from US Native American communities are presented.


Discusses differences of motivation and approach among documentary researchers and communities and how these affect collaborative projects, with illustrations from the Pacific.


Seminal article presenting a vision for linguistic research where the language community rather than the researcher determines the goals and outcomes.

Archiving

Language documentation emphasizes the long-term preservation of documentary corpora, and hence archiving plays an important role in the field. The basic principles and approach taken by archivists are covered in Conathan 2011, while the organization of a corpus to make archiving easier is discussed in Johnson 2004. Audio archiving principles are covered in Bradley 2009. Nathan 2011 reviews the particular challenges of digital archiving, where changing software and data formats require the continual refreshing of archival materials; the author also discusses in detail “protocol” requirements, that is, specification and management of restrictions on access and use of archived data. Trilbeek and Wittenburg 2006 covers similar ground from the perspective of archivists for the Volkswagen-funded Documentation of Endangered Languages (DOBES) Project. Nathan 2010 discusses new directions in language documentation archiving, especially the application of Web 2.0 social networking models.

Authoritative reference on audio archiving. Also available online.


Discussion of the policies, principles, and practices of archives, with particular relevance to curation, cataloguing, and the preservation of language materials.


Introduction to the basic principles of archiving and corpus management to ensure preservation and usability of the documentary materials collected by researchers.


Presents an approach to language archiving developed at the Endangered Languages Archive at SOAS that builds on Web 2.0 social computing models, which allow the archive to serve as a communication channel between users and depositors.


Overview of archiving issues raised by digital materials, with particular attention to the need to control the access to and use of deposited data and analysis for endangered language communities.


Introduction to the role of archiving in language documentation, with particular reference to the approach taken for the DOBES Project.

**Mobilization and Revitalization**

Documentary linguistic corpora are not only collected for research purposes; they may also be organized in such a way that they can be mobilized for practical uses such as the creation of multimedia and teaching materials. Amery 2009 argues that failure to collect data on speech formulas and routines, neologisms, and non-traditional conversation makes corpora less useful to both researchers and those wishing to revitalize languages. The role of interfaces in mobilization is discussed in Nathan 2006, while Francis and Navarrete Gómez 2009 argues that mobilization nicely complements more narrowly focused research agendas. There is an enormous literature on language revitalization; Hinton 2011 serves as a good general introduction. See also the *Oxford Bibliographies* article on Endangered Languages.


Argues that a documentary corpus that takes into consideration the possibility of revitalization would include data on speech formulas, neologisms, and conversation in nontraditional as well as traditional contexts.
Drawing on experiences with Nahuatl speakers in Mexico, the authors argue that the research interests of documenters do not necessarily conflict with those of communities concerning the goals and outcomes of documentation and language maintenance.

Introductory overview of issues and methods in language revitalization.

Discusses how multimedia products based on documentary materials can serve the purpose of language maintenance, strengthening, and revitalization.

Training
Language documentation is a new field within linguistics and requires a more complex range of skills and knowledge than is traditionally included in training programs in linguistics—skills more typically associated with recording arts, data management, information and communications technologies, ethnography, and so on. Austin 2008 examines how these skills are taught at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS). Jukes 2011 gives a broad overview of training for language documentation. The training of native speakers is discussed in Himmelmann and Florey 2010, while Maxwell 2010 covers both groups. Course materials are available online from DOBES Training Courses, ELDP Grantee Training, and the InField 2008 Workshops and InField 2010 Workshops training courses.

Discussion of skills and training needs for language documenters, with examples of how these are provided in postgraduate degree courses, workshops, and grantee training at SOAS.

DOBES Training Courses.
Information and materials from training courses for the recipients of DOBES grants from the Volkswagen Foundation.

ELDP Grantee Training.
Schedule, syllabus, and training materials used at SOAS to train grant recipients before their projects begin.

Discussion of an innovative training course for native speakers and local researchers in Indonesia sponsored by the Volkswagen Foundation.
InField 2008 Workshops. University of California, Santa Barbara.
Course materials include handouts intended for native speakers and language activists.

InField 2010 Workshops. University of Oregon.
Course materials with a particular emphasis on collaborative methods.

Overview of the goals, methods, and structures of training courses for language documenters, drawing on examples from training of various types.

Broad-ranging study of the skills needed by students and community members for language documentation, arguing that co-constructed projects can lead to greater satisfaction in goals, outcomes, and dissemination.