

## The Importance of Documentary Linguistics Workshops: A Personal Account

BADAGAROV, Jargal  
Buryat State University

This paper offers an account of two Documentary Linguistics Workshops held in Tokyo based on the author's personal experience. The workshops have been held for nine consecutive years at the Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA), Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (TUFS). The advantages and disadvantages of the courses are discussed in detail, and recommendations to students seeking similar programs are given.

**Keywords:** Documentary linguistics, training, fieldwork techniques, workflow, best practices

1. Introduction
2. Why documentary linguistics?
3. Documentary Linguistics Workshop
4. Conclusion

### 1. Introduction

I am a linguist working on my native tongue (Buryad) and related varieties (Mongolic) from both diachronic and synchronic perspectives. Unfortunately, Buryad is an endangered language, despite the fact that it is an official language of the Buryat Republic within the Russian Federation. The Buryad are Siberia's largest native nation and one of the only ones with a long literary tradition and complex social and religious practices prior to Russian colonization. Buryad has many dialects, most of which are severely endangered. For the most part, Buryad dialects lose out on the one hand to Standard Buryad and on the other to Russian, because over the decades, Standard Buryad proved to be inadequate to the contemporary needs of a modern language. Standard Buryad is the product of an early Soviet project that, being underfinanced, was ultimately never able to develop into a full-ranged standard linguistic variety supported by the media and education system. Russian has increased in usage due to abrupt industrialization and a drastic decrease in the proportion of the Buryad living on their native lands on the one hand, and the exclusion of Buryad language instruction

---

BADAGAROV, Jargal. 2017. "The importance of Documentary Linguistics Workshops: A personal account". *Asian and African Languages and Linguistics* 11. pp.57–69. [Permanent URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/10108/89207>]

from education curricula in the 1970s, on the other. The situation is not improving and activists are struggling for the survival of their language. This leads the field of Buryad linguistics to concentrate on issues aimed at documentation of the dialects and development of language-specific study materials. This eventually led me to language documentation, and I am very glad that I was able to experience the Documentary Linguistics Workshop in Tokyo. It allowed me a systematic education in the field of language documentation, which truly changed my life, both as a linguist and a member of an endangered language community.

## 2. Why documentary linguistics?

Documentary linguistics first formulated its principles and methods a couple of decades ago and has since been widely employed in the documentation of endangered languages (Austin 2003; Himmelmann 2006; Thieberger 2012; Austin and Sallabank 2015). It aims at a broad documentation of speech acts in an anthropological setting, the results of which can be used not only by the researcher but also by many others, both academic and layman, and especially by members of the speech community. A seasoned field linguist may ask, “What is the point of having a ‘documentary’ variant of what has long been known as field linguistics?” The key feature of documentary linguistics lies in its comprehensiveness: its theoretical and methodological underpinnings account for linguistic, ethnographic, ethical, technical, and many other aspects of the collection of speech data; ultimately, it is targeted at creating and preserving a full-scale cross-cut of a linguistic situation for current and future research. This becomes especially important in the context of the dramatically decreasing number of languages and dialects across the globe, a modern linguistic disaster.

## 3. Documentary Linguistics Workshop

As with others who have had some experience in linguistic fieldwork, I was not always sure if I was going about things in the right way. Thus, I wanted to learn proper methodology. Consequently, I read extensively on technical procedures and equipment. Additionally, I considered the types of questions a linguist should ask in the field, ways of communicating with informants, and effective methods of collecting and preserving data. However, despite the time and effort, I still lacked confidence. Therefore, I realized that to gain confidence I would have to learn the best practices of language documentation from experts. Fortunately, I found this in the Documentary Linguistics Workshop at the Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA), Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (TUFS), which became a major turning point in my efforts.

The workshop had been running as a part of the LingDy project at ILCAA for

nine consecutive years. I appreciate this opportunity to discuss my impressions of the workshop and will be happy if this helps lead others into the field of language documentation and linguistics. First, I am going to give a general overview of the workshop, its aims, and organization, and then I will briefly concentrate on particular courses, drawing, where applicable, on my impressions and thoughts.

The goal of the workshop was to provide basic training in language documentation for field linguists, including methodological and technical training in various aspects of language documentation and archiving of endangered/minority languages. Topics covered included the following: introduction to language documentation, language archiving, hands-on training in audio and video recording and photography, data management and metadata, discussion of issues in field linguistic research, elicitation, and many other aspects of documentary linguistics. The teaching staff comprised experts who had worked in the field for many years, such as Peter Austin (School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London), David Nathan (SOAS, University of London), Anthony Jukes (Centre for Research on Language Diversity (CRLD), La Trobe University), Sonja Riesberg (University of Cologne), and Hideo Sawada (ILCAA, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies). Project groups were led by native speaker consultants: Tshering Tashi (Royal Society for Protection of Nature, Board Director, Dzongkha native speaker (Bhutan)), Namgay Thinley (Dzongkha Development Commission, Senior Research Officer, Dzongkha native speaker (Bhutan)), Jargal Badagarov (Buryat State University, Lecturer, Buryat native speaker (Buryatia, Russian Federation)), Kristian Walianggen (Center of Endangered Language Documentation, State University of Papua, Language Consultant, Yali native speaker (Papua, Indonesia)).

The workshop achieved a unique balance between theory and practice through well-thought-out organization of theoretical classes with hands-on practice courses and group projects on the one hand, and through highly competitive selection of participants and language consultants on the other. This combination, which I believe was true for each of the nine workshops, led to the successful achievement of the workshop's mission and shared benefits for all participants, including teachers, language consultants, and organizers. The participants were mostly Japan-based MA and PhD students with a handful of international participants. The language of instruction was English. A certificate of attendance was given to students and language consultants.

In the following section, I will reflect on the benefits of the workshop as a whole and certain courses in particular.

### 3.1. Overall experience

A frequently asked question is “What skills am I going to gain from a workshop?” Well, firstly, participation in this workshop has helped fine-tune my knowledge and skills of audio and video recording and photography in language documentation, in

terms of both equipment and technique. I also learned about the ethical aspects of language documentation, regarding which systematic thinking is lacking in the Russian Federation and Mongolia. Data management and preservation was another aspect of this workshop, the importance of which cannot be underestimated. All of this material came together as a proven set of knowledge and skills during the implementation of a group project. I learned a lot about teamwork during the group project. The significance of teamwork is often underestimated in language documentation projects, because usually one person carries out both the fieldwork and the “postproduction.” Therefore, team projects were one of the cornerstones of this workshop, offering significant advantages over similar workshops I have since attended.

Theoretical and practical courses offered during the workshop were Introduction to Language Documentation; Planning Language Documentation and Group Projects; Ethics and Working with Communities; Audio & Video; Fieldwork Techniques & Elicitation; Software for Documentation—Survey & Practical Demonstration; Data Management; Multimedia & Mobilization; and Photography for Documentation. The importance of data management and metadata was very much stressed. Theory was discussed most intensively on the first day and again towards the second half of the workshop. Practical courses were demonstration oriented and had a carefully designed and effective structure.

About half the overall workshop time was devoted to group projects with language consultants, during which the following activities were conducted: preparing individual laptops/software, set-up of groups and projects, group project design and reports, and recording consultants.

There was also a public lecture called “Rethinking Language Documentation and Support for the 21st Century,” which enabled all the participants to take part in a discussion of the different aspects of language documentation.

### 3.2. Introductory class

The introductory class provided a stimulating start to the workshop thanks to Peter Austin’s clear-cut presentation style and well-structured slides discussing key concepts of language documentation theory. It walked the students through major aspects of language documentation, offering a basic understanding of the workflow and major challenges in language documentation projects, including corpus design, interlinear glossing, archiving, managing data and metadata, meta-documentation goals and methods, and sustainability issues in language documentation. The importance of metadata was constantly stressed throughout the class, sending a clear message to future experts in the field. The lecturer pointed out that “we need a theory of metadata,” that is, a theory that is applicable to the documentation of the process of language documentation. Sustainability, as covered in the class, was another under-theorized topic in language documentation. Through this, and the following lectures, the participants learned about the role of language consultant as compared to

that of an informant. A language consultant is an individual who actively participates in language documentation, often becoming the (co-)leader of the team. This role contrasts markedly with that of an informant, traditionally viewed as a mere conduit of information and someone assessed only on the “quality” of information provided, a standard set by the researcher alone. This major conceptual shift from a passive performer of communicative events to an active member of a language documentation project was very inspiring. In general, the presentation set out a very balanced understanding of the subject and its major problems and considered possible methods and directions to overcome them.

### 3.3. Research and group work planning

The Planning Language Documentation and Group Projects class by Anthony Jukes focused on the development of an actual language documentation project. During this process, he helped students understand topics such as what kind of projects granting agencies find most attractive and the major considerations behind the planning of a language documentation project, including project goals, timelines, audiences, outcomes and the researcher’s own skills and ways of combining them with the skills of other project members. The participants were advised to look for a balance between skills, time, and available resources, while at the same time understanding the fact that all documentation projects are different. The class also considered the possible goals of a language documentation project. A comparison of historical projects with more recent ones demonstrated that earlier projects were aimed at producing “a lasting, multipurpose record of a language” (Himmelman 2006: 1), whereas newer ones focused more on, for example, traditional ethnobotanical knowledge or traditional agricultural songs and stories. The students came to understand the importance of setting explicit timelines and that in any language documentation project, one will need to consider the audience and the possible outcomes of the project, such as grammars, linguistic/typological data, dictionaries, storybooks, schoolbooks, scholarly papers, websites, and accessible audio/video. Teamwork was another focus of the class: one should carefully reflect on one’s own skills and ways of combining these with others. In this class, I realized that participation in a language documentation project should not be restricted to linguists only. Language documentation can be all the more productive if members of the local community are involved not only for their language skills as informants or language consultants but also for their technical skills in assisting in the selection and use of equipment. Moreover, after the data collection and processing/annotation, assistance with technical equipment and archive curators will be necessary, and the most appropriate source of workforce is again from members of the community. This lecture was an essential part of the workshop and clarified very important aspects of language documentation.

### 3.4. Ethics and community interaction

Anna Berge (Alaska Native Language Center, University of Alaska Fairbanks), a guest presenter, continued the workshop with a presentation on ethics and community interaction in language documentation. Together with Peter Austin, who presented on Communities, Ethics and Rights, they covered ethical and legal concerns that might arise in the course of interaction between academia and a community during language documentation. The lecture successfully demonstrated the utmost relevance of ethical and legal considerations for all stages of language documentation. Language documentation was shown to be a partnership between different parties: communities, linguists, pedagogues, archivists/librarians, organizations, and funding bodies. A meaningful discussion of the community values and needs in the context of cultural differences and a community view of linguistic research was an essential part of the presentation and helped me gain a deeper understanding of community interests and the place of linguists in the process of language documentation. The concept of “giving back” on behalf of academia was new to me because of the differences in field research practices in the Russian Federation, rooted in Soviet tradition. At that time, the local community experienced linguists’ activities in the form of efforts to create orthographies and enacting positive changes in government policy in order to facilitate a better representation of the local language in society. This was especially true during the early Soviet period. Later on, there was only a shiny facade of “everlasting friendship” between the peoples of the Soviet Union, which more or less successfully concealed the gloomy reality of boarding schools, which prohibited children from speaking their mother tongue. This led to entire communities being deprived of their traditional ways of life and cultural practices. Naturally, this brought about the rapid degradation of languages and extinction of whole communities. In my view, the major weakness of the concept of “giving back” is that linguists, excluding a few, cannot devote their entire lives to the community they are studying. From the point of view of the community, a short-term effort is not an effort at all. Moreover, many community members would regard the whole enterprise to be a waste of time, money, and effort. However, this should not make us give up. We should remain steadfast in the belief that the preservation of a language and the linguistic and cultural practices of any endangered community is of the utmost benefit to humanity.

In his presentation, Peter Austin put forward a wider perspective of the concept of “giving back” as “establishing and maintaining relationships which (ideally) goes far beyond our departure from the field site.” Again, a specific realization of this concept may vary from project to project, enabling discussions and decisions to be made with the participation of the community. We can ask community members, especially those with whom we have worked extensively and/or can establish good relations, what the needs of their community are. Another important idea articulated in this lecture was the central role and conception of reciprocity between the researcher and community.

In other words, the researcher should negotiate the way a project is conducted, what the possible outcomes should be and in what way they will be interesting for the community. As Peter Austin stated in his presentation: “we need to question basic linguistic/academic/literacy assumptions,” with which I cannot agree more. Despite this having been recognized several years ago, it remains valid today. To conclude, I would like to quote the major principles that we should consider when working in the field (as formulated by Anna Berge): be honest, creative, flexible, and open; discuss issues; explain your work; give results back to the community; communicate, negotiate; and do not isolate yourself.

### 3.5. Audio recording

Next was Audio Theory and Practice for language documentation by David Nathan. He started by asking questions such as whether participants had ever recorded, published, or processed audio or if we thought digital or analogue was better for recording. This helped all participants to get off on the same foot, whether they were experienced or newbies. The lecturer formulated “big questions” to be kept in mind when recording (what, for whom, and why are we recording?) and explicitly formulated criteria for evaluating recordings, which proved to be instrumental in developing personal audio recording skills.

We learned a lot of technical information, which was presented in a clear and logical way with a less technically minded person in mind. Apart from the technical characteristics of devices and their settings, it is important to be able to adapt to a recording environment. For instance, trying to avoid hard, smooth, flat parallel surfaces, or facing away from noise sources, choosing a space away from doors, windows, traffic areas, and anything else noisy. The audio equipment selection depends on the goals of a specific documentation project. The lecturer gave a detailed description of microphone types and their advantages and disadvantages in different recording situations, although in the end there are only a few optimal choices. The best thing is to go directly to an expert. There was also detailed information provided about the correct way to use a microphone such as placement, distance, handling, and use in windy situations (e.g., using a deadcat).

The theoretical portion of the audio session concluded with an exhaustive description of audio workflow. The practical portion was truly impressive as the instructors demonstrated the use of some equipment such as a Superlux S502 full binaural microphone and a Rode NTG1 condenser shotgun microphone in the classroom.

### 3.6. Video and language documentation

Video and Language Documentation by Anthony Jukes concentrated on the advantages and disadvantages of video for language documentation. One of the major drawbacks of video footage as stated by the lecturer is that it “may seem ‘true’, but is actually less ‘authentic’ than audio” as it frames an environment rather than capturing

it.

When shooting video he recommends considering what is to be filmed, who is going to watch it, where/how they will watch it, how you will manage audio, how you are going to edit it, how much you are prepared to spend, and how much you are prepared to carry. Some basic technical information concerning lenses and sensors was explained in a succinct manner with examples of effects these two parameters produce on the final video. As is often the case, the key is to find a proper balance between price, specs, and picture when choosing a camera. Some specific models were discussed, from professional video cameras to camcorders; photo cameras from DSLR to cheap point-and-shoot cameras were also discussed, as they are becoming increasingly popular for shooting video. Aside from the best camera one can afford, one should always remember that “The best camera is the one you have with you.”

In addition to the technical side of video recording, the presentation addressed the basic principles required for quality video recordings, thoroughly discussing such principle components of an optimal video shot as framing, lighting, and camera movement. A quality camera and decent command of the basic principles of composition require appropriate stabilization equipment such as tripods, monopods, and camera rigs. When shooting a video, one should always take care to record the audio separately using suitable equipment because built-in audio recorders can be used only for syncing purposes and do not result in high-quality audio.

### 3.7. Fieldwork techniques and elicitation

Fieldwork Techniques and Elicitation by Sonja Riesberg started by providing some theoretical foundation to language documentation and reflection on its meaning. According to Himmelmann (2006: 7–10), the object of study is “linguistic practice and tradition” which are manifested in “1) the observable linguistic behavior and 2) the native speakers’ metalinguistic knowledge.”

While making recordings of linguistic practice and tradition seems to be quite natural and, technically speaking, straightforward, some issues are to be considered in order to make a comprehensive record of linguistic practice and tradition and provide a necessary quality of data. In reality, a record of natural communicative events is not quite possible, and therefore, in language documentation, a linguist has to manage observed or staged communicative events, or elicitation. Possible scenarios of all types of communicative events, both observed and staged, necessary to meet the requirements of a comprehensive record, were discussed in considerable detail with carefully selected examples and actual footage from real projects. Elicitation and use of stimuli to obtain explicit grammatical information, fill gaps in a paradigm, encourage narrative production, and elicit dialogues and speaker’s categorization of space and time all received a meticulous account. The material was presented in a systematic manner with the examples provided from the lecturer’s own experience. In general, the presentation managed to cover every important aspect of the topic, providing just the right amount



of detail.

### 3.8. Software tools

The lecture Software for Documentation (Peter Austin and David Nathan) and the following practical class focused on the processing of collected (recorded) information, the most time-consuming stage of documentation. This includes transcriptions, aligned annotations, interlinear glossing, vocabulary, and dictionaries. This is generally facilitated by specialized software tools covered in the lecture. Specific programs covered in this lecture include ELAN and Transcriber for preparing annotations, Toolbox and FLE<sub>x</sub> for data management, parsing and interlinearization of the annotations from the previous stage, WeSay for collecting and organizing lexical data for dictionaries, and Arbil and SayMore for metadata management. The advantages and disadvantages of each program were discussed at length, and the comparison was summed up in a convenient table. Some possible ways to distribute the results of documentation, especially among community members, were also discussed.

The practical part of the class was devoted to working with Toolbox/FLE<sub>x</sub> (Peter Austin) and ELAN (Anthony Jukes). In the beginning, participants were given an Ainu text and followed instructions to setup a new project in Toolbox/FLE<sub>x</sub> with text and lexicon databases. We were told to pay attention to the naming of a project and its folders, numbering the entries of the lexicon database, adding extra fields to the text and lexicon databases to reflect the names of those who entered the data. Because of time limitations, it was not possible to get any profound knowledge or skill, but still it was very useful as a gentle introduction to the tool.

The latter part of the practical class described ELAN and its use for transcription and annotation. Students learned what this tool can and cannot do and gained knowledge of basic terminology behind the software and its workflow. Seven exercises were suggested to the students covering major stages of a language documentation project setup.

I believe that the knowledge and skills gained in the class were crucial for further mastering the software: I knew what courses and summer schools to look for in order to further my understanding of those tools, especially ELAN and metadata management tools. Thanks to the group projects, we were able to immediately apply the skills we had gained in this class.

### 3.9. Data management

We need to carefully consider strategies for storing the rapidly increasing amount of data we are able to store on our computers to facilitate quick identification and access. This was the major point of data management class by David Nathan. The presentation effectively demonstrated why file naming and folder structure strategies are vital, what a digital object is and its identity, how to create a collection of materials that can be used in the absence of the creator, and how to document decisions on file name and

folder structure conventions creating an additional layer of metadata.

Three folder structure models were presented along with a discussion of their pros and cons: 1) a tree of descriptive folder and file names; 2) one folder with descriptive filenames; and 3) one folder with numerical filenames. These recommendations were very useful since I had had experience creating what turned out to be badly managed data sets.

In the final part of the presentation, the lecturer discussed the issue of encoding, presenting some possible problems and ways to avoid them. After the class, the researcher should be able to design a well-organized system of folders. These skills were immediately put into use during the group projects.

### 3.10. Photography

Photography in language documentation by Hideo Sawada concentrated on the roles of photography in language documentation and its technical aspects. The technical aspect focused on camera types and lenses. Participants learned about possible problems that make images unusable, including lighting, blurring, defocusing, and obscurity. There were also some tips on how to obtain the best picture possible under different circumstances.

During the lecture, the importance of tripods was highlighted again (see the paragraph on Audio and video class). The lecturer gave very helpful recommendations on choosing photography equipment, including tripods, and provided amusing demonstrations clearly illustrating possible problems in the field and ways to overcome them. Camera types, such as DSLR, mirrorless, high-end and point-and-shoot compact cameras, mobile and smartphone built-in cameras, and PC built-in cameras, received a detailed account along with a discussion of their advantages and disadvantages in a fieldwork context. Students learned to take into account lighting conditions to adapt equipment to different working situations. The role of close-ups in language documentation was examined, and useful tips for good quality close-up photos were given.

The students learned how to manage photos in a language documentation, about naming of files and software for bulk renaming, such as Flexible Renamer for MS Windows or Rename for Macs. Personally, I prefer using Total Commander on Windows and Terminal on Mac. Photo management software to enable keyword searches was discussed by the lecturer, including Picasa, StudioLine Photo Basic, and Adobe Lightroom. It should be added that newer versions of Windows and OS X enable users to organize files with tags. There is a study by Civan et al. (2008) showing that combining folders and tags (labels) is better than using only one of these methods for organizing files.

### 3.11. Digital archiving

The Endangered Language Archive (ELAR) and Digital Archiving for Documentation of Endangered Languages by David Nathan gave a very important perspective to the whole workshop, clarifying some intricate “secrets” of language documentation for the inexperienced. It began with a discussion of the definition of a digital archive, its functions, and the peculiar features of language archives rooted in the diverse and complex nature of language itself. Among the advantages of language archives mentioned were security, preservation, discovery, protocols, sharing, acknowledgement, mobilization, quality, and standards. Their drawbacks partly originate from the disadvantages of digital data: it is fragile and ephemeral.

Listeners were introduced to the architecture of language archives using the examples of the Open Archival Information System (OAIS) and ELAR models, and the need for redefining the digital ELAR was postulated. After the introductory section of the presentation, the lecturer discussed at length various aspects of endangered language archiving using ELAR and its inventory as an example. The lecture concluded with practical information on formats and standards. All of this requires a variety of computer skills. Therefore, one may benefit from acquiring such skills or collaborating with someone who has them.

### 3.12. Group projects

The group projects proved to be a critical element of the Documentary Linguistics Workshop. They helped the participants to consolidate their knowledge and strengthen their skills by working together on a project of their choice. The group in which I worked consisted of three highly motivated individuals I would like to mention by name—Sami Honkasalo, Robert Laub, and Kunio Kinjo—who concentrated on something that could be part of an actual language documentation project. We recorded a Buryad fairy tale and transcribed it in ELAN, collaborated on a translation in Google Docs, and then published it on YouTube with subtitles in Buryad and English.

Similar to most of the teams, we had at first experienced difficulties deciding on a topic. We had tried several other options, for example, discussing tense forms in Buryad, before finally deciding on the fairy tale. This proved to be an appropriate decision as the allocated time of four days was insufficient for anything too ambitious. We found Google Docs to be very useful in the course of our project, although it is not always usable in the field. We learned a lot from interacting within the group, as well as with other participants and teaching staff.

The culminating point of the group projects and the workshop itself was the presentation and discussion of the group projects. The groups presented successful projects and received a lot of feedback from all the participants. I believe that the opinions and advice we received at this point from our experienced instructors was extremely important.

### 3.13. Workshop atmosphere

The whole workshop was about free communication of ideas, knowledge, and skills. This concluded in an individual clinic and consultations, during which a student could ask for the advice of any lecturer or any language consultant. Some used this opportunity to set up a project in Toolbox or FLEx, while others chose to discuss their MA or PhD projects, or project proposals, or receive firsthand advice on equipment and its use. The range of possible topics was limitless, and I believe everyone was able to effectively use this phase of the workshop.

## 4. Conclusion

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize the role such workshops play. They have a significant influence on future careers since they provide excellent opportunities to interact with experts and senior specialists in the field and share in their firsthand experience. The Documentary Linguistics Workshop at ILCAA, TUFS (Tokyo) succeeded in this and granted its participants self-confidence and inspiration in their language documentation efforts.

There was a good balance between theory and practice, group projects, individual consultations, expert teaching staff, carefully selected language consultants, and students. Similar to any other event of this type, organizers tried hard to counterbalance contents and activities with very limited time. However, it is difficult to meet the expectations of every participant. Among minor imperfections was the limited coverage of documentation software, though I do realize that within the six-day timeframe, this was not possible. Therefore, students who seek further training in software tools for language documentation should look for more specialized workshops. However, it was possible to consult individually with instructors about the software.

In sum, I should say that this workshop proved to be a very solid introduction to language documentation. It provided a strong foundation to further training in the field and for starting individual projects. I believe that this type of workshop is very important for researchers and endangered language communities around the globe. Fortunately, the new iteration of the LignDy project implements a series of outreach activities as a continuation of the Documentary Linguistics Workshop in different parts of the world, including Indonesia, Mongolia, Russia, and China. This facilitates the dissemination of knowledge and skills and sets up long-term collaboration amongst academics and communities all over the world.

For anyone who participates in similar workshops, I would recommend that while enjoying the welcoming and relaxed atmosphere of such a workshop, participants take notes and read the recommended literature, or at least some of the papers one notes as important. I also recommend that participants download the workshop materials and the webpage to be able to use it offline.

Lastly, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to the LingDy team headed by Toshihide Nakayama. My participation in the workshop would not have been possible without the continued effort and careful arrangements of Yoshida-san (Sachiko Yoshida) and without the ongoing support and friendly advice of Professor Tokusu Kurebito, to whom I would also like to express my appreciation.

## References

- Austin, Peter K. 2003. "Introduction (LDD 1)". In Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language Documentation and Description* 1. London: SOAS. pp.6–14.
- Austin, Peter K. and Julia Sallabank, (eds.) 2011. *The Cambridge Handbook of Endangered Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Civan, Andrea, William Jones, Predrag Klasnja and Harry Bruce. 2008. "Better to organize personal information by folders or by tags?: The devil is in the details". *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 45 (1). pp.1–13.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 2006. "Language documentation: What is it and what is it good for?". In Jost Gippert, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann and Ulrike Mosel (eds.) *Essentials of Language Documentation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp.1–30.
- Thieberger, Nicholas. 2012. *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Fieldwork*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.