

**Title:** An ethnographic analysis of the collaborative design of community-based language archives

**Abstract:** In recent years, language archiving in the field of language documentation has undergone considerable changes in its format. The creation of digitized databases has explored some of the advantages of digital methods, such as the possibility of indexing large textual collections for user-friendly searches (Enge et al., 2015). Moreover, social changes have required us to redefine established recommended practices. Traditional boundaries and roles between the participants of documentary linguistics projects have been challenged through the empowerment of Indigenous communities in the documentation and revitalization of their languages (Henke and Berez-Kroeker, 2016), as well as in the creation of newly developed methods of participatory models and community-language research (Czaykowska-Higgins, 2009).

These conditions have also impacted the design choices of language archives. Recent literature has emphasized the need of tailoring their design and functionalities for their speech communities (Wasson et al., 2016). This is especially relevant when language archives are conceived not only as a tool for language documentation, but also as a key element to support language revitalization (Perez Báez et al., 2019). While the traditional lexico-grammar approach to language documentation has been criticized in favor of corpus-centered language documentation (Himmelmann, 2006), many of the existing digitized language resources focus on the former approach.

This presentation employs ethnographic observation to analyse the design choices of a community-based corpus-centered archive for Tsuut'ina (ISO 639-3: srs, Glottocode: sars1236), which has been developed using a co-design methodology in collaboration with language workers of Tsuut'ina Nation. Through an ethnographic analysis of the iterative development, this presentation aims to understand the interaction between recommended practices proposed within academia and the interests of the communities. By drawing a comparison between academia and the community, this work enables an in-depth analysis of underlying viewpoints on fundamental issues around language archiving such as the availability of materials, accessibility and expected users. Deepening the understanding on such matters aims to facilitate the alignment of the interests and expectations of academic research with the documentation and revitalization goals of the communities, therefore promoting sustainable collaboration between speech communities and members of academia.

## References

- Blokland, R., Chuprov, V., Levchenko, D., Fedina, M., Fedina, M., Partanen, N., & Rießler, M. (2016). *Komi media collection*. Syktyvkar: FU-Lab. <http://videocorpora.ru>
- Czaykowska-Higgins, E. (2009). Research models, community engagement, and linguistic fieldwork: Reflections on working within Canadian Indigenous communities. *Language Documentation and Conservation* 3(1).15–50. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4423>.
- Enge, J., Głowacz, A., Grega, M., Leszczuk, M., Papier, Z., Romaniak, P., & Simko, W. (2009). OASIS Archive – Open Archiving System with Internet Sharing. In: Mauthe, A., Zeadally, S., Cerqueira, E., Curado, M. (eds) *Future Multimedia Networking. FMN 2009. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 5630. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02472-6\\_28](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02472-6_28)
- Henke, R., & Berez-Kroeker, A. L. (2016). A brief history of archiving in language documentation, with an annotated bibliography. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 10, 411-457.
- Himmelman, N. P. (2006). Language documentation: What is it and what is it good for? In Jost Gippert, Nikolaus P. Himmelman & Ulrike Mosel (eds.), *Essentials of Language Documentation*, 1–30. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Northern Pomo Language Tools*. (2023). <https://northernpomolanguagetools.com/>
- Pérez Báez, G., Vogel, R., Patolo, U., (2019). Global Survey of Revitalization Efforts: A mixed methods approach to understanding language revitalization practices. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 13, 446–513.
- Spence, J. (n.d.). *Hupa Online Dictionary and Texts*. <http://nalc.ucdavis.edu/dictionaries/hupa-lexicon.php>
- Wasson, C., Holton, G., & Roth, H. S. (2016). Bringing user-centered design to the field of language archives. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 10, 641-681.