

their time freely. When I returned to that community two years later, people told me that they would be happy to work, but only for pay.

It can be complicated within your home university to get funds released from a grant if you have one if you are paying with gifts, or if people are unwilling to sign that they have received payment. You most likely need to meet community standards, so this is something to work out with your university.

*What about informed consent?* In getting an ethics protocol approved, informed consent is an important issue. It is necessary to think about how you will deal with issues of consent before you begin fieldwork, but this becomes real once you are actually engaged in the fieldwork. While what is most important is probably what underlies informed consent, it is useful to begin with a brief discussion of the mechanics of getting informed consent, as this is not necessarily as straightforward as asking someone to sign a document—the type of informed consent that is often anticipated by ethics boards.

Informed consent can be indicated in various ways. A signature is one way of showing consent, but oral consent is usually possible as well. Some people may not have written literacy, and some may be reluctant to give their signature on what appears to be an official-looking document out of concern for what the consequences might be. In general, people are willing to provide oral consent if they wish to be engaged in the work. Sometimes, where speakers agree to recording, a researcher might record a statement of consent in place of written agreement.

p. 418 What underlies consent is really what is important: the people who work with you need to understand what they are agreeing to do, and you need to find ways of explaining this clearly, in plain language, as discussed above. In an ongoing project, it is important to revisit issues of consent, as things will likely change over the duration of a project as the kinds of work change, as you become better known in the community.

When you seek informed consent, it is important that people know what they are consenting to. Linguistic fieldwork generally involves recordings, and consent must be sought to record (some people do not wish to be recorded; in some communities recording is not acceptable). This is only a first step, though. People must also be informed about how the materials might be used. At one extreme, will they be made freely available on the internet? At the other extreme, will they be available only to the researcher on a password-protected site? If the latter, what does this mean? Can they be used for commercial purposes? What are potential future uses? Issues of consent need to be negotiated and, generally, renegotiated as the research progresses. (See also Newman, Chapter 19 below.)

*And what about confidentiality?* In developing your ethics protocol, you had to discuss confidentiality. Many times in linguistic work, individuals want to be recognized by name, generally for stories, and often for elicited material as well. It is important to talk about this with people with whom you work, and to continue to talk about it, as people might change their minds, or want to be acknowledged for some materials but not for others. It is not good to make assumptions, or to generalize from one person, as not everyone will want the same thing, not every community will be the same, and an individual might feel differently about being identified depending on the material involved.

Confidentiality can be viewed in a second way. In addition to an interpretation of confidentiality as anonymity, discussed above, confidentiality can demand that information be kept private. For instance, there might be stories that are not meant for outsiders and that someone is willing to tell you, but does not want you to share with any others. In many Australian cultures, naming and showing pictures of people who have died is taboo, and if someone gives you such information, it may well be done believing that you will not share the knowledge with any others.

The above discussion is based on a model in which the researcher controls the agenda: the researcher determines, in advance, how things like informed consent will be handled, discussing these only later with