encyclopedic dictionary, with less coverage but giving priority to cultural information that is considered to be important. A linguist might feel that the detailed documentation described above must be privileged above all else; a community might feel that certain types of cultural knowledge are most important, and aim to focus narrowly on what they would like to record. From a more core linguistic perspective, views on what
p. 426 is ↳ important about language may differ. You may think that what is important about a language is its morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, while members of the community might value knowledge of its phonetics and lexicon.

Recognition that there are different knowledge systems leads to a number of questions.

What if the goals of the community and the goals of the researcher do not mesh? Is it appropriate for the researcher to try to persuade the community that his/her goals are the right ones? Is it appropriate for the community to insist on its goals? Is it possible for the two to work together to discover where there are overlapping goals and work from these together, respecting the needs of each to work on their own goals as well? What is my accountability to the community? There are extremes in how linguists undertake fieldwork. At one extreme, there is the linguist who flies into a community and collects their data. For someone who has already developed a relationship with a community, this likely does not raise any danger signals. But for someone going to a community without having already developed a relationship with people there, this will often create problems. Such a type of fieldwork might be helpful in terms of getting a particular type of data. However, it takes a while of working with people for each of you to figure out what the other is all about, what each of your strengths are, and so on. So quick trips simply to get data probably do not result in the best-quality data. And fly-in/fly-out fieldwork will not work in most communities because there is not an opportunity to develop the relationships that help to make ongoing fieldwork possible for you or for those who might follow you.

At another extreme, in some cases the community has had control of the research agenda. Wilkins (1992) addresses his work in Australia, identifying advantages to this type of research—personal growth, academic growth in learning things that he would not have learned otherwise. At the same time, the time to complete a degree is longer, he did not work on the questions that he originally brought with him, and he lost his scholarship funding.

Different kinds of balances exist. Czaykowska-Higgins (2009) outlines different ways of working with different communities in a community-based research project, and Holton (2009) details his very different experiences in Alaska and Indonesia, pointing to the local nature of ethical responsibilities.

The questions that introduce this section have no single answers, but many linguists and communities have found ways, over time, of defining common goals and respecting those that are not in common; people who have engaged in such work generally report that it is for the better for all. Often as linguists work with speakers, they come to find the fundamental similarities that exist in their goals, and work through the differences. Again, this takes time and patience. Working together often allows for common goals to be found. As a simple example, suppose that you want to record autobiographies because you are interested in getting first person forms, and the community wants stories in the language for the school. It might be
p. 427 possible to accomplish both of these, with you ↳ working together with teachers to do your part of creating the school materials while they work together with you to assist you in obtaining the recordings that you want.