p. 79

3.5.1 Language learning

Speech communities differ in their attitudes towards outsiders trying to learn their language. Some might not appreciate the researcher's ambitions to speak their language (Crowley 2007: 157; Hill 2006; Mosel 2006a: 73–4). But if they do, the researcher should try to learn the language because being able to communicate with the people

- is a pleasure and helps to cope with the fieldwork situation;
- contributes towards acceptance by the host community;
- brings the researcher into contact with more people in different situations and consequently allows the researcher to gather a more diversified corpus;
- allows the researcher to collect data by participant observation;
- raises the researcher's awareness of certain constructions, when native speakers correct his or her mistakes;
- allows the researcher to use the target language as the mediator language, which will reduce the danger of interference from the lingua franca. (Abbi 2001: 146; Bowern 2008: 9–10; Crowley 2007: 155; Dimmendaal 2001: 72–3; Everett 2001; Hale 2001: 81–2; Kibrik 1977: 52; Samarin 1967: 49–55).

However, with the exception of Healey (1975) and Burling (1984), language learning methods are not discussed in the literature on linguistic fieldwork.

3.5.2 Elicitation

Elicitation means collecting linguistic data by asking native speakers to produce words, phrases, or sentences that can serve as data for the analysis of a particular linguistic phenomenon. Some authors also speak of 'eliciting' texts, but here the term 'elicitation' will exclusively be used in the narrower sense defined above.

3.5.2.1 Questionnaires

For each elicitation session the researcher should have prepared a list of specific questions that he or she wants to ask the consultant in order to obtain data for hitherto unexplored areas of grammar or to clarify problems that have come up when analysing the results of preceding sessions. The collection of data with the help of questionnaires is not a 'mechanical process', as Kibrik (1977: 51) remarks, but should be guided by hypotheses that are based on the findings of linguistic typology and research into language universals and on the analysis of previously collected data. If the new data contradict a hypothesis, this hypothesis needs to be revised and checked against new data, until 'it predicts the construction of new data the investigator has not yet encountered' (p. 51). This routine of making and testing hypotheses can be equally
p. 80 applied to elicited and textual data, but the ↳ literature on linguistic fieldwork and typology only provides questionnaires for elicitation and for analysing and describing the typological profile of the target language:

1. Translational questionnaires consist of lists of words, phrases, and sentences whose translation into the target language is supposed to reveal some grammatical properties of the target language, e.g. '*a chief, the chief, some chiefs, the chiefs, both chiefs, the two chiefs,…*' (Tersis 1992: 277).
2. In scenario questionnaires, the questions first describe a particular scenario and then ask for an expression of a particular content that would be grammatically appropriate in the given context. Dahl's 'TMA questionnaire' is of this kind (1985: 198–206). The first question '[Standing in front of a