

For instance, MPI linguists have used a questionnaire which provides a structured tool for eliciting landscape terms and toponyms (Bohnemeyer and Enfield 2002). Data collected through this questionnaire are intended to support the broader MPI project on words for place and space. The developers of the questionnaire suggest three overarching questions:

how to formally identify placenames in the research language (i.e. according to morphological and syntactic criteria); what places placenames are employed to refer to (e.g. human settlements, landscape sites), and how places are semantically construed for this purpose. (p. 55)

Non-verbal stimuli developed by the MPI contain graphics which are used to elicit terms (e.g. for body parts) as well as story books, videos, and 3-D animations. Route descriptions have been especially effective for eliciting landscape terms and toponyms. Collaborators are also sometimes taken to prominent lookout points and asked to name landscape features that they can see.

Researchers at the MPI have also had success with referential communication tasks for collection of landscape terms (e.g. Burenhult 2008b). Two speakers are separated by a visual barrier but communicate by voice. One of them sees a target image or scene, and has to describe it well enough that the other speaker can reconstruct the scene or choose the correct image from a set of landscape images. The resulting dialog produces a good corpus of landscape terms, spatial relations, and directions in the context of natural discourse.

Heyes (2007) has used a number of visual and oral methods that he designed to gain an appreciation of Inuit conceptions of the environment. These included a series of drawing exercises, role-playing scenarios, 'knowledge-trees', memory exercises, genealogical charts, nomenclature exercises, and semi-structured interviews. He used a Filemaker database to assist with the sorting and coding of the large set of drawings of landscape features (with terms and names) that was obtained from collaborators.

Researchers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL 2009) have prepared a set of drawings for language elicitation, based on the environments and culture of ↘ Guatemalan regions of humid tropical forest. They provide picture sets for about sixty domains. One of the domains is 'natural phenomena', under which they provide illustrations of about 100 natural phenomena, many of which are of landscape scale or extent. Clearly, drawings have some advantages, and some disadvantages, compared to photographs. Unfortunately, there do not appear to be similar sets of images available for desert, semi-arid, or arctic environments, among others.

16.3 Threats to Validity of Cross-Language Interpretations of Landscape Terms

16.3.1 Some specific threats to validity

Some threats to validity of interpretation of landscape terms flow from the nature of ethnophysiography. Work on the ethnophysiography case studies discussed above indicates that definitions of landscape feature types in different languages differ significantly. The following list of potential threats to validity uses Yindjibarndi examples from Turk and Mark (2008), unless otherwise indicated:

- a. Terms may relate to fairly equivalent concepts between languages; however the set of examples fitting the concepts might be quite different, e.g. *muji* 'cave': In Yindjibarndi *muji* is the word for a deep hole in *marnda* ('rock face'), with an overhanging roof (a cave), large enough to shelter a person or animal. However, many speakers of English will have experienced a much larger variation of types