However, in the case of endangered languages, while elders are often considered to be the best collaborators, they might have mobility problems due to age. Field travel by modern vehicles may work well in some cultures, especially if the collaborators now normally travel in motor vehicles.

- For some landscape terms in some languages, it seems that observing *actions* in the landscape might better elicit terms that are tightly connected to affordances of landscape. For example, a term for a type of high ground might be coupled to the act of walking to the top of it for a view of surrounding terrain. Sometimes it might be possible to conduct appropriate actions in the field. However, animations or video clips might serve the same purpose and be more practical. They also would facilitate better
p. 389 'control', since the same clips could be shown to multiple collaborators. ↳

16.4 Some Ethical Issues

If ethnophysiography is genuinely to seek to understand the way that landscape is treated in languages across the world, it must do so from a perspective that is not biased towards western concepts of knowledge. In particular, if key case studies of differences between languages are carried out with indigenous peoples, then their worldviews must be reflected in resulting theories.

Such an approach is justified on scientific and ethical bases, but is also necessary to ensure collaboration by indigenous people in ethnophysiography research. Whiteley (1998) discusses what he sees as a crisis in ethnography as it has been practised with Hopi people, and explains why Tribal officials have adopted severe restrictions on research activities. He suggests: 'The reasons for indigenous resistance to cultural commodification by academic ethnography are several...but at base they are the result of the social and political estrangement of anthropology as a research-university discipline from the perspectives and situated interests of its subjects' (p. 6). Researchers must not only respect indigenous knowledges but also deliver practical benefits to communities.

Linguists, and others, collecting information about endangered languages may feel that language preservation is their key consideration. However, there is also almost always at least some element of 'appropriation', of 'taking away' things of value from the culture. The usual 'Enlightenment' defence that data collection for research is for the 'good of science' may not carry much weight for indigenous collaborators. Smith (1999: 1–2) put this position very strongly:

> From the vantage point of the colonized, a position from which I write, and choose to privilege, the term 'research' is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism. The word itself, 'research', is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world's vocabulary. When mentioned in many indigenous contexts, it stirs up silence, it conjures up bad memories, it raises a smile that is knowing and distrustful. It is so powerful that indigenous people even write poetry about research.... This collective memory of imperialism has been perpetuated through the ways in which knowledge about indigenous peoples was collected, classified and then represented in various ways back to the West, and then, through the eyes of the West, back to those who have been colonized.

Several indigenous participants at the 'Language in Landscape Workshop' in October/November 2008 expressed similar sentiments, arguing strongly that it was essential to understand the worldview of a specific indigenous group before attempting to interpret linguistic data (Turk and Mark 2011). They also emphasized the need for particular language communities to have a strong role in directing linguistic research, especially where the topic is landscape and toponyms, given the centrality of place in indigenous consciousness (Basso 1996). Similar sentiments were expressed by language communities in our own ethnophysiography case studies. For instance, members of the cultural maintenance group Juluwarlu have