to know which one this participant is talking about. Therefore, collection of physical samples is required to overcome assumptions.)

Since this process is time-consuming, it may require one or more additional interview sessions and take much longer than the free-listing exercise itself. An alternative approach is to complete a set of free-listing exercises with different individuals or groups, compile the composite results, and then, working with a few of the participants, collect the evidence samples. Although this would seem to be more time-efficient, it will still be necessary to take these samples to each of the participants for them to verify their answers; and since some time will have passed, and they were not involved in the collection of the samples, they may not be able to confirm or deny if the samples are representatives of their responses. This presumes that there is
p. 290 little synonymy or taxonomic overlap between individuals/groups, ↳ which is the most conservative option. It provides independent confirmation of terms when they are the same across the responses of the sample group, as well as evidence of differences when there is a spectrum of differences within a community of knowledge holders. The choice of using either individual or composite collections largely depends on the ease with which participants are likely to be able to identify the samples that are collected.

12.2.2 Inventory interview

A physical collection of one or more categories of organisms/environmental samples—for instance bees (Mendes dos Santos and Antonini 2008), birds (Boster 1987), crustaceans (Ferreira et al. 2009), fish (Johannes 1981), fungi (Lampman 2007), algae (Ostraff 2006), trees (Jernigan (2006)—is first compiled from a location where the researcher is working. This is then numbered and used as a standardized set of visual (and sometimes olfactory etc.) stimuli for eliciting responses from multiple individuals or groups of participants. Photographs are sometimes used (see Diamond 1991; Nguyen 2003), but there are so many drawbacks that their use is strongly discouraged, particularly because voucher specimens of actual materials will need to be collected as evidence eventually. Cases where photos are actually justified are when organisms are rare, endangered, extinct, or locally unavailable. Photos should not be used as a means to avoid work.

a. A participant (or group of participants) is shown specimens in a specific sequence and asked a set of questions about each one. The questions could be similar to those used in a free list but are often more specific to the details of the specimen being shown. For example, while being shown a specific soil sample (#1) a participant could be asked, 'Does this look familiar? If so, does it have a name? If so, where is this particular substance usually seen? Is it considered useful? If so, what would those uses happen to be?' After recording the responses to the questions, the participant would be shown the next sample (#2) and asked the same questions. Phillips and Gentry (1993a; 1993b) recommend that the minimum data required for inventory interviews are: 'Do you know this...?', 'Do you know a name for this...(and if so, what is it?)', and 'Do you use this... (and if so, how do you use it)?'

b. The process is repeated with multiple participants (or groups) to produce comparable data sets.

c. With each repetition, additional activities may be conducted using the specimens. For example, specimens may be used in pile sorting exercises to identify Berlin's (1992) hierarchical classifications (Lampman 2007; Mekbib 2007) and, in group or individual follow-up discussions, to determine cryptic classifications (Souza and Begossi 2007). Sorting systems often represent ways in which
p. 291 information is perceived about the world. One way to see more clearly how this ↳ information is perceived is to go beyond the classification by mapping indigenous world views (Davidson-Hunt et al. 2005).