than *reef* in English; additional elicitation might be needed to determine whether the term has a more broad semantic reference than originally thought, or whether it is polysemous.

7. A term may be used for a landscape feature but be in effect a generic term for something of that type (e.g. shape). In Yindjibarndi, *yirra* means the exact edge of a hilltop or a water body but also means 'tooth': is a body part metaphor being employed, or is the core meaning of *yirra* 'sharp edge'?

8. Some languages may have different terms for the same features which are used under different circumstances,—e.g. Navajo speakers use different proper names (toponyms) for the same features in different contexts, and some of these contexts are themselves seasonal. Also, some terms are based on appearance, which may vary with seasons.

9. It is possible to overemphasize lexicalization of concepts in our studies of categorization in ethnophysiography. Are monolexemic terms (i.e. concepts labelled by a specific, simple word) more cognitively salient than concepts that require longer phrases to describe? For instance, O'Meara has found that for Seri, of the 100 landscape terms that have been documented to date, at least 88 have transparent etymologies combining a term for a landscape material (rock, earth, fresh water, or sea water) with a modifier, or are a derived nominal (e.g. a nominalization). Thus at most 12 of the Seri terms for landscape elements are monolexemic. Mark and Stea have observed a similar, though less extreme, trend for the Navajo language, where at least 64 of 163 landscape terms and phrases from published dictionaries (and other sources) begin with a landscape material term followed by shape or position/orientation indicator(s), and are thus clearly multi-morphemic. ↳

p. 388

16.3.2 Addressing threats to validity

Many of the threats discussed in the previous section are addressed by the fieldwork methods discussed in §16.2. In general terms, threats will be reduced through: use of multiple methods ('triangulation': Webb et al. 2000) and iterative procedures; using a diverse range of collaborators; not 'leading the witness'; being open to alternative interpretations; and becoming as intimate as possible with lifestyle and social structures of the language community.

More specific ways of addressing threats to validity include the following:

- Elicitation can be done using only 'words' or 'language', either oral or (in some cases) written. Requesting formal definitions of terms can seem unnatural to language speakers, but it should not be dismissed as a method. Asking people to explain the meaning of a term may be a more natural way to gain insight on meanings. Asking for differences in the meanings of two or more terms that refer to entities in the same domain, or asking for examples of usage of terms, are especially useful approaches.

- Spelling is something of an issue in this research. For instance, the Yindjibarndi had no written language before European contact, and some of the sounds used in Yindjibarndi are not used in English. Hence, different linguists have decided to interpret and write down particular phonemes in different ways. Standardization of approach is critical to minimizing potential confusion. Where standardized spelling has been agreed upon by linguists it is important to recognize that this may achieve importance among indigenous peoples themselves: one of the authors was criticized by an indigenous Australian at a recent conference for a spelling 'mistake', when he did not follow spelling conventions adopted in a dictionary compiled by Europeans.

- Use of trips through the people's traditional country are very useful, and might produce the most 'authentic' results if one uses traditional modes of transport, such as walking or travel by canoe.