REGULATIONS ON USE

Stephen C. Levinson and Asifa Majid

This website and the materials herewith supplied have been developed by members of the Language and Cognition Department of the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (formerly the Cognitive Anthropology Research Group). In a number of cases materials were designed in collaboration with staff from other MPI departments.

Proper citation and attribution
Any use of the materials should be acknowledged in publications, presentations and other public materials. Entries have been developed by different individuals. Please cite authors as indicated on the webpage and front page of the pdf entry. Use of associated stimuli should also be cited by acknowledging the field manual entry. Intellectual property rights are hereby asserted.

Creative Commons license
This material is provided under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike license (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0). This means you are free to share (copy, redistribute) the material in any medium or format, and you are free to adapt (remix, transform, build upon) the material, under the following terms: you must give appropriate credit in the form of a citation to the original material; you may not use the material for commercial purposes; and if you adapt the material, you must distribute your contribution under the same license as the original.

Background
The field manuals were originally intended as working documents for internal use only. They were supplemented by verbal instructions and additional guidelines in many cases. If you have questions about using the materials, or comments on the viability in various field situations, feel free to get in touch with the authors.

Contact
Email us via library@mpi.nl
Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics
P.O. Box 310, 6500 AH, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

LANGUAGE OF PERCEPTION:
OVERVIEW OF FIELD TASKS
Asifa Majid & Stephen C. Levinson

The entries in this section all focus on the language of perception. The first entry "Language of Perception: The view from language and culture" provides an overview of linguistic and ethnographic phenomena relevant to this topic. It serves as a general orientation and provides some guidance to the language of perception so that you can conduct the standardised tests with the appropriate instructions for your field site.

The other entries provide guidelines for how to conduct the standardised naming tasks. The goal of these tasks is to test the hypothesis that some perceptual domains are more "ineffable" than others. It is commonly assumed that the vocabulary associated with the proximate senses (olfaction, taste, touch) is poorer than vocabulary associated with the distal senses (vision, hearing). For example, Slobin (1971) states that "We have an inadequate vocabulary for expressing sensations of the proximity senses" (p. 108 – see also Sturtevant 1964 p. 119, who argues that in smell and taste English "has a relatively small and weakly terminologised vocabulary"). Evidence from aphasics also suggests that the vocabulary for the proximate senses, particularly olfaction, may be particularly sensitive to disruption (Goodglass, Barton & Kaplan 1968). We want to test whether the proximate senses are universally ineffable – suggesting an architectural constraint on cognition – or whether they are just accidentally so in Indo-European languages, which would open the question of the relationship between language and the senses.

To test the hypothesis we have devised naming tasks for the different senses. We will compare response consistency within communities and establish whether some domains are more codable – or conversely more "ineffable" – than others. The domains are:

(1) vision – colour   (4) tactile texture
(2) vision – shape   (5) olfaction
(3) sound   (6) taste

It is important to collect data for ALL of these domains. The tasks are all brief, consisting of a small number of stimuli, so they should not take long to run. Furthermore, we are interested in primary responses so long interviews with all consultants are not required.

NOTE – For all of these tasks, we wish to know whether there are ordinary terms that refer to the abstract properties of colour, shape, texture, sound, olfaction and taste. We are interested in terms that are relatively frequent, formally simple and relatively salient, not in hypertrophied descriptions. Of course, if there are no ordinary terms then we wish to know what other resources speakers can use to describe such stimuli. If you elicit a long-winded description, do try and elicit a shorter, more targeted description by asking *Is there a simpler way of saying it?* This will also facilitate the analysis component, where you have to code speaker responses.

Also note that because one of the goals of this project is to test for how much consistency there is between consultants in how they describe a stimulus it is important to test the consultants individually, and out of hearing of other consultants. We do not want to inflate apparent consistency by testing in groups!

We also urge you to video-tape all your sessions. Gestural information may provide additional cues as to local categories. Minimally audio-tape all sessions.

Each task will take approximately 10-30 minutes per consultant – colour may take the longest time since there are 80 colour chips. All other tasks have between 5 and 20 stimuli to name. You could run all tasks in a single session, in which case follow the order of tasks in the field manual. Alternatively, you can use each of the sub-tasks as a brief interlude between other tasks.

The standardised tests also provide a method for collecting vocabulary for the language of perception so that you can begin articulating the grammar of perception in your language and its underlying semantic parameters. For this component you should go beyond the strict protocol of the main tasks and conduct further elicitation. We have given some suggestions of questions to ask in an "Optional post-task elicitation". Any additional questions should not be asked until the main experimental phase is complete.

References
Slobin, D. I. (1971). *Psycholinguistics*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
Sturtevant, W. C. (1964). Studies in ethnoscience. *American Anthropologist*, *66*, 99-131.
Goodglass, H., Barton, M. I. & Kaplan, E. F. (1968). Sensory modality and object-naming in aphasia. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, *11*, 488-496.