

## Unanswered Questions, Wasted Answers, Loose Leaves Lost

Frans Plank

7iv2003

For such a standard tool of the typologist's trade as questionnaires or checklists are, there is rather little one can learn about them from textbooks, handbooks, or history books.

What need not be learnt because it is self-evident is that when typologists use their own kinds of questionnaires, it is because they would like to obtain and record the SAME KIND of grammatical and/or lexical information for any number of languages, so as to allow, and possibly facilitate, the COMPARISON of languages. Therefore, a typological questionnaire has to be equally suitable for obtaining that information for ANY language □possibly: structurally defined subsets, e.g. all lgs with noun incorporation□. The ultimate objective in typology is to get an idea of how one language can differ SYSTEMATICALLY from other languages – any other language, not just those assumed to be historically related through common origin or borrowing. Therefore, a typological questionnaire, apart from covering parameters for variation individually, ought to alert its users to systematic CO-variation: the typologist's job of sorting out precisely what co-varies with what else can be made much harder by a questionnaire ill-constructed.

It is in the particulars of questionnaire design, above and beyond what follows from such general considerations, that typology could benefit from improved methodological awareness. And there is much to be learnt from good and bad examples.

Frequently, typological questionnaires are ANALYTIC, asking questions such as “Does language *a, b, c* ... have forms, constructions, rules, or other analytic constructs of category *x*?” (for *x* = bilabial affricates, a trial number, adjectives, a passive for intransitive verbs, parasitic gaps with finite verbs, a basic colour term for TURQUOISE, etc.). Analytic questions that can be answered concisely by “yes/no/don't know” are considered preferable to those asking for an essay in response, if only because this is known to influence the questionnaire's return ratio. But there are circumstances

where DATA-ELICITING questionnaires promise to be more useful, asking for words, (in) sentences, (in) texts (in contexts) of languages *a, b, c, ...*, typically by means of translations or picture descriptions, and leaving the analytic work entirely to the questionnaire's author. And questionnaires can also be mixed: asking for translated sentences plus something as innocuous as word-by-word or morpheme-by-morpheme glossing is asking for analysis and interpretation.

Whether analytical or data-eliciting or mixed, typological questionnaires can be short or long, selective, focusing in depth and often at length on particular structural areas, or comprehensive, attempting to cover much or all of grammar and lexicon at one go.

A common assumption of questionnaire authors, though not always well founded, is that the particular sort of information sought is not to be had in the published literature, at least not readily or not in the form that is required for purposes of crosslinguistic comparison, and that native speakers or linguists sufficiently knowledgeable about relevant languages are therefore the only sources to be tapped. Getting the questionnaire to a representative set of consultants is no longer such a logistic challenge. The chief problems continue to be getting it back with the blanks filled in, and with the blanks filled in well, and putting to good use what one has gotten back from one's respondents – and failure in these three respects is perhaps commoner than failing to ask the right analytic or data-eliciting questions.

Here, by contrast, are two current questionnaires whose typological ranking is high by any standards:

Comrie, Bernard & Norval Smith (1977). *Lingua Descriptive Studies: Questionnaire*. *Lingua* 42–1.

This questionnaire is amazingly comprehensive, especially as to grammatical features. Filling it in for a language, you in fact end up writing a grammar – though one that makes the language eminently comparable, whatever the sacrifices in respect of readability. This is what makes it typologically so useful; there is hardly a recent sample without lots of *LDS* languages. The *LDS* questionnaire has been filled in for close to 40 languages from a wide range of families and areas and of widely different characters, published by North-Holland, Croom Helm, and Routledge (one of the best things these successive publishers ever did – not that they liked doing it forever). The features whose values are to be filled in do not come weighted for their typological salience.

Weighting by way of selection is what typologists are getting here:

*Ethnologue* Language Typology Questionnaire:

[http://www.ethnologue.com/ethno\\_docs/language\\_typology\\_form.asp](http://www.ethnologue.com/ethno_docs/language_typology_form.asp)

Part of *Ethnologue*, 14th edition, edited by Barbara F. Grimes. Dallas, Texas: SIL International, 2000.

This questionnaire asks for information – ranging from yes/no answers to free-style monographic treatment – about only 16 features, from basic constituent order to tonal/non-tonal. Presumably these have not been chosen randomly, but because they are assumed to be most characteristic □salient□. ‘Being characteristic’ can mean one of two things: (i) to uniquely characterize a language and distinguish it from all other languages; (ii) to characterize a language as a member of a class of similar languages (in which case the characteristic features should be ones predictive of many other features, not specially mentioned in the typological characterization). Typological

questionnaires tend towards the latter, but not always unequivocally so. More practical questions I have been asking myself about the *Ethnologue* Typology Questionnaire is who is filling it in, and what they are doing with those which are submitted to *Ethnologue*'s editor. Is anybody USING that information? *Ethnologue* itself does not include typological information.

Though differing vastly in comprehensiveness, these are both whole-language questionnaires. Implicitly, or to some extent explicitly (in the case of grammar series following a programme), modern grammar writers writing an introductory chapter intended to give a typological sketch of "their" language, as one has almost come to expect, are in effect filling in such whole-language questionnaires of the less comprehensive type.

By now, there are numerous typological questionnaires in use (or in recent use) targeting individual structural areas, in greater detail than even the most comprehensive whole-language questionnaire on the market. Few are in the public domain, though.

Therefore, various initiatives are being taken to make the information obtained through typological questionnaires, nowadays typically stored in the form of electronic databases, available to the public at large and to preserve it for posterity. Sure, there is something gained if individual investigators obtain the information they find useful for their own purposes by means of a well-constructed typological questionnaire. But given the nature of the typological enterprise, where every single feature might turn out to co-vary with every single other feature, unsuspected by the individual investigator focusing her/his selective attention on this feature or that but not on all of them together, there is much to be said for pooling resources and comparing what is in everybody's databases. To some extent, love's labour would be lost if information obtained for the purpose of a specific typological research project would be allowed to go to waste with the end of that project: other typological projects might stand to benefit greatly from being able to re-use it, instead of having to obtain the same information again or missing out on it altogether.

Typology did not begin yesterday or with Joseph Greenberg: it is a research programme that has been under way for more than three centuries. This said,<sup>1</sup> the collective factual knowledge about crosslinguistic variation has evidently increased

---

<sup>1</sup> For a brief defence of this historiographical claim see Plank (2001).

vastly, and typological theory and method have never been as sophisticated. Given the attention that is now being paid to methodological matters, one wonders whether the use of questionnaires has been a contributing part of this progress. Or is it only recently that information obtained by such tools as the *Lingua Descriptive Studies Questionnaire* has begun to enrich typological practice?

Though ignored by historians and current practitioners of the trade, typological questionnaires as such are not new. The question of their past impact is, however, a somewhat melancholy story, with these four episodes (or these are the ones I am aware of).

Georg von der Gabelentz (1840–93) has been justly credited, not with starting, but with reorientating the typological research programme. The main message in a posthumous paper and in frequently quoted passages from the equally posthumous second edition of his textbook:

Gabelentz, Georg von der (1894). Hypologie [sic] der Sprachen, eine neue Aufgabe der Linguistik. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 4: 1-7.

--- (1891). *Die Sprachwissenschaft: Ihre Aufgaben, Methoden und bisherigen Ergebnisse*. Leipzig: Weigel. (Revised edition: Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1901.)

was that after some 200 years typology had better get professional, not the least in the matter of the procurement of reliable information about a representative sample of the languages of the world.<sup>2</sup> The traditional method was for individual researchers to wade through, or dip into, whatever published accounts were available and to use excerpts from these as the basis of their inductive generalizations. Often they would be unable to assess the reliability of their sources, which, moreover, could differ widely in descriptive format and theoretical framework. Such difficulties could be overcome if typologists were able to consult with recognized experts on particular languages and if these consultations were standardized. What was urgently called for, thus, was the use of a questionnaire designed by a team of experts, so as to cover all crosslinguistic eventualities (Gabelentz 1894: 6):

---

<sup>2</sup> See further Plank (1991).

Die Arbeit verlangt eine Kommission, und die Kommission verlangt ein bis ins Einzelste ausgearbeitetes Programm, und dies Programm verlangt mehr selbstentsagenden Gehorsam, als man von der Mehrzahl der Gelehrten erwarten darf. Doch solche Schwierigkeiten sind zu überwinden.

Unter dem Programme aber denke ich mir eine Art Fragebogen, der kategorienweise alle grammatischen Möglichkeiten erschöpft, so dass jede Frage mit einem Ja oder Nein beantwortet ist. Eine solche Fragestellung ist schwierig für den Fragesteller selbst, manchmal auch für den Beantworter; aber Unmögliches wird keinem der Beteiligten zugemutet.

After more than a century, this is what we are still at, organizing questionnaire work, forming committees, planning for a better typological future.

Actually, Georg von der Gabelentz himself, calling for a grand typological master questionnaire, had just gone on record with a questionnaire of his own:

Gabelentz, Georg von der (1892). *Handbuch zur Aufnahme fremder Sprachen*. Im Auftrage der Kolonial-Abtheilung des Auswärtigen Amts verfasst von Georg von der Gabelentz. Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler und Sohn, Königliche Hofbuchhandlung. in-8, xv, 198 pages.

It is unlikely to have been drawn up in collaboration with other linguists; if there were consultations, then they were with the German colonial administration who presumably commissioned the questionnaire. And it is not the most typological of questionnaires conceivable; it certainly does not meet Gabelentz's own specifications, as set out a couple of years later in the above quote, requesting yes/no questions about all grammatical parameters for crosslinguistic variation, ordered by categories.

Dies Handbuch ist in erster Reihe für unsere Kolonialbeamten, Missionare und Forschungsreisenden, dann aber auch für alle Anderen bestimmt, die, während sie in fernen Landen weilen, Zeit und Lust haben, die Sprachenkunde zu

fördern. Sprachforscher vom Fach kommen selten in die Lage, an Ort und Stelle Materialien sammeln zu können. [...]

Wir haben es, soviel sich bisher beurtheilen und vermuthen lässt, in unseren Schutzgebieten nicht mit besonders schwierigen Sprachen zu thun. [...]

Unser sprachenreichstes Gebiet, wohl eins der vielsprachigsten der Erde, ist das der Neu-Guinea-Kompagnie. [...] (p. 1)

□give a few details about contents: emphasis on lexicon□

□Papuan languages easy!□

□What are professional linguists supposed to be so busy with, that keeps them away from all these languages out there?□

It is unknown to me how often this questionnaire was filled in, for languages of (German) New Guinea or others; the archives of what used to be the *Kolonial-Abtheilung* of the German Foreign Office might tell. □filled in for Basque, apparently by Gabelentz himself; Familienarchiv Gabelentz im Thuringischen Staatsarchiv Altenburg, p.c. Manfred Ringmacher□ The *Handbuch* itself is difficult to get hold of: few libraries seem to have a blank copy. I have never seen, or heard of, one filled in.

The archaeologist, ethnologist, and linguist Max Uhle (1856–1944), once a student of Gabelentz at Leipzig (actually doing his doctorate with him, on Chinese), appears to have used it working in South America. See Höflein (2002: 6).

Georg von der Gabelentz's own textbook, *Die Sprachwissenschaft*, though dwelling on language documentation in its substantial methodological parts, makes no mention of the *Handbuch zur Aufnahme fremder Sprachen*.

I am aware of at least one questionnaire before Gabelentz and two shortly after which might with more justification be called typological. They were not really success stories either.

[Bakmeister', Gartwix' Ludwix' Xristijan'] (1773). **Ob'javlenie i prosenie kasajuscijasja do sobranija raznyx' jazykov' v' primèrax'.** *Avertissement et invitation concernant un seul sujet à traduire en plusieurs langues. Idea et desideria de colligendis linguarum speciminibus. Nachricht und Bitte wegen einer Sammlung von Sprachproben.* V Sanktpeterburgè: pri Akademii Nauk'. 34 pages.

What was requested in this pamphlet was a translation, by the author's correspondents themselves or by their native consultants, of *rèci/a sujet/formulae/an Aufsatz*, consisting of numerals (1-22, further decades, plus 71, 72, 99, 100, 200, 1000) and of 22 sets of more or less coherent sentences, also showing some coherence across sets (e.g., 3) *Die Mutter küsset ihre Kinder. Sie hat viel Milch in den Brüsten. Ihr Mann liebt sie.* 4) *Diese Frau war schwanger. Sie hat vor sechs Tagen einen Sohn geboren. Sie ist noch krank. Ihre Tochter sitzt bei ihr, und weinet.*), plus information about common male names. This was in a sense meant to supersede the Lord's Prayer, arguably the first, and widely used typological questionnaire based on translation, though of a text not without certain drawbacks. The word-by-word translation was to be given in the normal orthography of the target language (if there was one) and in a phonetic transcription (on the basis of the letter-sound correspondences of French or German or any other European language), to be accompanied by phonetic and grammatical notes. Examples were provided of what was wanted, though with a different short sample text, for Arabic (translated from Russian), Finnish (from French and from German), and Swedish (from German).

Hartwix Ludwig Christian Bacmeister (1730–1806), himself a polyglot, then Inspector at the *Gymnasium* of the Imperial Academy of Sciences (later *Etatsrat* in the Finance Ministry), and friend and collaborator of Peter Simon Pallas, who was in charge of editing Catherine the Great's *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa*, addressed this questionnaire to the scholars and language lovers of Europe, sending out 600 printed copies, in four parallel languages, Russian, French, Latin, and German. According to Adelung (1815: 26-31), the literary executor of his late friend Bacmeister, the translation, transcription, and annotation job was being



done, in full or in part, for 96 languages, often more than once, not just from the Russian empire but from all over Eurasia and beyond. They are all listed, together with the correspondent and informant (if distinct), by Adelung, who was probably the last to have looked at the returned questionnaires. Alas, Bacmeister himself lost interest in this project. The replies that had been pouring in over 15 years – and some were still to come, notably for South American languages, sent in by Christoph Gottlieb von Murr (1733–1811), a jurist and historian – are still to be found, unmined, in the Adelung Archive of the manuscript department of the Saltykov-Scedrin Library in Sankt-Peterburg, if somebody is interested. Only Pallas used some of the lexical information for the Great Comparative Vocabulary.

(On Murr see Wilhelm von Humboldt, *Gesammelte Schriften* vol. 6: 148 Note; and also Adelung 1815: 25-26 Footnote 6.)

**van Ginneken, Jacques (1907). Untersuchung über die Typologie der Sprachen.  
Enquête sur la typologie des langues. *Anthropos* 2: 690-707.**

The actual questionnaire, intended to be filled in by missionaries, is not included in *Anthropos* editions I have had access to in various libraries; presumably it was loosely added. I was confident to get a copy, and possibly further information about questionnaires returned, from the Anthropos Institute at Sankt Augustin; but that hope was dashed:

Sehr geehrter Herr Prof. Plank,  
vielen Dank für Ihre E-mail Anfrage. Ich bedaure Ihnen mitteilen zu müssen,  
dass auch wir im Anthropos Institut den von J. van Ginneken im  
ANTHROPOS 2.1907: 706/707 erwähnten Fragebogen/Questionnaire nicht  
besitzen. Leider konnte ich auch nicht in Erfahrung bringen, ob dieser  
Fragebogen in Gebrauch war und von jemandem ausgewertet wurde.  
Mit freundlichen Grüßen  
Ihr  
Othmar Gächter  
Anthropos Redaktion  
Arnold-Janssen-Str. 20  
D-53754 Sankt Augustin  
Germany  
<http://www.anthropos-journal.de>  
E-mail: [anthropos@steyler.de](mailto:anthropos@steyler.de)  
Fax: +49-(0)2241-20 58 23

Van Ginneken's questionnaire must have survived somewhere, filled in or, more likely, blank. Perhaps in a van Ginneken archive at his home university, Nijmegen – though it would be understandable if they had thrown away anything connected with him after the German occupation, where his role was at least dubious.

As Jacques van Ginneken *S.J.* (1877–1944), a repeated contributor to *Anthropos*, the ethnological-linguistic journal founded and edited by *P. Wilhelm Schmidt S.V.D.*,

informs his readers in the article giving some background on typology as he saw it and announcing the questionnaire, the questionnaire project was intended to assist Schmidt in his plan to describe all languages and cultures, in which van Ginneken, with his thesis (*Principes de linguistique psychologique*, 1907) just defended at Leiden, had been asked to collaborate. Schmidt's truly wide-ranging linguistic work was to culminate in *Die Sprachfamilien und Sprachenkreise der Erde* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1926), with an accompanying atlas showing the areal distribution of a dozen or so salient typological traits. There is no indication, however, that book or atlas drew on information obtained through van Ginneken's questionnaire. (Not that I could tell precisely what it was the questionnaire asked for – genitive before/after head noun, dual, trial, inclusive/exclusive, complexity of onset/coda clusters, and what not, considered typologically salient by Schmidt.) Neither are the numerous language descriptions in future volumes of *Anthropos* recognizably based on or inspired by it. As it says in an obituary of van Ginneken's: "Unfortunately the material he received in answer [to the questionnaire] proved insufficient to build on" (Wils 1966: 448).

Wils, J. (1948). In Memoriam: Jacques van Ginneken (21 April 1877 – 20 October 1945). *Lingua* 1: 133-139. Reprinted in Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.) (1966), *Portraits of Linguists*, vol. 2: 447-454. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

[Johannes Wils was a student of Jacques van Ginneken, and the teacher of Leon Stassen.]

**Cohen, Marcel (1931). *Questionnaire linguistique*. Comité international permanent de linguistes. Publications de la commission d'enquête linguistique. Adresse du secrétaire générale: Prof. Dr. Jos. Schrijnen, St. Annastraat 17, Nimègue (Hollande).**

in three parts: (i) Avant-propos, sommaire et index; (ii) A; (iii) B.

“Le présent questionnaire a pour base le questionnaire linguistique publié en 1928 par l'Institut d'ethnologie de l'Université de Paris.”

first edition:

*Instructions d'enquête linguistique*. (Instructions pour les voyageurs.) Mâcon: Protat frères; Paris: Institut d'ethnologie, 191, rue Saint-Jacques, 1928. In-16, 125 pages.

2nd, revised edition:

*Instructions d'enquête linguistique*. (Instructions pour les voyageurs.) Paris: Institut d'ethnologie de l'Université de Paris, 1950, 143 pages.

biographical info on Cohen: 1884–1974

characterize contents: quote from Preface

what was it used for? by which “travellers”?

no idea what the Comité international permanent de linguistes did with it

*Les langues du monde*, par un groupe de linguistes [mostly from the Société de Linguistique (de Paris)], sous la direction de A. Meillet et Marcel Cohen, 1924.

Meillet, A. & Marcel Cohen (eds.) (1952). *Les langues du monde*. 2 volumes. Paris: H. Champion.

does not seem to have benefited from the *Questionnaire*, which is not even mentioned in the extensive bibliographical surveys

Cohen himself taking care of Hamito-Semitic, where his special expertise lay, and of Quechua, on the basis of published sources, including his own work

□

Questionnaires are an essential tool for the typologist, yet an ephemeral genre.

#### Other References

- Adelung, Friedrich (1815). *Catherinens der Großen Verdienste um die Vergleichende Sprachenkunde*. St. Petersburg. (Reprinted, with an introduction and an bibliographical index by Harald Haarmann: Hamburg: Buske, 1976.)
- Höflein, Michael (2002). *Leben und Werk Max Uhles. Eine Bibliographie*. (Ibero-Bibliographien, 1.) Berlin: Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz; [http://www.iai.spk-berlin.de/ibero\\_bib/download/IB1-\\_Max\\_Uhle.pdf](http://www.iai.spk-berlin.de/ibero_bib/download/IB1-_Max_Uhle.pdf)
- Meillet, A. & Marcel Cohen (eds.) (1952). *Les langues du monde*. 2 volumes. Paris: H. Champion.
- Murr, Christoph Gottlieb von (1785). *Reisen einiger Missionarien der Gesellschaft Jesu in Amerika*. Aus ihren eigenen Aufsätzen herausgegeben. Nürnberg: Johann Eberhard Zeh.
- (1809). *Nachrichten von verschiedenen Ländern des Spanischen Amerika*. Aus eigenhändigen Aufsätzen einiger Missionare der Gesellschaft Jesu herausgegeben. Halle: Joh. Christian Hendel.
- Plank, Frans (1991). Hypology, typology: The Gabelentz puzzle. *Folia Linguistica* 25: 421-458.
- (2001). Typology by the end of the 18th century. In Sylvain Auroux et al. (eds.), *History of the Language Sciences: An International Handbook on the Evolution of the Study of Language from the Beginnings to the Present*, vol. 2, 1399-1414. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wils, J. (1948). In Memoriam: Jacques van Ginneken (21 April 1877 – 20 October 1945). *Lingua* 1: 133-139. (Reprinted in Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.) (1966), *Portraits of Linguists*, vol. 2: 447-454. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.)



□ SHOULD COME ABOVE

□

of the characteristics of a language considered most salient in relation to other languages – ANY other language, not just those assumed to be historically related through common origin or borrowing. Therefore, it is wise for a typological questionnaire to be specially aimed at allowing, and possibly facilitating, inductive inferences about diversity and uniformity across languages with respect to such SALIENT characteristics; .

□

having the 40 *Wenker Sätze*, to take a famous dialectological example (1880, now at <http://staff-www.uni-marburg.de/~naeser/wenker.htm>: *1. Im Winter fliegen die trockenen Blätter in der Luft herum. [...] 40. Ich bin mit den Leuten da hinten über die Wiese ins Korn gefahren.*), translated into lots of languages or dialects other than German does not make it a typological questionnaire. The way the *Wenker Sätze* have been chosen, they were meant to elicit salient diversity of vocabulary, phonology, morphology, and syntax across the dialects of (greater) German. They might accommodate further languages or dialects, not too dissimilar in structure and culture, but that would be inadvertent rather than by design: there was no intention to capture worldwide variation in, say, denotations for the seasons or in demonstrative systems.

□

Other cases are unclearer. Take this example – and there must be many other similar ones, if not always publicly available:

Meinhof, Carl (1899). *Grundriß einer Lautlehre der Bantusprachen nebst einer Anleitung zur Aufnahme von Bantusprachen*. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, 11, 2.) Leipzig: Brockhaus. (2nd edition: Berlin: Reimer, 1910. Translated, revised and enlarged in collaboration with the author and Alice Werner by N. J. van Warmelo: *Introduction to the Phonology of the Bantu Languages*. Berlin: Reimer, 1932. 3rd edition, 1984.)

First, purists might doubt whether ‘instructions’ are ‘requests for responses’, let alone ‘questions’. Second, though not intended for just one language like the *Wenker Sätze*, the *Anleitung* is specifically targeted at a particular, genealogically defined subset of languages: Bantu. Third, its primary aim aims are practical rather than theoretical, enabling colonial administrators (or also missionaries or others going abroad) to familiarize themselves with the local languages, rather than typologists to find patterns of crosslinguistic diversity and uniformity.

But then, to familiarize themselves with languages is something that behoves typologists too; and fieldwork manuals, though primarily meant for descriptive linguists grappling with insufficiently described languages, are likely to include just the sort of questions to be asked of native speakers that a typological questionnaire would ask of native speakers or fellow linguists too. In the case of Meinhof’s *Anleitung* there are good reasons why it has probably never been followed outside Bantu, but there are other fieldwork manuals which are more adaptable. Doing lexical typology, for example, I see no reason not to use this fieldwork manual, according to its title intended for only two macro-areas, as a comprehensive lexical data-eliciting questionnaire for languages on whatever continent they are spoken:

Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa  
(1966/67). *Linguistic Questionnaire for Asia and Africa*. 2 volumes. Tokyo:  
Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa. (Later  
reprints, at least of vol. 2.)

Volume 2 lists the equivalents of 2000 common words in Japanese, English, French, Arabic, Chinese, German, Hindi, Indonesian (Malay), Persian, Russian, Spanish, and Swahili, with no obvious cultural bias; volume 1 is the questionnaire proper, with blanks to be filled in by investigator or consultant, here with only Japanese, English, and French equivalents as targets.

□



parameters for a typology of (more or less prototypically) typological questionnaires:

- Who obtains and preserves the information?
  - ultimately, the typologist
- From whom?
  - native speaker informant/consultant (in the field, in the researcher's office or class), data collector, published descriptions, typologist herself (in collaboration with native-speaker consultant)
- What kind of information, and how much?
  - whole language or particular structural areas
  - grammatical and/or lexical
  - pure data (actual forms-in-constructions-in-contexts, meaning of forms and constructions, as elicited through translations, picture descriptions, random speech) or analysed/interpreted data (word-by-word, morpheme-by-morpheme correspondences, more elaborate analyses in terms of segmentation and classification)

most important:

analytical questionnaires: Does language L have category x (bilabial affricates, a dual, a passive of intransitive/unergative verbs, adjectives, indirect objects?)

vs.

data-eliciting questionnaires, asking for words, (in) sentences, (in) texts (in contexts), typically by means of translations or picture descriptions, and leaving the analysis entirely to the questionnaire's author

asking for sentences plus morpheme-by-morpheme glossing, is asking for analysis

□□

Bouquiaux, Luc & Jacqueline M. C. Thomas (1992). *Studying and Describing Unwritten Languages*. Dallas, Texas: SIL. [Translated by James Roberts from: *Enquête et description des langues à tradition orale*. 3 volumes. Paris, SELAF, 1973.]