

Folklorists in 1984: A Survey
Report Submitted to the Executive Board
of the American Folklore Society
by Frank de Caro

Volume 13, number 2 of the American Folklore Newsletter contained a questionnaire which solicited information from American Folklore Society members in a variety of areas relevant to folkloristics as a profession and field of study. Two hundred forty eight were returned by members. This represents a return of about twenty percent (based on a Newsletter circulation of approximately 1,200); such is quite a good rate of return, especially given the fact that there were no preliminary announcements about the questionnaire nor were there follow-up letters sent to the members. More than half of the returns included comments, some fairly extensive. A copy of the questionnaire follows this report for reference. The report will attempt first to proceed from question to question, but also to consider some comparisons of the data received from the answers to selected questions, finally to give a synopsis of comments received. Unless otherwise indicated, numbers given in parentheses are percentages.*

*Unless otherwise noted in the text of the report, all percentages, except for questions 6a-6g, are expressed in terms of the total sampling of 248. Unless otherwise noted percentages for questions 6a-6g, when given, are expressed in terms of the number of respondents to that particular question.

Question 1 asked respondents to characterize themselves in terms of affiliation with a discipline. The responses were as follows (only first preference taken into account where several selections were indicated and ranked):

Folklorist/folklife scholar: 138 (55.645)

Anthropologist: 22 (8.871)

Archivist: 0 (0.0)

Ethnomusicologist: 7 (2.823)

Literary scholar: 23 (9.274)

Historian: 3 (1.210)

Other: 45 (18.145)

No response: 10 (4.032)

One hundred twenty-two persons (49.194) indicated more than one possible response here, 78 two responses (31.452), 33 three (13.306), 10 four (4.032), and one more than four (0.403); most of these, though not all, ranked their choices. Of those who ranked their choices and chose two responses, 34 (13.710) indicated folklorist/folklife scholar as their primary choice, 35 (14.113) the secondary choice; one did not include that as a choice. Of those who ranked and chose three responses, 12 (4.839) indicated folklorist/folklife scholar as their primary choice, 11 (4.435) as second choice, 7 (2.822) as third choice; one (0.403) did not include that as a choice. The single respondent who checked more than four designations here indicated folklorist/folklife scholar as secondary.

The "other" designations provided by those who specified what they were were as follows: social scientist, college professor, attorney (noted folklorist/folklife scholar and anthropologist as "avocations"), Asian studies scholar, Judaic studies scholar, American studies scholar (three respondents), dance ethnologist, linguist (eight respondents), South Asian

studies scholar, editor (two respondents), oral historian (two respondents), public administrator (two respondents), art historian (two respondents) librarian/information scientist, social historian, English teacher ("literature and composition"), "plain old professor of English," museum curator, librarian (five respondents, including "subject cataloger for folklore materials"), body movement analyst, poet, folk singer, volunteer teacher, computer applications specialist, writer, scientific/technical developer, brain person, public radio producer specializing in folk music, child developmentalist, computer type, sociologist, performance studies scholar, archaeologist, museologist, educator, ethnographer, communications scholar, professional mother, Egyptologist, teacher, museum director (retired), community arts administrator, radical sociologist, gypsy studies specialist, arts administrator, art educator, museum specialist, historic preservationist, ethnographer of communication, anthropology student, in transition from television to museums, media producer, photographer, film and record producer, printing estimator, historical archaeologist, documentary film maker, folklorist active in public sector, film studies scholar, analyst with special expertise in folklore and social scientist (research, administration and computer programming), artist, Africanist, herbalist, singer, dance specialist, ethnicity studies specialist, art dealer (19th century American), budding semiotician, research consultant manque, layperson interested in folklore, language teaching methodologist, museum educator, ethnobotanist, and one respondent who does "not make distinctions between folklorist/anthropologist/ethnomusicologist."

Those who presented themselves as folklorists/folklife scholars were equally divided between males and females (69 respondents each), as

compared to more males than females to identify themselves as anthropologists (54.55 as opposed to 45.45 percent), ethnomusicologists (71.43 as opposed to 28.57 percent), literary scholars (56.52 as opposed to 43.48 percent), and historians (100 percent male). (Percentages in this paragraph are for the total in each identificational category in question 1.)

Responses came from 52 geographical designations (states, provinces, countries were designated) (question 2). The designations with the ten highest numbers of responses were:

California: 25 (10.081)

Pennsylvania: 19 (7.661)

Indiana: 16 (6.452)

Ohio: 13 (5.242)

Massachusetts: 12 (4.839)

Illinois: 11 (4.435)

New York: 10 (4.032)

Kentucky: 9 (3.629)

Texas: 7 (2.823)

District of Columbia, Virginia: 6 each (2.419 each)

There were 15 non-responses (6.048). There were no responses from these states: Hawaii, Kansas, Nevada, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming. Dividing the responses into somewhat arbitrarily determined regions, we find 61 responses (24.597) from the Northeast (including Maryland, Delaware, the District of Columbia), 40 (16.129) from the South (including Kentucky and West Virginia), 62 (25.000) from the Middle West, 25 (10.081) from the West (including Texas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, the Dakotas, but excluding the Coast), 32 (12.903) from the West Coast, 3 (1.210) from Alaska, 5 (2.016) from Canada, 4 (1.613) from Europe, and 1

(0.403) from a Caribbean nation.

The ages of respondents were as follows (question 3):

under 18:	0 (0.0)	
18-25:	4 (1.613)	(4 female, 0 male)
26-35:	83 (33.468)	(48 female, 35 male)
36-45:	97 (39.113)	(47 female, 50 male)
46-55:	44 (17.742)	(16 female, 28 male)
56-65:	15 (6.048)	(5 female, 10 male)
over 65:	5 (2.016)	(3 female, 2 male)

The gender of respondents divided almost equally, 123 women (49.597), 125 men (50.403).

Nine respondents (3.629) indicated that they were physically disabled (question 5); one (0.403) indicated hearing impairment, five (2.016) indicated mobility impairment, none indicated visual impairment (question 5a). One (0.403) indicated a need for special access hotel rooms (question 5b), one (0.403) for a personal attendant for daily assistance (question 5d). One (0.403) indicated a need for signed interpretation, one (0.403) for oral interpretation.

Question 6 requested information on the nature of the respondent's employment. Those who indicated only one type of employment fell into the following pattern:

University/college teacher:	115 (46.371)	(49 female, 66 male)
High school teacher:	1 (0.403)	(1 female, 0 male)
Elementary school teacher:	0 (0.000)	
Museum professional:	5 (2.016)	(3 female, 2 male)
Librarian:	2 (0.806)	(1 female, 1 male)
Archivist:	1 (0.403)	(0 female, 1 male)

Federal, state, local government
employee in folklore-related (non-teaching,
non-museum) job: 22 (8.871) (9 female, 13 male)

Graduate student: 16 (6.452) (13 female, 3 male)

Undergraduate student: 0 (0.0)

Employee of historical society,
historical preservation organization, cultural
center, or similar agency: 1 (0.403) (1 female, 0 male)

Other employment: 18 (7.258) (10 female, 8 male)

Unemployed: 3 (1.210) (2 female, 1 male)

Retired: 3 (1.210) (2 female, 1 male)

Sixty-one persons (32 female, 29 male) (24.597) checked off more than one form of employment, as follows (each row of X's across represents one individual's having indicated that he or she is employed in those capacities):

	univ. teacher	high teacher	s. teacher	elem. prof.	mus. prof.	libr' ian	archi- vist	govt. empl.	grad. stud.	undergr. student	hist. empl.	oth. emp.	unem.
1.	X					X		X					
2.	X					X							
3.								X	X				
4.	X							X	X				
5.					X	X							X
6.	X									X			X
7.					X			X	X				
8.	X								X				X
9.					X				X		X		
10.								X	X				X
11.	X								X				

12.	X				X			
13.	X	X						
14.				X	X		X	X
15.	X							X
16.					X		X	
17.				X			X	
18.	X				X		X	
19.	X							X
20.					X			X
21.	X						X	
22.	X							X
23.	X	X					X	
24.			X				X	
25.	X						X	X
26.					X			X
27.	X							X
28.						X		X
29.	X							X
30.	X				X			
31.					X			X
32.	X							X
33.			X		X			
34.	X				X			
35.			X		X	X		
36.					X			X
37.	X				X			X
38.		X						X
39.					X			X

40.	X							X
41.	X							X
42.	X							X
43.					X			X
44.							X	X
45.	X		X					
46.	X				X			X
47.		X					X	X
48.					X		X	
49.	X							X
50.	X							X
51.					X		X	
52.			X		X			
53.		X			X			
54.	X							X
55.	X				X			
56.	X		X					
57.	X							X
58.	X							X
59.		X						X
60.	X				X			
61.					X			X

In some instances, evidently more than one designation was checked to apply to a single position because more than one seemed to apply.

Those who checked off more than one form of employment and included "other" as one choice indicated that their other employment was as follows (the number in brackets refers to the individual noted in the chart above):

self-employed [5], public sector work [8], consulting [10], self-employed [14], writer [15], farrier [19], writer/folk consultant [20], consulting [22], university administrative staff [26], interim pastor [29], development funding [31], college administration [32], university staff [36], author [37], consultant [38], university research [40], editor/consultant/administrator [41], freelance [42], free-lance grants [47], cultural center director [49], consultant [50], consultant [54], freelance research [57], research consultant [58], oral history consultant [59].

Those who indicated "other" employment only and who specified what that employment was provided the following designations: full time mom, systems analyst, folk-art center employee, attorney, musician, self-employed, fulltime parent, salesman, freelancing, private consultant, educational consultant, copy editor, public radio, folklife consultant, free-lance folklorist, print estimator, folksinger/herbalist, self-employed, advertising agency employee, post doctoral fellow, folk music programming.

(In some cases these designations duplicate information given for question 1, which was meant to provide information on "disciplinary affiliation," rather than "employment," though the two are, of course, related.)

Questions 6a through 6h requested further details on employment. The responses reported below are in terms of the total response to each question. In some instances persons responded to these questions even when they did not check off the corresponding response in question 6 (e.g., retired persons checked off information in the area of former employment, non-academic university employees responded to some questions intended for university teachers); it was thought that, given complex employment

situations, such responses should not be discounted as "incorrect," and all responses are reported. Also, persons who checked off a response in question 6 did not necessarily go on to answer questions intended for persons checking that designation. Hence there may be discrepancies in terms of responses to question 6 and responses to questions in the 6a to 6h group.

There were fourteen questions under the 6a designation, relevant to college/university teachers.

One hundred nine (73.649) who indicated that they were college/university teachers taught in public institutions, 39 (26.351) in private (question 6a1).

The size of colleges and universities at which respondents taught (with 132 persons responding to this question) ranged from 200 to 60,000 students. The mean average size was 16,437 (question 6a2).

Questions 6a3 and 6a4 requested information on the number of courses taught in folklore and other subjects for two different years ("last" and "before last"), excluding summer school. The breakdown for folklore courses last year was as follows:

0: 31 (21.379)	5: 5 (3.448)
1: 43 (29.655)	6: 3 (2.069)
2: 34 (23.448)	7: 1 (0.690)
3: 9 (6.207)	
4: 19 (13.104)	

For folklore courses the year before last:

0: 28 (19.178)	3: 7 (4.795)
1: 44 (30.137)	4: 19 (13.014)
2: 37 (25.342)	5: 7 (4.795)

6: 4 (2.739)

For courses in other subjects last year:

0: 33 (22.603)	6: 18 (12.329)
1: 16 (10.959)	7: 8 (5.479)
2: 13 (8.904)	8: 6 (4.110)
3: 18 (12.329)	more than 8: 7 (4.794)
4: 15 (10.274)	
5: 12 (8.219)	

For courses in other subjects the year before last:

0: 39 (26.531)	6: 15 (10.204)
1: 14 (9.524)	7: 9 (6.122)
2: 16 (10.884)	8: 6 (4.082)
3: 17 (11.565)	more than 8: 7 (4.762)
4: 12 (8.163)	
5: 12 (8.163)	

The mean average of responses to questions 6a3a and 6a3b indicates that the "average" respondent taught 1.821 folklore courses "last academic year" and 1.877 folklore courses "during the academic year before last."

One hundred eight respondents (72.973) reported that their institutions used the semester system, 32 (21.622) the quarter system, 4 (2.703) the trimester, 4 (2.703) other systems (question 6a5).

Enrollment in folklore/folklife courses "last year" (with 122 persons reporting) ranged from 4 to 300 (question 6a6).

Tenure was held by 94 respondents (60.645) (32 female, 62 male), not held by 61 (39.355) (35 female, 26 male) (question 6a7). Of those who did not have tenure, 24 (40.678) (17 female, 7 male) reported holding tenure-track appointments, as opposed to 35 (59.322) (17 female, 18 male) who did not (question 6a8). Thus 118 have tenure or tenure-track appointments, as

opposed to the 35 who do not. (Two persons who indicated that they did not have tenure in question 6a7 did not respond to question 6a8.)

Academic ranks (question 6a9) covered the full spectrum of possibilities listed, but with a concentration in the assistant/associate/full professor range:

lecturer: 7 (4.516)	(4 female, 3 male)
instructor: 9 (5.807)	(6 female, 3 male)
assistant professor: 32 (20.645)	(25 female, 7 male)
associate professor: 41 (26.452)	(15 female, 26 male)
professor: 52 (33.548)	(15 female, 37 male)
other: 13 (8.387)	(7 female, 6 male)
combination: 1 (0.645)	(0 female, 1 male)

Those who noted their ranks as other specified the following: Graduate Teacher; Senior Lecturer; Visiting Assistant Professor ("for four years now"); "not yet determined"; Assistant Director of University Publications; Research Associate; Exxon Fellow (Research Fellow); Associate Professor and Project Director; Sessional Lecturer/Researcher; Associate Professor and Director; Associate Professor, "case in for promotion to Professor"; Faculty ("a non-rank, non-tenure position"); Teaching Assistant.

Academic appointments were held in the following departments (question 6a10):

Folklore: 9 (5.806)	(5 female, 4 male)
American Studies: 7 (4.516)	(2 female, 5 male)
Anthropology: 21 (13.548)	(12 female, 9 male)
English: 52 (33.549)	(22 female, 30 male)
Other: 50 (32.258)	(20 female, 30 male)
Combination appointments: 16 (10.323)	(6 female, 10 male)

Other departments listed were: Music, Humanities, Graduate Architecture, Special Education, Engineering School, Performance Studies, Theater Arts, Publications, Humanities and Social Sciences, Intercultural Studies, Education, Library, French, Writing Program, Archives, Jewish Studies, Slavic Languages and Literatures, Art Education/Art Therapy, Communications, Art History, Curriculum and Instruction, President's Office, Modern Languages and Intercultural Studies, Social Sciences/Humanities/Allied Health, Program in Science, Technology and Society, Classical Studies, Museum, General Social Sciences, Social Science, German, History, Afro-American Studies, Social Work, Dance, Native (Indian) Studies, Applied Arts, Modern Languages, Library and Information Science, "essentially...an interdisciplinary studies program," "no departments," "Art-Continuing Education-Off-Campus."

Sixteen respondents reported that they were department chairpersons (6a11). Eleven were men and 5 women. Eighteen reported that they chaired special programs within larger departments (question 6a12).

Question 6a13 asked those who had indicated "yes" to 6a12 to indicate whether the program they chaired was in folklore or included folklore/folklife. The number of responses to this question does not tally with the number of responses to 6a12, suggesting that this question may have been misunderstood by some respondents. Nevertheless, the answers given were as follows:

Yes: 17

No: 10

Twenty-four persons noted that they held administrative positions other than department or program chair (question 6a14).

Questions under the 6b heading were directed at high school and elementary school teachers. The single high school teacher respondent

indicated use of folklore materials in the classroom, adding that (question 6b) "folklore is offered as a semester-long, half-credit English course and is one of thirty English classes offered to students in grades 10-12. I usually teach 2 sections per year." This respondent was from Delaware. The single elementary school respondent (New York) noted that "we teach nursery school, so folklore is taught as part of our culture." Two persons who did not check off either high school or elementary school teacher in question 6 noted some involvement in folklore education at those levels, one as an Artist in Residence in the schools (California), the other as a presenter of folk songs (New Mexico).

Questions under the 6c heading were directed to museum professionals. There were twelve responses to these questions (a retired museum professional who did not check off the museum professional designation in question 6 also responded, accounting for the discrepancy between the number of museum professionals noted above and the number of responses here). Eight persons (66.667) (3 female, 5 male) indicated that folklore or folklife was a major focus of their museums' collections and/or purpose, while 4 (33.333) indicated that it was not (question 6c1). Five persons (41.667) noted that their museum had a major outdoor component, 7 (58.333) that it did not (question 6c2). One respondent (8.333) indicated that his or her museum could be designated an historical site, 2 (16.667) that theirs could be designated an historical house museum, 1 (8.333) that his or hers could be designated a living history museum (question 6c3). Ten respondents (83.334) had folklore/folklife related jobs at museums, as opposed to 1 (8.333) who did not and 1 no response (8.333) (question 6c4). Four (33.333) had museology training, 8 (66.667) did not (question 6c5). (Numbers in parentheses in this paragraph are percentages of the total of

12 persons who answered all or some of the questions under the 6c heading.)

Questions under the 6d heading were directed to librarians and archivists. There were 12 responses to the questions under the 6d heading. Exactly half indicated that they worked in a folklore archive or library, exactly half that they did not (question 6d). Under question 6d1 they provided such information as that, though they do not work in a folklore archive or library they catalogue folklore books, that their work could be described as "total," or that they hold a certain job title such as "Director/Archivist."

Questions under the 6e heading were directed to government employees in folklore-related positions. Twenty-seven respondents (79.412) (14 female, 13 male) indicated that the agencies they worked for were not primarily concerned with folklore or folklife, 7 (20.588) (2 female, 5 male) indicating that their agencies were (question 6e1). Twenty-three indicated that their agencies were primarily concerned with cultural affairs, while 3 indicated that was not the case (question 6e2). Twelve persons (5 female, 7 male) reported that they were "state folklorists," whether or not they held that precise title (question 6e3). Job titles reported under question 6e4 included Folklife Consultant; Architectural Historian; State Folklorist; Historic Preservation Program Assistant; Senior Ethnomusicologist; Assistant Director, Folk Arts Program; Folk Arts Consultant, Special Projects Director; Research Assistant II; Folk Arts Coordinator; Intern, Traditional Arts Program; Coordinator, Folk Arts in Rural Libraries Project; Folklorist and Research Specialist; Folklife-in-Education Coordinator; Director of Folk and Ethnic Arts Programs; Folk Arts Intern; Folklife Programs Administrator; Project Coordinator; Director/State Folk Arts Coordinator, _____ Folklore Center, University of _____; Member, Folk Arts Panel, NEA; State Folk Arts Coordinator;

Director of State Folklife Programs; Historian; Assistant to the Director/Folklorist; Research Associate; Senior Editor; Director, Bureau of _____ Folklife Programs; Program Director; Subject Cataloger; Folklife Specialist; Consultant/US AID.

Graduate students responding to questions 6f1 and 6f2 reported the following:

Fields of concentration:

Folklore/folklife: 28 (66.667)	(21 female, 7 male)
Anthropology: 6 (14.285)	(4 female, 2 male)
English: 1 (2.381)	(1 female, 0 male)
Other: 4 (9.524)	(4 female, 0 male)
Combination: 3 (7.143)	(1 female, 2 male)

Degree:

MA: 6 (14.285)	(5 female, 1 male)
PhD: 31 (73.810)	(23 female, 8 male)
Other: 3 (7.143)	(2 female, 1 male)
Combination: 2 (4.762)	(1 female, 1 male)

There were two undergraduates who responded to the questionnaire and who replied to the questions under the 6g rubric. One was majoring in anthropology, the second indicated education as his or her major. Neither indicated a minor.

Some responses to question 6h, which asked people to note details about part-time employment simply noted that their employment was part-time. Others provided explanations ("museum only needs 20hrs. week for the folklorist position"; "funding cutbacks have reduced my role"; "short term public sector work"; "self-employed—1/2 of my time is spent on folklore/life related projects—the other 1/2 is purely for \$"; "I can't

find a full time, paying job"), or noting some combination of part-time activities. Seventeen people provided responses under question 6h.

Respondents indicated that they hold a variety of degrees in a variety of fields (question 7), as follows (the designations mostly are those provided, with minor editorial modifications, although in a few instances there has been a combining of categories [as for "folklore and folklife" and "folklife and folklore"]; in some cases the categories obviously overlap with others):

1. Doctoral degrees:

American Civilization, 4; American Studies, 3; American Studies and Folklore, 1; Ancient Near Eastern Civilization, 1; Anthropology, 18; Anthropology and Folklore, 4; Art Education, 1; Business, 1; Child and Human Development, 1; Classics, 1; Communication, 1; Comparative Literature and Near Eastern Studies, 1; Creole Studies, 1; Cultural Anthropology and Art, 1; Education, 2; Education and Folklore, 1; English, 16; English (Medieval), 1; English and Comparative Literature, 1; English and Education, 3; English and Folklore, 4; Ethnomusicology, 3; Folk Theory and Middle East Studies, 1; Folklife (English), 1; Folklore, 46; Folklore and Anthropology, 3; Folklore and Celtic Studies, 1; Folklore and Folklife, 19; Folklore and American Studies, 3; Folklore and Mythology, 1; French Language and Literature, 1; German, 2; Germanic Studies, 1; Hispanic Language and Literature, 1; History, 2; Interdisciplinary, 2; Law, 1; Linguistics, 2; Linguistics and Folklore, 1; Music, 1; Musicology, 1; Philosophy, 1; Romance Philology, 1; Scandinavian Languages, 1; Scandinavian Literature, 1; Slavic Linguistics, 1; Social Anthropology, 3; Social Psychology, 1; Sociology and Folklore, 1; Sociology, 1; South Asian Languages, 1; Spanish, 1; ABD (Linguistics, Folklore, History), 3; No response, 72.

2. Masters degrees:

African Oral Literature, 1; American Civilization, 4; American Folk Culture, 2; American Literature, 1; American Studies, 4; American Studies and Folklore, 1; Anthropology, 14; Anthropology and Folklore, 3; Anthropology and Sociology, 1; Art Education, 1; Art History, 1; Behavioral Science, 1; Cultural Anthropology, 1; Dance, 1; Drama and Philosophy, 1; Education, 2; Education and Folklore, 1; Education and Library Science, 1; Educational Media, 1; English, 31; English and American Studies, 1; English and Education, 1; English and Folklore, 2; English and History, 2; English and Medieval Studies, 1; Ethno/American Studies, 1; Ethnomusicology, 1; Fine Arts, 1; Folk Culture, 2; Folk Studies, 1; Folk Studies and Composition, 1; Folk and Calender Festival, 1; Folklore, Mythology, Celtic Literature, 1; Folklife Studies, 1; Folklore, 47; Folklore and Anthropology, 1; Folklore and Mythology, 5; Folklore and Educational Media, 1; Folklore and Folklife, 12; Folklore and Library Science, 3; Folklore, Mythology, English, 1; French, 1; French and English, 1; German, 3; German Literature, 1; History, 1; History, Museology and Folklore, 1; History and Museum Studies, 1; Home Economics and Folk Studies, 1; Interdisciplinary, 1; Library Science, 4; Linguistics, 3; Linguistics and Anthropology, 1; Literary Criticism, 1; Literary Studies, 1; M.Litt., 1; Medieval Studies, 1; Music, 2; Music and Folk Art, 1; Music Composition, 1; Philosophy, 1; Religion, 1; Religion and Anthropology, 1; Rhetoric, 1; Rural Sociology, 1; Scandinavian Languages, 1; Scandinavian Literature, 1; Scandinavian Studies, 1; Slavic Folklore, 1; Slavic Linguistics, 1; Social Anthropology, 2; Sociology, 1; South Asian Studies, 1; Spanish, 2; Uralic Studies, 1; Zoology, 1; No response, 40; None, 2.

3. Bachelors degrees:

American Civilization, 1; American Literature, 1; American Studies, 5;

American Studies, English/American Literature, 1; Anthropology, 23;
Anthropology and English, 1; Anthropology (Folklore), 1; Anthropology and
Humanities, 1; Anthropology and Philosophy, 1; Art (Painting), 1; Art
Practice, 1; Art and Filmmaking, 1; Art and Art Education, 1; Art
History/Library, 1; Biology, 1; Business, 3; Chemistry, 1; Civilization
Studies, 1; Classical Studies and Folklore, 1; Classics, 2; Comparative
Literature, 1; Cultural Anthropology, 1; Cultural Studies, 1; Drama and
Linguistics, 1; Education, 2; Education/English Methods, 1; Education and
Library Science, 1; Electrical Engineering, 1; Elementary Education, 1;
English, 55; English and Anthropology, 2; English and Art, 1; English and
Classics, 1; English and Education, 2; English and French, 1; English and
General Studies, 1; English and History, 3; English and Latin, 1; English
and Philosophy, 1; English and Physics, 1; English Education, 1; English
Education and Fine Arts, 1; Ethnic Arts, 1; Ethnology and Structuralism, 1;
Film and American Culture, 1; Fine Arts, 1; Folk and Studio Crafts, 1;
Folklore, 2; Folklore and Folklife, 1; Folklore and Music, 1; Folklore and
Mythology, 1; Foreign Language, 1; French, 2; French and Russian, 1;
German, 2; German and Education, 1; Historic Preservation, 1; History, 10;
History and German, 1; History and Spanish, 1; Home Economics, 1; Housing
and Design, 1; Integrated Studies, 1; Journalism, 3; Language and
Education, 1; Language Arts, 1; Languages, 1; Latin and Social Sciences, 1;
Liberal Arts, 1; Linguistics, 1; Linguistics and Anthropology, 1;
Literature, 5; Literature and Biology, 1; Medieval Studies, 1; Modern
European Languages, 1; Music, 5; Music Education, 2; Music Performance, 1;
Philosophy, 3; Philosophy and Music, 1; Political Science, 3; Pre-Medicine,
1; Psychology, 3; Psychology and Sociology, 1; Religion, 1; Religious
Studies, 1; Russian Area Studies, 1; Russian Literature, 1; Secondary

Education, Social Science, and English, 1; Slavic Linguistics, 2; Social Anthropology, 2; Social Relations, 2; Social Science, 1; Sociology, 4; Sociology and History, 1; Spanish, 2; Spanish and English, 1; Speech, 1; Speech Communication, 1; Textile History, 1; No Response, 24.

Eighty-eight persons (35.484) reported that they held degrees in a field other than folklore but had done theses or dissertations on folklore topics while working on those degrees (question 8).

Question 9 requested information on respondents' formal, academic training in folklore/folklife. Twenty-three (9.274) did not check any of the five designations. Those who did provided the following information:

Other training only: 60 (24.194)

Ph.D. only: 54 (21.774)

M.A. and Ph.D.: 47 (18.952)

M.A. only: 25 (10.081)

B.A. and M.A.: 11 (4.436)

Non-credit seminars/institutes only: 8 (3.226)

Non-credit institutes/seminars and other training: 5 (2.016)

Ph.D. and non-credit institutes/seminars: 4 (1.613)

B.A., M.A. and Ph.D.: 3 (1.210)

Ph.D. and other training: 2 (0.806)

M.A. and other training: 2 (0.806)

M.A. and non-credit institutes/seminars: 1 (0.403)

B.A. only: 1 (0.403)

B.A., M.A., Ph.D. and other training: 1 (0.403)

B.A., M.A., Ph.D. and non-credit institutes/seminars: 1 (0.403)

There were no other combinations checked. Those who indicated "other training" and who specified what it was noted such things as ABD status, some combination of graduate or undergraduate course work, Ph.D. minors,

part of a Ph.D. course of study, self-education, contact with folklorists, post-doctoral study, "lots of singing of folk songs," being a research or teaching assistant for a folklorist, "night school," "self-trained fieldwork," "extensive reading and consultation," dissertation research, and "I'm formally ignorant." The number of folklore degrees reported here under question 9 does not tally with the folklore degrees reported under question 7. Apparently some respondents who reported degrees in fields closely allied to folklore in question 7 felt that their degrees were in fact folklore degrees, despite their being formally in another field, and hence checked off that they held a folklore degree in question 9.

Forty-nine persons (19.758) did not provide any information under question 10, which asked about annual income (from employment noted in question 6). Salaries given ranged from \$600 to \$60,000 (each with one respondent). Divided into categories, the data fit the following scale:

\$5,000 and under:	17 (6.855)	(14 female, 3 male)
\$5,001-\$10,000:	11 (4.435)	(8 female, 3 male)
\$10,001-\$15,000:	14 (5.645)	(7 female, 7 male)
\$15,001-\$20,000:	39 (15.726)	(19 female, twenty male)
\$20,001-\$25,000:	37 (14.919)	(26 female, 11 male)
\$25,001-\$30,000:	31 (12.500)	(7 female, 24 male)
\$30,001-\$35,000:	25 (10.081)	(7 female, 18 male)
\$35,001-\$40,000:	16 (6.452)	(3 female, 13 male)
\$40,001-\$45,000:	2 (0.806)	(0 female, 2 male)
over \$45,000:	7 (2.823)	(1 female, 6 male)

The mean average for all salaries reported was \$23,503.63.

In terms of the occupations noted in question 6, the income data were as follows (the percentages in parentheses are for each individual occupational category):

	Professors	Government employees	Other	More than one checked, ques. 6
\$5,000 & under	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	11 (22.00)
\$5,001-\$10,000	1 (0.97)	1 (5.26)	1 (9.09)	5 (10.00)
\$10,001-\$15,000	2 (1.94)	2 (10.53)	6 (54.55)	4 (8.00)
\$15,001-\$20,000	18 (17.48)	6 (31.58)	4 (36.36)	8 (16.00)
\$20,001-\$25,000	23 (22.33)	4 (21.05)	0 (0.00)	8 (16.00)
\$25,001-\$30,000	20 (19.42)	3 (15.79)	0 (0.00)	6 (12.00)
\$30,001-\$35,000	20 (19.42)	1 (5.26)	0 (0.00)	4 (8.00)
\$35,001-\$40,000	13 (12.62)	2 (10.53)	0 (0.00)	1 (2.00)
\$40,001-\$45,000	2 (1.94)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
over \$45,000	4 (3.88)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	3 (6.00)

The single high school teacher reported an income of \$22,000, the single librarian \$18,000, the single archivist \$20,000, the single employee of an historical society, etc., \$27,000. Four museum professionals reported incomes of \$8,000 (2 persons), \$20,000, and \$21,000. Graduate students reported incomes of \$2,000, \$2,700, \$4,500 (2 persons), \$5,000 (2 persons), and \$6,400.

Academic salaries in terms of academic rank were as follows (figures in parentheses are percentages for each rank; figures given are for all who responded to question 6a9 for whom there was income information):

	lect.	instr.	asst. prof.	assoc. prof.	prof.	other	combination
\$5,000 & under	1 (16.667)	3 (33.334)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	1 (7.692)	0 (0.000)

\$5,001-\$10,000	1 (16.667)	2 (22.222)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	1 (7.692)	0 (0.000)
\$10,001-\$15,000	1 (16.667)	0 (0.000)	1 (3.571)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	3 (23.077)	0 (0.000)
\$15,001-\$20,000	2 (33.332)	2 (22.222)	13 (46.429)	2 (5.128)	1 (2.381)	4 (30.770)	0 (0.000)
\$20,001-\$25,000	1 (16.667)	0 (0.000)	9 (32.143)	11 (28.205)	3 (7.143)	3 (23.077)	0 (0.000)
\$25,001-\$30,000	0 (0.000)	1 (11.111)	2 (7.143)	15 (38.462)	7 (16.667)	0 (0.000)	1 (100.0)
\$30,001-\$35,000	0 (0.000)	1 (11.111)	2 (7.143)	8 (20.513)	12 (28.571)	1 (7.692)	0 (0.000)
\$35,001-\$40,000	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	1 (3.571)	3 (7.692)	10 (23.809)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)
\$40,001-\$45,000	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	2 (4.762)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)
over \$45,000	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	7 (16.667)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)

Academic salaries in terms of departmental affiliation were reported as follows (numbers in parentheses are percentages of the total for a particular departmental affiliation; figures given are for all who responded to question 6a10 for whom there was income information):

	Folklore	American Studies	Anthropology	English	Other	Combination
\$5,000 & under	1 (14.286)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	1 (2.439)	3 (20.000)
\$5,001-\$10,000	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	2 (4.167)	2 (4.878)	0 (0.000)
\$10,001-\$15,000	1 (14.286)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	1 (2.083)	3 (7.317)	0 (0.000)
\$15,001-\$20,000	1 (14.286)	1 (14.286)	6 (30.000)	9 (18.750)	6 (14.634)	1 (6.667)
\$20,001-\$25,000	2 (28.571)	1 (14.286)	4 (20.000)	10 (20.833)	11 (26.829)	0 (0.000)
\$25,001-\$30,000	2 (28.571)	3 (42.856)	3 (15.000)	5 (10.417)	10 (24.391)	3 (20.000)

\$30,001-\$35,000	0 (0.000)	1 (14.286)	3 (15.000)	11 (22.916)	4 (9.756)	5 (33.332)
\$35,001-\$40,000	0 (0.000)	1 (14.286)	0 (0.000)	8 (16.667)	4 (9.756)	1 (6.667)
\$40,001-\$45,000	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	1 (5.000)	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	1 (6.667)
over \$45,000	0 (0.000)	0 (0.000)	3 (15.000)	2 (4.167)	0 (0.000)	1 (6.667)

In terms of the disciplinary affiliations noted in question 1, incomes worked out as follows (percentages in parentheses are for each disciplinary affiliation category; only first preference taken into account where several selections were indicated under question 1):

	Folklorists	Anthro.	Ethnomus.	Lit. scho.	Other
\$5,000 and under	12 (10.17)	2 (12.50)	1 (14.22)	0 (0.00)	2 (6.45)
\$5,001-\$10,000	8 (6.78)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (6.45)
\$10,001-\$15,000	9 (7.63)	0 (0.00)	1 (14.285)	1 (5.555)	3 (9.68)
\$15,001-\$20,000	25 (21.19)	5 (31.25)	0 (0.00)	1 (5.555)	6 (19.35)
\$20,001-\$25,000	23 (19.49)	4 (25.00)	0 (0.00)	6 (33.33)	3 (9.68)
\$25,001-\$30,000	16 (13.56)	2 (12.50)	1 (14.285)	3 (16.67)	8 (25.81)
\$30,001-\$35,000	10 (8.47)	0 (0.00)	1 (14.285)	5 (27.78)	5 (16.13)
\$35,001-\$40,000	10 (8.47)	0 (0.00)	3 (42.86)	1 (5.555)	2 (6.45)
\$40,001-\$45,000	0 (0.00)	2 (12.50)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
over \$45,000	5 (4.24)	1 (6.25)	0 (0.00)	1 (5.555)	0 (0.00)

Two historians reported incomes of \$6,000 and \$18,200.

Income for those who reported that they were "state folklorists" ranged from \$5,000 to \$30,000. The mean average for these salaries was \$21,000 (11 persons who indicated that they were "state folklorists" provided income data). However, the low figure represented part time employment and respondents who reported the two highest figures indicated that this

included other income also. The mean average for females in such an employment situation was \$17,200 (\$20,250 excluding the low, part time figure), for males \$24,166 (but the two highest figures given, including other income, were from males).

As was to be expected, responses to question 11 indicated that AFS members have done fieldwork in a great variety of places. The following are merely selected, representative samples: ethnic communities in San Francisco (traditional arts and cultural preservation); California suburbia (lifestyle analyzed through vernacular architecture); Faroe Islands, Denmark (oral-formulaic analysis of Faroese heroic ballad texts); southeast Kentucky (ballads of disasters); Utah (stone carving, folk housing, folk music and musicians, folk history); Nova Scotia (folksong at archaeological site); Sonora/Sinaloa (folklife surveys, study of pottery manufacturing, study of ceremonial masking); Yugoslavia (history and social construction of "tradition" in folk-musical performances); Michigan (occupational folk arts); southern Indiana (folk architectural surveys); Minnesota/Ontario (collection and editing of Ojibwa and Cree traditional literature and oral history); Pennsylvania and Virginia (folksongs); South Carolina (survey of quilting in three counties); Illinois (college folklore); Tokyo, Japan (diffusion of bluegrass music); Indiana (woodcarvers, turtle butchering, stonecarving); Chicago (Polish-American folklore); Finland (village study comprising collection of all genres); San Antonio, Texas (guitar-making family); Yosemite National Park (photographing and talking to "park people"); Oregon (survey of folk art of Willamette Valley); Kansas (material culture); Tompkins County, New York (museum exhibit and documentation of Greeks and Finns, customs); Philadelphia suburbs (Quaker folk speech). A full analysis of the material reported here could comprise a separate report, if that is thought desirable.

Responses to question 12 indicated that members have worked in a variety of libraries and archives, including the Museum of the Southwest (Los Angeles); Archives of Appalachia (Burton-Manning Folklore Collection); Indiana University Library; Indiana WPA Collection, Indiana State Library; Smithsonian Institution Library; Wintherthur Museum; University of Pennsylvania Museum; Wayne State University Folklore Archives; Folklore Archives, Helsinki; Archive of Folk Song, Library of Congress; Barker Texas History Center. Brief evaluations of the collections in some of these have been given. A separate analysis of this material can be provided if that is thought desirable.

As was to be expected, AFS members have a wide array of research interests (question 13). Responses ranged from the fairly specific (camp meeting songs, "helping to edit a book of collected folksongs") to the rather general (humor). This could be the subject of a separate report.

In doing their fieldwork AFS members who responded to the questionnaire have used various kinds of equipment for recording and documenting folklore (question 14):

pen/pencil and paper: 227 (91.532)
cassette tape recorder: 223 (89.919)
reel to reel tape recorder: 129 (52.016)
other sound recording equipment: 13 (5.242)
8mm motion picture camera: 8 (3.226)
super 8 motion picture camera: 29 (11.694)
16mm motion picture camera: 20 (8.065)
35mm still camera: 176 (70.968)
other type still camera: 15 (6.048)
videotape camera: 63 (25.403)

other: 13 (5.242)

Specified under "other cameras" were (as given by respondents) 120 film reflex, Kodak 104, Kodak Disc, Instamatic, 126 still camera, 120, 4x5, 2 1/4x2 1/4, 2 1/4 still camera, reflex, Polaroid SK-70, medium format 2 1/4x3 1/4; several persons listed 35mm still cameras here rather than check off the 35mm box (Leica 35mm, 35mm, Olympus II, 35mm Nikon). Specified under "other equipment" were microcomputer, "plain camera," old photographs, Xerography, word processor, plant press, ground penetrating radar, proton magnetometer, plane table, alidade, "hired a press photographer," magnetic wire recorder, stenography, phonograph-tape recorder, measuring devices, "professional photography of rituals (grant funding)," informant donated documents, computer, dance notation, "going to use video"; one respondent wrote, "would certainly use my microcomputer today [why isn't it on list?]."

Their fieldwork and other folklore research has been supported financially in a number of ways (question 15). The most common response to this question was some designation indicating the use of personal funds ("out of my pocket," "by me," "savings," "husband's income," "wife's bank account," "self-financed"), but respondents also reported other means of support: contracts, grants from private foundations or governmental agencies, loans, the loan of university equipment, dissertation fellowships, other fellowships or scholarships, travel grants, support from a university (other than scholarships), "city, state and federal funds," "grants built into jobs." The research might be carried out as part of a job. One said that the research had been supported "by hook and crook, which is why I'm getting a Ph.D." A few indicated that they thought their research had been supported "poorly," in a "spotty" manner or that they had received "zilch" support, one indicating no support despite having "tried

hard."

Nonetheless, respondents reported financial support in the way of grants, etc., from a wide variety of sources (question 16). The following sources were listed by more than one individual, the number in parentheses indicating the number of persons who listed this source: National Endowment for the Humanities (52), National Endowment for the Arts (43), state humanities organizations (33), state arts organizations (32), Smithsonian Institution (13), Fulbright (12), American Council of Learned Societies (12), Wenner-Gren Foundation (10), Guggenheim Foundation (7), IREX (7), Rockefeller Foundation (7), American Philosophical Society (7), Ford Foundation (6), National Institutes of Mental Health (6), U.S. Department of Education (5), National Science Foundation (5), American Association of University Women (4), state historical societies (4), Social Science Research Council (4), Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture (3), Exxon (3).

The following sources were listed by two respondents as having provided research support: Maybelle MacLeod Lewis Foundation, Lilly Foundation, university alumni associations, National Museum of Canada, Woodrow Wilson Center, Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada, unspecified state and/or local agencies, Union Pacific Corporation, state oral history commissions, National Institute of Health, Mellon Foundation.

The following were listed once as having provided research support: Organization of American States, Faroese Visiting Scholar Fund, Second International Ballad Conference Fund, state department of natural resources, Earthwatch, Government of Canada, North Plains Consortium, Skaggs Foundation, American Folklife Center, state sea grant program,

Doherty Foundation, Tinker Foundation, Middle Atlantic States Arts Consortium, Baker Foundation, African Studies Association, Center for Urban Ethnography, Highgate Road Social Science Research Station, American Association for Advanced Slavic Studies, Canadian Folk Music Society, Saskatchewan Government, British Columbia Provincial Archives, Quebec Ministry of Culture, Celebrate Saskatchewan Centennial Committee, Meewasin Valley Authority, NDFL Title VI Foreign Area Fellowship Program, George Marshall Fund, NYFA, SCOCA, American Heart Association, Nordic Cultural Fund, Nordic Research Scholarship, Finnish-Danish Cultural Fund, Clara Lackman Fund, International Folk Art Foundation, Whatcom Museum, E. and Melville Jacobs Research Fund, ARCO, CNEA, Shastri Indo-Canadian Institute, Research for Better Schools, Canada Council, FSNEP (Brazil), Swiss National Foundation, Federal Arts/Humanities Commission, Phi Beta Kappa, Burlington Northern Fund, state department of archives and libraries, state arts and humanities organization, Seminole Tribal Council, Minorca Heritage Foundation, state cattlemen's association, Winn-Dixie Corporation, Educational Foundation of America, National Research Council, Muskiwinni Foundation, Olin Corporation, Haynes Foundation, Christian Children's Fund, Center for Applied Linguistics, Ross Laboratories, Bush Foundation, Missouri Gerontological Institute, National Institute of Education, National Anthropological Archives, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Metropolitan Museum, Library of Congress, Whitney M. Young Jr. Foundation, Mescalero Apache Tribe, Weatherhand Foundation, folk festival, Appalachian Studies Fellowship, Woodrow Wilson, Oral History Research Center, U.S. Office of Education.

Three persons reported support from a university foundation and 78 from universities. However, support from universities probably covers a wide variety of types of assistance, including graduate fellowships and

sabbatical leaves as well as outright grants (the question was not specific on that point and neither were most of the replies).

In questions 17 and 18 respondents were asked to rank in importance the media for communicating information and ideas about folklore with other folklorists (question 17) and non-folklorists (question 18); they were asked to rank twelve categories (including an "other"). The results produced (via a process of points assigned and added up, 12 points to a first ranking, 11 to a second and so on) the following ranking of those media, in order of descending importance (the first figure for each category is the total number of points; the second indicates how many persons ranked this category at all; the third indicates how many ranked it first):

Communicating with other folklorists (question 17):

Journal articles:	2522	229	113
Books:	2302	226	51
Papers read at meetings:	2011	206	27
Presentations at meetings (other than formal papers):	1569	181	15
Reviews:	1245	168	5
Films	1073	150	4
Archives (i.e., by depositing materials therein):	972	146	10
Exhibitions:	842	137	2
Records:	753	138	2
Other:	699	71	38
Videotapes:	662	124	2
Film strips and slide			

presentations:	634	119	3
Communicating with with non-folklorists (question 18):			
Books:	2074	202	81
Exhibitions:	1913	188	57
Films:	1912	186	38
Records:	1224	152	13
Film strips and slide			
presentations:	1222	141	10
Videotapes:	1019	131	11
Journal articles:	1009	136	12
Presentations at meetings			
(other than formal papers):	978	135	17
Archives (i.e. by depositing			
materials therein):	715	131	1
Papers read at meetings:	706	117	5
Other:	672	63	38
Reviews:	440	95	2

The "other" media mentioned under question 17 mostly related to some form of personal communication ("informal conversations," "private interaction," "personal discussions," even "face to face communication in small groups," "gossip," and "rumor?"), but also included invited conferences, museum deposits, workshops and seminars, correspondence, classrooms, "ethnographic performances," newsletters (especially the American Folklore Newsletter), meetings, "live demonstrations," festivals, joint projects, regional and state meetings, informal symposia, fieldwork. Those mentioned under question 18 mostly involved the use of some sort of popular media or popular presentations (television, radio, newspapers, magazines, festival

and concerts, popular articles), but also included lectures to civic groups, schools, etc., live demonstrations, personal communications, newsletters, workshops, teaching, "verbally," "as consultant." Several respondents pointed out that question 18 did not draw a distinction between other scholars who are not folklorists and the general public. It is true that not having drawn such a distinction makes the interpretation of the responses to question 18 somewhat problematic.

Question 19 asked for a listing of the journals to which respondents were most likely to submit their best work in folklore. No ranking of any sort was requested. Nearly a hundred publications were listed and it seemed obvious that a variety of factors enter into such decisions, including such things as regional interests, subspecialties, and the nature of a particular article. Journals mentioned included Living Blues, Speculum, Fabula, Pennsylvania Folklife, Asian Folklore Studies, Studies in Art Education, Borneo Research Bulletin, and "quilting history publications." Several respondents specifically mentioned that it depended upon the circumstances. The most frequently mentioned journal was, however, the Journal of American Folklore (by 127 people). Other frequently mentioned journals were Western Folklore (79 times), the Journal of Folklore Research (23 times), New York Folklore (11 times), Pioneer America/Material Culture (10 times), Ethnomusicology (10 times).

Question 20, no doubt phrased ambiguously, was too variously interpreted by respondents to yield satisfactory information.

Question 21 asked how many papers respondents had presented in three separate years. The mean averages for those years were as follows:

1983: 2.69 1982: 2.64 1981: 2.66

In terms of numbers of papers delivered over several years (question

21), persons who identified themselves as folklorists delivered the greatest number of papers in each of the three years asked about (one person gave 11 and another 15 in 1983; 8 and 11 were reported for 1982 and 11 and 15 in 1981). However, there did not seem to be any particular pattern generally in terms of persons with particular disciplinary identifications giving more or fewer papers, although there was some shifting from year to year. For example, in 1983 62.86 percent of folklorists gave one or two papers, whereas 64.28 percent of the anthropologists and 64.28 percent of the literary scholars gave 3 or more. However, in 1982 43.44 percent of the folklorists gave 3 or more papers as opposed to 33.33 percent of the anthropologists and literary scholars. In 1981 43.29 percent of the folklorists gave three or more papers as opposed to 23.53 percent of the anthropologists and 36.37 percent of the literary scholars.

Men gave more papers than women. For example, for the year 1983 24 men gave 1 paper, as compared to 21 women, 30 men and 22 women gave 2 papers, 18 men and 11 women 3 papers, 10 men and 9 women four papers, 15 men and 6 women 5 or more papers. The pattern was similar for 1982 and 1981.

Question 22 asked how many AFS meetings respondents had attended in the last five years:

1: 44 (17.742)
2: 31 (12.500)
3: 25 (10.081)
4: 50 (20.161)
5: 53 (21.371)
no response: 45 (18.145)

Unfortunately, 0 was not given as a possible choice on the questionnaire

for question 22; however, it seems reasonable to suggest that a "no response" indicates that 0 meetings were attended in the last five years.

Not unsurprisingly, folklorists (that is, those who so designated themselves in question 1 as either their only or first choice) were more likely to attend American Folklore Society meetings. For example, 36.43 percent of folklorists reported attending all of the last five meetings, while none of the anthropologists did and only 7.14 percent of the literary scholars did. Only one meeting had been attended by 38.46 percent of the anthropologists and 42.42 percent of those who indicated "other" in question 1. Also not surprisingly, income seemed to be a factor in meeting attendance. For example, over 60 percent of respondents whose income was over \$25,000 and who attended at least 1 meeting attended 4 or 5 of the last 5, while under 30 percent attended only 1 or 2. However, only slightly over 26 percent of respondents whose income was \$10,000 or under and who attended at least 1 meeting attended 4 or 5, while nearly 57 percent attended only 1 or 2.

Fifty-two respondents (20.968) declined to venture an opinion as to the best folklore journal in America (question 23); 196 did so, however. One hundred twenty-eight respondents (51.613) indicated that they thought the Journal of American Folklore the best American journal. However, a substantial minority of 55 (22.177) thought of Western Folklore as the best. Six persons (2.419) put the Journal of Folklore Research (formerly the Journal of the Folklore Institute) in that slot and 7 (2.823) opted for other journals (Pioneer America/Material Culture [mentioned twice], Ethos, Fabula, Pennsylvania Folklife, Urban Life, New York Folklore).

Seventy two persons (29.032) did not provide an opinion on the second best American folklore journal (question 23), 72 (29.032) put Western

Folklore in that position, 43 (17.339) the Journal of American Folklore, 23 (9.274) the Journal of Folklore Research and 38 (15.323) other journals. Nineteen other journals were mentioned; of those the Southern Folklore Quarterly was most frequently mentioned (6 times); New York Folklore and Pioneer America/Material Culture were each mentioned 5 times.

One hundred one respondents (40.726) did not indicate their choice for the third best journal, 48 (19.355) put the Journal of Folklore Research in that position, 27 (10.887) Western Folklore, 11 (4.435) the Journal of American Folklore, and 61 (24.597) other journals. Twenty four other journals were mentioned; of those New York Folklore was mentioned the most (16 times), with the Southern Folklore Quarterly mentioned 8 times.

Asked to assess employment opportunities for folklorists in four areas in questions 24a-24d, respondents indicated the following:

University/college teaching:

excellent: 5 (2.016)	(1 female, 4 male)
good: 25 (10.081)	(12 female, 13 male)
fair: 87 (35.081)	(40 female, 47 male)
poor: 77 (31.048)	(37 female, 40 male)
no response: 54 (21.774)	(33 female, 21 male)

Other teaching:

excellent: 1 (0.403)	(0 female, 1 male)
good: 36 (14.516)	(22 female, 14 male)
fair: 83 (33.468)	(37 female, 46 male)
poor: 58 (23.387)	(27 female, 31 male)
no response: 70 (28.226)	(37 female, 33 male)

Government agencies:

excellent: 7 (2.823)	(2 female, 5 male)
good: 68 (27.419)	(34 female, 34 male)

fair: 83 (33.468) (40 female, 43 male)
 poor: 17 (6.855) (7 female, 10 male)
 no response: 73 (29.435) (40 female, 33 male)

Museums, historical sites:

excellent: 13 (5.242) (6 female, 7 male)
 good: 76 (30.645) (37 female, 39 male)
 fair: 77 (31.048) (34 female, 43 male)
 poor: 13 (5.242) (7 female, 6 male)
 no response: 69 (27.823) (39 female, 30 male)

Reponses to question 24 in terms of disciplinary self-identification were as follows (numbers in parentheses indicate percentages of total in identificational category; only sole or first choice to question 1 taken into account):

University teaching:

	no response to ques. 24a	1. excellent	2. good	3. fair	4. poor
no reponse to ques. 1	2 (20.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (10.00)	4 (40.00)	3 (30.00)
folklorist	16 (11.59)	2 (1.45)	16 (11.59)	54 (39.13)	50 (36.23)
anthro.	7 (31.82)	0 (0.00)	1 (4.55)	5 (22.73)	9 (40.91)
ethnomus.	2 (28.57)	0 (0.00)	1 (14.29)	3 (42.86)	1 (14.29)
lit. schol.	7 (30.43)	3 (13.04)	2 (8.70)	7 (30.43)	4 (17.39)
historian	2 (66.67)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (33.33)	0 (0.00)
other	18 (40.00)	0 (0.00)	4 (8.89)	13 (28.89)	10 (22.22)

Other teaching:

	no response to ques. 24b	1. excellent	2. good	3. fair	4. poor
no response to ques. 1	2 (20.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (10.00)	3 (30.00)	4 (40.00)
folklorist	23 (16.67)	1 (0.72)	22 (15.94)	55 (39.86)	37 (26.81)
anthro.	10 (45.45)	0 (0.00)	2 (9.09)	4 (18.18)	6 (27.27)
ethnomus.	3 (42.86)	0 (0.00)	2 (28.57)	2 (28.57)	0 (0.00)
lit. schol.	10 (43.48)	0 (0.00)	4 (17.39)	6 (26.09)	3 (13.04)
historian	2 (66.67)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (33.33)	0 (0.00)
other	20 (44.44)	0 (0.00)	5 (11.11)	12 (26.67)	8 (17.78)

Government agencies:

	no response to ques. 24c	1. excellent	2. good	3. fair	4. poor
no response to ques. 1	3 (30.00)	0 (0.00)	4 (40.00)	2 (20.00)	1 (10.00)
folklorist	24 (17.39)	7 (6.07)	46 (33.33)	52 (37.68)	9 (6.52)
anthro.	8 (36.36)	0 (0.00)	3 (13.64)	8 (36.36)	3 (13.64)
ethnomus.	2 (28.57)	0 (0.00)	4 (57.14)	1 (14.29)	0 (0.00)
lit. schol.	12 (52.17)	0 (0.00)	4 (17.39)	6 (26.09)	1 (4.45)
historian	2 (66.67)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (33.33)	0 (0.00)
other	22 (48.89)	0 (0.00)	7 (15.56)	13 (28.89)	3 (6.67)

Museums, historical sites:

	no response to ques. 24d	1. excellent	2. good	3. fair	4. poor
no response to ques. 1	2 (20.00)	1 (10.00)	4 (40.00)	2 (20.00)	1 (10.00)
folklorist	25 (18.12)	9 (6.52)	46 (33.33)	47 (34.06)	11 (7.97)
anthro.	8 (36.36)	1 (4.55)	4 (18.18)	9 (40.91)	0 (0.00)
ethnomus.	3 (42.86)	1 (14.29)	2 (28.57)	1 (14.29)	0 (0.00)
lit. schol.	11 (47.83)	1 (4.35)	7 (30.43)	4 (17.39)	0 (0.00)
historian	3 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
other	17 (37.78)	0 (0.00)	13 (28.89)	14 (31.11)	1 (2.22)

Responses to questions 24a-24d arranged according to occupations noted in question 6 were as follows (numbers in parentheses indicate percentage of total in occupational category):

University teaching:

	no response to ques. 24a	1. excellent	2. good	3. fair	4. poor
univ./coll. teacher	19 (16.52)	1 (0.87)	11 (9.57)	54 (46.96)	30 (26.09)
high school teacher	1 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
museum pro- fessional	1 (20.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (40.00)	1 (20.00)	1 (20.00)
librarian	1 (50.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (50.00)
archivist	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (100.00)	0 (0.00)
government employee	3 (13.64)	0 (0.00)	2 (9.09)	7 (31.82)	10 (45.45)

graduate student	5 (31.25)	0 (0.00)	3 (18.75)	6 (37.50)	2 (12.50)
employee, hist. soc. etc.	1 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
other	9 (50.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	3 (16.67)	6 (33.33)
unemployed	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	3 (100.00)
retired	2 (66.67)	1 (33.33)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
more than one checked, ques. 6	12 (19.67)	3 (4.92)	7 (11.48)	15 (24.59)	24 (39.34)

Other teaching:

	no response to ques. 24b	1. excellent	2. good	3. fair	4. poor
univ./coll. teacher	31 (26.96)	0 (0.00)	13 (11.30)	46 (40.00)	25 (21.74)
high school teacher	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (100.00)
museum professional	1 (20.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	3 (60.00)	1 (20.00)
librarian	1 (50.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (50.00)	0 (0.00)
archivist	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (100.00)
government employee	5 (22.73)	0 (0.00)	5 (22.73)	6 (27.27)	6 (27.27)
graduate student	5 (31.25)	0 (0.00)	4 (25.00)	6 (37.50)	1 (6.25)
employee hist. soc., etc.	1 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
other	9 (50.00)	0 (0.00)	3 (16.67)	4 (22.22)	2 (11.11)
unemployed	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (33.33)	0 (0.00)	2 (66.67)

retired	3 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
more than one checked, ques. 6	14 (22.95)	1 (1.64)	10 (16.39)	17 (27.87)	19 (31.15)

Government agencies:

	no response to ques. 24c	1. excellent	2. good	3. fair	4. poor
univ./coll. teacher	38 (33.04)	2 (1.74)	32 (27.83)	39 (33.91)	4 (3.48)
high school teacher	1 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
museum professional	1 (20.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (40.00)	2 (40.00)	0 (0.00)
librarian	1 (50.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (50.00)	0 (0.00)
archivist	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (100.00)	0 (0.00)
government employee	3 (13.64)	2 (9.09)	7 (31.82)	9 (40.91)	1 (4.55)
graduate student	4 (25.00)	0 (0.00)	5 (31.25)	5 (31.25)	2 (12.50)
employee hist. soc., etc.	1 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
other	9 (50.00)	0 (0.00)	4 (22.22)	4 (22.22)	1 (5.56)
unemployed	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (33.33)	2 (66.67)
retired	3 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
more than one checked, ques. 6	12 (19.67)	3 (4.92)	18 (29.51)	21 (34.43)	7 (11.48)

Museums, historical sites:

	no response, ques. 24d	1. excellent	2. good	3. fair	4. poor
univ./coll. teacher	33 (28.70)	7 (6.09)	37 (32.17)	38 (33.04)	0 (0.00)
high school teacher	1 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
museum professional	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (40.00)	2 (40.00)	1 (20.00)
librarian	1 (50.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (50.00)	0 (0.00)
archivist	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (100.00)	0 (0.00)
government employee	5 (22.73)	1 (4.55)	6 (27.27)	6 (27.27)	4 (18.18)
graduate student	4 (25.00)	1 (6.25)	5 (31.25)	5 (31.25)	1 (6.25)
employee hist. soc., etc.	1 (100.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
other	9 (50.00)	0 (0.00)	6 (33.33)	3 (16.67)	0 (0.00)
unemployed	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (33.33)	0 (0.00)	2 (6.67)
retired	1 (33.33)	0 (0.00)	1 (33.33)	0 (0.00)	1 (33.33)
more than one checked, ques. 6	14 (22.95)	4 (6.56)	18 (29.51)	21 (34.43)	4 (6.56)

Responses to questions 24a-24d arranged according to income of the respondents (question 10) were as follows (numbers in parentheses indicate percentage of applicable horizontal category):

University/college teaching:

	no response to ques. 24a	1. excellent	2. good	3. fair	4. poor
no response to ques. 10	19 (38.78)	3 (6.12)	3 (6.12)	15 (30.61)	9 (18.37)
\$15,000 & under	10 (23.81)	0 (0.00)	4 (9.52)	10 (23.81)	18 (42.86)
\$15,001-\$30,000	20 (18.69)	1 (0.93)	13 (12.15)	34 (31.78)	39 (36.45)
over \$30,000	5 (10.00)	1 (2.00)	5 (10.00)	28 (56.00)	11 (22.00)

Other teaching:

	no response to ques. 24b	1. excellent	2. good	3. fair	4. poor
no response to ques. 10	22 (44.90)	1 (2.04)	7 (14.25)	12 (24.49)	7 (14.25)
\$15,000 & under	10 (23.81)	0 (0.00)	8 (19.05)	15 (35.71)	9 (21.43)
\$15,001-\$30,000	30 (28.04)	0 (0.00)	13 (12.15)	35 (32.71)	29 (27.10)
over \$30,000	8 (16.00)	0 (0.00)	8 (16.00)	21 (42.00)	13 (26.00)

Government agencies:

	no response to ques. 24c	1. excellent	2. good	3. fair	4. poor
no response to ques. 10	21 (42.86)	0 (0.00)	11 (22.45)	12 (24.49)	5 (10.20)
\$15,000 & under	12 (28.575)	1 (2.38)	12 (28.575)	13 (30.95)	4 (9.52)
\$15,001-\$30,000	28 (26.17)	4 (3.74)	33 (30.84)	36 (33.64)	6 (5.61)
over \$30,000	12 (24.00)	2 (4.00)	12 (24.00)	22 (44.00)	2 (4.00)

Museums, historical sites:

	no response to ques. 24d	1. excellent	2. good	3. fair	4. poor
no response to ques. 10	18 (36.74)	2 (4.08)	14 (28.57)	9 (18.37)	6 (12.24)
\$15,000 & under	11 (26.19)	2 (4.76)	13 (30.955)	13 (30.955)	3 (7.14)
\$15,001-\$30,000	31 (28.97)	5 (4.67)	31 (28.97)	36 (33.65)	4 (3.74)
over \$30,000	9 (18.00)	4 (8.00)	18 (36.00)	19 (38.00)	0 (0.00)

Two hundred fifteen (86.694) favored the publication of a directory of professional American folklorists (question 25), while 18 (7.258) opposed such a move; there were 15 non-responses (6.048). Two hundred eleven (85.081) would want to be included in such a directory, 18 (7.258) would prefer not to be included (question 25a); 19 non-responses (7.661). Two hundred nine (84.274) would actually purchase a copy, 26 (10.484) would not (question 25b); 13 non-responses (5.242).

Approximately half the respondents provided comments, usually under sections 26 and 27. Comments ranged from brief to fairly extensive. Some merely provided clarifications or personal details to support earlier answers, but many involved the voicing of opinions on both broad and narrow topics, including directions to be taken in the field of folklore studies; jobs and folklore as a profession; the Society, its concerns, actions and publications; and the questionnaire itself. It is, of course, impossible to give a quantitative analysis of these comments, and any summary is bound to be subjective to some degree. It seems best to report on these comments

by trying to establish certain general areas of interest and concern and by then quoting liberally from the comments themselves to directly provide some idea of the general run of opinions and ideas.

It seems fair to say that one area of considerable concern to AFS members, perhaps the area of greatest concern in terms both of the number of comments upon it and of the depth of feeling shown in some of these comments, is that of jobs and employment in the folklore profession. Some suggest only a general need to move toward "increasing employment opportunities for those with degrees in the field," or "support[ing] and initiat[ing] ideas that increase opportunities for teaching in colleges, universities, and secondary schools," or "promot[ing] employment opportunities," or they merely ask, "what is a folklorist good for if he/she/it is not doing...some task called folklore?". Other respondents, however, provided lengthy discussion of the job situation as they see it:

I believe it is imperative for the AFS to become as involved in the professional aspects of our field as it has been in the intellectual. At present, I regard many AFS activities as being vanity exercises for the participants, focusing on near-sighted concerns and all but ignoring the crisis in employment and other matters of professional public status for those in our field. I personally favor the organization of a separate professional folklorists' guild, with membership limited to those holding advanced degrees in the field and with a commitment to assertion of joint action in protection of our professional interests. The proliferation of bogus activities in the name of folklore/folk-life/folk arts (many of them funded with public moneys), the hiring of non-credentialed or predetermined personnel in such activities, the co-opting of legitimate folklorists through token

participation in these ventures, and pay scales and job benefits far below those pertaining in comparable professions all testify to the actual powerlessness of folklorists in much public sector work. Similar conditions, of course, surround the current academic job market (especially for younger folklorists). The AFS has failed miserably even in dissemination of basic job information, as evidenced by last fall's edition of the newsletter, in which the application deadlines for two positions announced on the front page had passed nearly a month before the newsletter was even mailed. The present questionnaire and suggestion of a professional directory are minimal steps in a good direction, but to have any real value, they must lead to some forms of concerted professional action, through a certification process for folklore programs and activities, and through petition, censure, and even boycott of those which do not conform to standards.

* * * * *

Without question, the AFS ought to be committed, first and foremost, to the advance of the discipline and the profession of folklore in the US. From my perspective as one of many unemployed and underemployed folklorists, however, it is difficult to see exactly what the AFS is doing right now to do this. The market for qualified folklorists shrinks every year, with the result that it becomes more and more difficult for new scholars to find work, while every spring word gets around that distinguished young folklorists have been denied tenure, putting them back into the market and making the competition all the more

severe for the entry-level people. Add to this the deliberate duplicity of such departments as the _____ English Dept.—which informed me that I would be invited to an interview on campus (which was never scheduled) at the same time that they knew exactly who would be hired—and you have a situation in which young folklorists are being asked blithely to subject themselves and their families to an indeterminate period of hell, with no prospect of assistance or even moral support from the professional organizations set up to promote their interests....

From what I could gather from conversations with the current President, the AFS is now committed to a sort of scholastic "Reaganomics," in which much effort is placed in the Centennial celebrations, in the hopes of generating the scholastic and popular respect that is now missing. Once publicity is given the discipline of folklore, I am asked to believe, then jobs will be created and funds allocated, and eventually the benefits first reaped by established figures...will "trickle down" to such as I....

I find this attitude totally unsympathetic. The AFS counts on me to read papers...submit my "best work" to JAF, review books, and evaluate articles submitted to it. I do so because I feel (however deluded I may be) that I am a professional and have some sort of responsibility to the discipline.... But has the profession any responsibility to me? (and to my friends who are in even worse situations?) Or is the AFS committed to the same kind of cynical exploitation of human resources that many of our folksongs decry?... Does it mean nothing that a generation of young folklorists are being written off? I see nothing in these

newsletters or in the public pronouncements of its officers to suggest otherwise.

Happy Birthday?

As for specific action in regard to a perceived employment problem, there were various suggestions. At least two persons suggested that the root of the problem may lie in overproducing trained folklorists or perhaps in not having given sufficient thought to the "supply" of folklorists. One writes that

the AFS really needs to consider what it's going to do w/ all the folklore Ph.D.s the universities are turning out. The jobs simply aren't there & I would hate to see us shrug our shoulders like AAA does & say "that is the way it is".... The well-established professors need to realize that their positions in higher education are flukes—a one-time-only bonus courtesy of the baby boom. Now even their prize students cannot find work.

Another insists that folklorists should "make it absolutely clear that there are no academic jobs in folklore to all prospective students," and that folklore programs should "accept no students unless summer intern programs (paid) are available for them, and make establishment of such programs top priority for departments." Other writers indicated steps which could be taken by AFS to improve the situation, such as placement services and related possibilities ("Improve placement service and job announcements"; "More aggressive policy toward finding, opening job options for folklorists"; "Job file for younger folklorists and folklore grad students"). The Society could also work to promote jobs in particular sectors, for example, by "actively campaign[ing] for...folkloristic awareness within the federal and state governments [as] employment

opportunities for folklorists are not going to improve until public officials recognize what folklorists do." Young folklorists might also be encouraged to "keep one foot on the floor of reality and prepare another means of making a living; few of us can do a fulltime folklore job, at least for the first twenty years." Some "unemployed" folklorists have managed to support themselves by freelancing, but even those who successfully find such work may find such an arrangement a mixed blessing:

I find plenty of work on contracts ranging from 2 weeks to 1 year at a time—I'd love to see more permanent folklife positions. While I enjoy the variety of contract work, it would be nice to light in one place for a while.

One commentator suggests that AFS might follow the lead of the American Anthropological Association in helping to provide at least unpaid academic "positions" which would give a folklorist a base, if little else:

Perhaps a more realistic form of support for non-professional/unemployed folklorists would be simple, non-financial affiliation to particular institutions; something that has recently been considered by the American Anthro. Assoc. I quote from the AAA's newsletter (V.25, #1, Jan. 1984):

3.) Motion on Institutional Affiliation for Non-Teaching Anthropologists.

Whereas total unemployment or part-time teaching or non-academic employment are pronounced among recent recipients of doctorates;

Whereas institutional affiliation is required to qualify for many fellowships, grants-in-aid and other funding;

Whereas access to university libraries is often

difficult, even for graduates of said institutions;

Whereas many of these problems can be ameliorated through the creation of (unpaid) Research Associateships;

Therefore be it moved that the American Anthropological Association call upon senior-level anthropologists to assist their unemployed, marginally employed, or nonacademically employed colleagues in their efforts to qualify for grants, fellowships, to gain access to research materials, and to maintain scholarly contacts through the creation of Research Associate positions which would provide such individuals with institutional affiliation.

Modification of this motion, to fit whatever requirements the AFS might feel are needed, could be of great help to those concerned, even if such affiliation is used by non-professional folklorists only for the submission of manuscripts to scholarly journals (enabling editors to determine non-professionals' qualifications).

In line with this concern over employment and folklore as a profession, there were also a significant number of comments about the need to pay greater attention to folklorists in the "public sector" or in lines of work outside the academic profession of university teaching to which traditionally most AFS members have belonged. Indeed, questionnaire responses made it clear that there are AFS members in quite a variety of professions, a situation which may become increasingly the case, creating new needs which the Society thus must come to terms with. Several non-academic respondents pointed out that the questionnaire itself seemed decidedly oriented toward academic members (as it probably was, having been

formulated primarily by academics, though with some in-put by others). Respondents included "a layperson with no formal training or employment background [in folklore]...just beginning to find my way around [in AFS]"; "basically a musician/writer [who hasn't] had time yet to be active in any Society...activities"; "an independent scholar driven out of Academe by my inability, for good or ill, to deal with the politics therein...working in an unrelated job but trying to find time to work on a long-standing project...having real trouble getting access to the books I need...[and who] would be curious to know if other people are also in this kind of situation"; a reference librarian who simply "enjoy[s] any questions that come 'over the desk' having even a vague folklore connection"; a "practitioner" of folksongs; and an art dealer who commented:

As a nonacademic person interested in folklore and folklife, I have found very little of the activity of the A.F.S. directed towards me. I even wrote the President Elect...and stated that some day, someone would show more interest in those of us not teaching or writing in our field on a full time basis, but paying year after year our dues supporting others' activities.

Someday—take a look at the true configuration of your membership roles and note the numbers who respect and admire the work of the academics, but for various reasons, work in other fields. We pay our dues and buy your books and records and films, but questionnaires like this leave me a little cold.

An educational consultant suggests that the questionnaire "should have asked us how we use folklore in our current non-folklore occupations." And a high school teacher writes:

I applaud this survey and consider it long overdue.

However, only two questions specifically for elementary and

secondary school teachers? Are you only paying us lip service? We may not be very visible at meetings or conventions (our school systems—often on the brink of financial collapse—seldom pay travel expenses or even grant us days off for such things) or very numerous, but we do touch the lives of one hell of a lot of people. Don't be so elitist—are you going through NEA or NCTE or UFT to find out what we are doing? Remember, we are influencing some who are enrolling in university classes, visiting museums, utilizing libraries/archives, and attending festivals (and their parents!). Find the others and encourage their membership; many don't know that you exist either!

However, even those who do work as professional folklorists in the "public sector" expressed a need for greater attention to their area, for "equal support for applied, public & academic folklore," "recognition and appreciation of the work of non-academic 'public sector' folklorists, including as equal weight being given to the films, records, exhibits, etc. they produce as to the 'scholarly' papers of academic folklorists," "greater respectability for public sector folklorists." One academic folklorist notes of the questionnaire, "there's no real attempt in this survey to deal with public sector folklorists other than to find out where they work." There should also be "more recognition and acceptance of the non-academic presenter & interpretor" and a sense of "being kinder to out of work folklorists or those not associated with institutions." One freelance folklorist felt that a professional directory would be especially helpful to those who work independently.

There were also a number of comments directed toward generating influence and pressure upon public agencies to see the significance of

folklore and to deal with the utilization of folklorists. "More influence on governmental policy concerning...folklore & public sector" is not, of course, only a question of "more work in public sector," but there is certainly a close relationship between greater governmental interest and strengthening of employment opportunities in this sector ("since jobs do seem more available in public sector more contact with sources outside of folklore discipline...would be beneficial"). One academically employed folklorist notes that "I am encouraged by what I see happening at state and federal level in terms of folklore visibility & quality of those in key positions," but another calls attention to the need for "pressuring agencies dealing with folklore...to have genuine, trained folklorists on their boards and administrative bodies," suggesting that public sector interest in folklore and folklife has not always translated into opportunities for folklorists or into work governed by truly professional standards.

Not unrelated to public sector interest in folklore generally or to employment opportunities is the whole issue of public relations and informing the public accurately and responsibly about the nature of folklore. Though such public outreach surely can be seen as a desirable end in itself ("Here we are within a few years' of our centennial, and still people have never heard of AFS or still think Paul Bunyan is American folklore."), clearly greater public understanding could lead to more jobs, as one comment makes plain:

Help justify our existence! Being a forum for scholarly research and an outlet for a "meeting of the minds" are valuable focuses for the Society and should never be abandoned. However, as one whose folklore-related employment becomes shakier every year..., I plead with the organization to become sort of a public

relations agency as well.

There were many other comments stressing that we should "be pursuing goals and policies which will narrow the chasm between folklorists and the general public," "promote the credibility of the field," "encourage and be involved in the development of non-academic folklore publications in all media and of public programming in folklore," and "educat[e] non-folklorists about what we do and why we do it." There were, however, fewer suggestions as to just how this should be accomplished. "Folklorists writing for more mainstream journals" was one possibility and an AFS public relations office, a Washington lobbyist, and a film about folklorists and what they do were other ideas mentioned. Folk festivals went virtually unmentioned in this regard, though one person noted "I'm not sure any more that folklife festivals are that effective." It was also thought that the Centennial could be an effective means of bringing folklore to public attention.

Of course the funding of fieldwork, other research and other folkloristic activity also has to do with how folklorists get along in the world and get on with what they do as folklorists, and there were various comments on funding. In general, it was thought that we should "aggressively pursue the establishment of folklore funding programs at major and minor foundations," "promot[e] research opportunities for folklorists w/ the state, local, & federal agencies relevant to folklore/folklife," and that "funding specific field projects [by AFS] for individuals or groups would be a tremendous breakthrough—even if these individuals are only given a small allowance for transportation costs." To promote better funding for folklore work we might "'cultivate' a consciousness, if you will, in the area of business and industry [where]

obviously our best candidates would be companies who might derive some benefit from the specific research in addition to a tax credit," make available "more info on how to plan & write successful fieldwork grants," and engage in an "organized effort to contact relevant organizations & provide names of consultants...[to] publishing houses, especially for grade school texts...research funding organizations...public agencies which might hold folklore related events—local craft festivals, for example."

The comments quoted and summarized thus far were, for the most part, responses to the question "What focus, goals, or policies would you like to see the American Folklore Society pursue?" Some of them are perhaps not, strictly speaking, literal and direct answers to that question, but in general they tend to imply some directions in which the Society and its members might look. Other comments dealt more directly with Society functions and productions, such as the annual meeting, publications, and politics. A survey/questionnaire of this sort tends to invite criticisms, observations about what is wrong, and suggestions about what needs to be improved. Indeed, there were a number of such critical comments, but it is interesting to note that a few respondents complimented the Society on a job well done:

I should like to see the Society keep up the good work. It has done well in most ways up to now. A little more concern with myth as a genre would interest me, and folksong is also of personal interest. But I think the work of the past few years has been about right.

* * * * *

I think the Society is doing a fine job of trying[.]

Among the things which bothered respondents, however, were what could loosely be called political issues (both internal politics and Society involvement in "issues"). Several respondents regretted what they saw as

political factionalism in the Society. And not unrelated to the question of factions was this comment regarding the need to "democratize" the Society:

I would like to see the American Folklore Society make its Constitution a working one so that democratic involvement by the membership is made possible. By creating a reasonable structure within which we can all function with an equal voice we will become a mature society which allows for maximum input and judgment by professional peers. This will not be a restricting move, but a freeing one. Too many of the "older" generation in the Society, especially a close-knit group of male scholars, have tried to keep a corner on power bases from which they could act informally but still in the name of the Society. These individuals are not the sole voice of the Society, we all are, and we should have a voice in how it works. That is what was intended by the new Constitution implemented in 1976. When this Society is democratized we will see an explosion of good scholarship and compelling research.

More than one respondent felt that the Fellows of the AFS should be abolished as an organization or modified, with the implication at least seeming to be that this group was not a "democratic" institution. For example:

Abolish the Folklore Fellows, or, failing that, eliminate all connections between that group & the AFS. We have no need for this type of "old-boys" club. Its existence is a detriment to the profession. In most fields, "Fellows" are elected by all members of an organization; our mechanism is an anachronism.

So far as Society involvement in "issues" is concerned, some members were strongly in opposition:

No political stances, statements, fusses, or actions. I agree with recent positions taken within AFS but I nonetheless deplore the politicization of a professional society. It's like prayer in schools: there are far better places to pray.

* * * * *

Less attention to social-action concerns such as ERA, special facilities for the handicapped, etc. and more attention to intellectual and scholarly issues.

Others, however, were equally insistent that we should be more involved in such matters:

Whether working in academia or the public sector, we are all involved in "cultural engineering." In taking that role more seriously, I feel we should become more involved in social and political issues as they involve the right to freedom of traditional cultural expression.

* * * * *

Sustain and keep pushing the discipline's tradition of social consciousness and ethical responsibility. Perhaps explore both the praxis and philosophical dimensions of Folklore and Advocacy. The "applied" should be an organic dimension of our most theoretically rich work.

But the majority of comments on Society actions and functions related not to somewhat shadowy factions or moral stances but to such tangibles as publications and the annual meeting, though one commentator deplored the "social stratification" found at the annual meeting, an attitude which seems to echo the calls for a more democratic spirit in AFS generally:

There is too much social stratification among folklorists, as among members of other academic disciplines. I am overly idealistic in nature, but I do not believe such stratification belongs in academics, and especially not in the field of folklore. The annual AFS meetings are discouraging in the magnitude of their political nature—the informal and formal ranking is offensive. The latest meetings look & feel like a convention of junior executives, all vying for position near "important" people, in search of power. There is not an open, friendly feeling of communication between participants, but rather constant competition for attention and status seeking. Those who openly promote or "market" themselves externally receive the above rewards of attention and status attribution. Such attitudes and values are not conducive to a true intellectual exchange. Subtle and not so subtle "in" groups have formed, in no way different from junior high school or East Coast high society. Those who have an "in" make it to the "in" parties. The current insecurity and competition for decent jobs is partially a cause of this situation, but in no way an excuse for it. It is odious to notice that only those participants with a proper title are really listened to with respect....

In general it was thought that there was a need to "continue and strengthen the reviewing procedure for AFS annual meeting presentations—it has gotten a good start but needs to be continued" and "sharpen...the academic standards governing acceptance of papers at professional meetings." And the meetings as presently constituted were seen as both too large and not very lively:

AFS meetings are now too large, I think. I would like to see AFS support and help organize regional societies. If membership in AFS automatically carried membership in the society in your region, the smaller groups would be strengthened. Then it would be possible to alternate years—for example, regional societies meet simultaneously every third year instead of AFS. Cost, distance, and size of the national meeting are making it difficult to attend for many of us, and I think increased regionalism is a realistic path for the future.

* * * * *

Liven up the format at AFS meetings!! I'm sick unto death of 4 papers, each running a bit over time such that there's no discussion. Meet jointly w/ other groups (Ethnomusicology, Oral History, Afro-American Studies etc.) to allow for variety and interchange of ideas. We're supposed to be interdisciplinary but we're getting just inbred.

Though many of us might well agree with the writer who noted that "I do see the meetings as an important occasion for those of us who are geographically isolated to see our colleagues, renew our energies, and exchange ideas and data." Some members, of course, are unfortunately unable to afford to attend the meetings, at least not as often as they might like, and it was suggested that the meetings should be held more often in larger cities, which were presumed to be more accessible for cheaper air fares. In line with the need for public relations it was suggested that

Perhaps we could start by having some kind of "events" at our annual meetings (maybe starting with the centennial years) that the press would cover—a dynamic lecture on a provocative topic in American folklore, or the unveiling of a high quality

film or videotape or exhibit, etc.

Or the meetings could be held mostly "in cities where most of [the Society's] constituents (especially students in folklore programs) are found." In addition, one commentator noted that "I would like the Society to make its meetings more accessible to disabled, hearing impaired & visually impaired members and non-member participants...to adopt a policy of holding meetings only at accessible hotels & conference centers & of providing sign language interpreters on a regular basis."

Most comments about Society publications were made about the Journal and, indeed, the Journal seemed to be somewhat controversial. There were certainly comments which showed that some looked upon the journal favorably ("keep up excellent journal"; "retain high standards in JAF"; "I certainly value receiving the Journal"), but there were also some reasonably harsh criticisms, some related to content and focus, others to style. One writer "would like JAF to be more open to problems of current complexity of folklore & folklore theory, less attached to older genres and research approaches," and another thought that "something must be done about the overall thrust of JAF—it is totally unrepresentative of current thinking/research in the field." One went so far as to say "every folklorist I know belongs to AFS, and receives the JAF, but few read anything except the table of contents, reviews, and Notes and Queries," though this comment seemed to be in the context of suggesting that not much attention was paid to the activities of public-sector folklorists in the Journal's pages. Someone else stressed the desirability of "freeing JAF from factional ties" and it was thought by more than one writer that the Journal did not publish enough American material:

I have never understood the implied editorial policy of the

JAF which seems to be terrified of publishing articles on AMERICAN folklore and folklife. I think the Society should question why we have a journal which consistently fails to speak to the research and professional interests of most of its members (at least my generation, those who have come out of graduate school in the last 10-15 years).

* * * * *

At the risk of sounding provincial, I must say I would like to see more articles in JAF on American subjects. As it is, I am often disappointed to find more on theory and non-American subjects than I find on the folklore of our land.

There was some feeling against the "academic prose style in folklore journals such as JAF [with a] loftiness and dryness of many of the articles [which has] rendered them unreadable." Others recommended that the Journal should "publish less jargony stuff..., devote less to erudite description and more to analysis with a penchant to meaning," or noted that "I would like to see a return of the format of the JAF to its pre-social science form [as] I find it more readable than the science model, and...less likely to attract jargon than the science model," and that we should "return JAF to a readable style and format and rescue it from the quasi-scientific jargon of sociology."

So far as other AFS publications go, there was some anxiety expressed over the continued existence of the Publications series. It was thought that "a public sector journal that might complement the academic bias of JAF" could be published by the Society. One writer regretted the passing of the Center for Southern Folklore publication and wondered if AFS could come up with something similar. And one respondent expressed some misgivings about the new format of the American Folklore Newsletter:

I find that while the AFS Newsletter looks more professional in its new format, it is almost too "tidy" for our purposes. We have lost the "Notes and Queries," "Among the States," "New and Noteworthy," and "On Campus" sections that once kept us in touch with our colleagues. Now one has to belong to several state and regional organizations and societies to receive that sort of news. Further while pictures are nice, they and the "contests" that have appeared take space away from columns that could carry more information to more members. In addition, although as president of one of the sections I was asked to write my annual report to the Society so that it would be suitable for publication in the Newsletter, it has not been published, nor for that matter have most of the annual reports that we receive in our convention folders. True, if one attends the annual meeting, he will receive such reports; those who are unable to attend such meetings never see these reports or the financial statements.... I think that we need to assess the present offerings in the Newsletter and possibly attempt to reach a happy medium between what we had under John West and Theodor Suhuchat...and our present publication.

Other comments fall into somewhat less clearly definable general categories than those noted above. Some relate to policies which might be adopted or actions which might be taken by AFS, others to the thrust of the field of folklore (though often with the implication that the Society could play a role here) in both theoretical and practical ways.

So far as AFS policies and actions are concerned, it was suggested that oral history of folklore studies and folklorists should be continued,

that there should be "more minority representation...since so much of what has made AFS was based on the collections and analyses of, e.g., African American & Native American [materials]," and that we should "develop more folklife opportunities abroad." Others stressed the need for "more serious scholarship and scholarly pursuits," and "more attention to women," suggested the establishment of "a distribution center or even free library of films that deal specifically with folk-culture & folklife in general," and that the Newsletter might be sent first class to those who are willing to pay extra for that service. One "would like to see more of a sense of a profession—working for a purpose in common with other folklorists, but even that seems less and less feasible in a business that rewards individual achievement, not very well," and another thought that

In general we are long overdue for an updating of the Society. We need to deemphasize the romantic and the petty—let it flourish in the halls and after 5:00—and turn our energies to a commitment of relevance and seriousness.

There was certainly sentiment in favor of the greater organization of research and other activities both in national and regional terms. One writer recommended "organized field research on national scale, centralized archives for collected materials, full time professionals coordinating research in each state," another that "links with international scholars through USIA and networks of regional studies programs throughout the country...be developed," a third called for "aid in organizing information networks—centralized archiving, film and videotape resources, folkloric specialists." "More involvement with state and regional societies" was called for. Other recommendations included:

Divide the country into areas, and have all areas represented by a specific director. That is, map out folk

culture areas roughly, and appoint a representative for that area in reporting to the Newsletter.... Or, feature a different area in each Newsletter.

* * * * *

Funding specific field projects for individuals or groups [by AFS] would be a tremendous breakthrough—even if these individuals are only given a small allowance for transportation costs.

Perhaps because we tend to see folklore as "interdisciplinary" or as a field of study with very close ties to several other fields, comments given also stressed the desirability of maintaining close links with other disciplines. There should be "more recognition of the interfacing of folklore with other academic areas," "increasing interaction with related fields, on both the individual & Society level," and "more communication between folklorists & anthropologists, sociologists, ethnomusicologists, historians, etc." This could in part be accomplished through cooperation with other learned societies ("better relationship with other learned societies"; "I think interdisciplinary conferences, or joint-sponsored confs. are a good idea"; "As an ethnomusicologist, would like to see greater AFS-SEM interaction"). A few of the comments about interdisciplinary directions were also cautionary:

Encourage interdisciplinary studies, while avoiding the unfortunate tendency to borrow concepts without full comprehension.

* * * * *

Folklore is a discipline. Let us not be overwhelmed by linguistic or other models.

It was thought that the Society could in several ways promote guidelines for those in the profession:

STANDARDS—as the national society of the profession, AFS should continue to set the standards for the field by encouraging and rewarding excellence.

* * * * *

I believe the AFS needs a code of ethics. I've been disappointed it has taken so long to present one to the membership.

* * * * *

Development of professional standards and guidelines for all...development of ethics oath...development of specialized standards for public sector work.

Despite the possible slanting of the questionnaire toward academic folklorists (or perhaps because of it?), there were few comments on folklore in academia. One recommended the establishment of more folklore minors in the university curriculum, another "the inclusion of folklore in the general education requirements of college and university B.A. degrees," and there was one suggestion that the serious, advanced teaching of folklore could be taken out of the university in a kind of outreach:

I would like the Society to examine how to help folklorists who would like to continue their education in folklore... The tiny number of graduate programs in folklore is quite limiting to anyone such as myself who has gotten a Master's degree, worked for a while, and would eventually like to go on for more study. There are a number of us who have done this, and now have families, which limits our ability to go on for an advanced degree. Perhaps the Society could look into the possibility of

holding regional seminars such as those held by the American Association of State and Local History. These could provide an opportunity for academic folklorists to teach courses in theoretical folklore which could be of great assistance to folklorists working in the public sector.

A number of commentators made suggestions and observations concerning trends in folklore theory, methods, or areas of study. For example, one saw a need for "more integration of mythological studies into academic folklore," another wanted:

Much more emphasis on analysis using adequate analytical methods. At present there is too much concentration on descriptions, which, though important is not the final end of fieldwork. We need more analysis in order to be a 20th or 21st century discipline, not something left over like folklore was when John Thoms revived it from oblivion in the 19th century. We're still treating folklore as a novelty item, not a discipline grounded in scholarly principles.

We should "get rid of all traces of specious scientism" and not "forget nor neglect collectanea in favor of esoteric theoretical stuff that drains the life out of folklore," foster "collecting, bibliography," and "change Folklore from a religion to a profession." Longer comments in this general area included:

Offer more tangible academic level in the discipline so that folklorists' training has more analytical basis which would be more acceptable in other academic fields—better statistical analysis, etc. When a folklorist goes for a job also being applied for by historian or anthropologist, folklorist should

have some understanding of their analytical bases of research formulation, & so be on equal footing for the jobs.

The sense in the academic world is often that folklorists are the bastard children of other academic disciplines, and research topics are for fun, often without a "valid" research question in mind which could be applicable in some way. The Society should work toward tightening up the loose ends of the discipline and make inroads into linking the field with its allied fields....

* * * * *

[Current focus in the field should be] to redress the tilt (as I perceive it) toward sociological & anthropological methods as the solely valuable approach to the discipline. Encourage the presentation of quality papers (at the meetings) and articles with a literary, psychological & historical approach.

* * * * *

Too much rigidity in trying to define the discipline is bad. Ethnology seems to be in vogue now. The addition of more of the cultural anthropology methods to the field has been good. But as a humanist I get uneasy when any one group wants to negate the work of another. Popular culture, for example, should not be scoffed at. Folklore is not exclusively a "science." That way lies sterility.

* * * * *

The old fight/dispute between the contextualists and text-people continues. This seems silly at best because neither is adequate. The self-serving posing as social scientists is, I think, essentially destructive because folklore is an

interdisciplinary endeavor. Folklorists are still too self-conscious & I'd suggest scrapping the term in favor of "traditional culture" or some such.

* * * * *

Sustain and promote interest in theory development and conceptual issues. The field is often disparaged by deans as "popular," filled with "collectors and doers," not enough philosophers. Keep the intellectual side of the enterprise strong.

Finally there is the questionnaire itself. Some of the criticisms of it have been noted above and there were others. One respondent noted that the term "city" should not have been used in no. 2, as some folklorists do not live in a city or town. Another complained that there was not enough space for answering some questions. It was thought that nos. 19, 20 and 23 "smack of being popularity contest questions" with no real purpose, and that much more information should have been asked from public sector folklorists ("how they communicate with each other...whether they can pursue their own research interests as distinct from what they do in their jobs"), and that "the bias of this questionnaire is the assumption that folklorists are working in the field of folklore; no questions relate to why folklorists are not working in the discipline." One person stated:

I found this questionnaire quaintly archaic & biased to academia.... Why not a single follow-up question for people not now employed as what you consider a folklorist? (Don't you wonder what's happened to those people? After all _____ is a journalist, I'm a programmer, there are others.) This non-curiosity contrasts with the American Anthropological

[Association], which runs full-page feature stories on anthropologists in non-traditional employment.

Another noted:

Some questions difficult & answering could be misleading. E.g. # 17, 18. Most of the questionnaire I did not enjoy or feel comfortable with—and I filled it out only to be cooperative in this endeavor.

However, there were also a number of positive responses ("a good idea"; "Thanks for asking all these questions"; "good questionnaire; it should prove useful"; "I think this survey is important and congratulate you on a well-designed questionnaire"). Several persons noted that they were interested in seeing the results. And there were suggestions about future follow-up actions:

I suspect that the results of this survey will pinpoint the needs for other finer surveys of special areas, such as public sector folklore/folklife workers. This seems like a good start.

* * * * *

I think this is an excellent project that should be repeated every five years.

It is, then, for the Board to decide whether there should be additional reports based on the data gathered by this questionnaire (some possibilities were mentioned above) and whether there should be additional surveys, perhaps more skillfully designed than this one. It might well be a good idea to undertake such further projects in the context of the Centennial with the aim of knowing ourselves better on our hundredth anniversary.

This questionnaire project was originally conceived in the AFS Committee on the State of the Profession. A number of persons provided useful in-put into the project at various stages, including Alan Jabbour, Peter Bartis, Annellen Archbold, James Leary, Sylvia Grider, Lynwood Montell, Charles Camp, Rosan A. Jordan, Charles Perdue, Bruce Jackson Katherine Paine, Marta Weigle, Rayna Green, and especially Susan Dwyer-Shick.
