This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

FOLK ART STUDY IN HIGHER EDUCATION
IN NORTH AMERICA

presented by

MARSHA LOUISE MacDOWELL

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Education

Peggy M. Riethmiller
Major professor

Date November 10,1982

FOLK ART STUDY IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

By

Marsha Louise MacDowell

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1982

ABSTRACT

FOLK ART STUDY IN HIGHER EDUCATION
IN NORTH AMERICA

By

Marsha Louise MacDowell

Public enthusiasm in America for folk art has in recent years become a national phenomenon. It was not, however, until the early part of the twentieth century that folk art was given much scholarly attention. As in any newly-emerging area of inquiry, the increasing scholarly interest in folk art has prompted the development of a wide assortment of approaches to the material. Since the actual body of knowledge about folk art, folk artists and folk art production and distribution in America is relatively small, though quickly expanding, there has been little integration of new knowledge into curriculum development and improvement in colleges and universities.

This examination of folk art study in higher education attempts to provide information that will assist in the integration of knowledge about folk art into curriculum development. While it is realized that much knowledge is transmitted outside the walls of academe, this study assumes that institutions of higher education perform a

critical and influential role in institutionalizing and propagating knowledge. On that premise, this examination of folk art study in higher education first traces the intellectual history of folk art interest both in general and academic spheres. Secondly, this study reports information gathered through a survey of contemporary folk art courses being offered in art history and folklore degree programs at institutions of higher education. This survey solicited information on course structure and history; course instructors' backgrounds; ways in which courses fit into departmental structures; and institutions which listed the courses.

Among the findings of this two-part survey were the following:

1. Folk art as a field of study is a relatively new phenomenon in higher education in the United States.

2. Folk art study has not been based on a unified theoretical base, but there exists a recent trend toward interdisciplinary emphasis.

3. Studies of folk art have historically been published primarily in art history or antiques-oriented publications, but are not usually primary source materials for students.

4. Most folk art courses are located in folklore or American studies departments or programs or interdisciplinary programs.

5. Most courses in folk art are taught by instructors who have minimal or no training in art history.

6. The term "folk art" has been and continues to be an inherent problem in the development of folk art study.

These observations of both historical and current trends may offer important clues to those who are not only presently teaching courses in folk art but also to those who intend to initiate new courses. Perhaps by reviewing the historical summary and the results of the contemporary survey, shapers of folk art theory and pedagogy might gain insights to forge new directions for the study of folk art.

"Please remember when you get
inside the gates you are part
of the show."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with deep appreciation that I thank the members of my doctoral committee for their guidance in the preparation and review of this study. Nan Stackhouse, Keith Anderson, Richard Featherstone and Peggy Reithmiller all lent considerable support to the development of this dissertation. In addition, I would like to acknowledge the generosity of time and ideas which have been given by my colleagues who study folk art. Without their stimulating ideas and reflective discourse, I would not have been able to develop the historical overview of folk art study or confirm the need for the contemporary survey. Lastly, I wish to acknowledge the everpresent counsel and support of my colleague and husband, C. Kurt Dewhurst. Without his critical insight and analysis of both the past history and developing present state of folk art study, this dissertation could not in theory have been written. And without his patience and personal support on the home front, this dissertation could not in reality have been written. For that, I am grateful.

PREFACE

In the summer of 1963 when I was thirteen years old, my parents planned the family's yearly travel and camping trip around the Pennsylvania Dutch Festival in Kutztown, Pennsylvania. Already in its fourteenth year, this annual week-long festival was a wonderful showcase of the traditional life of this region. Shows on Plain Dutch garb and snake lore, programs on everything from Dutch funeral customs to hunting and fishing lore, hoedown and jigging demonstrations, displays of handcrafts, an exhibition of quilts and stands serving such food specialties as "shoo-fly pie" and funnel cakes provided a smorgasboard of lasting taste and visual impressions for my whole family. In the following years the visit was relived in our family many times over through photographs, stories and recollections. I kept in a box with other important "treasures" of my life, the festival souvenir program which had been published as an insert to an issue of Pennsylvania Folklife, the Pennsylvania Folklife Society's quarterly publication. Whether it was prophetic or simply fortuitous may now be debated, but that 1963 issue I so carefully saved carried one of the first published chronicles of the folklife studies movement. This article, authored by Don Yoder, has

continued to be cited by folklorists as one of the landmark writings on the inclusion of folk arts in the field of study of American folklore.[1]

While it may be construed that the festival and that article instigated a budding interest in folk arts, it would be more correct to observe that it simply reinforced an already developing interest in the subject. As a child I had already participated in learning folk art skills through traditional avenues. My mother and my grandmother had taught me about various kinds of art, especially needle-work arts. Alice "Baba" Lane, my great-grandmother, was an avid quilter and from her I learned firsthand not only the techniques but the love of quilting as a creative activity. From my father and his father, a pattern-maker for the Grand Ledge [Michigan] Chair Company, I learned about an appreciation for wood and the hand-made object. From all of them, especially my father's mother who gave me many of her treasures, I learned to care about the family artifacts and skills handed down from other generations.

Perhaps one might also remark on the fact that I was born in a pivotal year for the attention given to folk art by two of the academic disciplines studied here. The publication in 1950 of a special issue of The Magazine Antiques provided the first public forum in print for art historians to express their views on American folk arts. This was also the year in which the Indiana University Folklore Department hosted the first national academic conference to

address the notion of folklife (of which folk arts were considered a part).

Whatever the signs indicated, the interest in folk arts continued to develop throughout high school. By the time of undergraduate and graduate work, this interest gained additional support by a husband who shared the same professional interests. Together we began to embark on a personal course of study that eventually led to the founding of a Michigan folk art archives, folk art exhibitions and numerous jointly-authored publications.

Then in November of 1977 we were invited to participate in a three-day conference of American folk art to be held at the Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum in Delaware in conjunction with a major exhibition of folk art. The catalogue for the exhibit, entitled Beyond Necessity: Art in the Folk Tradition, was written by Kenneth L. Ames, an adjunct associate professor of art history at the University of Delaware. Published in September and read by most conferees before they arrived at the conference in November, this essay sent shock waves through the world of folk art and established a challenging tone for the conference. The conferees came "ready to take up" the challenge Ames had made to so many assumptions about how folk art had been collected, exhibited and analyzed. Many came prepared for and in fact witnessed a shoot-out. Collectors, dealers, and art historians took sides against the folklorists and anthropologists. Emotions ran high, generalizations ran

rampant, intellectual interchange sparkled. In short, it was a conference atmosphere electrically charged with opinions and ideas.[2] The 1977 Winterthur conference on folk arts continues to be used as an intellectual historical reference point by participants, conferees and the folk art world in general.

Viewers of the Pan-American Exposition of 1901 were once advised in a Short Sermon for Sightseers: "Please remember when you get inside the gates you are a part of the show."[3] As a scholar participating in the study of folk art and as a participant-witness of that 1977 conference, I am aware that I too am now a part of the show. Thus, as a part of that show, I have embarked on this historical and contemporary investigation of how folk art study has evolved in higher education in America.

Preface Footnotes

[1]Don Yoder, "The Folklife Studies Movement," Pennsylvania Folklife, Vol. 13, No. 3 (July 1963), pp. 43-56.

[2]For a description of this occasion, refer to Ralph Rinzler, "Folklore and Folk Art: The Origins of Two Movements," The 26th Annual Washington Antiques Show (Washington, D.C.: The Thrift Shop, 1981), pp. 37-39 and J. Garrison Spratling, "Winterthur Holds Conference on American Folk Art," Maine Antique Digest (Jan./Feb. 1978), pp. 12A-13A.

[3]Sophia A. Walker, "An Art Impression of the Exposition," Independent, 53, 2746 (July 18, 1901), 1678. Cited in Neil Harris, "Museums, Merchandising and Popular Taste: The Struggle for Influence," in Ian M. Quimby, Material Culture and the Study of American Life (New York: W. W. Norton, 1978), p. 144.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

INTRODUCTION

The study of folk art has been derived primarily from other fields which are tangential to it: art history, the study of antiques and folklore. When the Wintherthur conference convened in 1977, these three fields of interest essentially constituted the three ideological camps at odds with each other. Each claimed folk art as its own territory for study and each field adamantly promoted its methodology and philosophy for that study. As a participant/witness to this free-for-all and as a scholar who had already developed a methodology for study that incorporated various tools of both the disciplines of art history and folklore, I found that this emotionally and publicly expressed difference was of great curiosity. How had these proponents of the respective disciplines developed their ideologies? Where had they learned one viewpoint or another? On what readings or experiences were their stances founded? Who had taught them? In short, how had they learned about folk art?

This examination of folk art study in higher education attempts to provide information that will begin to address those questions. While it is realized that much knowledge is transmitted outside the walls of academe, this study

assumes that institutions of higher education perform a critical and influential role in endorsing, institutionalizing and propagating knowledge. On that premise, this examination of folk art study in America will trace the intellectual history of folk art interest both in general and in academic spheres. Then the results of a survey of folk art courses currently being offered in higher education will be reported.

Thus, Chapter I will provide an overview of the rise of the "folk art phenomenon," to establish a framework on which the following chapters will be based. Chapter II will offer a general historical perspective to the growth of academic interest in folk art, as well as a look at the growth of two of the disciplines (art history and folklore) which have embraced folk art most enthusiastically. It is assumed that these first two chapters will give the reader sufficient background to understand the basis for the survey of contemporary folk art study courses.

Chapters III and IV will outline the proposal for the study, describe the actual administration of the study and report the accumulated data. Lastly, in Chapter V, conclusions will be based on the survey results and the historical development of folk art study. It is hoped that both the data and the conclusions drawn from them will provide important information on which the future study of folk art will be based.

NOTE: The terms folk art and folk arts will be used throughout this study. The plural term folk arts has generally been used to describe either a variety of performing and visual arts or to describe a variety of visual arts. The singular term folk art generally refers to material culture or visual art. Neither term has been used consistently in the evolution of folk art study in America. However, in this investigation, the term folk art will refer to material culture or non-performing arts.

CHAPTER I

THE FOLK ART PHENOMENON

Public enthusiasm for folk art has in recent years become a national phenomenon. Trend-setting department stores are mounting national advertising campaigns centered on the theme of the "country" look. Bloomingdale's, a fashion-conscious store in New York City, recently conducted a merchandising thrust focussed on Kentucky's Appalachian crafts and craftsmen. With Kentucky's First Lady and former Miss America, Phyllis George Brown, helping to coordinate the event, Kentucky folk arts were placed solidly in the national media spotlight. Shrewd Madison Avenue advertising agencies have jumped on the folk arts bandwagon and have utilized American folk arts as backdrops for marketing new products. Thus, if one views the array of popular periodicals for sale at any magazine stand he or she will be exposed to countless photographic images of quilts, weathervanes and decoys. Inside such popular magazines as Better Homes and Gardens, McCalls and Family Circle, one will find numerous articles on how to decorate with folk art, how to make folk art and how to collect folk art. Indeed, entirely new serial publications have been devoted to American folk arts. The fashion and advertising

industry have so popularized the products collectively described as folk arts that American folk arts as a whole and folk art motifs in particular are being reproduced on bed sheets, tablecloths and wallpapers.

In the introduction to Beyond Necessity: Art in the Folk Tradition, Kenneth Ames states that,

> It is clear that the folk art phenomenon corresponds to important social and artistic changes in the last two centuries and that from historical, sociological, and psychological points of view, the movement and its rhetoric are every bit as interesting as the objects themselves. The fascination with folk art may be linked to the general shift in values in the western world since the eighteenth century. Because the age of absolute monarchs and inherited titles has given way to the age of the common man, it seems appropriate to devote attention to objects that were part of the daily life of the many rather than the few. It makes sense to provide people in the twentieth century with a more balanced view of the artifactual world of the past. Today's reverence for egalitarianism and democracy calls for an unprejudiced look at artifacts from the past to give the inarticulate majority and other unsung and uncelebrated people an honest and unbiased hearing.[1]

Ames' call "for an unprejudiced look at artifacts from the past" heralds the need for more comprehensive and systematic scholarly inquiry. Certainly the folk art phenomenon in America is about us, as both scholars and the media are quick to acknowledge. Yet in order to understand how folk arts are studied in higher education, it will be helpful to understand what Ames referred to as "the movement and its rhetoric."

The European Interest in Folk Arts

It was not until the early part of the twentieth century that much scholarly attention was paid to American folk art. European interest in their native folk arts had evolved much earlier and provided a background from which American interest was eventually sparked.[2]

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, a wave of nationalistic feeling spread through northern Europe and began to spawn both romantic and scholarly appraisals of local culture. Henri Focillon, a French art historian, suggested that this appraisal was, in part, due to the fact that,

> In certain regions of Europe, wars and their consequences augmented the value of folk arts in their role as historical witness. As they prolonged the poetic and political thrust of Romanticism, folk arts became a public institution . . . The taste for folk arts and their processes of manufacture were propagated at the level of primary education, thereby assuring their force in the more profound depths of national sentiment . . . In nations where the peasant element dominated and charmingly preserved old-time talents, sophisticated spirits judged that it was possible by calling to mind indigenous habits and handicrafts, to profitably compete with the banal, interchangeable products of mass production, and thus, by wedding folk art to the business life of the nation, to save their most precious cultural heritage.[3]

The late-nineteenth century European nationalistic and Romantic tendencies fostered the organization of collections and displays of local traditional arts. In numerous towns, special exhibitions were formulated to display the products of local art and industry, several of which led to the

establishment of museums for the decorative and folk arts collections.[4]

Perhaps the most influential force in the continued development of the collection and study of European folk arts was Artur Hazelius of Sweden. Hazelius initially mounted an innovative exhibition of folk arts at the 1878 World's Fair in Paris. Upon seeing this exhibition, Bernard Olson, who later founded the Danish Folk Museum stated that it,

> . . . clearly sets itself apart from the rest of the exhibition with its amassed industrial wonders and trifles, manufactured for the occasion and worthless afterwards. Here was something new--the emergence of a fresh museum concept associated with a class, the life and activities of which had hitherto been disregarded by the traditional and official view of what was significant to scholarship and culture.[5]

Hazelius' innovative approach eventually led to the establishment of the Nordiska Museum and Skansen. The Nordiska Museum houses Scandinavia's largest library of cultural history, which is a vast repository of folk cultural materials and houses the folklife research center operated in conjunction with the University of Stockholm. Skansen, an open-air museum planned by Hazelius to be a "place where the lives of everyday people could be presented in a living way," consists of over 140 buildings that have been moved from sites all over Scandinavia. Both the Nordiska Museum and Skansen provided the model for other nations and smaller community-oriented efforts in museum development.

In the United States, museums ranging in size from the large Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan, or the complex of buildings at Colonial Williamsburg, Virginia, to the small regional outdoor museums at the Iron County Museum and Historical Society in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan have been founded on the guiding principles that originated with Hazelius and that were pioneered at the Nordiska and Skansen.[6]

Modern European artists also played an important role in the rise of interest in folk arts. In 1938, Robert Goldwater published the first scholarly study of the inter-relationship between primitive and modern art. In his ground-breaking book, Primitivism in Modern Art, Goldwater chronicled the development of ethnological museums which had provided artists with an accessibility to ethnic and tribal arts; the identification of Paul Gauguin as a leader in the primitivism movement; the Brücke's and Fauves' links to aboriginal art; the Blaue Reiter artists' emulation of children's and Bavarian folk arts; and the influence of African sculpture on such "intellectual" artists as Picasso.[7] Goldwater outlined the series of historical contacts that European modern artists had had with primitive arts, beginning with Vincent Van Gogh and Gauguin's visit to the Paris Exposition of 1889 where the architecture and sculpture of primitive people were on display. Of special interest was his description of the folk-art-collecting activities of various modern artists. As Goldwater pointed

out, these activities not only had direct influences on the artists' work but also most likely set a model for American modern artists to follow. While Goldwater provided a very careful description and analysis of the influence of primitive arts on modern artists, he was quick to point out that,

> . . . although modern artists admired primitive art they neither copied it nor, despite what they themselves sometimes thought, ever really had the same ends in view . . . [and that] however much or little primitive art has been a source for modern art, the two have almost nothing in common.[8]

The American Interest in Folk Arts

Before this examination of folk art study in America proceeds further, it will be necessary to briefly outline the development of American interest in the subject. The rise of an awareness of and interest in folk art by both a popular and academic audience provides some illuminating clues for the analysis of American folk art study in higher education. Several distinct influences which contributed to this growth of interest will be examined here.

Until the first quarter of the twentieth century, it would be safe to say that neither popular nor scholarly interest in traditional folk arts existed on a wide scale in this country. A folk arts tradition persisted, indeed even flourished, but simply as an integral part of everyday life not as a dominating art trend. And, it was definitely not a popular aspect of culture to be observed, studied and recorded. Information about the processes of folk art was

generally transmitted orally, bound to a localized area and tied to an apprentice-craftsman tradition. Knowledge about folk art was very rarely institutionalized and therefore remained totally out of the formal cultural or educational systems.

The Jacksonian Era

However, there were some cultural developments in the nineteenth century which set the stage for the acceleration of interest that began in the 1920s and has persisted through present times. When Andrew Jackson was elected president in 1828, it marked the first time a "man of the people" had risen to that high governmental office. An age of democracy had been ushered in with him--an age that called for egalitarianism throughout all cultural/political systems. The Jacksonian movement implied an idealistic recognition of the common man and constituted an attack on privilage at any level. Here, in principle, lay the philosophical charter for the study of folk art in the United States. Yet, though the Jacksonian movement fostered a democratic notion of equality for all, an idea that extended to education and who should be taught, it did not encourage an expanded notion of <u>what</u> should be taught. Curriculum remained essentially classical in nature and, despite the early reform movements, changed very little in speaking directly to the needs or knowledge of the common man.

The Growth of Museum Collections

While Jackson was espousing his egalitarianism, others were concerned that the American citizenry be educated in knowledge and taste. Study societies sprang up, libraries were established and the whole period was marked by a tremendous growth in the founding of colleges and universities. In this same period a group of high-minded zealots, whom the social critic Russel Lynes in The Tastemakers labelled "art missionaries," began to promote the establishment of an American national gallery of art. They believed that this would "provide a touchstone for taste, and that such an educational and cultural institution would be a stabilizing influence in the world of the fine arts."[9] In America art museums were generally established to be the custodians of treasures and to educate the public taste. These comments made at one American museum's dedication in 1880 underscored the educational thrust of museums: "that the diffusion of a knowledge of art in its higher forms of beauty would tend directly to humanize, to educate and refine a practical and laborious people."[10] The elevation of popular taste and the nation's morals continued to be a major purpose in the formation of museums for many years and, even today, that educational premise guides the operational philosophy of some museums. The notion that the museum is both a guardian of and guide to cultural taste placed the museum in a potentially powerful position for institutionalizing social biases. "The idea that museums

might be agencies not simply of cultural history but of cultural indoctrination . . . was lost on the [social] reformers of the [nineteen] sixties."[11]

The Influence of Private Collectors

Russel Lynes has written much about James Jackson Jarves, who had assembled what is today regarded as one of the great collections of Italian primitive paintings outside Italy. He described Jarves' unsuccessful attempt to persuade various American institutions to purchase his remarkable collection of art in the 1860s. Lynes' comments on this historical failure to attract a buyer have implications for the way in which American folk art has been treated by museums and the public:

> In retrospect it is easy to say that the public taste was not yet ready for primitives, but in justice to Jarves' contemporaries it must be added that the public taste is never ready for primitives. They become acceptable and palatable only when they have been enshrined in the fastnesses of museums or have become a part of daily life, as they do when they remain in the churches and monasteries for which they were originally intended.[12]

Jarves' enthusiasm for primitive paintings was not altogether lost on the American audience for his persistence in bringing art to the public affected many museum curators. By bringing those paintings to the attention of museum curators Jarves helped to lay the foundation for future acceptance of folk and primitive art in museum collections.

Nineteenth-Century Technological and Societal Changes in America

By the latter part of the nineteenth century, several changes had occurred in the United States that would ultimately affect both production of and knowledge about folk arts: (1) the rise of the industrial revolution, (2) the development of complex communication systems, (3) the improvement of transportation and the westward migration, and (4) the influx of great numbers of ethnic groups. Separately and together these societal and technological changes in America affected how folk art processes were learned, what kind of folk art was produced, what quantities of folk art forms were created and where types of folk art were created.

The industrial revolution had both positive and adverse effects on folk art production. On one hand, it mechanized some of the techniques and processes that were associated with hand-made items, forcing the production of those items to be transferred from home to factory where they were more easily produced. The mass-produced items were cheaper, more standardized and more plentiful. It also encouraged the training of a labor force skilled in processes such as bookbinding, engraving and blacksmithing--crafts which had previously been oriented to small-scale production. Though it has often been commented that the Industrial Revolution heralded the close of the folk arts era, it merely caused shifts in the types and means of folk art production.

The development of complex communication systems enabled information about traditional, localized folk art forms to be distributed over a wide geographical area. The publication of "how-to" booklets and the circulation of ladies' magazines increased the possibility that a person could learn about a folk art process in a non-oral, non-traditional manner. The ladies' magazines were an especially effective means of popularizing folk forms since many of them carried columns explaining old-time techniques. (It is interesting that, to this day, women's magazines have continued to carry feature articles on craft revivals.) This distribution of information on folk art processes established a framework in which a very significant change could occur in the way folk art skills were learned. Instead of having to rely solely on the traditional method of gaining skill in a folk art process (through oral transmission or behavioral observation of processes) an individual could simply read about a technique or folk art skill.

The improvement of transportation systems and the westward migration of citizens also contributed to a wider awareness of what were once localized traditional forms. Folk art forms that may have been known or practiced in only one community had a far greater chance of becoming known in other parts of the country. As individuals followed the migratory routes toward resettlement they brought with them their regional traditions. By tracing the

geographical spread of folk art forms, scholars of American culture have been able to better understand the influences on and changes within American society.

Lastly, the latter part of the nineteenth century saw an incredible flood of immigrants to this country. Each wave of ethnic groups arriving at Ellis Island brought with it a new set of folk traditions of language, dress, food, religion and arts. Though some of their traditions were quickly blended into the American experience, the immigrants did not entirely give up their Old World ways. Some of their customs were popularly accepted by the Americans, other traditions formed the basis for American ethnic subcultural identities--identities that would persist and eventually resurface in the 1970s.

American Artists, Dealers and Museum Curators

By the 1920s a popular interest in American folk art in this country was beginning to develop and the source of that interest can be traced to a small group of artists, art dealers and museum curators in New York City. Beatrix T. Rumford, in an illuminating essay entitled, "Uncommon Art of the Common People: A Review of Trends in the Collecting and Exhibiting of American Folk Art," chronicles a series of events which played perhaps the pivotal role in establishing folk art as a popular phenomenon. Rumford noted that in the summer of 1913 Hamilton Easter Field established the Ogunquit School of Painting and Sculpture

at Ogunquit, Maine. The modernist artists used the colony's fishing shacks as summer studios and decorated them with "decoys, weathervanes, homemade rugs and unsophisticated paintings which Field, who enjoyed hunting antiques, had purchased cheaply at local auctions or junk shops."[13] Some of these artists so admired those decorations that they and other New York artists began to collect folk art for themselves.

This interest of modernist artists in primitive or folk arts has been the subject of much speculation. It has already been pointed out that European modernists such as Picasso and Gauguin had already embraced African and Oceanic art forms. Daniel Robbins, an art historian, has suggested that there were several reasons why the works of individual artists such as Rousseau, the art of tribal peoples and American folk art were so influential in the early part of this century. Among those reasons was the widespread notion that a similar approach to art existed among all primitive people. The honesty and simplicity of primitive art were especially appealing to modernists, who themselves were producing an art based on the ideas of "meaningful invention," sincerity of expression and communication of individual personality. With the acceptance of the idea of a universality of abstractions and manipulations of forms that seemed to characterize all primitive and folk art expression, modern artists found a justification for their own abstractions. This need of modern

artists to find a foundation, a raison d'être for their particular brand of art, was clearly stated by Robbins:

> One of the most interesting aspects of the acceptance of modern art in the United States is the very special place within it that was assumed by American folk art. This has to do with the internal collapse of what had, up until the arrival of modern art, been regarded as high art. In view of this sudden foundering of values, a need developed to discover a tradition out of which one might explain the emergent triumphs of a new high art: modernism. This was the role thrust upon folk art. It furnished, almost overnight, an unbroken American tradition with a clear relationship to what was being done by leading American artists in the early thirties.[14]

In a similar exploration, Alice Winchester came right to the point when she stated that "the cult of American folk art did not exist until the artists of the 1920s began seeking the roots of American art in early nonacademic work."[15]

In February of 1924, the first public gallery showing of folk art, entitled "Early American Art," was held at the Whitney Studio Club in New York City. The 45 items selected for this showing included paintings, a brass bootjack, carvings, and a plaster cat, some of which were loaned by artists from the Ogunquit Artist Colony. This assemblage of objects quickly created an interest in folk art among collectors, dealers and museum curators. One dealer, Isabel Carleton Wilde, began to advertise in Antiques that she was offering "American Primitives."[16] Appointed to the National Committee of the American Chapter of the International Commission on Folk Arts, Wilde became the first of

a series of dealers whose commitment to folk art and whose "influence on the field extended beyond sales activity."[17] Art and antique dealers have continued to play an influential role in the rising interest in folk art taking the lead in exhibiting, cataloguing and publishing information on folk arts. In fact, some of the first serious writing about American folk art appeared in the pages of such magazines on art and antiques as Art in America and The Magazine Antiques.

The close relationship between art dealers and some art museum curators contributed further to the growing interest in American folk art. Edith Halpert, owner of the Downtown Gallery in New York City, invited Holger Cahill, a staff member of the Newark (New Jersey) Museum, to spend the summer of 1926 with her and her painter-husband, Sam Halpert, in Ogunquit. Having been exposed to the folk art collections of the other artists at the colony, both Halpert and Cahill returned to New York with ideas to assemble exhibitions. In 1929, Halpert began to sell folk art along with the work of the Ogonquit artists. By September of 1931, she had established the American Folk Art Gallery under the auspices of the Downtown Gallery as "a kind of laboratory devoted altogether to American folk expression in the Fine Arts."[18] The establishment and success of Halpert's gallery provided a model that would eventually be followed by countless other arts and antiques dealers.

Holger Cahill came back to the New York area charged with the notion of organizing a museum-sponsored exhibition of folk paintings that would be accompanied by an informative catalogue. By November 1930, with assistance from Katherine Coffey and Elinor Robinson, Cahill had assembled 83 paintings and three sculptures for an exhibition that opened at the Newark Museum. The catalogue contained a short three-page essay by Cahill who described "American Primitives" as

> . . . the work of simple people with no academic training and little book learning in art . . . this kind of painting comes out of a tradition of craftmanship rather than out of an academic tradition passed on by schools, and in this sense it is similar to the tradition of the old masters.[19]

The catalogue entries actually were called "descriptive notes" and they merely contained subjective analyses of the design elements or impressionistic notes on the subject of each painting. The notes did not contain biographical or historical data on the works of art. Unfortunately, even though this landmark museum exhibit set a precedent for exhibiting folk art in a setting where elite cultural ideals are usually perpetuated, the catalogue itself became a model for many subsequent folk art catalogues produced for museum exhibits. In their tendency to treat folk art primarily as anonymous creations, writers of folk art catalogues continued for many years to perpetuate the attitude that these items were art works divorced from a historical

or social context. Writing in 1977 Kenneth Ames pointed out the continuation of this trend:

> In the majority of recent exhibitions, there has been little inclination to place objects in historical context. In fact, the opposite has been the case. Emphasis is usually on what is described as the artistic merit of individual pieces rather than on what are condescendingly called "their historical associations."[20]

While Ames disparaged the disassociation of objects from their contexts, his diatribe on the falsification of context by some writers on folk art was even more strongly put:

> Many of the authors freely hypothesize about the past, and their tendency to wrench objects from context makes it easy to avoid confronting the myths [as Ames has described assumptions related often to folk art] with data which might undermine them . . . Folk art enthusiasts have created a communal fantasy world that distorts the integrity of both the objects and the people originally associated with them.[21]

Ames has perhaps overstated and overgeneralized his description of the body of writing on American folk arts that began in the late 1920s and early 1930s, but it is obvious that since those first articles and museum catalogue essays were published, description, rather than analysis, of the material remained the rule for many years.

In the 1930s, Holger Cahill continued to remain a domineering force in bringing folk arts to the attention of the public. At the Newark Museum, the show of American primitive paintings was followed by an exhibition in 1931 of folk sculpture. In 1932, serving as acting director of the Museum of Modern Art in New York City, Cahill organized

another folk art exhibition entitled "American Folk Art, The Art of the Common Man." This exhibition created waves in the New York art scene and as Rumford noted it, "unquestionably, it established American folk art as an aspect of our art history that deserved to be recognized."[22]

At the same time that modernist artists were looking to folk arts as a validating link to their own work, American art critics and museum curators were also attempting to determine "the character of American artistic statement . . . which resulted in a concerted effort to discover indigenous aspects of American culture."[23] The designation of folk art at the Whitney exhibit as the early American art continued to be made by writers through the twenties and thirties, as folk art was enthusiastically collected and exhibited. As recently as 1961, in an introduction to an exhibit entitled "What is American in American Art?," Lloyd Goodrich, former director of the Whitney Museum of American Art, continued to uphold folk art as the American artistic forerunner of modern art. In a brief outline of the history of American art, Goodrich noted that even many of even our best artists were self-taught, due to the absence of art schools. "Hence early America had a larger proportion of folk art then Europe, and this remained true well into the 19th century. Created directly by innate talent out of local content, folk art contained the essence of native flavor on a popular level."[24]

Thus, the exhibitions at the Whitney Studio Club, Downtown Gallery, Newark Museum and Museum of Modern Art brought to popular and critical attention a body of work that began to be enthusiastically embraced not only for its stylistic connection to modern art forms but also for filling in a spot in American art history that previously had been mysteriously vacant. In the New York Sun, writer Henry McBride echoed these growing feelings:

> It is impossible to regard them [folk art objects] even casually as one is apt to do in museums, without a nostalgic yearning for the beautiful simple life that is no more . . . Artists who find themselves growing mannered or stale will always be able to renew their appetite for expression by returning to the example of those early pioneers, and for that reason it becomes necessary for our museums to take our own primitives as seriously as they already take those of Europe.[25]

Therefore, it is worth noting that when Holger Cahill assembled folk art objects together for exhibitions at the Newark Museum and the Museum of Modern Art, he was beginning the process of making folk art "acceptable and palatable." From the 1930s until today, countless museums and other cultural institutions have organized folk arts exhibitions which, whether reflecting or informing, continue to affect public taste and nurture the belief that folk art is "acceptable and palatable."

Governmental Sponsorship, The Depression, The "Back-to-Earth" Movement and The Bicentennial

Among the additional influences which have affected the collection and presentation of information on American

folk arts were the formation of a public archives on folk art, Depression-era studies and programs, the "back-to-earth" movements of the 1960s and 1970s and the American Bicentennial. These factors have not only contributed to the general popularity of folk arts but have also lent respectability and significance to the attention to folk art.

One of the most influential of these factors was the formation of the first public archive of information on American traditional arts. Under the Works Progress Administration of the 1930s, Holger Cahill directed The Index of American Design project, a national effort which attempted to record early arts and crafts in the United States. The project was conceived for a two-fold purpose: first, to provide employment for out-of-work artists and designers; and secondly, to provide a comprehensive source record of American design. State Index staffs were divided into groups of researchers who identified local materials to be documented and groups of artists who executed, generally in watercolor and presumably with strict objectivity, a faithful rendering of the material, color and texture of each selected and researched item. Now housed at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., the Index contains over 17,000 renderings of American decorative arts ranging from before 1700 to about 1900. These renderings have provided a ready source of documentary data for scholars and designers. Special exhibitions from the Index are

shown in the Gallery building and travelling exhibitions of original renderings are circulated across the nation, thereby serving an educational role in bringing information to a wide populace. Yet, perhaps the Index's greatest value lies in its educative potential as Constance Rourke, an integral member of the Index's national staff has suggested:

> Not the least of the revelations of the Index may be those offered to the student of American social history. Fresh light may be thrown upon ways of living which developed within the highly diversified communities of our many frontiers, and this may in turn give us new knowledge of the American mind and temperament. Finally, if the materials of the Index can be widely seen they should offer an education of the eye, particularly for young people, which may result in the development of taste and a genuine consciousness of our rich national inheritance.[26]

Thus, one might observe that the federal government had joined forces with the museum community in helping to educate taste and knowledge regarding folk arts.

During the Depression years, the recognition and production of native traditional arts also received a boost through government sponsorship of cottage industries. "Records show that there were under direct governmental control through the Works Progress Administration about three thousand handicraft projects."[27] The Farm Security Administration, the State Department of Education and the Extension Service all provided governmental leadership and support to home-based industries. Allen H. Eaton, who directed the [Russel Sage Foundation sponsored] seven-year study of handicrafts in the New England states, was

convinced that this governmental support had both tangible and intangible affects:

> Of all governmental efforts, state or federal, to promote handicrafts, it may be said that, valuable as many of them proved to be in concrete results, they were even more powerful as symbols of a great and new conviction in American life, the conviction that an economic depression need not rob our people of their skills of hand and mind.[28]

Eaton's study clearly demonstrated the vitality of traditional expression in American life and presented a case for further government support.

Of course in a very practical way, the Depression years also prompted a resurgence of interest in folk arts. Individuals attempted to produce items they could no longer afford to buy (for instance, quilts),[29] to create a few objects that could be sold to augment meager incomes, or simply to find a way of filling up their waking hours while they were out of income-producing jobs. The importance of keeping time, mind and hands occupied during periods of stress was plaintively stated by a 1930s craftsman: "Let me do something, anything, my hands have gone dead."[30]

The late sixties and early seventies brought another resurgence of interest in folk arts. The general disenchantment and disillusionment with "the establishment," expressed by a younger generation, extended to the institutional forms of art and the educational process of learning those art forms. Swept away with the back-to-nature movement, youth sought instruction and information on the

hand-made, the traditional folk techniques of construction. Non-elitist dress and hair styles were adopted. Some international folk traditions, such as Indian clothing, became symbols of the anti-establishment movement. Once again, this interest spawned countless "how-to" booklets (how to build a log cabin, how to macrame, how to bake bread, etc.). The emphasis on the natural, non-mechanized, non-polluted way of life encouraged an appreciation for the customs and traditions of a pre-industrial age.

In more recent times the occasion of the Bicentennial celebration of the signing of the Declaration of Independence prompted yet again a renewed interest in all that was American. As is the case of the artists and art critics of the 1920s enthusiastically adopting folk arts as a link between a contemporary America and an historic past, so did American citizens in the 1970s in general search for the origins of the American image. In the scurry to identify which unique aspects of American cultural history would be celebrated in 1976; exhibits, parades, pageants and publications, many citizens turned their attention to "the traditionally American customs of the colonial period." Unfortunately, this popular movement tended to whole-heartedly adopt the primarily Anglo-American customs of late eighteenth-century New England as typically American and tended to neglect the vast and rich folk resources of other regions and groups in this country. However, it was soon discovered that the Bicentennial-prompted investigation of

"the traditional American customs" on a local level yielded non-typically American, yet significantly regional cultural materials. The identification of pockets of regional traditions and material culture prompted further research and analysis which encouraged a rise in a sense of regional identity. Once again, folk arts were being researched, collected and exhibited with a vigor. The hand-made items of this country's pioneer forefathers were providing visible evidence of this nation's creativity, ingenuity and resourcefulness. It is also worth noting that Elinor Horwitz in a recent publication entitled The Bird, The Banner and Uncle Sam stated that:

> At times of national commemoration folk and popular art based on patriotic imagery appears in great quantity . . . Some of it folk art of considerable charm inspired by heartfelt patriotism, and a good bit of it tasteless kitsch manufactured in a totally unharnessed commercial spirit.[31]

Thus, in a cyclical manner did the commemorative objects of the 1876 celebration crop up in folk arts exhibitions of 1976 and most probably will objects from both celebrations be part of future commemorative events.

In the post-Bicentennial years the analysis of the various ethnic cultural histories and the American experience has continued to be undertaken. An era has finally arrived in which the cultural contributions of those waves of nineteenth-century immigrants can be more openly examined and celebrated. In conjunction with the rise of regional identity there has began to emerge a sense of an

American-ethnic identity. The United States is now more than ever considered a culturally pluralistic nation--no longer a total melting pot, but a conglomeration of cultural subgroups. Each of these cultural subgroups, whether Native American, Vietnamese, southern white, urban black, Midwest farmer or any of the multitude of ethnic or regional groups, has its own set of traditions and customs which contribute to the sum total of the American experience. Now, instead of an attempt to find what are typically American folk expressions, the door has been opened to search out, record and celebrate the folk art traditions of each group --a series of traditions that together form the set of American folk traditions.

Summary of Chapter

What has been acknowledged here then is the tremendous but relatively recent growth in both scholarly and public sector interest in American folk art. Folk art has not only been the subject of numerous exhibitions, the feature of countless popular and how-to articles but has also become the focus for serious scholarly inquiry and theory. However, the focus for American academic interest has been rather slow to develop, in spite of the wide popular appeal of folk art. Daniel Robbins pointed out in Folk Sculpture: USA that though the appreciation of American folk art has grown considerably, it has been relatively untouched by

both

why

Kenn

moti

asse

web

of t

for

more

prod

as a

hist

revi

can

high

both traditional and new scholarship. He cites two reasons why he things this has occurred:

> . . . the first is the continued attractiveness of the democratic notion that simple and untutored Folk can create work that rivals in value the selfconscious production of highly trained and sophisticated artists, the second is the still-growing power of the idea that an interested society can stamp its own artistic values upon almost any kind of object, that each man who approaches life as an artist will find art.[32]

Kenneth Ames further substantiated the popular but misguided notions that have characterized writings on folk art. He asserted that, "Folk art rhetoric rests upon an interwoven web of assumptions which are implicit or explicit in much of the writing on the subject, particularly that intended for a general audience."[33] Both scholars have advocated more scholarship that focuses on the study of folk art, its producers and its processes.

In the following chapter, the development of folk art as a field for academic investigation will be outlined. An historiography of folk art study will be developed by reviewing the gradual incorporation of the study of American material culture and the study of folk art into formal higher education curricula.

Chapter I Footnotes

[1]Kenneth L. Ames, Beyond Necessity: Art in the Folk Tradition (Winterthur, Del.: The Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum, 1977), pp. 11-12.

[2]For an excellent overview of this interest refer to Guiseppe Cocchiara, "Folk Art," in Massimo Pallottino, Editor-in-Chief, The Encyclopedia of World Art, Vol. 5 (New York, Toronto and London: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963), pp. 452-506.

[3]M. Henri Focillon, "Introduction" to Art Populaire (the English translation) in Robert F. Trent's Hearts and Crowns (New Haven, Conn.: New Haven Colony Historical Society, 1977), p. 16.

[4]C. Kurt Dewhurst and Marsha MacDowell, "Folk Arts in Sweden: Focus on Nordiska Museum and Skansen Open-Air Museum/Stockholm," The Clarion (1979), pp. 46-49.

[5]Ibid., p. 46

[6]C. Kurt Dewhurst and Marsha MacDowell, "Popular Culture and the European Folk Museum," in Fred E. H. Schroeder, ed., Twentieth-Century Popular Culture in Museums and Libraries (Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1981), p. 109.

[7]Robert Goldwater, Primitivism in Modern Art, rev. ed. (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), p. xxii.

[8]Goldwater, Primitivism in Modern Art, pp. xvi and xvii.

[9]Russell Lynes, The Tastemakers (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1954), p. 37.

[10]Barbara Y. Newsom and Adele Z. Silver, eds., The Art Museum as Educator (Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1978), p. 13.

[11]Newsom and Silver, The Art Museum as Educator, p. 16.

[12]Lynes, The Tastemakers, p. 60.

[13]Beatrix T. Rumford, "Uncommon Art of the Common People: A Review of Trends in the Collecting and Exhibiting of American Folk Art," in Ian M. G. Quimby and Scott Swank, eds., Perspectives on American Folk Art (New York: W. W. Norton, 1980), p. 15.

[14]Daniel Robbins, "Folk Sculpture without Folk," in Herbert W. Hemphill, Jr., ed., Folk Sculpture: USA (Brooklyn, New York: The Brooklyn Museum, 1976), p. 19.

[15]Alice Winchester, "Introduction," in Jean Lipman and Alice Winchester, eds., The Flowering of American Folk Art, 1776-1976 (New York: The Viking Press in cooperation with The Whitney Museum of American Art, 1974), p. 10.

[16]Rumford, "Uncommon Art of the Common People," in Perspectives on American Folk Art, p. 21.

[17]Ibid., p. 22.

1

Sculpt

1

tives

2

2

2

Persp

Jean

(New

Whitn

In Ar

p. 13

Pers

to C

(New

Bona

See

Art

E. F

[18]Robbins, "Folk Sculpture without Folk," in Folk Sculpture: USA, p. 11.

[19]Holger Cahill, "Introduction," in American Primitives (Newark, New Jersey: Newark Museum, 1930), p. 7.

[20]Ames, Beyond Necessity, p. 19.

[21]Ibid., p. 21.

[22]Rumford, "Uncommon Art of the Common People," in Perspectives on American Folk Art, p. 36.

[23]Thomas Armstrong, "Preface," in Thomas Armstrong and Jean Lipman, eds., American Folk Painters of Three Centuries (New York: Hudson Hill Press, Inc. in cooperation with the Whitney Museum of American Art, 1980), p. 8.

[24]Lloyd Goodrich, "Introduction," in What is American in American Art (New York: M. Knoedler and Company, 1971), p. 13.

[25]Rumford, "Uncommon Art of the Common People," in Perspectives on American Folk Art, p. 36.

[26]Constance Rourke in Holger Cahill, "Introduction," to Clarence P. Hornung, Treasury of American Design, Vol. 1 (New York: Henry Abrams, Inc., 1950), p. xxvii.

[27]Allen H. Eaton, Handicrafts of New England (New York: Bonanza Books, 1969), p. 326.

[28]Ibid., p 328.

[29]For a discussion of quilts in the Depression years see C. Kurt Dewhurst, Betty MacDowell and Marsha MacDowell, Artists in Aprons: Folk Art of American Women (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1979), pp. 128-129.

[30]Eaton, Handicrafts, p. 328.

[31]Elinor Lander Horwitz, The Bird, The Banner and Uncle Sam: Images of America in Folk and Popular Art (Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1976), p. 19.

[32]Robbins, "Folk Sculpture without Folk," Folk Sculpture: USA, p. 14.

[33]Ames, Beyond Necessity, p. 21.

I

inves

variou

Henri

ledge

to Ar

Intern

I

Intel

Commi

inten

of fo

of wi

and a

Recog

CHAPTER II

FOLK ART AND SCHOLARLY INTEREST: AN HISTORICAL LOOK

That the subject of folk art as a field for scholarly investigation has only recently attracted the attention of various academic disciplines was perhaps first noted by M. Henri Focillon, a Professor at the Sorbonne. He acknowledged an academic neglect of folk art in his introduction to Art Populaire, a collection of papers given at the First International Congress of Folk Art held in 1931 in Prague:

> The vast domain of folk art long remained unknown to historians, intellectuals and connoisseurs. One might say that until the end of the Age of Reason, folk art belonged to the category of secret treasures, as did the the arts of the Middle Ages and those of the Orient.[1]

Proposed by the League of Nation's Commission for Intellectual Cooperation under the initiative of the Sub-Committee for Literature and the Arts, this Congress was intended to lay the groundwork for a methodological study of folk art and that it might provide "interesting exchanges of view on the ties which unite the national forms of life and action found among its member-states."[2]

Even though the published papers from that Congress recognized a growing contemporary scholarly concern with

the subject of folk art, they did little to foster a surge of growth in the number of courses on folk art being offered at American universities.

This observation of the lack of scholarly attention to folk art has continued to be a reoccurring one among those who have turned their analytic attention to the body of materials labelled folk art. As recently as 1977, Robert F. Trent stated rather pointedly that: "An important segment of the art historical and historical community still does not recognize folk art as an aesthetically and culturally significant phenomenon."[3] And Kenneth Ames noted at the 1977 Winterthur Conference that "Folk art study, as it is currently practiced, is largely a twentieth-century phenomenon."[4] Even though fifty years had passed since Focillon's address to the congress in Prague, the call for more scholarly recognition of folk art was continuing to be raised.

Part of the slowness of scholarly attention to folk art in America can be attributed in part to the relatively recent interest in material culture studies and American Studies. Material culture, as defined by Melville Herskovits, a cultural anthropologist, consists of "the totality of artifacts in a culture, with the vast universe of objects used by humankind to cope with the physical world, to facilitate social intercourse, to delight our fancy, and to create symbols of meaning."[5] More simply put, material culture refers to the tangible rather than the

int
ref
his

Dee
als
wor
hav
tar
sch
fie
shi
pol

mate
eit
exp
Mat
Swee

intangible world of man. In its broadest sense, it may refer to items as diverse as these that James Deetz, an historical archaeologist, has suggested:

> Siberian fish hooks, office buildings, banjos, Freaky cereal and the little band of Freakies which dwell in the box, the box, standing rib roast, apple pies, jumbo jets, step ladders, Venus figurines, and a number of other objects too numerous to mention here.[6]

Deetz further suggested that material culture study should also consider the ways in which man modifies the animate world according to a set of cultural plans. Thus he would have scholars studying the way in which man cuts a privet, tattoes a bicep, how a person kneels to pray or how a high school band develops its configurations on the football field at half time. Deetz suggested inverting the relationships between material culture, archaeology and anthropology and placing material culture in the forefront:

> This new order would hold the study of material culture to be the proper study of man. Its subdisciplines would include ethnography, ethnology and archaeology. Anthropology departments would be material culture departments, and as we expand and define our jargon, we may soon be asking, "Is the study of material culture a science?"[7]

Despite such advocacy for the importance of studying material culture, the use of the tangible in our world as either primary or supplementary data has yet to be fully explored by contemporary scholars. In the introduction to Material Culture and the Study of American Life, John A. H. Sweeney pointed out that:

> Material culture does not exist as a separate academic discipline. It is an umbrella under which many disciplines coexist for the common purpose of identifying and interpreting man-made objects. The study of material culture may be undertaken by the historian, the art historian, the anthropologist, the archaeologist, any or all of whom may use the research techniques of the social sciences. Museums contribute to the study of material culture by collecting, preserving, exhibiting and interpreting materials deemed worthy of effort. These are the practitioners of material culture.[8]

The "practitioners of material culture" are, however, quite in the minority among scholars in American Studies, even with the advent of what is now referred to as the "new history." Thomas Schlereth has suggested that this "new history":

> . . . puts principal emphasis on learning as intellectual inquiry rather than rote memorization; seeks to involve students in the process of first-hand research investigations using primary sources; and attempts to recognize that much historical evidence, knowledge and understanding exists outside the traditional history classroom.[9]

Since most of the material culture evidence available for study lies outside the classroom, scholars rarely come in contact with it as an identifiable source of research data.

Then too, the cultural history of the United States has not until recently been a major area of study for either educational institutions or the general public. The prevailing attitude for many years within academic spheres was that the cultural accomplishments of Americans was of secondary importance to those in Europe. Perhaps the first movement toward the development of an interest in American

Stu
the
in
era
and
Jac
to
onl

son
Ger
not
to
inte
anc
phil
ing.
that
a pr
thro
"al
coll
What
Amer
Euro
bega

Studies came in 1828 with the election of Andrew Jackson to the American presidency. At that time higher education was in the throes of an accelerated expansion. The Jacksonian era placed an emphasis on the recognition of the common man and called for an egalitarianistic approach to education. Jackson himself spoke out against the use of public money to support a system of higher education that would serve only an elite society.

Coinciding with the Jacksonian era was a movement among some of the leaders of higher education to embrace the Germanic notion of a university. As Frederick Rudolph noted in The American College and University, there began to exist, "a recognition and nuturance of new professional interests that did not draw their inspiration from the ancient learning."[10] In 1916, John Dewey, the educational philosopher, defined his prerequisites of thought and learning. His belief that there must first be an experience that interests the student which would then be followed by a problem developed out of that experience sent shock waves through the halls of academe. Rudolph pointed out that "almost as if licensed by this 1916 statement of Dewey's, colleges and universities now created programs of study in what was called American Civilization, American Studies, or American Culture."[11] A shift from a preoccupation with European studies to an interest in American Studies had began to take effect.

A recognition that American folk art, an aspect of material culture made in America, has developed into a focus for popular and scholarly interest has provided the basis for this dissertation study. Individuals are now studying folk art and courses on folk art study are being offered in institutions of higher education. A description of the emergence of those courses within academic disciplines and an examination of contemporary course structures and content will comprise the remainder of this study.

Within the last fifty years, a number of courses on folk art have been developed and offered in seats of higher education in the United States. By examining the general historical development of the two major academic disciplines in which these folk art courses most logically and in reality have been offered--art history and folklore --some of the primary differences in their respective approaches to the same body of material will be illuminated. This general historical overview will particularly examine both the art history and folklore curriculum development in four-year degree-granting academic programs in an effort to understand the framework for the introduction of folk art courses in respective curricula. Major philosophical, social, political and methodological influences which contributed to the development of these disciplines of undergraduate and graduate study will be noted. Key individuals and influential writing will be cited in the presentation of this historical overview.

Lastly this study will also focus on the specific development of folk art study courses within the two disciplines of art history and folklore.

The Folklore Discipline and the Study of Folk Art

Although courses on the study of folk art seem today to be predominately situated in folklore departments, an acceptance of the importance of the study of material aspects of traditional culture is a relatively recent phenomenon in the folklore field. Indeed, the article by Yoder published in my 1963 Kutztown Folk Festival souvenir book was one of the first attempts by an American folklorist to encourage research on material culture in the United States. In that article he suggested that,

> . . . the application of the folklife concept in the United States could, first of all, provide the necessary corrective to the undisciplined or commercially-slanted "collecting" of "folk art" and "antiques." In Pennsylvania and elsewhere the "collector" has set his sights on commercially valuable prices -- i.e., items which could be displayed decoratively in the urban home -- and left the remaining aspects of the folk culture behind to disintegrate. The "antique" collectors of the 19th and 20th centuries ripped individual pieces out of their settings, the "folk art" collectors did the same.[12]

This statement, essentially a rallying cry for folklorists to turn their attention to the material aspects of folk culture, was not really taken up by folklore scholars until the late sixties and early seventies. From that period of time through a substantial growth in folkloristic attention to material culture can be traced. What factors stymied

this growth or precipitated the interest in material folk culture can be understood only by reviewing the history of the folklore discipline in the United States. Such a review will provide insights into the nature of a developing body of specialized knowledge and the incorporation of that knowledge into an academic curriculum.

Folklore study began primarily as a "gentleman's activity"--the pursuit of collections of popular antiquities (fairy lore, witchcraft or songs) as a leisurely and unscholarly pastime.[13] When a few individuals (notably the brothers Grimm in 1812) eventually began to systematically collect, analyze and classify folktales, the study of folklore became what Europeans call a "proper" and separate field of study. On August 22, 1846, William John Thoms, an English scholar, sent a letter to the Athenaeum, a British magazine catering to the intellectually curious, suggesting that "the new word 'Folk-lore' be thenceforth adopted in place of the cumbersome phrase 'popular Antiquities.'" By that time the study of folklore had begun to be acknowledged by and attracting to it a wider audience. In Britain, particularly, more men of letters turned their attention to the collection, classification and even publication of regional lore, thereby making the study of folklore known to an even wider public.

By the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century, the new study of folklore had been accepted by enough scholars to warrant the establishment of scholarly societies.

In Britain the English Folklore Society (1878) and in the United States, the American Folklore Society (1888) each were established issuing their respective societal publications. The American Folklore Society has continued to attract new members and by the mid-1960s was able to meet as an independent body breaking away from its original parent associations--the Modern Language Association and American Anthropological Association.

By 1940, folklore had evolved mainly as an auxiliary science to other disciplines in the United States. Ralph Steele Boggs wrote in the Southern Folklore Quarterly that,

> . . . the field has been studied in allied sciences in its parts rather than as a whole in the United States, and from different viewpoints rather than a unified perspective . . . But at the same time, folklore has been developing as an independent science, with its proper unified perspective, and unprejudiced by those of its sister sciences.[15]

In this first major published statement of the state of folklore in higher education, Boggs had already begun to sound the call for the development of folklore study in its own special right. At the time of his article, which was based on a survey of folklore course offerings in higher education, 23 colleges and universities listed 59 different courses in the subject. The majority of the courses were found in English or Anthropology departments, with a smattering of courses offered in modern languages and music departments.[16] The first graduate program which led to an M.A. major or a Ph.D. minor in folklore was established

October 3, 1939, at the University of North Carolina. This pioneer folklore graduate program consisted of an interdisciplinary faculty and emphasized the cross-discipline nature of the material.

By 1950, Richard Dorson reported in the Journal of American Folklore that, quickly following University of North Carolina's lead, Indiana University had established a master's and doctor's degree in folklore. He also noted at the time that other programs were underway: the University of California at Los Angeles was considering an undergraduate folklore curriculum; the University of Alabama had recently recognized interdepartmental ties to folklore; and lastly, Franklin and Marshall College had developed a Department of American Folklore. Clearly, the development of folklore study in American colleges and universities had begun to blossom.

Dorson reported a count of an additional 37 colleges and universities which offered 65 courses in folklore.[17] [It is interesting to note that this included Michigan State College, where at that time Dr. Dorson was a member of the history department.] In the ten years which had elapsed since the Boggs' report, the main problems which continued to plague the smooth development of the discipline seemed to Dorson to be the following: (1) the uncertainty of the appropriate departmental affiliation of folklore; (2) the discrepancy in a consensus of what constituted an introductory course; and (3) the lack of a

coherent definition of course content. Of the courses cited in Dorson's survey, most found their departmental home in Anthropology and English based on inter-disciplinary cooperation.

MacEdward Leach had found by 1958 that around 223 of 307 American colleges replying to a poll indicated that they "teach folklore in some form or other." Seventy-one percent of these courses were offered in English departments and 74 percent of these were undergraduate courses. However, another survey by Winkelman and Brown (1964) listed in addition to the four large centers only 45 schools having folklore courses.[18] In these studies it was acknowledged that the surveys were not comprehensive and that some respondents were not sure that they were teaching folklore in the strictest sense of the discipline. Still it was apparent that the study of folklore in America was involving more students on both an undergraduate and graduate level.

In 1968, a more concentrated effort to assess the state of folklore programs and courses in higher education was conducted. With the support of the American Folklore Society, Ronald Baker, a folklorist from Indiana State University, sent out 1,800 questionnaires of which 600 were returned. The results underlined the amazing inroads the study of folklore had made in American higher education. Baker concluded that, "nearly every American university and college of any size offers or has plans to offer at least a

course in folklore (and) . . . at least 170 institutions now offer folklore courses."[19] The overwhelming majority (70%) of these courses were offered through English departments; only two percent were offered through newly-established folklore departments. Baker underscored the unceasing aspirations of folklorists, though, when he called for the recognition of folklore as a legitimate undergraduate liberal arts major:

> Indeed, folklore is as worthy of undergraduate attention as is any one of the other established majors -- philosophy, history, English, anthropology, sociology and so on, particularly since undergraduate liberal arts programs seek ideally, to educate students about themselves and the world around them rather than to train for a specific vocation.[20]

Although the study of folklore had existed within one class or a series of classes on a graduate level, it had by this time proceeded to become a distinct program area within some graduate programs (either as a cognate area, minor or even a degree program). Folklorists such as Baker advocated that the study of folklore be not only an integral part of a graduate program, but also be considered a "legitimate undergraduate program."

By the end of the sixties folklore as a field of study had not only become academically sanctioned but also had proved to be a popular field of study for undergraduate and graduate students. Richard Dorson, who had become the nationally-recognized leader of folkloristic studies, reported in 1976 that at Indiana University, "enrollment in

undergraduate courses ran about 2,000 students."[21] He pointed out that over 150 graduate students pursued a Master of Arts and/or a Doctoral degree in Folklore. At the same time, the University of Pennsylvania also offered a Ph.D. in Folklore and its undergraduate courses were always filled. Even community colleges had begun to offer courses. A 1976 survey of folklore offerings in 47 California community colleges showed that most listed at least one course and several were developing programs of folklore studies.[22]

Despite the fact that scores of colleges and universities now offer undergraduate and graduate courses in various aspects of folklore and folklife, folklorists have continued to feel impelled to justify or even defend their discipline. A "folklorist cannot confine his efforts to teaching and research but must ceaselessly attempt to explain to his colleagues and the public the nature of his activities,"[23] asserted Dorson in the introduction to Folklore and Fakelore. Dorson contended that misunderstandings of folklore studies are generated as a result of the popular appeal of the material itself, an anti-intellectual slant to some of its contents, or an idea that the material dwells on a picturesque but archaic past. Acting as a self-appointed watchdog for the newly-emerging academic discipline of folklore, Dorson stressed the need for vigilance in continued scholarly approaches to the material. The concern he expressed can be applied to any specialization of a

field--that the establishment of a new area of inquiry in curriculum does not necessarily mean that it will continue to grow or even to be tolerated.

From the beginning of the folklife studies movement in the United States, the inclusion of the study of material culture has been slow-moving and problematic. The terms "folklife" and "folklore" themselves have provoked some of the problems. Folklife is a term of Swedish origin and like the German term "Volkskunde," denotes an interest in all aspects--material, oral and behavioral--of a folk society. Folklore has had almost as many definitions as there have been scholars working in the field. Coined by W. J. Thoms in 1846, the term was originally intended to describe "that department of the study of antiquities and archaeology which embraces everything relating to ancient observances and customs, to the notions, beliefs, traditions, superstitutions and prejudices of the common people."[24] In its strictest definition, the term folklore has been used to describe the spiritual folklore but not the physical forms of folk tradition. Yoder reported that the 1950 Midcentury International Folklore Conference held at Indiana University was perhaps the first national forum to give attention to the term folklife. However, as late as 1953 Stith Thompson, another folklorist, complained that "both folklorists and ethnologists in America have failed to make adequate systematic studies of the material culture and customs of the dominant white groups, mostly of

European origin."[25] The American Folklore Society has generally been sluggish in broadening its definition of folklore. In his 1963 article, The Folklife Studies Movement, Yoder pointed out that:

> In a 1957 symposium "A Theory for American Folklore" there is not a single reference to the "folklife" approach and its possible relation to the "folklore" approach. The key article by Richard Dorson pays lip-service to "folk-culture" and the contributions anthropologists can make to folklore studies, but the image of "folklore" that one retains after reading his suggestions is still limited to oral literature plus custom plus folk art.[26]

Nine years later in the Journal of American Folklore (the American Folklore Society's publication), Norbert F. Riedl not only noted the continued confusion over the terms folklore and folklife but also criticized,

> . . . the almost total absence of organized scientific efforts to study the non-ideational, material aspects of American folk culture cannot go unnoticed and should be a matter of concern to folklorists and anthropologists alike . . . on the whole, the gross neglect of the material aspects of American folk culture is a truism which can't be denied.[27]

Riedl qualified his criticism by recognizing that there were among the folklorists some "notable exceptions" who had emphasized the need for the study of material folk culture.

Two folklorists in particular can be considered among the "notable exceptions." One was Don Yoder who has ascribed to the philosophy he preached and has produced numerous studies on regional, sectarian and religious

material folk culture. Yoder (a professor in the folklore department at the University of Pennsylvania) has continued to provide scholarly leadership in the study of American material folk culture. Louis C. Jones has been another folklorist who spearheaded interest in America's folk art. Having been trained in folklore and armed with a research interest in New York State folklore, Jones was appointed in the late forties to serve as director of the New York State Historical Association (NYSHA). At that time, NYSHA had already been maintaining a collection of artifacts, an archive/research library and an outdoor farm museum -- all situated in Cooperstown, New York. Jones' first recognition that folk art might be an integral field of study in folklore was vividly related by him in 1975:

> One day I was in the Farmers Museum with George Campbell, the curator and there was a triangular drag for cultivating a field and I said "George, what do you call that?" and he said, "Why that's an A drag." And suddenly I remembered that when I'd been collecting witchcraft lore in Rensselaer County [New York] they put an A drag at the crossroads on Friday night so the witches wouldn't come. Suddenly I realized that there was a whole world of three-dimensional objects, of artifacts that were just as much a part of the academic concern, which had been mine, as the words were. It was a great help because then I began to see that the songs and stories and customs and objects and, ultimately, the art were all part of the same level of society, they were things that the academic historians had been ignoring, that the academic aestheticians had been ignoring and literary people had been ignoring, so this was a great eye opener for me.[28]

Once sensitized to the potential of folk art study, Jones took the lead in collecting folk art for NYSHA as well as institutionalizing the study of folk art in higher education. In 1950, he incorporated sessions on folk art into the first of what are now annual summer Seminars on American Culture held at Cooperstown. When he developed a graduate program in folklore and museum work at Cooperstown, he made sure that several folk art courses were offered as a part of the degree requirements. Indeed, Jones who was the only folklorist who contributed to the series of essays in the May 1950 issue of The Magazine Antiques which attempted, for the first time in print, to deal with the definition of folk art. Jones has continued to follow the approaches to folk art that he first espoused in an article entitled "Three Eyes on the Past: A New Triangulation for Local Studies."[29] In it, he suggested that the folklorist, local historian and the museologist might combine skills in an interdisciplinary approach to folk art.

Riedl pointed out in his 1966 article that in the United States at that time the interest in material aspects of folk culture

> . . . has so far centered largely on the education of students through the introduction of university courses under the headings of "Technology" (Desmond Clark of Berkeley) or "Material Culture" (Warren Roberts at Indiana University) but more especially through the Folk Culture Programs of the New York State Historical Association at Cooperstown.[30]

Despite the leadership demonstrated by Jones, Yoder, Clark, Roberts and other folklorists, folk art was considered of minor concern to the folklorists' field until the end of the 1960s. By then the ground-breaking studies of the previously-mentioned folklorists; the tremendous rise in the number of folklore students and programs; and an influential textbook on material culture all contributed to a flurry of academic folkloristic interest in folk art.

Beginning with the appearance of a textbook for the study of folk art, Pattern in the Material Folk Culture of the Eastern United States (written by Henry Glassie, a former student of Jones and Roberts), there has been a remarkable escalation in the written information on folk art, appearing in folklorist-authored papers given at professional society meetings, articles published in academic journals and entire books on folk art published. The approach taken by folklorists to material culture in general and folk art in particular has not been marked by a unity of theory, method and concept. An overview of the multiple and sometimes opposing approaches to folk art that folklorists have employed has been carefully outlined by Simon J. Bronner and Michael Owen Jones in several articles.[31] These recent studies have implied that not only has material culture study had an academic acceptance in the folklore field but that its acceptance has been accompanied by an advancement of philosophical and methodological ideas. As Bronner summarized in one article,

> The variety of existing approaches to the study of objects reflects the goals of individual researchers . . . Indeed, the study of material aspects of American folk culture is a field without a unified academic concept, but one which reflects a common interest in using artifacts as evidence for views of culture.[32]

The American Art History Discipline and The Study of Folk Art

The study of the history of art has also been a relatively recent newcomer to the accepted disciplines in American higher education. The historiography of American art history is rather complex and has been bound closely to the cultural and intellectual history of the United States. Knowledge about and interest in arts has always been intertwined with what Russel Lynes has called the "Story of American Taste." In The Tastemakers, Lynes chronicled the development of the American art scene--the artists, dealers, patrons, collectors, critics, academies, museums and art historians. As he has noted, the first part of the nineteenth century was generally a period marked by an attitude of colossal public indifference toward art and artists.[33]

For the most part, the early art scene in the United States consisted of a few private collections of art and contained virtually no art dealers, critics or art academies. Artists and craftsmen were usually employed as producers of functional objects or an occasional portrait. In general, the dominance of a European heritage reinforced a prevailing attitude that considered American accomplishments

as secondary to European. American connoisseurs developed private collections that emphasized European masterpieces, hired scholars to assist in curating these collections and published catalogue raissonés of their holdings. Connoisseurs such as Bernard Berenson exerted a strong influence on setting standards for what Lynes might call the "Private Taste"--a set of standards perceived to be associated with the rich, elite and refined sector of society.

In order to combat the general public's indifference, a number of "art missionaries" initiated efforts to cultivate the American public taste. Among those efforts were: the formation of art unions devoted to distributing works of art and the coupling of art exhibits with popular entertainment. For instance, P. T. Barnum advertised a facsimile of Benjamin West's "Christ Healing the Sick in the Temple" along with "The Albino Lady" and 400,000 curiosities. Because of the commercialization and sensationalism of such efforts, the American public quickly and enthusiastically began to embrace the arts. The average citizen who wanted to cultivate his or her taste for acquiring tasteful objects was provided with formula prescriptions through newly-published periodicals and household guidebooks. One such influential book was American Woman's Home, written by Catherine Beecher and Harriet Beecher Stowe in the 1860s. In this guide, the Beecher sisters not only suggested how much of the budgeted household money should be spent on pictures for decorating a living room but also

specified which pictures were desirable.[34] Many guidebooks to decorating touted the cheap, hand-colored lithographs produced by Currier and Ives or the plaster statuettes created by John Rogers and as a result, these forms of art became household institutions. The endorsement and mass production of art promoted an accessibility to visual art works that had been heretofore unknown by the general public (outside of their own handmade or folk art items, of course).

Even though the general public began to patriotically embrace, as equal to any Europe could offer, the few acknowledged American artists such as Benjamin West, Charles Wilson Peale and John Singleton Copley, the academic institutions continued to look toward Europe for art historical subjects to study. This neglect of American art study has recently been noted by Tom Armstrong, Director of the Whitney Museum: "The condescension and even lack of interest in the art of this country has nowhere been more apparent than in art history curricula. Until twenty-five years ago, no graduate degrees in American art history were given by American universities."[35] In 1964, Walter Muir Whitehall had offered this even more personal perspective:

> Forty years ago when I was a Harvard undergraduate the history of art seemed to fall into a neat pattern, according to which towering peaks of achievement rose at irregular but quite well-agreed-upon points in time and space above valleys that were mostly obscured in mist . . . the superior altitude of classical Greece, Renaissance Italy, Gothic and post-Renaissance France, seemed to be

> recognized beyond dispute . . . While the United States, if considered at all, was regarded as a kind of mirage from the European foothills . . . On graduation from Harvard I decided to make the history of art my career. It never once crossed my mind that what was near at hand in New England offered a suitable field of investigation.[36]

Some of the strongest history of art programs have been located in the older liberal arts colleges and universities where there has been a developed interest in the classics. Pioneers in the establishment of university art collections, these institutions developed departments specializing in the preparation of scholars and museum-curators for those collections.[37] As Whitehall's remarks have indicated and as the collections themselves at that time visibly demonstrated, the European orientation had tended to dominate scholarly activities.

The study of American art has not however been totally without its proponents. A few gentlemen-historians who depended largely upon private incomes began in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century to gather and publish information on American antiquities. In 1910, William Sumner Appleton spearheaded the organization of the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities dedicated to collecting valuable antiquities and publishing a journal. In 1922, Homer Eaton Keyes launched The Magazine Antiques which promoted even more interest in the American arts. Yet Wendell Garrett, current editor of that magazine, co-authored an article with Jane Garrett that pointed out

that t

inten

larly

socia

ignor

that

slow

also

littl

by th

spect

criti

propo

theor

can h

1977

relat

Thoug

colle

natur

sive.

arts

that though "amateurs and collectors began to undertake intense and thorough research and eventually produced scholarly articles and monographs, . . . art historians and social historians in colleges and universities continued to ignore the American arts."[38] The Garretts especially noted that not only were the gentlemen-historians and antiquarians slow to incorporate new trends in professional history but also that "professional historians were utilizing very little of the historical materials on social life discovered by the amateurs."[39] They suggested that the differing perspectives of the "scientific historians" who emphasized the critical examination of original texts and the "patrician proponents" of American artifacts who had no training in theoretical analysis fostered an overall division in American historiography which continues to plague the field. In 1977 Kenneth Ames echoed this lament particularly as it related to folk art:

> Unlike the field of folklore which both in England and America has become an intensely and impressively challenging study, folk art study is remarkable for its lack of depth and analysis. It is still largely a field dominated by the collector-amateur. Were Hofstadter alive today, he might be tempted to add a chapter on folk art to his Anti-Intellectualism in American Life.[40]

Though the writings of gentleman-historians, amateurs and collectors were not always of an intellectual, scholarly nature, the information that they have provided is extensive. The overwhelming bulk of early writings on American arts and folk art in particular have been authored by

connoisseurs, folk art enthusiasts, dealers and knowledgeable collectors. These writings found their way into such publishing outlets as The Magazine Antiques, International Studio, Bulletin, American Mercury, Art Digest, Art in America and numerous art exhibition catalogues. As some of those popular publications raised their scholarly standards and other academic quarterlies such as Art Bulletin (the journal for the professional organization of historians of art on university faculties) began to include articles on American art, a more academic approach eventually developed.

In the Enclyclopedia of World Art, Guiseppe Cocchiara has suggested that "the concept of folk art as a 'primitive expression has led many scholars and critics to underrate it.'"[41] When in the past leading art historians such as Bernard Berenson dismissed it altogether, one doesn't wonder that so few academic art historians turned their attention to folk art. The experience of James Jackson Jarves in the 1850s and 1860s with his collection of Italian primitives clearly illustrates the reticence of the scholar and his institution to consider folk arts for study or collecting purposes. He had unsuccessfully attempted to interest the Boston Athenaeum and the New York Historical Society in purchasing his magnificent collection of early Italian paintings. Yet when the collection was finally put up for auction in 1871, Yale acquired what is now considered one of the world's great Italian collections for $22,000, a mere pittance of its market value.[42]

Though Jarves had not been able to sway opinion about primitives, he had continued to insist that "his collection was important as an educational instrument" because it demonstrated that art "could and should be studied as a historical progression of styles."[43] This historical approach to the study of art in terms of the development and achievement of period styles continued to earmark art history studies in America until the 1960s when the "new art history" emphasized "art in context" or "art in society" rather than art as historical progression. This new view of art has

> . . . reestablished the principle that the art of the past is not an immutable reality: not only does the past condition the present but our view of the past is a function of present reality; there does not exist a truly objective historical reality--only our subjective vision and interpretation of the past.[44]

As Amy Goldin pointed out in an article entitled "Problems in Folk Art," the fundamental axioms of "influence" and "style" on which much of art history has been studied have continued to be used to explain the continuity of a folk artistic tradition.[45] And as long as these two organizing principles continue to underlie the art historians' professional inquiry, folk art study will be investigated in an elitist rather than contextual manner.

With the advent of the recognition of context as a new criteria for studying art, the door was opened for the reappraisal of the study of folk art. Herein lay the

possibility for a creative collaboration between the art historian and the ethnographer or social historian. In the Encyclopedia of World Art (which provides one of the best overviews of the historiography of folk art), Cocchiara gave credit to Austrian art historian Alois Riegl for approaching folk art with a scholarly, unprejudiced eye, thereby acknowledging the dignity of folk art in the field of art criticism.[46] In 1931, one of the leading art historians of the period Henri Focillon further legitimized the study of folk art when he summarized the history of its study to date and proposed new models for analyzing folk art.

Although Whitehall's description of his experience with art history study at Harvard has continued to be fairly typical of most art history graduate programs, the study of art history in American higher education has nevertheless expanded to include tribal, primitive, Oceanic, Latin American and American arts. The study of American folk art, though it has been a focus of interest in countless articles published in art journals, catalogues and books, has only recently made its way into the art history curriculum. Generally speaking, folk art has been given only passing reference in survey courses on American art history or in American decorative arts. Only in a few universities have entire courses on American folk art been accepted into the curriculum.

Summary of Chapter

What has been attempted to be outlined here have been the conditions which have contributed to a formalized study of folk art. Such conditions have provided the basis for the academic institutionalization of folk art study. As has been indicated, Henri Focillon sounded one of the first cries for scholarly attention to folk art and that cry has continued to be raised by numerous individuals in the last fifty years.

Among the developments which have been described here and which have affected the rise in scholarly interest in folk art and its subsequent entrance into higher education curricula were the following: the budding interest in American studies; the growing acceptance of the importance of the study of material culture; the development of museum collections which provided artifactual evidence to be studied and analyzed; and the emergence of the folklore and art history disciplines in the United States. Within these latter developments, several specific shifts have been noted: the growing interest in the concept of folklife rather than the limited interest in folklore; the recognition of a strong American art heritage that might rival the European art tradition; and the emerging emphasis on the study of art-in-context rather than the study of art as solely an historical progression of style. When one views these conditions for scholarly attention in conjunction with the influences affecting popular enthusiasm for folk

art, it becomes evident that an examination of folk art study in higher education is not only a timely study but one which may provide useful information for the much-needed continued development of folk art study.

Now that the historical background for the study of folk art has been summarized, the remaining chapters of this study will be devoted to an examination of the contemporary treatment of folk art study in higher education. By bringing this study up-to-date it is hoped that it will aid in the further growth of scholarly attention to folk art so that the call that Focillon once sounded will cease to be heard as often and as loudly as it seems to have been.

Chapter II Footnotes

[1]M. Henri Focillon, "Introduction" to Art Populaire (the English translation) in Robert F. Trent's Hearts and Crowns (New Haven, Conn.: New Haven Colony Historical Society, 1977), p. 15.

[2]Robert F. Trent, Hearts and Crowns (New Haven, Conn.: New Haven Colony Historical Society, 1977), p. 16.

[3]Ibid., p. 14.

[4]Kenneth Ames, "Folk Art: The Challenge and the Promise," in Ian M. G. Quimby and Scott T. Swank, eds., Perspectives on American Folk Art (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1980), p. 297.

[5]Thomas Schlereth, Artifacts and the American Past (Nashville, Tennessee: The American Association for State and Local History, 1980), p. 2.

[6]James Deetz, "Material Culture and Archaeology--What's the Difference?" in Leland Ferguson, ed., Historical Archaeology and the Importance of Material Things, Special Publications Series, Number 2, The Society for Historical Archaeology, 1977, p. 10.

[7]Ibid., p. 12.

[8]John A. H. Sweeney, "Introduction" to Ian M. G. Quimby, ed., Material Culture and the Study of American Life (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1978), p. 1.

[9]Schlereth, Artifacts and the American Past, p. 1.

[10]Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University: A History (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), p. 342.

[11]Ibid., p. 470.

[12]Don Yoder, "The Folklife Studies Movement," Pennsylvania Folklife, Vol. 13, No. 3 (July 1963), p. 55.

[13]Tristam P. Coffin, Our Living Traditions: An Introduction to American Folklore (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968), p. 15.

[14]Richard M. Dorson, Folklore and Folklife (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1972), p. 1.

[15]Ralph Steele Boggs, "Folklore in University Curricula in the United States," Southern Folklore Quarterly, Vol. IV (1940) p. 93.

[16]Ibid., pp. 98-109.

[17]Richard M. Dorson, "The Growth of Folklore Courses," The Journal of American Folklore, Vol. 63 (1950), pp. 352-359.

[18]Ronald L. Baker, "Folklore Courses and Programs in American Colleges and Universities," Journal of American Folklore, Vol. 84, No. 232 (April-June 1971), pp. 222-223.

[19]Ibid., p. 225.

[20]Ibid., p. 227.

[21]Richard M. Dorson, Folklore and Fakelore (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976), p. 114.

[22]Gregory J. Longnecker, "The Place of Folklore and Folkloristics in California Community Colleges," Western Folklore, Vol. 35, No. 1 (January 1976), pp. 65-71.

[23]Dorson, Folklore and Fakelore, p. 1.

[24]Yoder, "The Folklife Studies Movement," Pennsylvania Folklife, p. 45.

[25]Ibid., p. 45.

[26]Ibid., p. 46.

[27]Norbert F. Riedl, "Folklore and the Study of Material Aspects of Folk Culture," Journal of American Folklore, Vol. 79 (1966), p. 558.

[28]Donnorae Gordon and Betsy Mankin, "The Way I Remember It," New York Folklore, Vol. 1 (1975), p. 23.

[29]Louis C. Jones, "Three Eyes on the Past: A New Triangulation for Local Studies," New York Folklore Quarterly, Vol. 12 (1956), pp. 3-13.

[30]Riedl, "Folklore," Journal of American Folklore, p. 561.

[31]See Simon J. Bronner, "Concepts in the Study of Material Aspects of American Folk Culture," Folklore Forum, Vol. 12, Nos. 2 and 3 (1979), pp. 133-172 and Michael Owen Jones, "The Study of Folk Art Study: Reflections on Images," in Linda Degh, Henry Glassie and Felix Oinas, eds., Folklore Today: A Festschrift for Richard M. Dorson

(Bloomington, Ind.: Research Center for Language and Semiotic Studies, 1976), pp. 291-304.

[32]Bronner, "Concepts," Folklore Forum, p. 16.

[33]Russell Lynes, The Tastemakers (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1954), p. 13.

[34]Ibid., p. 66.

[35]Thomas Armstrong, "Preface," in Thomas Armstrong and Jean Lipman, eds., American Folk Painters of Three Centuries (New York: Hudson Hill Press, Inc. in cooperation with the Whitney Museum of American Art, 1980), p. 8.

[36]Walter Muir Whitehill, The Arts in Early American History (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1965), pp. 3-4.

[37]Guy Hubbard, "Art Education: Colleges and Universities," in Lee C. Deighton, Editor-in-Chief, The Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 1 (New York: The MacMillan Company and The Free Press, 1971), p 298.

[38]Wendell Garrett and Jane Garrett, "A Bibliography of the Arts in Early American History," in Walter Muir Whitehill, The Arts of Early American History (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1965), pp. 40-41.

[39]Ibid., p. 41.

[40]Ames, "Folk Art: The Challenge and the Promise," p. 313.

[41]Guiseppe Cocchiara, "Folk Art," in Massimo Pallottino, Editor-in-Chief, The Enclopedia of World Art, Vol. 5

(New York, Toronto and London: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc.), p. 463.

[42]Lynes, The Tastemakers, p. 62.

[43]Ibid., p. 61.

[44]Luigi Salerno, "Historiography," in Massimo Pallottino, Editor-in-Chief, The Encyclopedia of World Art, Vol. 7 (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963), p. 528.

[45]Amy Goldin, "Problems in Folk Art," Artforum, Vol. 14, No. 10 (June 1976), p. 50.

CHAPTER III

FOLK ART AND HIGHER EDUCATION: A CONTEMPORARY REVIEW OF FOLK ART COURSES

This chapter will focus on the development and status of courses on folk art currently being offered in higher education curricula in the United States. Outlined here will be the structure for the survey which was undertaken to investigate the following information on those courses on folk art: departmental affiliation, number of courses, number of students enrolled, the textbooks used and other instructional materials, history of the course within the department, relationship with museum collections, course requirements, course contents, and training of instructors. Attention was also intended to be given to the way in which the individual courses fit into a degree-giving program.

Need for the Study

As in any newly-emerging area of inquiry, the increased interest in folk art has prompted the development of a wide assortment of approaches to the material. Philosophical definitions, fieldwork, methodology, scientific analysis and educational applications of the subject have been under scrutiny and evaluation by, among others, those involved in studies of art, art history, folklore, popular culture,

cultural geography, cultural anthropology, history and psychology. Yet since the actual body of knowledge about folk art, folk artists and folk art production and distribution in America is relatively small, though quickly expanding, there has been little integration of that knowledge into curriculum development. As more data is accumulated and multidisciplinary views emerge, it is inevitable that the study of folk art will contribute in significant ways to our knowledge and understanding of man and his creations. The developers of curriculum in higher education must be prepared to provide students of folk art with adequate training and background in the various methodologies and philosophies concerning folk art in order for those students to be able to knowledgeably synthesize their analysis and use of folk art. This study was intended to aid the developer of new courses in providing information about: (1) the differing definitions of folk art; (2) what kind and amount of training or background in folk art do the teachers bring to their classroom; (3) what analytical tools must the scholar employ in assessing the material; (4) what methodologies or theories of other disciplines might be used in the study of folk art; (5) what will the art historian have to know about the folk, and the folklorist know about art, in order to conscientiously consider the material; and (6) how should the study of folk art fit into the overall ongoing discipline program. Provided with such information about the development of specific folk art

study courses, curriculum developers should be better equipped to draw upon resources from complementary points of view--infusing the learner, who will eventually become the purveyer and molder of knowledge with a wholistic, rather than narrowly defined view of the study of folk art. The specialization of approach, which would characterize the study of folk art within respective disciplines, tends to narrow the possibilities of comprehending the material from more than one level of consideration. It also promotes both a defensive posture for the discipline and limits cross-disciplined interaction. Creative problem solving and progressive advancement of knowledge cannot exist when the opportunities for transferrance or cross-breeding of ideas is so limited. Openness to the alternative definitions and methodologies will in the long run contribute to a more vital exploration of the who, what, why and how of folk art production.

For all the published information available on folk art, ethnic arts, higher education and curriculum development, there exists surprisngly little information on the study of folk art in any level of education. An historiography of folk art in higher education has been initiated with this study and it is hoped that the information provided here will provide a solid building block for future work.

The review of available literature on folk arts in higher education for this study began with an ERIC search.

An introduction to the ERIC search was provided by Linda Dewit of the MSU Library Services. In discussing with her the appropriate key terms to be used in the computer assisted retrieval of information related to folk arts and higher education courses, it was decided on the descriptor "folk culture" taken from the Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors: "folk art, ethnic arts, and material culture" were not descriptors found in the thesaurus, even under major descriptor headings such as ethnic groups, folklore or art.

The ERIC printout dated 7/11/80 from Bibliographic Retrieval Services, Inc. of Scotia, New York, was rather short and amounted to a total of 18 computer printout pages with 36 reported citations. The citations included journal articles, books, conference papers and technological reports from projects. Of those citations, it was found that only 16 were retrieved using the key word "folk-culture" as a main descriptor. Of those citations retrieved using "folk-culture" as either a major or minor descriptor, only three had even a remote connection with folk arts and those dealt with folk literature, not folk arts. Curiously enough, the only citation actually incorporating the words "folk art" in an article title was "Teaching as Folk Art" by Marvin Gottleib (Media Ecology Review, Vol. 4, No. 2, Summer 1975, pp. 9-15). This article did not deal at all with material culture but, according to the abstract, focused on the effectiveness of

current educational philosophies and strategies and provided a conceptual framework for evaluating them.

As a precautionary measure to make sure "folk-culture" was the most appropriate descriptor, the descriptors "art, arts education and ethnicity" were also checked during a manual search. An assessment of the usefulness of the citations revealed that, as in the original ERIC search, none of the articles dealt directly with the proposed dissertation topic. Moreover, those that had a connection to the topic were usually only minimally related. For instance, an article on folklore in education dealt with elementary school-aged children or a paper on folk arts dealt with the history of scrimshaw. For this researcher then, the most important, indeed most surprising, discovery was the noted lack of published or reported literature on this topic.

Dissertations Abstracts International was manually searched using the descriptors "folk, folk cultural, folklore and folkloristics," and by referring to the "Folklore" section in the table of contents. A search of volumes 36-41 yielded only two references of possible tangential relevance.

In 1976, the American Folklore Society published Folklore Theses and Dissertations in the United States as volume 27 of their Bibliographical and Special Series, edited by Dan Ben-Amos and Kenneth Goldstein. Compiled by Alan Dundes, this bibliography of theses and dissertations

relevant to the study of folklore is arranged chronologically and is cross-indexed by subject, author and institution. The only two listings this comprehensive source had that were related directly to folk arts in education dealt with folk arts in primary and secondary education.

Other indices and bibliographies that were reviewed included the following: Abstracts of Popular Culture, Popular Abstracts, MLA (Modern Language Association), International Bibliography of Books and Articles on the Modern Languages and Literature, Education Index, Art Education: A Guide to Information Sources and A Critical Bibliography of American Folk Art.

The author of the latter work, Simon J. Bronner, observed that

> . . . published studies of folk art exist in scattered sources and range from superficial tourist information to complex theoretical treatises. The literature represents several disciplines that include folk art in its purview and apply their own methods for its study. At a large academic institution such as Indiana University, for example, an interested student may find himself scurrying between the art library, the museum, and the history, anthropology and folklore collections just to locate the basic texts on folk art.[1]

The researcher of this study is used to similar experiences and has now added the education collections to the shuttling process described so well by Bronner. In the review of literature on folk art or education it was especially interesting to note that while the bulk of writing has existed within the art history field, the majority of folk

art courses have been and continue to be offered in the field of folklore.

Generalization of Need

The demand for personnel and scholars versed in folk arts has risen dramatically within the past few years. Museums, state arts and humanities councils, park interpretation centers, festival organizers, research institutions and education centers have been listing openings for individuals who have had some training or involvement in folk arts. It has become evident that there are few qualified candidates who have been adequately trained in the study of folk art materials. Folklorists who have applied for these positions have come from programs that have traditionally placed an emphasis on the lore of our culture. Art historians who have sought these positions have been graduated from programs that have given only passing consideration to the folk of our culture. Therefore, those newly-listed positions have tended to be filled by staff members whose background may have only minimally included a knowledge of folk arts, or who have harbored a narrowly defined view of folk arts. By providing curriculum developers in the respective disciplines with the results of this study, perhaps new courses in folk art will be offered or present ones modified as a result of the information presented. The eventual outcome may well be better-informed

and more well-trained students and leaders in the area of folk art study.

Limitations of the Study

While it is known that a few courses in folk art study are offered in programs as diverse as home economics, cultural anthropology, cultural geography and popular culture, the majority of the offered courses in folk art are within folklore curricula and secondarily within art history (included in this category are those offered within architectural history where folk art and architecture are termed vernacular). Therefore, the study has concentrated on analyzing the courses of folk art study only in the two major disciplines, though this will mean that the occasional course in other areas will not be treated.

This study has focused on those courses which are called folk art study (or material culture, vernacular art or traditional art). It has not been concerned with general folk culture or art history survey courses that deal, only in part, with the study of folk art. In addition, this study has been based on those courses which focus on folk arts in America and will not cover European folk art courses.

Definition of Terms

One of the most distracting aspects of the study of folk art study has been disagreement and confusion over the exact terminology to be applied to the body of materials

presently being called folk arts. The term folk art does not yet have, or perhaps will it ever have, a precise and widely held definition.

Vernacular art, traditional art, American ethnic arts, popular art, native art and primitive arts have been used to describe some of the objects also called folk art. A more generic term, material culture, includes folk art materials in addition to all other man or man and machine-made items. Those proponents of the term material culture generally have avoided then the sticky questions that have arisen when an object has been designated an art object and, accordingly, those proponents have not tackled the answers involving matters of aesthetics, taste and quality. Yet the term folk art has persisted and has been traditionally accepted in the United States to describe a set of objects. However, the term has continued to elicit confusion. By juxtaposing the two words--folk and art--a wide variety of connotations and associations are posed. Each word, taken on its own has its own connotations and taken together, some of their meanings are paradoxical. Rarely has anyone, general public and academic community alike, agreed on the exact corpus of material that should fall under the umbrella term of folk art, hence the emanating confusion. This study, however, has acknowledged that not only has the term folk art been a meaningful term for many individuals, and that a body of objects exists, but that it has been helpful in

describing those objects not adequately covered by any other descriptive word.

In order to understand the study of folk art study, definitions for the following terms have been supplied:

Folk art -- "The artifact is art to the extent that it is an expression of an intention to give and take pleasure and it is folk art to the extent that the intention was esoteric and traditional."[2]

Folkloristics -- "To avoid confusion it might be better to use the term folklore for the materials and folkloristics for the study of the materials."[3]

Material Folk Culture -- "In direct contrast to this oral folklore is physical folklore, generally called material culture."[4]

"Essentially, then, a folk thing is traditional and non-popular; material folk culture is composed of objects produced out of a nonpopular tradition in proximity to popular culture."[5]

Folk -- "The term folk can refer to any group whatsoever who share at least one common factor. It does not matter what the linking factor is--it could be a common occupation, language or religion --but what is important is that a group formed for whatever reason will have some traditions which it calls its own. In theory a group must consist of at least two persons, but generally most groups consist of many individuals."[6]

Traditional Art -- This term is synonymous with the term folk art.

Vernacular Art -- Primarily, this is art that reflects regional or local traditional characteristics.

Design of Survey

The second chapter of this study traced the development of both art history and folklore courses in institutions of higher education in the United States. It has also traced the general development of folk art study courses within those two disciplines.

In order to elicit more up-to-date information a questionnaire has been devised and sent to present instructors of folk art courses being offered in art history and folklore degree programs. General surveys of the curricula of these two disciplines have been made within the past few years, but in none of the surveys were the folk art courses singled out for scrutiny. However, these general surveys were intended to provide a partial source for obtaining listings of folk art courses that are being offered and questionnaires were intended to be sent to instructors of folk art courses listed in these surveys. Questionnaires would be sent to instructors of folk art courses being offered in folklore degree-granting programs or in folklore emphasis programs. They would also be sent to some of the instructors listed in Ronald Baker's survey (1966) of folklore courses and the programs listed in the American

Folklife Center at the Library of Congress survey. Additional sources not cited in either listing would be solicited through correspondence with key individuals in the field and through placement of a notice in the American Folklore Society newsletter. Questionnaires would also be sent to those individuals, now retired from teaching, who were instrumental in setting up some of the first courses in folk art study. Questionnaires would also be sent to some of the degree granting art history programs listed in the College Art Association listings. Since some courses in vernacular architecture are offered through architectural history programs, an effort was intended to be made to send questionnaires to those instructors as well.

The questionnaire would attempt to solicit information about folk art study courses that had not been gathered to date in hopes of aiding future curriculum developers in the planning of similar courses. The questionnaire would consist of: (1) a series of closed answer questions in which the respondent merely had to check off the appropriate answer; (2) a series of open-answer questions to allow for brief interpretive or explanatory answer; and (3) a narrative section to allow for any additional information or opinions not structured in the questionnaire. The following objectives would be used to guide the formation of the questions:

1. To identify the texts/readings used in folk art study courses

2. To identify how a course fits into overall academic framework--in what department/departments is it offered?
3. To identify relationships with other institutions --i.e., museums, research centers, fieldwork experiences, etc.
4. To identify the training/expertise of instructors --the number of courses, field experience, collections experience, etc.
5. To identify the number of times course was offered a year
6. To identify how the course was staffed--by one person, team taught, guest lectures, etc.
7. To identify how the course evolved--through student, departmental or instructor initiation
8. To identify how the course fit into degree requirements--was it an elective or a requirement for the particular program?
9. To identify the number, if possible, of non-folklore or non-art history students in the class.
10. To determine the number of students enrolled
11. To identify how long the class had been offered
12. To identify course format--fieldwork, slides, lectures, etc.
13. To gather information on future course plans--would the course be modified, dropped, expanded, divided, etc.

14. To identify number of credits given for course completion

To aid in the securing of information on the development of folk art study courses, it was intended that further data and knowledge would be sought from key individuals in the field of folk art, folklore and art history. Though most information was intended to be drawn from the completed questionnaires distributed to present instructors of folk art, additional information from those individuals who have been instrumental in the rise of folk art scholarship would be sought to help broaden the scope of information. These individuals, whether working in government, private or public positions have greatly contributed to the body of knowledge about folk art. It was determined that their perceptions and knowledge about the development of folk art study within academic frameworks would undoubtedly strengthen the findings of this study. Through semi-structured interviews conducted in person or when that would be impossible, by telephone, experiences and observations about the history, present state and future direction of the study of folk art study would be solicited. When possible, these interviews would be taped and transcribed. It was expected that these narratives would help establish an overview to the factual data garnered through the use of the questionnaires. Among the questions that were intended to be posed to these individuals were the following:

1. What in your view are the most influential writings in the field?
2. What are some of the inherent problems in the study of folk art?
3. Are you satisfied with your own training/background in the area of folk art?
4. Where do you think improvements in training new scholars of folk art can be made?
5. How would you structure a course in folk art study?
6. In which academic discipline should the study of folk art materials be pursued? Should it be interdisciplinary?
7. What term would you prefer to be accepted that would adequately describe folk art materials?
8. In your experience or observation, in what manner has the study of folk art materials evolved?
9. What do you perceive to be the greatest obstacles to the further development of folk art study?

Report of Data

Most information solicited through the questionnaire would be direct or demographic information and only a minor portion of the survey would address attitudinal information. This fact, coupled with the estimate that no more than 100 questionnaires would be sent out to identified folklore or art history programs, would eliminate the need for data to be processed by a computer. Where appropriate though,

statistical tabulation of demographic or attitudinal information would be simply or statistically reported.

Since where possible interviews would be taped and transcribed, it was intended that this portion of the assembled information would be reported in the form of short edited narratives.

Summary of Chapter

Previous chapters have established the historical need for a contemporary review of folk art courses but it is hoped that this chapter has provided a clarification of the continued need for the review of current folk art study offerings. As has been noted here, it is also hoped that the results of the survey will provide data that will better equip curriculum developers in the area of folk art study. The following chapters will report that data and will offer both observations, conclusions and suggestions that should enable students to begin to forge ahead in the area of folk art study.

Chapter III Footnotes

[1]Simon J. Bronner, A Critical Bibliography of American Folk Art (Bloomington, Indiana: Folklore Publications Group, 1978), p. 1.

[2]Henry Glassie, Patterns in the Material Folk Culture of the Eastern United States (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968), p. 253.

[3]Alan Dundes, ed., What is Folklore (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 3.

[4]Richard Dorson, ed., Folklore and Folklife (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), p. 2.

[5]Glassie, Patterns, p. 6.

[6]Dundes, What is Folklore, p. 2

CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTION OF THE SURVEY AND REPORT OF THE DATA

The first part of Chapter IV will contain a description of the development and administration of the questionnaire survey of folk art courses in higher education. This description will be followed by a section which will report and comment on the numerical data collected by the survey. Lastly, a section will be devoted to a summary of opinion comments gathered both through the questionnaire and by interviewing key individuals.

Formulating the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument, in the form of a questionnaire, was primarily based on those questions initially listed in the dissertation proposal. Questions were broken into sections designed to gather information on the following: the institution in which a folk art course was offered; the course itself; and the instructor of the course. An evaluation of the questionnaire was solicited from the following individuals: Dr. Ronald Baker, Chairperson, English Department, Indiana State University; Dr. Mary Rohrkemper, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Maryland; Dr. Roger Welsch, Professor,

Department of Anthropology, University of Nebraska; and Dr. Peter Bartis, Researcher, The American Folklife Center, Library of Congress. Drs. Welsch, Bartis and Baker reviewed the questions for their appropriateness of the field of folk art study, while Dr. Rohrkemper made recommendations on the structure and language used in formulating questions. Dr. Baker, who had previously administered by questionnaire a survey of folklore courses in American higher education, offered the following comments:

"I think your questionnaire is well designed and easy to answer. In my next survey of folklore programs and courses, I had planned to ask for the same kind of information you want on the first page of your questionnaire."[1]

Based on the input from these reviewers, the format of the questionnaire and the terminology used in phrasing the individual questions were only slightly modified. However, it had become evident from their comments that a series of optional opinion questions placed at the end of the data eliciting questions could partially supplant the originally proposed interview format for gathering additional information. Thus, an optional opinion page consisting of nine questions was incorporated into the printed questionnaire. Questionnaire reviewers also suggested that the survey should not attempt to gather information on courses dealing with folk or vernacular architecture but rather on those who dealt with non-building information.

Once the questionnaire had been reviewed and the reviewers' recommended changes made, it was printed (Figure 1A-1G) and sent to course instructors. An introductory cover letter (Figure 2) and an addressed and stamped return envelope completed the mailing package.

The Identification of Courses in Folk Art

A variety of methods were employed to identify what was hoped would constitute a universal sample of folk art courses. Since it was already known that the number of courses would probably be few, colleagues in the field of folk art research were first called upon to list courses with which they were familiar. Previously administered surveys of folklore courses were consulted for additional listings. Both of these methods provided the majority of known course offerings. However, in order to ferret out those courses not known in the professional society circles, an announcement (Figure 3) of the survey was placed in the following national newsletters and magazines: The Clarion (a monthly magazine sent to members of the Museum of American Folk Art in New York); The American Folklore Society Newsletter (the quarterly newsletter sent to members of the professional society); Folkline (the newsletter sent to members of the Folk Arts Section of the American Folklore Society); Folk Art Finder (a subscription newsletter); and The College Art Association Newsletter (sent to members of the professional association).

Figure 1A-1G. Questionnaire.

FOLK ART STUDY IN HIGHER EDUCATION SURVEY

Date_____

Name _____

Institution_____

Name of Course (as it appears in catalog or course schedule book)

_____

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Answer every question.
2. For each of the forty questions, circle only one response unless otherwise instructed.
3. Use either a pen or a pencil to mark response.
4. The term folk art refers to material culture produced in a traditional, non-academic manner.
5. The terms folklore,folk culture and folklife are used here interchangeably.
6. All information within this questionnaire will be coded to retain anonymity.

PLEASE INCLUDE ANY COURSE SYLLABUS, COURSE DESCRIPTION, PROGRAM INFORMATION WITH THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE. THANK YOU.

Figure 1A.

INSTITUTIONAL DATA

1. Location of Institution: Circle one state

Alabama	Indiana	Nebraska	South Carolina
Alaska	Iowa	Nevada	South Dakota
Arizona	Kansas	New Hampshire	Tennessee
Arkansas	Kentucky	New Jersey	Texas
California	Louisiana	New Mexico	Utah
Colorado	Maine	New York	Vermont
Connecticut	Maryland	North Carolina	Virginia
Delaware	Massachusetts	North Dakota	Washington
Florida	Michigan	Ohio	West Virginia
Georgia	Minnesota	Oklahoma	Wisconsin
Hawaii	Mississippi	Oregon	Wyoming
Idaho	Missouri	Pennsylvania	District of Columbia
Illinois	Montana	Rhode Island	

2. Size of Institution (including undergraduate and graduate population)

a. Under 1000
b. 1000-2500
c. 2500-5000
d. 5000-10000
e. 10000-20000
f. 20000-30000
g. Over 30000

3. Land-Grant Institution?

a. Yes
b. No

4. Is the institution?

a. Private
b. Public

5. Which of the following best describes the institution?

a. Two year only
b. Four year only
c. Graduate only
d. Four Year and graduate
e. Other (specify)_____

6. Which of the following describes the academic year?

a. Quarterly system (ten week term)
b. Semester system (fifteen week term)
c. Other (specify) _____

COURSE DATA

7. How long has the course been offered?

a. Less than one year
b. One-two years
c. Three-five years
d. Six-ten years
e. Eleven-fifteen years
f. Over fifteen years

8. How many times a year is the course offered?

a. Once
b. Twice
c. Three times
d. Four or five times
e. Other (specify) _____

9. When is the course scheduled for offering?

a. Daytime
b. Evening
c. Daytime and evening
d. Special workshops or seminars
e. Other (specify) _____

10. Is the course offered on campus?

a. Yes
b. No

Figure 1B.

11. Is the course offered off campus?

a. Yes
b. No

12. How many credits are given for the course?

a. One
b. Two
c. Three
d. Four
e. Five
f. Six
g. Seven
h. Eight or more

13. Does the course have FORMAL affiliations with any of the following inside or outside the parent institution?
(Mark yes or no for items a-f and give additional information where possible)

a. Folk arts museum Yes or No
Specify_____

b. Open-air museum Yes or No
Specify_____

c. Library Yes or No
Specify_____

d. Research Institute Yes or No
Specify_____

e. Folklore Archives Yes or No
Specify_____

f. Other _____

14. Is a course syllabus available? (*If yes, could you forward a copy with completed questionnaire.)

a. Yes*
b. No

15. Is a course reading list available? (*If yes, please forward copy with completed questionnaire)

a. Yes*
b. No

16. Is the course listed in the school catalog?

a. Yes
b. No

17. Are there plans for the course to be dropped?

a. Yes
b. No

18. If the answer to Question#17 is YES, for which of the followin reasons will the course be dropped?
(Mark yes or no for items a through f)

a. Lack of qualified instructor yes or no
b. Lack of students yes or no
c. Financial considerations yes or no
d. Physical space problems yes or no
e. Scheduling problems yes or no
f. Administrative decision yes or no
g. Other (specify)_____
_____

19. Are there plans for the course to be radically changed?

a. Yes
b. No

If yes, specify _____
_____

20. What was the PRIMARY reason for establishing a course in folk art study at your institution?

a. Student-initiated demand
b. Instructor-initiated demand
c. Department-initiated demand
d. Don't know background
e. Other (specify) _____

21. For what level student is the course designed?
(Mark yes or no for items a through e)

a. Undergraduate yes or no
b. Graduate yes or no
c. Auditor yes or no
d. Non-degree yes or no
e. Other (specify)_____ yes or no

Figure 1C.

22. What is the average student enrollment in the course?

a. Under 10
b. 11-15
c. 16-30
d. 31-40
e. 41-50
f. 51-75
g. 76-100
h. Over 100

23. What percentage of students in the folk art course are from the following majors?
(Mark one response for each item a through j)

	none	a few	many	almost all
a. American Studies	1	2	3	4
b. Anthropology	1	2	3	4
c. Art History	1	2	3	4
d. English	1	2	3	4
e. Engineering	1	2	3	4
f. Folklore	1	2	3	4
g. Geography	1	2	3	4
h. History	1	2	3	4
i. Home Economics	1	2	3	4
j. Museum Studies	1	2	3	4
i. Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4

24. Is the course offered as an interdisciplinary listing?

a. Yes
b. No

25. If the answer to question #24 is YES, in which of the following departments is the course cross-listed?
(Mark yes or no for items a through m)

a. American Studies	yes or no
b. Anthropolgy	yes or no
c. Architecture	yes or no
d. Art	yes or no
e. Art History	yes or no
f. English	yes or no
g. Ethnic Studies	yes or no
h. Folklore/Folk Culture	yes or no
i. Geography	yes or no
j. History	yes or no
k. Home Economics	yes or no
l. Museum Studies	yes or no
m. Other (specify)_____	yes or no

26. If the answer to question #24 is NO, then with which department is the course listed or offered?
(Mark yes or no for items a through j)

a. American Studies	yes or no
b. Anthropology	yes or no
c. Architecture	yes or no
d. Art History	yes or no
e. English	yes or no
f. Ethnic Studies	yes or no
g. Folklore/ Folk culture	yes or no
h. Geography	yes or no
i. History	yes or no
j. Other (specify)_____	

Figure 1D.

27. Is the course REQUIRED in any of the following DEGREE programs? (mark yes or no for each item a through f)

a. Anthropology
b. American Studies — yes or no
yes or no
c. Art History — yes or no
d. Cultural Geography — yes or no
e. Folklore or Folk culture — yes or no
f. Other (specify)_____ — yes or no

28. Is the course offered as an ELECTIVE in the following DEGREE programs? (mark yes or no for each item a through j)

a. American Studies — yes or no
b. Art History — yes or no
c. Architecture — yes or no
d. Cultural Geography — yes or no
e. Engineering — yes or no
f. Folklore or Folk culture — yes or no
g. Ethnic Studies — yes or no
h. Home Economics — yes or no
i. History — yes or no
j. Other (specify) _____ — yes or no

29. What format does the course take? (Mark one response for each item a through j)

	used never	used seldom	used moderately	used primarily
a. Lecture(didactic)	1.	2	3	4
b. Slide lecture	1	2	3	4
c. Readings	1	2	3	4
d. Discussion	1	2	3	4
e. Fieldwork	1	2	3	4
f. Demonstrations	1	2	3	4
g. Research projects	1	2	3	4
h. Other (specify)	1	2	3	4

30. Do assignments for the course include the following? (Mark one response for each item a through i)

	never	seldom	usually	always
a. Readings	1	2	3	4
b. Fieldwork	1	2	3	4
c. Presentations	1	2	3	4
d. Demonstrations	1	2	3	4
e. Semester journals	1	2	3	4
f. Term papers	1	2	3	4
g. Research projects	1	2	3	4
h. Exams	1	2	3	4
i. Other (specify)_____	1	2	3	4

31. Is material generated by the students deposited in an archives or library?

a. Yes
b. No

If yes, specify_____

32. What are the primary texts for the course? (Mark one response for each item a through h)

	never used	sometimes used	usually used	always used
a. Beyond Necessity: Art in the Folk Tradition	1	2	3	4
b. Flowering of American Folk Art	1	2	3	4
c. Folklore and Folklife	1	2	3	4
d. How to Know American Folk Art	1	2	3	4
e. In Small Things Forgotten	1	2	3	4
f. Patterns in Material Folk Culture in the Eastern United States	1	2	3	4
g. Perspectives in American Folk Art	1	2	3	4
h. Other (specify)_____	1	2	3	4

_____

Figure 1E.

33. Which of the following journals/magazines do you recommend in your course?
(Mark yes or no for each item a through j)

a. Journal of American Folklore yes or no

b. Journal of Popular Culture yes or no

c. Journal of American Culture yes or no

d. The Magazine Antiques yes or no

e. The Clarion yes or no

f. Pioneer America yes or no

g. Landscape yes or no

h. Keystone Quarterly yes or no

i. Western Folklore yes or no

j. Other (specify)_____ yes or no

34. By whom is the course primarily taught?

a. One instructor
b. Two instructors
c. Team instruction
d. Other (Specify) _____

35. What faculty rank does the primary instructor of the course hold?

a. Graduate assistant
b. Instructor
c. Assistant professor
d. Associate professor
e. Professor
f. Visiting artist
g. Adjunct specialist
h. Other_____

Figure 1F.

36. Which of the following qualifications should an ideal instructor of a course in folk art have?
(Mark one response for each item)

	not necessary	somewhat helpful	very helpful	essential
a. fieldwork experience	1	2	3	4
b. publications experience	1	2	3	4
c. degree in folklore/folk culture	1	2	3	4
d. degree in art history	1	2	3	4
e. craftsmen experience	1	2	3	4
f. collecting folk art	1	2	3	4
g. completed formal course in folk art	1	2	3	4
h. degree in related field	1	2	3	4
i. museum experience	1	2	3	4

37. Which of the following describes the qualifications of the primary instructor of the course in folk art at your institution?
(Mark one response for each item)

	none experience	minimal experience	moderate experience	primary experien
a. formal training in folklore/folk culture	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
b. formal training in folk art	1	2	3	4
c. informal training in folklore/folk culture	1	2	3	4
d. informal training in folk art	1	2	3	4
e. formal training in art history	1	2	3	4
f. publishing record in folk art	1	2	3	4
g. fieldwork in folk art	1	2	3	4
h. craftsman of folk art	1	2	3	4
i. worked in museum collections	1	2	3	4
j. collector or dealer of folk arts	1	2	3	4

58. In your opinion, should a course in folk art study be a requirement for an undergraduate degree in folklore/folk culture?

a. yes
b. no

59. In your opinion, should a course in folk art study be a requirement for a graduate degree in folklore/ folk culture?

a. Yes
b. No

60. In your opinion, should a course in folk art study be a requirement for a graduate degree in art history?

a. Yes
b. No

Figure 1G.

OPINION PAGE (optional)

Please elaborate on the following questions. If there is another area of concern or issue which you would like to address, please feel free to elaborate on the back of this sheet or by further communication

1.What in your view are some of the most influential writings in the field? Why?

2. What are some of the inherent problems in the field of folk art study? Do you have suggestions for improvement?

3. Are you satisfied with your own training or background in folk art? Why/why not?

4. Where do you think improvements in the training of new folk art scholars can be made?

5. If different than already described in the questionnaire, how would you structure a course in folk art?

6. In which academic department/discipline should the study of folk art materials be pursued? Should it be interdisciplinary?

7. What terms would you prefer to be accepted for general use that would adequately describe folk art materials?

8. Given your experience or observation, how has the study of folk art materials evolved?

9. What do you perceive to be the greatest obstacle to the further development of folk art study? Why? Do you have suggestions or solutions?

Figure 2. Introductory Cover Letter.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

THE MUSEUM EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824

Enclosed you will find the FOLK ART STUDY IN HIGHER EDUCATION SURVEY and a stamped, addressed return envelope. This survey examines data relevant to the study of American folk art in institutions of higher education in the United States. It seeks information from instructors about those courses which stress the examination of material culture of a traditional, non-academic nature. Information is not being sought about courses which deal primarily with academic art, primitive or tribal art, folk dance or folk music. The survey is being sent to present instructors of folk art courses. If you no longer are teaching a course in folk art, please return the questionnaire unanswered. If you know of someone else teaching a course in folk art or of a new course being offered, I would appreciate it if you could forward the name and address of that instructor.

Prepared in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree in education at Michigan State University, this questionnaire has been reviewed by individuals knowledgeable in the field. Your cooperation in providing us with information concerning the formation, staffing and format of folk art courses will assist in both the evaluation of present programs and in the development of new course offerings. The data assembled will be made available in report form to both participating individuals and the general public. All surveys will be coded to maintain anonymity and results will be statistically reported. An opinion sheet for additional comments will be summarized and also be made available.

The survey should take no more than ten minutes to complete. While I realize that your time is important, I believe that the few moments taken to complete and mail the survey back will be well spent in adding to our knowledge of how courses develop and are taught.

I would appreciate receiving the questionnaire by _____. If by that time I have not received it, I will be reminding you by mail or by phone. If you have any questions regarding this form, please contact me by mail or call at 517-355-6511.

Thank you for your participation,

Marsha MacDowell
Curator, Folk Arts Division
The Museum

Figure 2.

Figure 3. Announcement of Survey.

information

For opportunity to exhibit at International Institute of Education and to update files, information, biographies and slides are sought of former **Fulbright grantees in the visual arts** (especially in N.Y.C.). Contact Roger Howrigan, c/o Visual Arts Program, 809 United Nations Plaza, N.Y.C. 10017.

For a Yale University Art Gallery exhibition and catalog, information is sought on **19th and 20th century fans, fan designs, screens, and screen designs** by European and American artists. Contact Ginny Butera, Asst. to Director, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Box 7646, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101 or Michael Komanecky, Asst. to Director, Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, Conn. 06511.

For a critical study of the work of **Oliver Newberry Chaffee** (1881—1944), an American painter active in Detroit, Provincetown, New York, Paris, and southern France, information is sought regarding location of his works in American and European collections as well as biographical information regarding his activities in this country and abroad. Contact Solveiga Rush, University of Cincinnati, Mail Location #168, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221.

For a biographical dictionary of **Philadelphia architects working prior to 1930**, biographical information and surviving architectural documents (plans, renderings, correspondence, office records, etc.) of architects born or whose years of major professional activity occurred in the Philadelphia metropolitan area before 1930 are sought. Contact Sandra Tatman, The Athenaeum of Philadelphia, 219 South Sixth Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19106.

For a survey of **folk arts courses** in higher education to help evaluate present course offerings and to assist in development of new courses, information is sought regarding course content, structure, administration, requirements, population, location, and academic departmental affiliations. Instructors of courses focusing on the study of American material culture produced in a non-academic, traditional context are urged to contact Marsha MacDowell, The Folk Arts Division, The Museum, Michigan State Univ., East Lansing, Mich. 48824.

For a lecture series and research paper, information is sought on **patterned imagery** (contemporary artists such as Robert Kushner included). Contact Shirley Raphael, Box 5371, St. Laurent Postal Station, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H4L 4Z9.

For a dissertation in progress on **John Steuart Curry** information on the Topeka mural commission or the location of his paintings and drawings is sought by Sue Kendall, 134 Arthur Avenue, S.E., Minneapolis, Minn. 55414.

For a major exhibition on **Artistic Collaboration in the Twentieth Century**, which opens in March 1983, photographs and documentation are sought relating to significant projects in the visual arts, unique works or works-in-series, which two or more artists conceived and executed together. Contact Cynthia Jaffee McCabe, Curator for Exhibitions, Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

For a small exhibition of the art and collection of the painter **Katherine Schmidt** (1898-1978) to be held February 4 April 4, 1982, send photographs and any information about the artist and her work to Patterson Sims, Whitney Museum of American Art, 945 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10021.

Information is sought on the life and works of American artist **Da Loria Norman** (1872—1935), who did rare book illumination and mystical painting. She lived in London until 1914; from 1914 until her death, she lived and worked in the New York area, Boston, and Grand Rapids. Contact Cynthia Norman, 214 "S" Street, Washington, D.C. 20001.

Documents, correspondence, reminiscences, photographs and other material are sought for a memorial exhibition of paintings by former Long Island University teacher **Albert Kotin** (1907 1980). Contact Martin Ries, Dept. Fine Arts, LIU, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201.

For an exhibition to be held January 9 May 16, 1982, the Brandywine River Museum is trying to locate the works of Philadelphia illustrator **Charlotte Harding** (1873 1951). Contact John Sheppard, Director Public Relations, BRM, Brandywine Conservance, P.O. Box 141, Chadds Ford, Pa. 19317.

Participation by artists is sought for a two-part documentation project on **artists' records and sound art** jointly undertaken by One Ten Records and Peter Frank. For the first phase, Frank is preparing a monographic study of artists' records, including recordings of sound poetry (or text-sound, music by artists, and unique record art-objects, for publication in 1982. For this he needs archive copies and background information on phonograph records created in the context of contemporary visual art. In conjunction with the monograph, One Ten Records is compiling a discography of the genre. For the second phase, archive copies and background information are needed for an international listing of artists' records, sound art, text-sound, electronic music and new music. This listing is intended for eventual inclusion in a book-length guide on sound art and artists and record cassette editions by B. George and M. DeFoe. Contact M. DeFoe, OTR, 110 Chambers Street, New York, N.Y. 10007. (212) 964-2296.

letters

JOSHUA TAYLOR FUND

To the Editor:

I have just learned of the College Art Association's generous contribution to the Joshua C. Taylor Research Fellowship Fund. I wish to express my personal gratitude for their gift which will be a continuing expression of Joshua Taylor's most cherished concern the promotion of scholarship in American Art.

With heartfelt thanks and all good wishes.

S. Dillon Ripley ■
Secretary,
The Smithsonian Institution

/professional publications

ects are also discussed. Includes discussions of lease provisions and protections, recent litigation involving tenants rights, developments in other jurisdictions, with an evaluation of the prospects for artists' housing in New York. 157 pp. Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts, 36 W. 44 St., Suite 1110, N.Y.C. 10036. $11.00.

The Visual Arts in the Ninth Decade, edited by Fred V. Mills and Donald J. Irving. Contributions by a number of educators and administrators dealing with important issues facing arts administrators in the coming decade. 143 pp. Fred V. Mills, Chairman, Dept. of Art, Illinois State University, Bloomington-Normal, Ill. 61761. $7.00.

Wherewithal: A Guide to Resources for Museums and Historical Societies in New York State, compiled by Tema Greenleaf Harnik. Detailed descriptions of 145 nonprofit organizations and government agencies that offer funds, consultant services, technical assistance, legal services, circulating exhibitions, workshops, research facilities, and more. The majority of the organizations listed are national in scope so that this is a useful tool for institutions throughout the country. Indexed to locate specific types of services. 96 pp. Center for Arts Information, 625 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10012. $5.75, postage included. Bulk order discounts available.

Writing a Resume. A guide expressly for individuals seeking jobs in arts management. 22 pp. Opportunity Resources for the Arts, 1501 Broadway, N.Y.C. 10036. $3.50 (free to OR registrants). ■

If you have ever seen painted or stamped **woven wire screens** of 19th or 20th century vintage; or reference to their existence, use, location, or painters in America or abroad, contact Elaine Eff, The Baltimore Museum of Art, Art Museum Drive, Baltimore, Md. 21218. ■

Figure 3.

Lastly, course catalogs from some universities and colleges which were suggested by colleagues or indicated in other published sources were reviewed for possible listings.

Methods Used to Elicit Data

In the fall of 1980, the first questionnaires were sent out. Questionnaires were continued to be sent out as additional listings were identified until the spring of 1982, by which time it had been determined that a fairly universal sample had been contacted. The initial contact was made by mail. This was followed up by a postcard reminder if the questionnaire had not been completed by a specified date (usually six weeks after the postmark of the initial mailing). In a few cases, the questionnaire was administered by phone. In three unusual cases, where no direct contact was made with the course instructors, information was drawn solely from current course catalogs.

Description of Sample

A total of 34 questionnaires were sent out but the results of the survey are based on data retrieved from 25 completed forms. The additional nine questionnaires were not included either because it was discovered the course was no longer offered, or it was found that the course did not place a significant focus on American folk art. For instance, it was discovered that a Masters of Folk Arts degree program at Dusquesne University offered a course concentrating in European, not American, folk art.

From the instructors who responded to the questionnaire, it was learned that five of the universities offered more than one course and that one university (New York University) offered an entire Master's degree program in Folk Arts consisting of seven folk art courses. Therefore, a total of 39 courses on American folk art were identified. [NOTE: The University of Delaware offered a doctoral degree program in American Material Culture, but only one course was devoted specifically to folk arts.] However, the tabulated information was based on one course listing per university or college, or a total of 25 courses. The remaining additional courses did not significantly alter the data save for the total number of folk art courses which were being offered.

The courses which have been included in this report are the following:

College/University	Instructor	Course Title
Arkansas College	George E. Lankford	Folklife
Boston University	Jane Nylander	Studies in American Material Culture
Brigham Young University	Pamela Blakely	Folklife and Material Culture
Cooperstown Graduate Program, State University of New York	Louis C. Jones	American Folk Painting and Sculpture
George Washington University	Francis Grubar	Folk Arts in America
Georgia State University	John Burrison	America's Folk Crafts

College/University	Instructor	Course Title
Indiana University	Warren Roberts	Folklife and Material Culture
Memorial University of Newfoundland	Gerald Pocius	Material Culture
Michigan State University	C. Kurt Dewhurst	Special Problems American Studies: Seminar in American Folk Arts
New School for Social Research	Bill Ketchum	Collecting American Antiques
New York University	Robert Bishop	Folk Arts in American Life
Pennsylvania State University	Yvonne Milspaw	Topics in American Folklore: Material Culture
State University of New York at Canton	Varick Chittenden	Survey of American Folklore and Folklife
University of Alabama	Brenda McCallum	Folk Arts in America
University of California at Berkeley	James Deetz	American Material Culture
University of California at Los Angeles	Michael O. Jones	Folk Art and Technology
University of Delaware	Bernard Herman	American Folk Artifacts
University of Kentucky	Thomas Adler	Folklife and Material Culture
University of Mississippi	Maude Wahlman	Southern Folk Art
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	Charles G. Zug III	Traditional Craftsmanship
University of Pennsylvania	Henry Glassie	Material Folk Culture

College/University	Instructor	Course Title
University of Texas at Austin	John M. Vlach	American Material Culture
Ursinus College	William Parsons	Pennsylvania Dutch Art
Western Kentucky University	Lynwood Montell	Folk Art and Technology
Western Michigan University	Holly Delach	American Folk Art

Report of the Numerical Data

The data obtained in the questionnaire has been reported in the pages that follow. Each question which was shown on the questionnaire has been listed sequentially in the report. A numerical summary of responses to each question has been displayed below the question and, where appropriate, a percentage table has also been included. A brief narrative summary has concluded the report of each question. [NOTE: When the question/answer was not applicable, the response has been recorded "not applicable." When no response or insufficient information was available, the response has been recorded "no response."]

Institutional Data

QUESTION 1: Location of institution: Circle one location.

Alabama	Georgia	Maine	Nevada
Alaska	Hawaii	Maryland	New Hampshire
Arizona	Idaho	Massachusetts	New Jersey
Arkansas	Illinois	Michigan	New Mexico
California	Indiana	Minnesota	New York
Colorado	Iowa	Mississippi	North Carolina
Connecticut	Kansas	Missouri	North Dakota
Delaware	Kentucky	Montana	Ohio
Florida	Louisiana	Nebraska	Oklahoma

Oregon	Tennessee	Virginia	Wyoming
Pennsylvania	Texas	Washington	District of Columbia
Rhode Island	Utah	West Virginia	
South Carolina	Vermont	Wisconsin	Canada
South Dakota			

DATA DISTRIBUTION: Of the 25 samples, four were from New York; three from Pennsylvania; two each from Michigan, Kentucky and California; and one each from Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Georgia, Indiana, Massachusetts, Mississippi, North Carolina, Texas, Utah and Newfoundland.

COMMENTS: The courses were offered in fairly wide spread geographic locations with only five states having more than one being offered. While the northeastern part of the United States was fairly well represented, the Plains and the Southwest were not represented at all.

* * * * *

QUESTION 2: Size of institution (including graduate and undergraduate population):

a. Under 1000
b. 1000 - 2500
c. 2500 - 5000
d. 5000 - 10000
e. 10000 - 20000
f. 20000 - 30000
g. over 30000

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 2	a. 8%
b. 1	b. 4%
c. 2	c. 8%
d. 1	d. 4%

e.	6	e.	24%
f.	8	f.	32%
g.	5	g.	20%

COMMENTS: Nineteen samples, or 76%, of the total number of courses were being offered in institutions with an enrollment of over 10,000 students. Only 24% of the courses were offered in small or medium-sized institutions.

* * * * *

QUESTION 3: Land-grant institution?

a. yes
b. no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:		PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:	
a.	6	a.	24%
b.	19	b.	76%

COMMENTS: A majority of the courses were offered in institutions of higher education which were not land-grant.

* * * * *

QUESTION 4: Is the institution?

a. public
b. private

DATA DISTRIBUTION:		PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:	
a.	20	a.	80%
b.	5	b.	20%

COMMENTS: A majority of the courses were offered in public institutions of higher education.

* * * * *

QUESTION 5: Which of the following best describes the institution?

a. Two year only
b. Four year only
c. Graduate only
d. Four year and graduate
e. Other (specify) _____

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 2	a. 8%
b. 2	b. 8%
c. 1	c. 4%
d. 20	d. 80%
e. 0	e. 0%

COMMENTS: A majority, or 80%, of the courses in folk arts were offered at institutions of higher education which had both four year and graduate programs.

* * * * *

QUESTION 6: Which of the following describes the academic year?

a. Quarterly system (ten week term)
b. Semester system (fifteen week term)
c. Other (specify) _____

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 6	a. 24%
b. 18	b. 72%
c. 1 (4 - 1 - 4)	c. 4%

COMMENTS: A majority, or 72%, of those institutions which offered folk art courses were on a semester system.

* * * * *

Course Data

QUESTION 7: How long has the course been offered?

a. Less than one year
b. One to two years
c. Three to five years
d. Six to ten years
e. Eleven to fifteen years
f. Over fifteen years

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 5	a. 20%
b. 4	b. 16%
c. 5	c. 20%
d. 4	d. 16%
e. 2	e. 8%
f. 1	f. 4%
No response - 4	No response - 16%

COMMENTS: Almost all (80%) of the surveyed folk arts courses currently being offered in higher education have been developed within the last fifteen years, while a majority (56%) have only been offered within the last five years.

* * * * *

QUESTION 8: How many times a year is the course offered?

a. Once
b. Twice
c. Three times
d. Four or five times
e. Other (specify) _____

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 22	a. 88%
b. 2	b. 8%
c. 0	c. 0%
d. 1	d. 4%
e. 0	e. 0%

COMMENTS: A majority (88% or 22) of the surveyed courses on folk arts were being offered only once a year. Only 12%, or 3, courses were offered more than once.

* * * * *

QUESTION 9: When is the course scheduled for offering?

a. Daytime
b. Evening
c. Daytime and evening
d. Special workshops or seminars
e. Other (specify) _____

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 18	a. 72%
b. 5	b. 20%
c. 2	c. 8%
d. 0	d. 0%
e. 0	e. 0%

COMMENTS: A majority (18 or 72%) of the courses were only offered in the daytime. Only 28% of the courses were offered in the evening.

* * * * *

QUESTION 10: Is the course offered on campus?

a. yes
b. no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 25	a. 100%
b. 0	b. 0%

COMMENTS: All of the courses were offered on campus.

* * * * *

QUESTION 11: Is the course offered off campus?

a. yes
b. no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 2	a. 8%
b. 22	b. 88%
No response - 1	No response - 4%

COMMENTS: Only 8% of the courses were offered off-campus. Respondents did not specify where the off-campus locations were.

* * * * *

QUESTION 12: How many credits are given for the course?

a. One
b. Two
c. Three
d. Four
e. Five
f. Six
g. Seven
h. Eight or more

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 0	a. 0%
b. 2	b. 8%
c. 19	c. 76%
d. 2	d. 8%
e. 1	e. 4%
f. 0	f. 0%
g. 0	g. 0%
h. 0	h. 0%
Not applicable - 1	Not applicable - 4%

COMMENTS: A majority (19 or 76%) of the courses were offered for three credits. These courses were all on the

semester system. The sample responding (a.) was a course given through a university extension program.

* * * * *

QUESTION 13: Does the course have FORMAL affiliations with any of the following inside or outside the parent institution: (Mark yes or no for items a-f and give additional information where possible.)

a. Folk art museum yes or no
Specify _____

b. Open air museum yes or no
Specify _____

c. Library yes or no
Specify _____

d. Research institute yes or no
Specify _____

e. Folklore archives yes or no
Specify _____

f. Other yes or no
Specify _____

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 4	a. 16%
b. 0	b. 0%
c. 6	c. 22%
d. 2	d. 8%
e. 11	e. 11%
f. 2	f. 8%
No response - 3	

COMMENTS: Many of the courses listed one or more formal affiliations with museums or archives. Among the institutions listed having formal affiliations with courses on

folk arts were the following: Michigan Folk Arts Archives and The Museum, Michigan State University; The New York State Historical Association and Fenimore House, New York; Robert Lowie Museum of Anthropology, California; The Folklore Center, University of Texas at Austin; The Museum of American Folk Art, New York; The Center for Southern Folklore, Memphis, Tennessee; University Museum at the University of Mississippi; Mississippi State Archives and History Museum; Delta Blues Museum, Mississippi; Archives of Folklore, Folklife and Oral History at Western Kentucky University; Winterthur Museum, Delaware; Center for the Study of North Country Folklife, New York; Arkansas College Folklore Archives; Georgia Folklore Archives at Georgia State University; and the Archives of Minority Cultures, University of Alabama.

* * * * *

QUESTION 14: Is a course syllabus available?

a. yes
b. no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 18	a. 72%
b. 3	b. 12%
No response - 4	No response - 16%

COMMENTS: Of the 72% who replied in the affirmative, ten sent a copy of their syllabus.

* * * * *

QUESTION 15: Is a course reading list available?

a. yes
b. no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 17	a. 64%
b. 4	b. 16%
No response 4	No response - 16%

COMMENTS: Of the 64% who replied in the affirmative, eight sent a copy of their reading lists.

* * * * *

QUESTION 16: Is the course listed in the school catalog?

a. yes
b. no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 25	a. 100%
b. 0	b. 0%

COMMENTS: All samples were listed in current course catalogs.

* * * * *

QUESTION 17: Are there plans for the course to be dropped?

a. yes
b. no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 2	a. 8%
b. 19	b. 76%
No response - 4	No response - 16%

COMMENTS: Only two samples (or 8%) responded that there were plans to drop the course. [NOTE: It was recently learned that only one of these courses had in fact been dropped.]

* * * * *

QUESTION 18: If the answer to Question 17 is YES, for which of the following reasons will the course be dropped? (Mark yes or no for items a through f.)

a.	Lack of qualified instructor	yes or no
b.	Lack of students	yes or no
c.	Financial considerations	yes or no
d.	Physical space problems	yes or no
e.	Scheduling problems	yes or no
f.	Administrative decision	yes or no
g.	Other (specify) _____	

DATA DISTRIBUTION:

a. 1
b. 0
c. 1
d. 0
e. 0
f. 2
g. 0
No response - 4
Not applicable - 19

COMMENTS: Only two of the samples reported that the course in folk arts was going to be dropped. One sample cited the reasons were administrative decision and lack of qualified instructor. The other sample reported the drop was proposed due to administrative decision and lack of funding. [NOTE: It was recently learned that a qualified instructor

had been hired and the course listing had been maintained.]

* * * * *

QUESTION 19: Are there plans for the course to be radically changed?

a. yes
b. no
If yes, specify _____

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 2	a. 8%
b. 19	b. 76%
No response - 4	No response - 16%

COMMENTS: For the two samples who reported plans for a radical change in the course, one replied that the course was in a currently developing program, while the other stated that the course varies according to who teaches it at their university.

* * * * *

QUESTION 20: What was the PRIMARY reason for establishing a course in folk art study at your institution?

a. Student-initiated demand
b. Instructor-initiated demand
c. Department-initiated demand
d. Don't know background
e. Other (specify) _____

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 0	a. 0%
b. 10	b. 40%

c. 8	c. 32%
d. 2	d. 8%
e. 1	e. 4%
No response - 4	No response - 16%

COMMENTS: One sample reported that the course was established because of student, instructor and departmental-initiated demand. However, most courses were initiated by instructor or department demand.

* * * * *

QUESTION 21: For what level student is the course designed? (Mark yes or no for items a through e.)

a. Undergraduate	yes or no
b. Graduate	yes or no
c. Auditor	yes or no
d. Non-degree	yes or no
e. Non-degree	yes or no
f. Other (specify) _____	

DATA DISTRIBUTION: (yes answers)	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 16	a. 32%
b. 16	b. 32%
c. 3	c. 6%
d. 4	d. 8%
e. 0	e. 0%
No response - 2	No response - 4%

COMMENTS: An equal percentage of samples responded that the course had been designed for an undergraduate and a graduate student level. One sample responded that their course/courses had been designed for undergraduate, graduate and auditor students.

* * * * *

QUESTION 22: What is the average student enrollment in the course?

a. Under 10
b. 11 - 15
c. 16 - 30
d. 31 - 40
e. 41 - 50
f. 51 - 75
g. 76 - 100
h. Over 100

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 2	a. 4%
b. 7	b. 28%
c. 10	c. 40%
d. 0	d. 0%
e. 1	e. 2%
f. 0	f. 0%
g. 0	g. 0%
h. 0	h. 0%
No response - 5	No response - 20%

COMMENTS: Seven (or 28%) reported that they had between 11 to 15 students and 10 (or 40%) reported between 16 to 30 students enrolled on an average in their course. Only one sample reported an average student enrollment over 41. In general, most courses had small to medium-sized student enrollment.

* * * * *

QUESTION 23: What percentage of students in the folk art course are from the following majors? (Mark one response for each item a through j.)

		none	a few	many	almost all
a.	American Studies	1	2	3	4
b.	Anthropology	1	2	3	4
c.	Art History	1	2	3	4
d.	English	1	2	3	4
e.	Engineering	1	2	3	4
f.	Folklore	1	2	3	4
g.	Geography	1	2	3	4
h.	History	1	2	3	4
i.	Home Economics	1	2	3	4
j.	Museum Studies	1	2	3	4
k.	Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	1	2	3	4	NA	NR
a.	1	6	5	1	1	7
b.	4	8	2	0	1	10
c.	3	9	1	1	1	10
d.	4	9	0	0	1	11
e.	9	2	1	0	1	12
f.	7	3	2	2	1	10
g.	7	5	0	0	1	12
h.	2	9	2	0	1	11
i.	8	3	0	0	1	13
j.	6	4	2	1	1	11
k.	2	3	3	0	1	16

COMMENTS: American studies, folklore, museum studies and art history majors were cited as comprising the majority of majors enrolled in five of the folk arts courses. In 15 of the courses, the following majors were cited as being represented by many of the students: American studies, folklore, anthropology, engineering, history, and museum studies. In three courses, many of the students were drawn from one of these majors: Pennsylvania German Studies, Western Civilization, Southern Studies and New England Studies. Other majors listed included urban planning and design, photo

journalism, decorative arts, career-oriented technologies, education, studio art and communication.

* * * * *

QUESTION 24: Is the course offered as an interdisciplinary listing?

a. yes
b. no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 12	a. 48%
b. 11	b. 44%
No response - 2	No response - 4%

COMMENTS: The course in folk arts was offered in approximately half the samples as an interdisciplinary course.

* * * * *

QUESTION 25: If the answer to Question 24 is YES, in which of the following departments is the course cross-listed? (Mark yes or no for items a through m.)

a.	American Studies	yes or no
b.	Anthropology	yes or no
c.	Architecture	yes or no
d.	Art	yes or no
e.	Art History	yes or no
f.	English	yes or no
g.	Ethnic Studies	yes or no
h.	Folklore/Folk Culture	yes or no
i.	Geography	yes or no
j.	History	yes or no
k.	Home Economics	yes or no
l.	Museum Studies	yes or no
m.	Other (specify) _____	yes or no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:
(yes answers)

a. 6
b. 5
c. 0
d. 1
e. 3
f. 2
g. 2
h. 6
i. 3
j. 2
k. 0
l. 2
m. 3 (one each Social Studies, Southern Studies and New England Studies)
Not applicable - 13

COMMENTS: The interdisciplinary course in folk arts was most often cross-listed in American studies, anthropology and folklore.

* * * * *

QUESTION 26: If the answer to QUESTION 24 is NO, then with which department is the course listed or offered? (Mark yes or no for items a through j.)

a.	American Studies	yes or no
b.	Anthropology	yes or no
c.	Architecture	yes or no
d.	Art History	yes or no
e.	English	yes or no
f.	Ethnic Studies	yes or no
g.	Folklore/Folk Culture	yes or no
h.	Geography	yes or no
i.	History	yes or no
j.	Other (specify) _____	yes or no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:
(yes answers)

a. 2
b. 2

c. 0
d. 0
e. 3
f. 0
g. 2
h. 0
i. 0
j. 2 (one each Museum Studies and Continuing Education)
Not applicable - 14

COMMENTS: The listing of the 11 non-interdisciplinary courses were fairly evenly distributed among the following departments: American studies, anthropology, English and folklore.

* * * * *

QUESTION 27: Is the course REQUIRED in any of the following DEGREE programs? (Mark yes or no for each item a through f.)

a.	Anthropology	yes or no
b.	American Studies	yes or no
c.	Art History	yes or no
d.	Cultural Geography	yes or no
e.	Folklore or Folk Culture	yes or no
f.	Other (specify) _____	yes or no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:
(yes answers)

a. 0
b. 0
c. 1
d. 0
e. 2
f. 3
No response - 6

COMMENTS: The course was listed as a requirement in only six different degree programs at institutions listed. Art

history, folklore, Southern studies and historic preservation were the degree programs cited.

* * * * *

QUESTION 28: Is the course offered as an ELECTIVE in the following DEGREE programs? (Mark yes or no for each item a through j.)

a.	American Studies	yes or no
b.	Art History	yes or no
c.	Architecture	yes or no
d.	Cultural Geography	yes or no
e.	Engineering	yes or no
f.	Folklore or Folk Culture	yes or no
g.	Ethnic Studies	yes or no
h.	Home Economics	yes or no
i.	History	yes or no
j.	Other (specify) _____	yes or no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:
(yes answers)

a. 8
b. 5
c. 0
d. 4
e. 1
f. 8
g. 2
h. 1
i. 5
j. 6 (two English and one each Southern studies, museum studies, education and Pennsylvania German studies)

No response - 4
Not applicable - 1

COMMENTS: It was reported that the course was offered as an elective most often in American studies and folklore degree programs.

* * * * *

QUESTION 29: What format does the course take? (Mark one response for each item a through j.)

		used never	used seldom	used moderately	used primarily
a.	Lecture (didactic)	1	2	3	4
b.	Slide lecture	1	2	3	4
c.	Readings	1	2	3	4
d.	Discussion	1	2	3	4
e.	Fieldwork	1	2	3	4
f.	Demonstrations	1	2	3	4
g.	Research projects	1	2	3	4
h.	Other (specify)	1	2	3	4

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	1	2	3	4	NR
a.	0	4	14	4	3
b.	0	2	10	9	4
c.	0	2	14	4	5
d.	0	1	15	4	5
e.	1	2	15	3	4
f.	4	12	2	1	6
g.	2	2	8	8	5
h.	0	1	1	0	23

COMMENTS: A majority of the instructors for the courses primarily used lectures, slide lectures, research projects, readings, discussion and fieldwork as teaching techniques. Having demonstrations was the least-used teaching technique.

* * * * *

QUESTION 30: Do assignments for the course include the following? (Mark one response for each item a through i.)

		never	seldom	usually	always
a.	Readings	1	2	3	4
b.	Fieldwork	1	2	3	4
c.	Presentations	1	2	3	4

d.	Demonstrations	1	2	3	4
e.	Semester journals	1	2	3	4
f.	Term papers	1	2	3	4
g.	Research projects	1	2	3	4
h.	Exams	1	2	3	4
i.	Other (specify)	1	2	3	4

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	1	2	3	4	NR
a.	0	0	9	12	4
b.	2	4	9	5	5
c.	4	4	7	5	5
d.	7	10	1	0	7
e.	14	2	1	0	8
f.	3	1	5	10	6
g.	1	2	6	12	4
h.	5	4	4	8	4
i.	2	0	1	0	22

COMMENTS: A majority of the instructors usually or always assigned readings, fieldwork, presentations, term papers, research projects and gave exams. Most seldom or never assigned demonstrations or semester journals. One respondent reported that he usually had students give public presentations in the communities in which they conducted fieldwork.

* * * * *

QUESTION 31: Is material generated by the students deposited in an archives or library?

a. yes
b. no
If yes, specify _____

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 15	a. 60%
b. 6	b. 24%
No response - 4	No response - 16%

COMMENTS: A majority (15 or 60%) of the respondents reported that material generated by their students was deposited in an archives. The specified archives were: The Michigan Folk Arts Archives at Michigan State University; The Folk Arts Archives at Fenimore House, Cooperstown, New York; The Folklore Archives of University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; the Museum of American Folk Art, New York; University of Kentucky Folklore Archives; Center for the Study of Southern Culture, Mississippi; Folklore Archives at Western Kentucky University; Center for the Study of North Country Folklife, New York; Pennsylvania State University Folklore Archives; Memorial University Folklore Archives, Newfoundland; Museum of People and Cultures at Brigham Young University; Folklore Archives at Arkansas College; Georgia Folklore Archives at Georgia State University; and the Archive of American Minority Cultures, University of Alabama.

* * * * *

QUESTION 32: What are the primary texts for the course? (Mark one response for each item a through h.)

	never used	sometimes used	usually used	always used
a. Beyond Necessity: Art in the Folk Tradition	1	2	3	4
b. Flowering of American Folk Art	1	2	3	4
c. Folklore and Folklife	1	2	3	4
d. How to Know American Folk Art	1	2	3	4
e. In Small Things Forgotten	1	2	3	4
f. Patterns in Material Folk Culture	1	2	3	4
g. Perspectives in American Folk Art	1	2	3	4
h. Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	1	2	3	4	NR
a.	6	9	2	1	7
b.	8	6	3	1	7
c.	5	6	3	4	7
d.	12	3	2	2	6
e.	7	1	3	5	9
f.	2	6	3	9	5
g.	10	4	4	0	7
h.	0	2	5	4	13

COMMENTS: Folklore and Folklife, In Small Things Forgotten, and Pattern in the Material Folk Culture in the Eastern United States were most often cited as usually or always used as primary texts for the course. Beyond Necessity, Flowering of American Folk Art and Perspectives in American Folk Art were the texts most often cited as only sometimes or never used. How to Know American Folk Art was the text

most often cited as being never used. Other texts cited once each which were always or usually used in the course were the following: The Encyclopedia of American Antiques and The Catalog of American Antiques; Hidden Dimension; Amish Society; The Golden Age of Homespun; Buckaroos in Paradise; House, Form and Culture; The Art of the Festival; Rockdale; Elements of Semiology; Craftsmen's Clients Contract; Kentucky Folk Architecture; Identifying American Architecture; Missing Pieces: Georgia Folk Art; The Afro-American Tradition in the Decorative Arts; Handicrafts of the Southern Highlands; Rainbows in the Sky: Folk Art of Michigan in the Twentieth Century; A Book of Country Things; American Folk Painting; America's Quilts and Coverlets; American Folk Sculpture; The Handmade Object and Its Maker; and Folksongs and their Makers.

* * * * *

QUESTION 33: Which of the following journals/magazines do you recommend in your courses? (Mark yes or no for each item a through h.)

a.	Journal of American Folklore	yes or no
b.	Journal of Popular Culture	yes or no
c.	Journal of American Culture	yes or no
d.	The Magazine Antiques	yes or no
e.	The Clarion	yes or no
f.	Pioneer America	yes or no
g.	Landscape	yes or no
h.	Keystone Quarterly	yes or no
i.	Western Folklore	yes or no
j.	Other (specify) _____	yes or no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:
(yes answers)

a. 13
b. 6
c. 4
d. 10
e. 8
f. 12
g. 3
h. 7
i. 7
j. 10
No response - 4

COMMENTS: The Journal of American Folklore, The Magazine Antiques, and Pioneer America were cited most often as recommended journals/magazines in the course on folk arts. Other journals or magazines each cited once which were recommended in the course were the following: The Newton Bee (cited twice); Ohio Antiques Review; Maine Antiques Digest; Winterthur Portfolio; Historical Archaeology; Vernacular Architecture Newsletter; Folk-Liv; Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism; Southern Folklore Quarterly; Pennsylvania Folklife; and Ulster Folklife.

* * * * *

Instructor Data

QUESTION 34: By whom is the course primarily taught?

a. One instructor
b. Two instructors
c. Team instruction
d. Other (specify) _____

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 23	a. 92%
b. 1	b. 4%
c. 0	c. 0%
d. 1 (rotating instruction)	d. 4%

COMMENTS: Almost all of the courses listed were taught by one instructor. One course was taught by two instructors; the other was taught by a series of instructors.

* * * * *

QUESTION 35: What faculty rank does the primary instructor of the course hold?

a. Graduate Assistant
b. Instructor
c. Assistant Professor
d. Associate Professor
e. Professor
f. Visiting Artist
g. Adjunct Specialist
h. Other _____

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 0	a. 0%
b. 3	b. 12%
c. 7	c. 28%
d. 4	d. 16%
e. 6	e. 22%
f. 0	f. 0%
g. 3	g. 12%
h. 2 (one each - professor emeritus and lecturer)	h. 8%

COMMENTS: The bulk (70%) of the courses were taught by at least assistant professor level faculty, with 28% of the instructors at the assistant professor level.

* * * * *

QUESTION 36: Which of the following qualifications should an ideal instructor of a course in folk art have? (Mark one response for each item.)

	not necessary	somewhat helpful	very helpful	essential
a. fieldwork experience	1	2	3	4
b. publications experience	1	2	3	4
c. degree in folklore/folk culture	1	2	3	4
d. degree in art history	1	2	3	4
e. craftsmen experience	1	2	3	4
f. collecting folk art	1	2	3	4
g. completed formal course in folk art	1	2	3	4
h. degree in related field	1	2	3	4
i. museum experience	1	2	3	4

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	1	2	3	4	NR
a.	0	1	6	14	4
b.	0	4	12	5	4
c.	2	2	10	7	4
d.	3	10	5	3	4
e.	6	11	4	0	4
f.	7	8	6	0	4
g.	2	6	8	4	5
h.	1	10	8	1	5
i.	2	8	10	1	4

COMMENTS: A majority of samples responded that fieldwork experience, publications experience, and a degree in folklore were very helpful or essential as qualifications for the ideal instructor of a course in folk art. Completing a course in folk art was an additional qualification also

rated by many samples. A majority of the samples thought that for the ideal instructor the following qualifications were either only somewhat helpful or not necessary at all: Degree in art history, craftsmen experience, collecting folk art, or a degree in related field. Museum experience was rated about equally by respondents as somewhat or very helpful.

* * * * *

QUESTION 37: Which of the following describes the qualifications of the primary instructor of the course in folk art at your institution? (Mark one response for each item.)

	no experience	minimal experience	moderate experience	primary experience
a. formal training in folklore/ folk culture	1	2	3	4
b. formal training in folk art	1	2	3	4
c. informal training in folklore/ folk culture	1	2	3	4
d. informal training in folk art	1	2	3	4
e. formal training in art history	1	2	3	4
f. publishing record in folk art	1	2	3	4
g. fieldwork in folk art	1	2	3	4
h. craftsman of folk art	1	2	3	4
i. worked in museum collections	1	2	3	4
j. collector or dealer of folk arts	1	2	3	4

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	1	2	3	4	NR
a.	3	2	1	16	3
b.	4	2	6	8	5
c.	3	0	6	3	13
d.	4	2	5	2	13
e.	7	4	4	5	5
f.	3	3	5	11	3
g.	0	1	5	16	3
h.	10	5	4	0	6
i.	4	4	6	7	4
j.	6	5	4	4	6

COMMENTS: A majority of the samples responded that their qualifications for teaching a course in folk art included formal training in folklore and fieldwork in folk art with a smaller number responding that they had a publishing record in folk art. Eleven instructors replied that they had minimal or no experience in art history.

* * * * *

QUESTION 38: In your opinion, should a course in folk art study be a <u>requirement</u> for an <u>undergraduate</u> degree in <u>folklore/folk culture</u>?

a. yes
b. no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 17	a. 68%
b. 3	b. 12%
No response - 5	No response - 20%

COMMENTS: A majority of the samples responded that in their opinion a course in folk art study should be required

for an undergraduate degree in folklore/folk culture.

* * * * *

QUESTION 39: In your opinion, should a course in folk art study be a requirement for a graduate degree in folklore/folk culture?

a. yes
b. no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 16	a. 64%
b. 4	b. 16%
No response - 5	No response - 20%

COMMENTS: A majority of the samples responded that a course in folk art study should be required for a graduate degree in folklore.

* * * * *

QUESTION 40: In your opinion, should a course in folk art be a requirement for a graduate degree in art history?

a. yes
b. no

DATA DISTRIBUTION:	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL:
a. 18	a. 72%
b. 2	b. 8%
No response - 5	No response - 20%

COMMENTS: A majority of respondents felt that a course in folk art study should be a requirement for a graduate degree in art history.

* * * * *

Using the preceding information, a profile of a typical course in the study of folk art might then be described as follows:

Institutional Base -- The course would probably be offered in a four-year plus graduate school that would have an enrollment of over 10,000 students. The public, but not land-grant, university would be located in the northeastern portion of the United States and would operate on a semester system.

Course Background -- The course would probably have been developed within the last 15 years and there would be no plans to radically change the course or to drop it in the near future. The course would be listed in the college catalog for three credits and would be offered during the daytime once a year on-campus. Designed for either undergraduate or graduate level, the course would have been initiated because of either departmental demand or instructor interest not student interest. The 11 to 30 students who would take this course as an elective were generally enrolled in American studies, folklore, art history or museum studies programs. The course itself would usually

be listed as an interdisciplinary offering in American studies, anthropology or folklore but would sometimes also be listed separately in the departments of American studies, folklore, English or anthropology. Usually the course would have a formal affiliation with a museum or a folklore archives in which student-generated material would be deposited. The course would be taught by one instructor who held the academic rank of at least assistant professor. The instructor, whose primary qualifications for teaching the course would have included fieldwork in folk art, a degree in folklore and a publications record in folk art, would believe that a course in folk art should be a requirement for either a degree in art history or a degree in folklore.

Course Format -- The primary teaching techniques normally employed by the instructor would include slide lectures, research projects, readings, discussion and fieldwork. Students would generally be expected to complete readings, fieldwork, class presentations, exams, term papers and research projects. The most often assigned readings would include Folklore and Folklife, In Small Things Forgotten and Patterns in the Material Folk Culture of the Eastern United States. The journals or magazines most often assigned would be The Journal of American Folklore, The Magazine Antiques and Pioneer America.

This hypothetical course description is but a composite but it highlights a variety of trends that will be discussed more in depth in the final chapter.

Report of Information from the Opinion Page of the Survey and from Interviews with Key Individuals in the Field

The questionnaire contained nine optional questions. Of the 25 samples, 16 responded to these optional questions. The respondents' answers to these questions are reported verbatim in this section.

Some of these same optional questions were addressed to the following key individuals in the field of folk art study:

Dr. Alan Jabbour, Director, American Folklife Center, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Simon Bronner, Assistant Professor of Folklore and American Studies, Pennsylvania State University

Dr. Robert Teske, Folk Arts Programs, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Sally Yerkovich, Folklife Specialist, National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D.C.

Gerald Parsons, Archivist, Archive of American Folk Song, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Elaine Eff, Research Specialist in Folk Arts, Renwick Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Roger Welsch, Professor of Anthropology and Folklore, University of Nebraska

Herbert Hemphill, Freelance curator and collector of folk arts, New York

These individuals were contacted during annual meetings of the American Folklore Society, at special folk arts conferences and in their Washington or New York offices. Their comments were not tape-recorded since the questions usually were not asked in a formal interview situation but rather were usually raised in a general philosophical discussion. The opinions elicited during these sessions are recorded anonymously under each question following the opinions gathered through the questionnaires.

Opinion Section

QUESTION 1: What in your view are some of the most influential writings in the field? Why?

COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRE:

"Holger Cahill, Alice Winchester, Jean Lipman, Nina Fletcher Little, John Vlach and Glassie"

"Best: Kenneth Ames, John Vlach, Simon Bronner -- more behavioral, less cultural"

"Louis Jones and Henry Glassie"

"Henry Glassie, 'Folk Art,' in Dorson, ed. Folklore and Folklife: An Introduction; Jones, et al. 'What is Folk Art,' Antiques, (May 1950)"

"Vlach's book -- introduces the ethnic element"

"Glassie's stuff which combines sound scholarship with a poetic vision and because he has inspired a generation of

scholars. Current work in semiotics and historic archaeology and new social history. Because of expanded analytical methods and interdisciplinary strengths."

"Lipman, Winchester, Black, L. C. Jones, Cahill, Hemphill, Glassie, Ferris, M. O. Jones, Ames"

"Glassie"

"Henry Glassie's work of great consequence, Michael Owen Jones, John Vlach -- also particularly valuable. Further, Don Yoder has contributed much to our field."

"Most of Glassie's writings -- one of few to treat folk art from folkloristic perspective"

"Those of Michael Owen Jones, John M. Vlach, Maude Wahlman -- try to redress aesthetic bias by emic, ethnographic, cross-cultural approaches"

* * * *

QUESTION 2: What are some of the inherent problems in the field of folk art study? Do you have suggestions for improvement?

COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRE:

"Lack of acceptance of folk art study by art history and anthropology -- a need to build bridges"

"Definition"

"An obsession with objects, a compelling desire to frame studies in terms of group style, a preoccupation with

aesthetics as a system of articulated principles, an insistence on treating folk art as a survival."

"Lack of contextual studies leading to misunderstanding of the materials in museums"

"Better communication between folklore and folk arts scholars"

"Definition; theoretical and methodological basis for classifications. Students need to understand connoisseurship without going that route themselves."

"Not enough has been written. More money for research and publications."

"No consensus of what is folk art. We should be dealing with folk art as part of expressive culture. I can't really answer this here -- too complex except to say there are some real problems and they are ideological."

"The apparent schism of art historical/folk cultural approaches. Solve by moderating strident language and melding the approaches."

"Separating conscious efforts from true artisans"

"definition of terms"

"More fieldwork -- more from object centered to craftsmen/user focus"

"Semantic problems create confusion. Non-traditional artists labeled 'folk artists'"

"Antiquarianism and collector's influence; western Anglo-European aesthetic bias"

* * * * *

QUESTION 3: Are you satisfied with your own training or background in folk art? Why/why not?

COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRES:

"Yes -- would like to see some opportunities for post-graduate work"

"Probably -- it was on the job training in the field and in the museum"

"Not really. There was only one course, but I wanted more . . . more . . . more!"

"No. I have no training. There was none when I studied folklore 1948-1953."

"No -- few universities have worthwhile programs"

"Yes and no. I am happy with what I got at Cooperstown, but would have liked for Glassie to have taught a special FOLK ART course while he (and I) were at Indiana."

"I could have used more courses on folk art"

"Yes (in progress) -- I learned by looking and speaking (Socratic method) and continue to find observations, reflection and discussion the best way to learn"

"My Cooperstown/Jones experience has been very helpful, as has reading and discussion with scholars, collectors and dealers"

"No -- not enough training available to further my own education"

"Somewhat"

"Yes"

"I would have been a better teacher if I had formal training in art history/criticism"

"Not really, but I'm learning"

"OK"

* * * * *

QUESTION 4: Where do you think improvements in the training of new folk art scholars can be made?

COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRES:

"More fieldwork and experience"

"More fieldwork and research -- fieldwork with the living, research with the dead"

"Conceptually! Getting people to see beyond the Foxfire concept of survivals in allegedly isolated areas among presumably conservation and tradition-bound folk"

"In folklife programs"

"In their orientation towards the most basic conceptual issues: definitions, structures, functions. There aren't enough serious thinkers who also do contextually-sensitive fieldwork."

"More money for research, more courses"

"Make them read philosophy, history and literature and go out and look at the world around them. FIELDWORK (and underline WORK)"

"By taking interdisciplinary approaches -- art history, aesthetics, cultural geography, ethnography, cultural history, folk culture, etc."

"Establishment of it as recognized curriculum"

"Not really sure it should be an isolated field of study"

"In interdisciplinary graduate courses, including work in cultural anthropology"

* * * * *

QUESTION 5: If different than already described in the questionnaire, how would you structure a course in folk art?

COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRES:

"I deal with the folk arts, treating matters of expressive behavior and taste generally, whether in regard to object making, narrating, celebrating, etc."

"Folk art should be studied as part of a solid program in folklife research"

"It would be different, since my course is really a FOLKLIFE course in which folk ART is a significant portion, but not the totality"

"Travelling lectures - tours"

* * * * *

QUESTION 6: In which academic department/discipline should the study of folk art materials be pursued? Should it be interdisciplinary?

COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRES:

"Programs such as American studies allow for a broad background in coursework from art history, sociology, folklore, art theory and applied experience (i.e., museum studies)"

"Certainly Folklore Studies or Art History departments or programs, and as interdisciplinary an approach as possible"

"Should be in a folklore/folklife department"

"Yes [it should be interdisciplinary]"

"Ideally, in a department of Folklife, OR as an interdisciplinary study spread between art, anthropology and perhaps psychology"

"Yes [it should be interdisciplinary]"

"Yes [it should be interdisciplinary]"

"Interdisciplinary"

"Interdisciplinary -- American studies and art history"

"Yes, interdisciplinary"

"Interdisciplinary. Particularly art history, anthropology and historical archaeology"

"Yes -- humanities"

"Folklore/folklife, ideally"

"Interdisciplinary, definitely"

* * * * *

QUESTION 7: What terms would you prefer to be accepted for general use that would adequately describe folk art materials?

COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRES:

"Material folk culture"

"Non-academic is most accurate but I can live with folk art"

"None do, and probably none can or will. But maybe 'the arts in everyday life' gets rid of some FOLK connotations to which I object."

"traditional - decoration"

"folk arts"

"I'm not sure but folk isn't one of them"

"Folklife"

"Could only respond to this with your feedback, as I'm not sure I understand what you're getting at"

* * * * *

QUESTION 8: Given your experience or observation, how has the study of folk art materials evolved?

COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRES:

"two directions -- from art history and from folklore"

"From study of index of cultural evolution, to a study of distribution of types related to migration of people to a study of its relation to institutions as part of an

integrated cultural whole, a study of it as a manifestation of cognitive and interactive processes"

"I can see very little progress or evolution in the past 20 years"

"It has not come very far as yet, but moved from a base of connoiseurship to the beginnings of an empirical field. There is still too much 'appreciation' without basis."

"from folklore to art history"

"si monumentum requiris, circumspice"

"personal interest groups pushing educational trend"

"Important changes only in last few years, as implicit assumptions questioned"

* * * * *

QUESTION 9: What do you perceive to be the greatest obstacle to the further development of folk art study? Why? Do you have suggestions or solutions?

COMMENTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRES:

"lack of adequate training programs -- and the lack of cooperation between disciplines"

"squabbling over definition and academic parochialism"

"the pervasive assumption that folk art is objects made by other people forming like-minded group inheriting a cultural legacy. Why is this an obstacle? It doesn't recognize or admit or allow for study of fundamental

processes of human behavior. Do I have a solution? No. I keep hammering away; so do a few others. Some people listen, some don't. Maybe if some more studies are published on behavior heretofore ignored it will help. Which is why I'm talking about and writing about arranging trash cans, cleaning fish, remodeling houses and so forth."

"inadequate opportunities for fieldwork"

"The tendency to think we can adequately read objects for aesthetic meaning in the absence of human interpreters. My only suggestion is a solid fieldwork-based program of research"

"I don't see any obstacles"

"academic myopia"

"Intransigent scholars/shabby scholarship/insufficient funds for exhibitions and publications"

"Informed instructors of visual and oral materials"

"perceived to be non-academic and 'fluffy' -- because not as important as art"

"publications by collectors and other amateurs. More qualified authors."

"academic turf disputes"

"aesthetic, object-oriented approach has been a big obstacle, but I think that's changing"

* * * * *

The preceding listing of expressed comments have offered strong collaborative evidence that the study of

folk art in the United States still remains in an infantile though rapidly changing stage of development. From these gathered comments it has also been evident that the study of folk art has evolved from disparate and sometimes clashing backgrounds. This conflict in its evolution continues to be observed but there is also a developing call for more interdisciplinary research and exchange. The respondents indicated that not only were they dissatisfied with their own training in folk art study but also that more courses in folk art should be offered. This consensus has underlined the value of this study.

CHAPTER IV FOOTNOTES

[1]Ronald Baker, correspondence, September 25, 1980.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, OBSERVATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The review of the historical development of folk art study in America and the tabulation of the results of the survey of contemporary folk art course offerings have provided evidence on which some observations, conclusions and suggestions might now be made. Perhaps by reviewing the historical summary and the results of the contemporary survey, shapers of folk art theory and pedagogy might gain insights that will help them forge new directions for the study of folk art study.

In Chapter III, it was stated that this study was particularly intended to aid the developer of new courses in folk art by providing information in the following areas of concerns: (1) the differing definitions of folk art; (2) what kind and amount of training or background in folk art do the instructors bring to their classroom; (3) what analytical tools must the scholar employ in assessing the material; (4) what other disciplines, methodologies or theories might be used in the study of folk art; (5) what will the art historian have to know about the folk and the folklorist know about art in order to conscientiously consider the material; and (6) how should the study of folk

art fit into the overall and ongoing program of the discipline. Some of the information in those areas was gathered and illuminated in the historical survey and yet other data that addressed those concerns was garnered through the administration of the surveys. The following list of conclusions drawn from the historical and contemporary surveys will hopefully contribute to the understanding of those areas of concerns:

1. Folk art as a field for study is a relatively new phenomenon in higher education in the United States.

2. Folk art study has not been based on a unified theoretical base. The practitioners of folk art study have yet to blend their approaches but there has existed a recent trend toward interdisciplinary interaction.

3. Studies of folk art have historically been published primarily in art history or antiques-oriented publications, yet these studies are not primary source materials for students in most folk art courses.

4. Most of the folk art courses are housed in one academic department and are located in folklore or American studies departments or programs.

5. Most of the folk art courses are offered in interdisciplinary programs. A majority of the respondents advocated that folk art study <u>should</u> be offered in interdisciplinary programs.

6. Most folk art courses are offered in universities that are large enough to support the introduction of new courses or programs.

7. Most folk art courses are offered in the northeastern part of the United States where interest in folk art study and collection has historically been stronger than in other regions of the United States.

8. Most courses in folk art are taught by instructors who have minimal or no training in art history.

9. The term "folk art" has been and continues to be an inherent problem in the development of folk art study.

These observations of both historical and current trends may offer important clues to those who are not only presently teaching courses in folk art but also to those who intend to initiate new courses. The number of courses will undoubtedly grow as the popularity of folk art continues to mount and as new scholars are attracted to the study of folk art. Even as this study has been concluded, Bloomingdale's (the fashion store in New York City) has kicked off a fall fashion and design campaign in conjunction with the Museum of American Folk Art. This event will be covered in every major women's or antiques publication and will push popular interest in folk art to an even greater high. The effects of this merchandising mania and public enthusiasm will very likely draw additional scholarly attention to the material, and ultimately initiate a demand for more courses in folk art.

In a 1951 article which reviewed the development of folklore studies, Robert Seager made some observations which parallel the development of folk art studies:

> At any given stage in the historical development of a people the folklore and legend of that people will serve as a sentimental and nostalgic link with the past. At the same time it will provide a cultural and emotional basis for contemporary group action and aspirations. In this sense, interest in folklore and the folk past of a people is closely associated with the development of national consciousness . . . as a result, the formal study of folklore and the institutionalization of that study in scholarly journals and college curricula is a significant reflection of a developmental stage of national awareness and on the intellectual and academic level, an expression of that awareness.[1]

The fact that the folklore discipline has begun to significantly contribute to the pedagogical developers of material culture study was recently noted in a 1981 colloquium on teaching from material culture entitled "Historians/Artifacts/Learners" held at Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia. Barbara C. Fertig in her report of the proceedings of that colloquium stated that:

> For some of us [in art history and art museum studies] whose chief focus is the art-artifact, there has been the cheering discovery that historians, cultural anthropologists, geographers, folklorists and the like have been on a similar quest and have included in their resources theories of art history and perception. Read back to us these theories seem to take on new power to inform our own work.[2]

The colloquium was designed to establish a framework for development a source book for teaching from material culture

and the meeting successfully provided a foundation on which such a publication will emerge.

It is this developing awareness and acceptance of material culture study within the academic community that will ultimately provide us with new information about and insights into the nature of folk art products, processes and producers. This emerging acceptance was recently commented on by Simon J. Bronner and Stephen P. Poyser.

> The growing number of courses on material folk culture in universities, and the increasing sophistication of American museums indicate the expanding scholarly recognition of material study's skills, methods, tools and concepts, a movement that has already encouraged numerous publications by young students of the field.[3]

This growing recognition must learn from the vitality and excitement that typified the theoretical and methodological exchanges that occurred at the 1977 Winterthur Conference. Knowledge prompted by exchanges such as those must be channeled into the constructive pathways for the continued expansion and strengthening of the study of American folk art.

Chapter V Footnotes

[1]Robert Seager, Midwest Folklore, Vol. 1, No. 3 (1951), p. 218.

[2]Barbara C. Fertig, "Historians/Artifacts/Learners: The History Museum as Educator," Museum News, Vol. 60, No. 6 (July/August 1982), p. 57.

[3]Simon J. Bronner and Stephen P. Poyser, "From Neglect to Concept: An Introduction to the Study of the Material Aspects of American Folk Culture," Folklore Forum, Vol. 12, Nos. 2 and 3 (1979), p. 127.

EPILOGUE

I have undertaken this study as both a participant in and an observer of the study of folk art. I have conducted it from "inside the gate" and as "part of the show." Fully expecting that this study would contribute to a greater understanding of my chosen field of study, I have been delighted with the insights that have been gained through the process of gathering and reporting the preceeding information. I now hope that the information presented herein will be useful to those who have been and will continue to be contributing to our body of knowledge about folk arts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND GENERAL REFERENCES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ames, Kenneth L. Beyond Necessity: Art in the Folk Tradition, exhibition catalogue. Winterthur, Delaware: The Winterthur Museum, W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1977.

Ames, Kenneth L. "Folk Art: The Challenge and the Promise." In Perspectives on American Folk Art, pp. 293-324. Edited by Ian M. G. Quimby and Scott T. Swank. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1980.

Armstrong, Thomas. "Preface." In American Folk Painters of Three Centuries, pp. 8-9. Edited by Thomas Armstrong and Jean Lipman. New York: Hudson Hill Press, Inc. in cooperation with the Whitney Museum of American Art, 1980.

Baker, Ronald L. "Folklore Courses and Programs in American Colleges and Universities." Journal of American Folklore 84:232 (April-June 1971), pp. 222-223.

Baker, Ronald L. Personal correspondence, September 25, 1980.

Boggs, Ralph Steele. "Folklore in University Curricula in the United States." Southern Folklore Quarterly IV (1940), pp. 93-109.

Bronner, Simon J. A Critical Bibliography of American Folk Art. Bloomington, Indiana: Folklore Publications Group, 1978.

Bronner, Simon J. "Concepts in the Study of Material Aspects of American Folk Culture." Folklore Forum 12:1-2 (1979), pp. 133-172.

Cahill, Holger. "Introduction." In American Primitives, exhibition catalogue, p. 7. Newark, New Jersey: Newark Museum, 1930.

Cocchiara, Guiseppe. "Folk Art." In The Encyclopedia of World Art, pp. 452-506. Edited by Massimo Pallottino. New York, Toronto and London: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

Coffin, Tristam P. Our Living Traditions: An Introduction to American Folklore. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1968.

Deetz, James. "Material Culture and Archaeology--What's the Difference?" In Historical Archaeology and the Importance of Material Things, Special Publications Series, No. 2, pp. 9-12. Edited by Leland Ferguson. The Society for Historical Archaeology, 1977.

Dewhurst, C. Kurt, and MacDowell, Marsha. "Folk Arts in Sweden: Focus on Nordiska Museum and Skansen Open-Air Museum/Stockholm." The Clarion (1979), pp. 46-49.

Dewhurst, C. Kurt, and MacDowell, Marsha. "Popular Culture and the European Folk Museum." In Twentieth-Century Popular Culture in Museums and Libraries, pp. 105-122. Edited by Fred E. H. Schroeder. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1981.

Dewhurst, C. Kurt, MacDowell, Betty, and MacDowell, Marsha. Artists in Aprons: Folk Art of American Women. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1979.

Dorson, Richard M. Folklore and Fakelore: Essays Toward a Discipline of Folk Studies. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.

Dorson, Richard M., ed. Folklore and Folklife. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Dorson, Richard M. "The Growth of Folklore Courses." The Journal of American Folklore 63 (1950), pp. 352-359.

Eaton, Allen H. Handicrafts of New England. New York: Bonanza Books, 1969.

Dundes, Alan, ed. What is Folklore. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Fertig, Barbara C. "Historians/Artifacts/Learners: The History Museum as Educator." Museum News 60:6 (1982), p. 57.

Focillon, M. Henri. "Introduction" to Art Populaire (the English translation). In Hearts and Crowns, pp. 15-20. Edited by Robert F. Trent. New Haven, Conn.: New Haven Colony Historical Society, 1977.

Garrett, Wendell, and Garrett, Jane. "A Bibliography of the Arts in Early American History." In The Arts of Early American History, pp. 35-152. Edited by Walter

Muir Whitehill. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1965.

Glassie, Henry. Pattern in the Material Folk Culture of the Eastern United States. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968.

Goldin, Amy. "Problems in Folk Art." Artforum 14:10 (June 1976), pp. 48-52.

Goldwater, Robert. Primitivism in Modern Art, rev. ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1967.

Goodrich, Lloyd. "Introduction." In What is American in American Art, exhibition catalogue, pp. 10-21. New York: M. Knoedler and Company, 1971.

Donnorae, Gordon, and Mankin, Betsy. "The Way I Remember It." New York Folklore 1 (1975), p. 23.

Horwitz, Elinor Lander. The Bird, The Banner and Uncle Sam: Images of America in Folk and Popular Art. Philadelphia and New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1976.

Hubbard, Guy. "Art Education: Colleges and Universities." In The Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 1, pp. 297-301. Edited by Lee C. Deighton. New York: The MacMillan Company and The Free Press, 1971.

Jones, Louis O. "Three Eyes on the Past: A New Triangulation for Local Studies." New York Folklore Quarterly 12 (1956), pp. 3-13.

Jones, Michael Owen. "The Study of Folk Art Study: Reflections on Images." In Folklore Today: A Festschrift for Richard M. Dorson, pp. 291-304. Edited by Henry Glassie and Felix Oinas. Bloomington, Indiana: Research Center for Language and Semiotic Studies, 1976.

Longnecker, Gregory J. "The Place of Folklore and Folkloristics in California Community Colleges." Western Folklore 35:1 (January 1976), pp. 65-71.

Lynes, Russell. The Tastemakers. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1954.

Newsom, Barbara Y., and Silver, Adele Z., eds. The Art Museum as Educator. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1978.

Riedl, Norbert, "Folklore and the Study of Material Aspects of Folk Culture." Journal of American Folklore 79 (1966), pp. 557-563.

Rinzler, Ralph. "Folklore and Folk Art: The Origins of Two Movements." The 26th Annual Washington Antiques Show, pp. 37-39. Washington, D.C.: The Thrift Shop, 1981.

Robbins, Daniel. "Folk Sculpture Without Folk." In Folk Sculpture: USA, pp. 11-30. Edited by Herbert W. Hemphill, Jr. Brooklyn, New York: The Brooklyn Museum, 1976.

Rourke, Constance. "Introduction." In Treasury of American Design, Vol. 1, pp. xix-xxvii. Edited by Holger Cahill. New York: Henry Abrams, Inc., 1950.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Rumford, Beatrix T. "Uncommon Art of the Common People: A Review of Trends in the Collecting and Exhibiting of American Folk Art." In Perspectives of American Folk Art, pp. 13-53. Edited by Ian M. G. Quimby and Scott Swank. New York: W. W. Norton, 1980.

Salerno, Luigi. "Historiography." In The Encyclopedia of World Art, Vol. 7, pp. 507-559. Edited by Massimo Pallottino. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.

Schlereth, Thomas. Artifacts and the American Past. Nashville, Tennessee: The American Association for State and Local History, 1980.

Seager, Robert II. "American Folklore and History: Observations on Potential Integration." Midwest Folklore 1:3 (1951), pp. 213-222.

Spratling, Garrison. "Winterthur Holds Conference on American Folk Art." Maine Antique Digest (Jan./Feb. 1978), pp. 12A-13A.

Sweeney, John A. H. "Introduction." In Material Culture and the Study of American Life, p. 1. Edited by Ian M. G. Quimby. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1978.

Trent, Robert F. Hearts and Crowns. New Haven, Conn.: New Haven Colony Historical Society, 1977.

Walker, Sophia A. "An Art Impression of the Exposition." Independent 53:2746 (July 18, 1901), 1678. Cited in

Neil Harris, "Museums, Merchandising and Popular Taste: The Struggle for Influence." In Material Culture and the Study of American Life, p. 144. Edited by Ian M. Quimby. New York: W. W. Nortion, 1978.

Whitehill, Walter Muir. The Arts in Early American History. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1965.

Winchester, Alice. "Introduction." In The Flowering of American Folk Art, 1776-1976, pp. 8-14. Edited by Jean Lipman and Alice Winchester. New York: The Viking Press in cooperation with The Whitney Museum of American Art, 1974.

Yoder, Don. "The Folklife Studies Movement." Pennsylvania Folklife 13 (July 1963), pp. 43-56.

General References

Adler, Elizabeth Mosby. "Directions in the Study of American Folk Art." New York Folklore I:3 (Summer 1975), pp. 31-44.

Alfor, Mary Lee. "An Inquiry into the Use of the American Folk Arts in the Teaching of Modern Junior High School Art." Unpublished M.A.E. Thesis, Texas Christian University, 1949.

Alpers, Svetlana. "Is Art History?" Daedalus 106:3 (Summer 1977), pp. 1-13.

Altman, Terri; Burack, Lynda; Dwyer-Shick, Susan; Edgette, Joseph; and Leeds, Wendy. "Folklore and Education: A Selected Annotated Bibliography of Periodical Literature." Keystone Folklore 22:1-2 (1978), pp. 53-85.

Ames, Kenneth L. "Meaning in Artifacts: Hall Furnishings in Victorian America." Journal of Interdisciplinary History 9 (1978), pp. 19-46.

Andrews, Ruth, ed. How to Know American Folk Art. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1977.

Bailis, Stanley. "The Social Sciences in American Studies: An Integrative Conception." American Quarterly 26 (1974), pp. 202-224.

Bauman, Richard, and Abrahams, Roger, with Kalcik, Susan. "American Folklore and American Studies." American Quarterly 28 (1976), pp. 360-377.

Betts, Leonadis. "American Folklore and the English Classroom." Indiana English Journal 11 (Winter 1976-1977), pp. 11-14.

Black, Mary C. "At the Sign of Gabriel, Flag or Indian Chief." Curator 9:2 (1966), pp. 134-145.

Boas, Franz. Primitive Art. 1927, reprint edition. New York: Dover Publications, 1955.

Boas, Franz. Race, Language and Culture. New York: The Free Press, 1940.

Boorstin, Daniel. The Americans: The National Experience. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.

Bronner, Simon J. "Chain Carvers in Southern Indiana: A Behavioristic Study in Material Culture." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1981.

Bronner, Simon J. "From Neglect to Concept: Introduction to the Study of Material Aspects of American Folk Culture." Folklore Forum 12:2 and 3 (1979), pp. 117-132.

Bronner, Simon J. "Investigating Identity and Expression in Folk Art." Winterthur Portfolio: A Journal of American Material Culture 16 (1981), pp. 65-83.

Bronner, Simon J. "Material Folk Cultural Research in the Modern American City." In American Material Culture and Folklife: A Symposium. Edited by Simon J. Bronner. Cooperstown: Cooperstown Graduate Association, forthcoming.

Bronner, Simon J., and Poyser, Stephen P., eds. Approaches to the Study of Material Aspects of American Folk Culture. Bloomington, Indiana: Folklore Forum Special Issue, Vol. 12, Nos. 2 and 3, 1979.

Browne, Ray B., ed. Popular Culture and Curricula. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Press, 1972.

Browne, Ray B., ed. Popular Culture and the Expanding Consciousness. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1973.

Browne, Ray B., and Wolfe, Ralph H., eds. Directions and Dimensions in American Culture Studies in the 1980s. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1979.

Brunvand, Jan Harold. A Guide for Collectors of Folklore in Utah. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1971.

Brunvand, Jan Harold. Folklore: A Study and Research Guide. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976.

Brunvand, Jan Harold. The Study of American Folklore. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1968.

Buckley, Bruce R. "New Beginnings and Old Ends: Museums, Folklife, and the Cooperstown Graduate Programs. In American Material Culture and Folklife: A Symposium. Edited by Simon J. Bronner. Cooperstown: Cooperstown Graduate Association, forthcoming.

Bunch, Clarence. Art Education: A Guide to Information Sources. Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1978.

Burack, Lynda. "Folklore and Education." Keystone Folklore 22:1-2 (1978), pp. 13-20.

Burns, Thomas A. "Aesthetic Judgement: The Interpretive Side of the Structure." Keystone Folklore Quarterly 18-19 (1973-74), pp. 61-94.

Carpenter, Inta Gale, ed. Folklorists in the City: The Urban Field Experience. Bloomington, Indiana: Folklore Forum Special Issue, Vol. 11, No. 3, 1978.

Carson, Cary. "Doing History with Material Culture." In Material Culture and the Study of American Life, pp. 41-64. Edited by Ian M. G. Quimby. New York: W. W. Norton, 1978.

Chalmers, F. Graeme. "A Cultural Foundation for Education in the Arts." Art Education 27:1 (January 1974), pp. 21-25.

Chalmers, F. Graeme. "The Study of Art in a Cultural Context." Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 32:2 (Winter 1973), pp. 249-256.

Christenson, Jackie. "Ethnic Folklore and the School Art Curriculum." New York Folklore 2:3 and 4 (1976), pp. 177-180.

d'Azevedo, Warren L. "A Structural Approach to Esthetics: Toward a Definition of Art in Anthropology." American Anthropologist 60 (1958), pp. 702-714.

Deetz, James. In Small Things Forgotten. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1977.

Deetz, James, and Dethlefsen, Edwin S. "Death's Head, Cherub, Urn and Willow." Natural History 56:3 (March 1967), pp. 28-37.

Degh, Linda; Glassie, Henry; and Onias, Felix J. Folklore Today. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1976.

Dewhurst, C. Kurt, and MacDowell, Marsha. American Folk Art, From the Collection of Martin and Enid Packard, exhibition catalogue. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Calvin College, 1981.

Dewhurst, C. Kurt, and MacDowell, Marsha. Cast in Clay: The Folk Pottery of Grand Ledge, Michigan. East Lansing, Michigan: The Museum, Michigan State University, 1980.

Dewhurst, C. Kurt, and MacDowell, Marsha. "Expanding Frontiers: The Michigan Folk Art Project." In Perspectives on American Folk Art, pp. 54-78. Edited by Ian M. G. Quimby and Scott T. Swank. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1980.

Dewhurst, C. Kurt, and MacDowell, Marsha. "The Folk Arts of Illinois." Chicago History 10 (Winter 1981-82), pp. 198-204.

Dewhurst, C. Kurt, and MacDowell, Marsha. "A Fundamental Problem in the Study of Folk Art." Paper presented at the American Folklore Society Meeting, Detroit, Michigan, November 1977.

Dewhurst, C. Kurt, and MacDowell, Marsha. "Immigrant Folk Art in the American Heartland: Opportunity and Assimilation." In Traditions: The Region/The World, exhibition catalogue. Bloomfield Hills, Michigan: Cranbrook Academy of Art in cooperation with ARTRAIN, 1981.

Dewhurst, C. Kurt, and MacDowell, Marsha. Rainbows in the Sky: The Folk Art of Michigan in the Twentieth Century. East Lansing, Michigan: The Museum, Michigan State University, 1978.

Dewhurst, C. Kurt, and MacDowell, Marsha. "Some Problems in Researching Folk Art." Paper presented at Michigan Academy of Arts and Sciences, Michigan Folklore Society Meeting, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan, April 1977.

Dewhurst, C. Kurt; MacDowell, Betty; and MacDowell, Marsha. Reflections of Faith: Religious Folk Art in America. New York: E. P. Dutton, forthcoming.

Dorson, Richard M. "The Academic Future of Folklore." Journal of American Folklore Supplement (May 1972), p. 117.

Dorson, Richard M. American Folklore and the Historian. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Dorson, Richard M. The Birth of American Studies. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1976.

Dorson, Richard M. Bloodstoppers and Bearwalkers: Folk Traditions of the Upper Peninsula. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Dorson, Richard M. Buying the Wind: Regional Folklore in the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Dorson, Richard M. "Concepts of Folklore and Folklife Studies." In Folklore and Folklife: An Introduction, pp. 1-50. Edited by Richard M. Dorson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Dorson, Richard M. "Editors Comment: The Folklore Boom, 1977." Journal of the Folklore Institute 15:1 (Jan.-April 1978), pp. 83-90.

Dorson, Richard M. Folklore: Selected Essays. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1972.

Dorson, Richard M. "Folklore in America vs. American Folklore." Journal of the Folklore Institute 15 (1978), pp. 97-112.

Dorson, Richard M. "We All Need the Folk." Journal of the Folklore Institute 15 (1978), pp. 267-269.

Dorson, Richard M., and Carpenter, Inta Gale. "Can Folklorists and Educators Work Together?" North Carolina Folklore Journal 26 (1978), pp. 3-13.

Dundes, Alan. Folklore Theses and Dissertations in the United States. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas Press, 1976.

Dundes, Alan. The Study of Folklore. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Fabian, Johannes, and Szombati-Fabian, Ilona. "Folk Art from an Anthropological Perspective." In Perspectives on American Folk Art, pp. 247-292. Edited by Ian M. G. Quimby and Scott T. Swank. New York: W. W. Norton, 1980.

Feintuch, Burt. "A Contextual and Cognitive Approach to Folk Art and Folk Craft." New York Folklore 2 (Summer 1976), pp. 69-78.

Ferris, William R. "Vision in Afro-American Folk Art: The Sculpture of James Thomas." Journal of American Folklore 88 (April-June 1975), pp. 115-131.

Fife, Austin, and Fife, Alta. Saints of Sage and Saddle: Folklore Among the Mormons. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1956.

Fitch, James Marston. "Uses of the Artistic Past." In American Folklife, pp. 27-48. Edited by Don Yoder. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1976.

Fleming, E. McClung. "Artifact Study: A Proposed Model." Winterthur Portfolio 9, pp. 153-173. Edited by Ian M. G. Quimby. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1974.

Fleming, E. McClung. "Symbols of the United States: From Indian Queen to Uncle Sam." In Frontiers of American Culture, pp. 1-24. Edited by Ray B. Browne, Richard H. Crowder, and Virgil L. Stafford. Lafayette: Purdue University Studies, 1968.

Georges, Robert A. "Prepared Comment." Journal of American Folklore Supplement 85 (May 1972), p. 117.

Georges, Robert A., and Jones, Michael Owen. People Studying People: The Human Element in Fieldwork. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1980.

Glassie, Henry. "Artifacts: Folk, Popular, Imaginary and Real." In Icons of Popular Culture, pp. 103-122. Edited by Marshall Fishwick and Ray B. Browne. Bowling Green, Ohio: Bowling Green University Press, 1970.

Glassie, Henry. "Folk Art." In Folklore and Folklife, pp. 253-280. Edited by Richard M. Dorson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Glassie, Henry. "Meaningful Things and Appropriate Myths: The Artifact's Place in American Studies." In Prospects 3: An Annual of American Culture Studies, pp. 1-49. Edited by Jack Salzman. New York: Burt Franklin, 1978.

Glassie, Henry. "Structure and Function, Folklore and the Artifact." Semiotica 7 (1973), pp. 333-341.

Goldstein, Kenneth S. A Guide for Field Workers in Folklore. Hatboro, Pennsylvania: Folklore Associates, 1964.

Gordon, Rosemary. "Art: Mistress and Servant of Man and His Culture." In The Study of Education and Art, pp. 14-53. Edited by Dick Field and John Newich. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

Gowans, Alan. "Popular Arts and Historic Artifacts: New Principles for Studying History in Art." Journal of Popular Culture (1973-74), pp. 88-105.

Green, Thomas A. "Prepared Comment." Journal of American Folklore Supplement 85 (May 1972), p. 120.

Grigsby, J. Eugene, Jr. Art and Ethnics. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1977.

Haselberger, Herta. "Method of Studying Ethnological Art." Current Anthropology 2 (1961), pp. 341-384.

Higgs, J. W. Y. Folk Life Collection and Classification. London: The Museum's Association, 1963.

Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Publishers, 1969.

Ickis, Marguerite. The Standard Book of Quilt Making and Collecting. New York: Dover Publications, 1960.

Jenkins, J. Geraint. "Field-Work and Documentation in Folk-Life Studies." Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 90 (1960), pp. 250-271.

Jones, Louis C. "Folk Culture and the Historical Society." Minnesota History 31 (1950), pp. 11-17.

Jones, Louis C. "The Genre in American Folk Art." In Papers on American Art, pp. 41-59. Edited by John C. Milley. Maple Shade, New Jersey: Edinburg Press, 1976.

Jones, Louis C. "Style in American Folk Art." Newport Folk Festival: 1967. Newport, Rhode Island: Newport Folk Festival, Inc., 1967.

Jones, Michael O. "Bibliographic and Reference Tools: Toward a Behavioral History." Paper read at the Folklore and Local History Conference, New Orleans, 1980.

Jones, Michael O. "Chairmaking in Appalachia: A Study in Style and Creative Imagination in American Folk Art." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1970.

Jones, Michael O. "The Concept of 'Aesthetic' in the Traditional Arts." Western Folklore 30 (1971), pp. 77-104.

Jones, Michael O. "Folk Art Production and the Folklorist's Obligation." Journal of Popular Culture IV:1 (Summer 1970), pp. 194-212.

Jones, Michael O. "Folkloristics and Fieldwork." In American Material Culture and Folklife: A Symposium. Edited by Simon J. Bronner. Cooperstown: Cooperstown Graduate Association, forthcoming.

Jones, Michael O. "'For Myself I Like a Decent, Plain-Made Chair': The Concept of Taste and the Traditional Arts in America." Western Folklore 31:1 (January 1972), pp. 27-52.

Jones, Michael O. The Hand Made Object and Its Maker. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975.

Jones, Michael O. "'I Bet That's His Trademark': 'Anonymity' in 'Folk' Utilitarian Art Production." Keystone Folklore Quarterly 16-17 (1971-72), pp. 39-48.

Jones, Michael O. "L. A. Add-Ons and Re-Dos: Renovation in Folk Art and Architectural Design." In Perspectives on American Folk Art, pp. 325-364. Edited by Ian M. G. Quimby and Scott T. Swank. New York: W. W. Norton, 1980.

Jones, Michael O. "Modern Arts and Arcane Concepts: Expanding Folk Art Study." Paper read at Midwestern Conference on Folk Arts and Museums, Minneapolis, 1980.

Jones, Michael O. "There's Gotta Be New Designs Once in Awhile: Culture Change and the 'Folk' Arts." Southern Folklore Quarterly 31:1 (March 1972), pp. 43-60.

Jones, Michael O. "Two Directions for Folkloristics in the Study of American Art." Southern Folklore Quarterly 32 (September 1968), pp. 249-259.

Jones, Michael O. "Violations of Standards of Excellence and Preferences in Utilitarian Art." Western Folklore 32 (January 1973), pp. 19-32.

Kaufman, Irving. Art and Education in Contemporary Culture. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1968.

Kavanaugh, James V. "The Artifact in American Culture: The Development of an Undergraduate Program in American Studies." In Material Culture and the Study of American Life, pp. 64-74. Edited by Ian M. G. Quimby. New York: W. W. Norton, 1978.

Kind, Phyllis. "Some Thoughts About Contemporary Folk Art." American Antiques (June 1976), pp. 28-44.

Ketner, Kenneth Laine, and Jones, Michael Owen. "Folkloristic Research as a Pedagogical Tool in Introductory Courses." New York Folklore 1 (Winter 1975), pp. 123-148.

Kniffen, Fred. "Folk Housing: Key to Diffusion." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 55 (1965), pp. 549-577.

Kniffen, Fred, "Milestones and Stumbling Blocks." Pioneer America 7 (January 1975), pp. 1-8.

Kniffen, Fred. "American Cultural Geography and Folklife." In American Folklife, pp. 51-70. Edited by Don Yoder. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1976.

Kouwenhoven, John A. "American Studies: Words or Things?" In American Studies in Transition, pp. 15-35. Edited by Marshall W. Fishwick. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964.

Kubler, George. The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.

Kubler, George. "The Arts: Fine and Plain." In Perspectives on American Folk Art, pp. 234-246. Edited by Ian M. G. Quimby and Scott T. Swank. New York: W. W. Norton, 1980.

Leach, MacEdward, and Glassie, Henry. A Guide for Collectors of Oral Traditions and Folk Cultural Material in Pennsylvania. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1968.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. Structural Anthropology. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1967.

Lewis, George H. "The Pop Artist and His Product: Mixed-Up Confusion." Journal of Popular Culture IV:2 (Fall 1970), pp. 327-338.

Lindahl, Carl; Rikoon, J. Sanford; and Lawless, Elaine J. A Basic Guide to Fieldwork for Beginning Folklore

Students. Bloomington, Indiana: Folklore Publications Group, Folklore Monography Series, Vol. 7, 1979.

Madden, David. "The Necessity for an Aesthetics of Popular Culture." Journal of Popular Culture 7 (Summer 1973-74), pp. 1-13.

Mari, Sami Khalil. "Toward a Cross Cultural Theory of Creativity." The Journal of Creative Behavior 10:2 (1976), pp. 108-116.

Marshall, Howard Wight. "Folklife and the Rise of American Folk Museums." Journal of American Folklore 90 (October-December 1977), pp. 391-413.

Malatek, Cindy Curtis. "A Full Circle, Not a Flat Line . . ." Art Education 30:7 (November 1977), pp. 16-22.

McCarl, Robert S. Jr. "The Production Welder: Product, Process and the Industrial Craftsman." New York Folklore Quarterly 30:4 (December 1974), pp. 243-253.

McFee, June K. Preparation for Art. San Francisco: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1961.

McFee, June King and Degge, Rogena M. Art, Culture, and Environment: A Catalyst for Teaching. Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1977.

Mills, George. "Art: An Introduction to Qualitative Anthropology." In Art and Aesthetics in Primitive Societies, pp. 73-98. Edited by Carol Jopling. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1971.

Mitchells, K. "Work of Art in Its Social Setting and in the Aesthetic Isolation." Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 25 (Summer 1967), pp. 365-373.

Moe, John F. "Concepts of Shelter: The Folk Poetics of Space, Change, and Continuity." Journal of Popular Culture 11 (1977), pp. 219-253.

Mooz, R. Peter. "An Art Historian's View: A Commentary on Style in Country Art." In Country Cabinetwork and Simple City Furniture, pp. 235-264. Edited by John D. Morse. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1970.

Mumford, Lewis. Art and Technics. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

Munro, Thomas. The Arts and Their Interrelations. Cleveland: The Press of Western Reserve University, 1967.

Newell, William Wells. "On the Field and Work of a Journal of American Folk-Lore." Journal of American Folklore 1 (1888), pp. 3-7.

Newman, Arthur. "Promoting Intercultural Understanding Through Art." Art Education 23:1 (January 1970), pp. 18-20.

Nicolaisen, Wilhelm F. H. "'Distorted Function' In Material Aspects of Culture." Folklore Forum 12 (1979), pp. 223-236.

Nye, Russel B. "Notes for an Introduction to a Discussion of Popular Culture." Journal of Popular Culture IV:2 (Spring 1971), pp. 1031-1038.

Nye, Russel B. The Unembarrassed Muse: The Popular Arts in America. New York: The Dial Press, 1970.

Otton, Charlotte M., ed. Anthropology and Art: Readings in Cross-Cultural Aesthetics. Garden City, New York: The Natural History Press, 1971.

Paredes, Americo and Steckert, Ellen. The Urban Experience and Folk Tradition. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1971.

Place, Linna Funk; Zangrando, Joanna Schneider; Lea, James W.; and Lovell, John. "The Object as Subject: The Role of Museums and Material Culture Collections in American Studies." American Quarterly 26 (1974), pp. 281-294.

Quimby, Ian M. Material Culture and the Study of American Life. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1978.

Rabb, Theodore K. "The Historian and the Art Historian." The Journal of Interdisciplinary History 4:1 (1973), pp. 107-117.

Reisdorf, Helen E. "Educational Uses of Folklore with Emphasis on Folk Arts." Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Wayne State University, Detroit, 1960.

Reuter, Frank. "John Arnold's Link Chains: A Study in Folk Art." Mid-South Folklore 5 (1977), pp. 41-52.

Robacker, Earl F. "The Rise of Interest in Folk Art." Pennsylvania Folklife 10:1 (1959), pp. 20-29.

Roberts, Warren E. "Fieldwork: Recording Material Culture." In Folklore and Folklife: An Introduction, pp. 413-444.

Edited by Richard M. Dorson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Roberts, Warren E. "Folklife Research and Fieldwork: The Tree Stump Tombstone as Exemplar." In American Material Culture and Folklife: A Symposium. Edited by Simon J. Bronner. Cooperstown: Cooperstown Graduate Association, forthcoming.

Robbins, Michael C. "Material Culture and Cognition." In Art and Aesthetics in Primitive Societies, pp. 328-334. Edited by Carol F. Jopling. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1971.

Ross, Stephen David. "Some Ambiguities in Identifying the Work of Art." Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 36 (1977), pp. 137-146.

Schlereth, Thomas J. "Material Culture Studies in America: Notes Toward a Historical Perspective." Material History Bulletin 9 (1979), pp. 89-98.

Schlereth, Thomas J. "Introduction: A Historical Perspective on American Material Culture." In Material Culture Studies in America. Edited by Thomas J. Schlereth. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, forthcoming.

Skramstad, Harold. "American Things: A Neglected Material Culture." American Studies International 10 (1972), pp. 11-12.

Sontag, Susan. On Photography. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1978.

Sykes, Richard. "American Studies and the Concept of Culture: A Theory and Method." American Quarterly 15 (1963), pp. 253-270.

Taylor, Anne. "The Cultural Roots of Art Education: A Report and Some Models." Art Education 28:5 (September 1975), pp. 8-13.

Tallman, Richard S. "Folklore in the Schools: Teaching, Collecting and Publishing." New York Folklore Quarterly 28:3 (September 1972), pp. 163-186.

Thigpen, Kenneth A. "Folklore at the Pennsylvania State University." Keystone Folklore 21:1 (1975), pp. 25-26.

Toelken, Barre. The Dynamics of Folklore. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1979.

Trindell, Roger T. "American Folklore Studies and Geography." Southern Folklore Quarterly 34 (March 1970), pp. 1-11.

Vlach, John Michael. "American Folk Art: Questions and Quandaries." Winterthur Portfolio 15:4 (1980), pp. 345-355.

Vlach, John Michael. The Afro-American Tradition in Decorative Arts, exhibition catalogue. Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1978.

Wampler, Jan. All Their Own. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1977.

Welsch, Roger. "A Note on Definitions." Journal of American Folklore 81 (1968), pp. 262-264.

Welsch, Roger. "Beating a Live Horse: Yet Another Note on Definitions and Defining." In Perspectives on American Folk Art, pp. 218-233. Edited by Ian M. G. Quimby and Scott T. Swank. New York: W. W. Norton, 1980.

Welsch, Roger. "Folklife Studies in American Scholarship." In American Folklife, pp. 3-18. Edited by Don Yoder. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1976.

Winchester, Alice, ed. "What is American Folk Art?" The Magazine Antiques 57:5 (1950), pp. 355-362.