

LAGS WORKING PAPERS, FIRST SERIES (1981)

WORKING PAPER NUMBER THIRTEEN

LAGS Fieldworkers: Styles and Contributions

Lee Pederson

LAGS Fieldworkers: Styles and Contributions

The fieldwork for the Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States was recognized from the outset as the most important set of tasks in the project. For that reason, the contributions of the investigators require special attention in light of a data-gathering operation that extended over a full 13 years, from January, 1968, through January, 1981. The deliberate elaboration of the fieldwork over 156 months steadily expanded the range of the investigation on the basis of preliminary findings and, in the process, incorporated the work of 271 interviewers.

Both of those factors--of chronology and personnel--reflect broad departures from the conventional assumptions of American linguistic geography, but each is inseparable from the aims, methods, and resources of the LAGS Project. From the earliest preliminary planning that began before the conference of May, 1968, the requisites of inventorial research took precedence over a narrowly defined synchronic survey. The experience of other American atlas surveys, notably the LAMSAS and LANCS projects, included useful fieldwork that had extended over more than two decades. And in neither of those investigations, nor in the more rigorously controlled schedules of research in New England and the Upper Midwest, was the quality of the data ever questioned by even its most severe critics. In the present survey, however, the research schedule was ultimately developed on the basis of available resources. Prior to 1973, support had been limited to several small grants, but, after that, generous support came from NEH and Emory. With that aid, however, also came a charge to

complete the task within a reasonable period of time. Without such a directive, the fieldwork would quite probably have been extended for at least another decade, and these basic materials would most certainly not have been published before the turn of the century. All of those considerations are essential in understanding how the data-gathering phase developed.

Perhaps even more questionable to some readers will be the inclusion of fieldwork contributed by so many investigators of such widely disparate preparation, experience, and motivation. Although the following explanation of the distribution of labor among the 271 participants will allay much of that concern, no apologies will ever be made for the use of student fieldworkers, however uneven some of their work may be. Like the Dialect Survey of Rural Georgia before it, LAGS was organized as an educational program to train students of linguistics in the methods of general linguistics, from basic training in articulatory phonetics and field procedures to a variety of exercises with the methods of descriptive linguistics. However imperfect the collections made by the students of C. M. Wise at LSU or Raven I. McDavid, Jr., at Chicago, those field records were recognized as powerful testimonies to the efficacy of such training because among those primitive efforts of some of the best general linguists of succeeding generations are some excellent insights into regional and social features of American English. The needs for control, supervision, and uniformity have been elaborated elsewhere--in the Manual, Guide, interim reports, and the Handbook, and the emphasis here is placed on the contributions of the 27 regular fieldworkers who gathered 855 of the records. None of

that, however, can in any way diminish the educational and practical skills developed by student fieldworkers trained by Billiard at Georgia State, by Foster at the University of North Alabama, and by Pederson at Emory. Indeed, this phase of the research was one of the most attractive aspects of the project to agencies concerned with the development of programs of general education.

The six phases of the LAGS data-gathering schedule coincide with a history of those grants that made the work possible. These include: 1) preliminary research that comprised work sheet composition and the establishment of procedures (1968-70), 2) preliminary fieldwork to refine the instrument and organize the grid (1970-72), 3) the first phase of basic coverage (1973-75), 4) the urban investigations (1976-77), 5) a second phase of basic coverage (1977-79), and 6) terminal fieldwork to improve the evenness of regional coverage and social balance (1980). The first phase was financed by Emory, ACLS, the Ford Foundation, and the Linguistic Research and Demonstration Center of Rome, GA, established in cooperation with the U. S. Office of Education. Two grants from the National Council of Teachers of English and the continued support of Emory sustained the research of the second phase. Since 1973, the project has been supported exclusively by NEH and Emory.

Because this summary of the styles and contributions of LAGS fieldworkers is prepared to assist readers of the protocols and auditors of the field records, emphasis is placed on the work of the regular investigators, whose efforts account for approximately four-fifths of the collection. Furthermore, because field procedures were not formalized until the first phase of basic coverage

began in 1973, it seems appropriate to confine the specific evaluations of styles and skills to the work of those 17 fieldworkers who participated in the major data-gathering operations of the program. Those observations are preceded here with a brief review of the contributions of the early fieldworkers and the volunteers, both experienced linguists and novice investigators.

The preliminary research that concluded with the first NEH/Emory grant in April, 1973, was sustained by seven regular fieldworkers, identified here with their total number of records noted in parentheses. Although Edward Crist and Barbara Rutledge also worked in this phase of the research, as major contributors in the later developments, their styles and skills are included in the general discussion below. The fieldworkers of the preliminary phase (1968-73) included Lee Pederson (42), Charles W. Foster (19), Grace S. Rueter (15), Christine W. Unger (15), Anne Malone Fitts (9), Thomas Clotfelter (7), and Joan Houston Hall (6).

During that early phase of the research, the aims and methods of the survey had not been fully formulated, so all aspects of fieldwork lacked the uniformity that was developed during the later phases. The use of the tape-recorded interview, however, had been Pederson's habitual approach since the early 1960s, and he sustained the same methods of community and informant selection, of rigorous coverage of work-sheet items, and casual conversation that he had used in Chicago, Minnesota, Missouri, South Carolina, Georgia, and Upstate New York in several other atlas projects and social dialect surveys. Combined with McDavid's training tape (WP #2), Pederson's East Tennessee field records (1970-71) were used to instruct all regular fieldworkers. The work from East Tennessee, reported in

WP #8, is characterized by mature interviewing that reflects experience and understanding of the aims and methods of the research. Those records are, however, generally inferior to the best work of Rutledge on three counts. The tentative nature of the preliminary research excluded many useful lines of inquiry that were developed later in the program. Second, operating on a limited travel schedule, Pederson chose to interview the largest number of informants possible. As a result, few of those East Tennessee records exceed six hours in duration, and none is characterized by the leisurely style that was later realized by Rutledge to perfection and somewhat less perfectly by Bailey, Bassett, Crist, McKemie and Shaffer. Finally, as an outlander with little familiarity with the folkways of the rural South, Pederson was ignorant of the implications of responses in the early records. That is the principal limitation of the fieldworker who lacks native competence in the language and culture of the region he investigates. Especially in the South, informants freely accept with some amusement strangers to their way of life, and this can result in the elaboration of detail that might be disregarded in conversations with fellow countrymen. As in scribal work, a foreign frame of reference can be a positive asset in fieldwork, but there is no substitute for the understanding that comes only with native familiarity or extended exposure to the dialects in native settings.

In sharp contrast to Pederson, Foster was the best informed student of local culture among the early investigators. As a professional musician and folklorist, he had considerable experience with the subject matter of the LAGS work sheets and utilized these skills effectively in Tennessee and Upper Alabama. Less experienced

than some with the tape recorder and restricted by a regular teaching schedule, Foster conducted interviews that were generally of shorter duration than those of Pederson, and among these were a substantial number of incomplete forms that have subsequently been classified as secondary records. Despite those considerations, Foster must be recognized as a primary contributor to this atlas because he volunteered his valuable services unselfishly and helped to make a viable program of the work. His easy, informal conversational style was particularly effective in the development of candid discussions with older folk informants, and his understanding and appreciation of their daily routines, from hardships to sources of entertainment, gave important substance to his field records. It is no exaggeration to designate Foster's work as the cornerstone upon which the LAGS research of folk culture was built.

Two graduate students at Emory, Rueter and Hall, were also greatly influential in the development of the research design. As Pederson's associates in the Dialect Survey of Rural Georgia from its earliest stages in 1968, both Rueter and Hall demonstrated the resources that were later fully developed in the larger survey. Specifically, the organization of the LAGS scribal program, the incremental composition of the work sheets, and the cooperative spirit that characterized all of the later work can be traced directly to the early efforts of Rueter and Hall.

Grace Rueter was the principal field investigator for the Georgia survey. She began her work with Howard Dunlap and James Fitzsimons in 1968 and continued until the full plan had been exe-

cuted in 1973. Rueter participated in the revision of the work sheets and, to a greater extent than any other fieldworker, was responsible for the development of procedures that were formalized during the course of the investigation. As a native of Savannah, she strengthened her work with full familiarity of Coastal Southern customs and dialects that nicely complemented the Upcountry expertise of Dunlap and other early workers in the survey. Rueter was an intrepid investigator, well-informed, efficient, and thorough. Although occasionally rushed by the demands of an ambitious schedule, she regularly located excellent informants, conducted relaxed interviews, and produced complete records in both the abbreviated format of DSRG and the fully elaborated work sheets of the LAMSAS project. Like Hall and Leas after her, Rueter's familiarity with the requisites of scribal work significantly improved her field investigations. She knew what the scribe would need and consistently sought to provide a full audial record, from personal data to complete explanations of lexical usage and semantic distinctiveness.

Joan Houston Hall joined DSRG during the second year of its operations and provided a valuable complement to Rueter. A native speaker of a California dialect that combined Inland Northern and North Midland features, Hall was quite sensitive to the local varieties of Georgia folk speech, including many forms that might be internalized and go unnoticed by Dunlap, Rueter, and other Georgians who undertook the early fieldwork. Hall's work is marked by the same enthusiasm and high level of competence that distinguished Rueter's interviewing. Her interview style, however, is a more

deliberate and formal approach than that of Rueter or Rutledge and an early example of the mode of investigation later pursued by Crist, Leas, Smith, and Starwalt. As elaborated later in this report, a principal conclusion of LAGS fieldwork is that no single style of inquiry can be clearly defined as superior to another, and, although fieldworkers in this project sustained registers that ranged from a strictly "consultative" to an "informal/nearly intimate" conversational mode, each approach offered a legitimate medium. The efficacy of any style is determined by the intelligence and persistence of the fieldworker. The source of the style is the personality of the interviewer. For those reasons, the interviewing of Hall is a model of the "consultative" style, the effective application of which was matched among the regular fieldworkers only by Leas.

Christine W. Unger was the first thoroughly successful LAGS fieldworker trained at Emory. After two years of graduate study in linguistics, she had solid understanding of the research design before she began her work. Unlike the early work of Pederson, Foster, Rueter, and Hall, Unger's research in Mississippi was initiated with a clear grasp of goals that were consistent with those of the later phases of the project. As a native of Middle Tennessee, she was quite familiar with the speech of the interior region of the LAGS territory, and she conducted her research with remarkable authority, good humor, and patience. Her contributions in Lower Mississippi (1972-73) were crucial in the investigation of the Central Gulf States. A mature, sensitive, and effective interviewer, Unger performed equally well with all social types and was matched later only by McKemie and Bassett in the collection of excellent records

of folk, common, and cultivated black speech. As a result of her skills, her Mississippi records provide much of the best preliminary data in the collection in terms of both thoroughness of coverage of work-sheet items and inclusiveness of extended conversational passages. More specifically, Unger's interviews are distinguished by a conversational style that ranges from "consulative/informal" to strictly "informal" and by a method of interrogation that concentrates most heavily upon lexical and semantic variation. Her tendency to treat formal grammatical and idiomatic work sheet items in a cursory manner followed the recommendations of McDavid and established the precedent that was most fully exploited in the later work of Rutledge. Like Foster, Unger provided preliminary notations of her records, improving all investigative skills by evaluating completed research and extending new methods into her subsequent fieldwork.

Another major contributor to the preliminary research was Anne Malone Fitts. Making nine critical records in Upper and Lower Alabama during the early work, Fitts was a splendid investigator of folk speech, sharing the natural conversational gifts of McCall and Unger. Although more deliberate in her approach than either of them, Fitts in no way inhibited her informants, all of whom were selected with painstaking care to sample a broad variety of subregional speech forms. As a result, she and Unger provided the first really useful data for the planning of a survey that would match the baseline coverage recommended by Kurath and McDavid and the delicacy of social sampling that had been so vigorously encouraged by McMillan in 1968, all of which is reported in WP #1. As a native of Middle Alabama, Fitts was equally comfortable with the cultural patterns of the Upcountry

speech in the Birmingham area and of the plantation forms of the Black Belt near Montgomery. Her work in the Alabama Black Belt complemented the earlier records of Foster and Pederson to the north, of Rueter and Hall to the east, and Unger to the south and west. On the basis of those findings, together with seven records gathered in the same period by Thomas Clotfelter in East Tennessee and Upper Georgia, the grid was established, the work sheets were put into an operational form, and plans could be organized for the basic phase of the research.

Through all phases of the research, but especially during the preliminary phase, student fieldworkers made significant contributions to the collection. Of these, none was more industrious than Thomas Clotfelter, whose efforts were substantial enough to classify him among the regular fieldworkers. His work provides a good example of the strengths and weaknesses of most student investigators. Although his work improved steadily through experience, his early interviewing was marked by unfamiliarity with the resources of the tape recorder, the implications of the work sheets, and the methods of sustaining a dialogue conducive to the acquisition of useful grammatical and idiomatic expressions. Like other student fieldworkers, Clotfelter's efforts are positively distinguished by a relaxed enthusiasm and a close familial tie with several of his informants. Essentially free of the competitive constraints imposed by graduate studies and professional requirements, Clotfelter and other student fieldworkers introduced a fresh breath of naïveté and charm that is hard to sustain over the long term. Among the other regular fieldworkers, only McKemie, Shaffer, and Wellborn preserved this attitude throughout their work, but in their respective situations the attribute seemed

to interfere with the development of field procedures in both the coverage of work-sheet items and the thoughtful pursuit of suggested material.

Although Clotfelter did a much better job than most of the student fieldworkers, several of them demonstrated skills that rank them among the very best of all the LAGS investigators. Among these are Lynne B. Friedman, whose DSRG fieldwork matched the work of Rueter and Hall, and Judy E. Mitchell, whose single record from Auburn, Alabama, was the finest conversational interview of black folk speech in the collection. Friedman was perhaps the best natural fieldworker to emerge from the Georgia survey and demonstrated those skills of thoughtful conversation that are matched in the LAGS collection only by the best work of Rutledge. Mitchell was clearly the ablest of several dozen black fieldworkers who participated in the project. Both Friedman and Mitchell had formulated their courses of academic study before doing fieldwork, and neither could be persuaded to defer those plans and join the project as regular investigators.

Another set of fieldworkers are those volunteer investigators who generously contributed research to improve the collection. These eight university professors and high school teachers in Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama produced 26 records, most of which fully reflect their formal training, interest in the research, and understanding of the research design. William J. Barnette provided five records from Middle Tennessee; Barbara C. Respass, four records from Lower Georgia and one from East Florida; Bethany Dumas, three records from Arkansas; Michael Montgomery, two records from Arkansas and one from East Flori-

da; Mary Norwood, two from Upper Alabama and one from Middle Tennessee; David B. Taylor, two from East Tennessee and one from Upper Georgia; Linda R. Reed, two from Middle Tennessee; John Stanley Rich, two from Upper Alabama. All of these contributors provided important additions to the LAGS collection. Of these, however, the efforts of Dumas and Montgomery deserve particular notice. As a valuable associate at the University of Tennessee, Dumas directed the urban supplement of records completed earlier by Pederson in Knoxville and Chattanooga, introduced Bailey and Pendergrass to the project, and conducted three very useful interviews in Arkansas. As an experienced fieldworker, Dumas distinguished her records with excellent informant selection and well-developed conversational interviews. Similarly, Montgomery took a strong interest in the goals of the project and was able to provide solid evidence from two widely separated regions as a result of his graduate studies in Florida and his teaching position in Arkansas. An East Tennessee native, Montgomery was able to conduct all three of those interviews with a good understanding of regional and social patterns, and that experience is clearly reflected in the quality of his reasearch.

All of the remaining fieldwork was managed by 17 regular fieldworkers, beginning in April, 1973, and concluding in January, 1981. Because all of them worked within a fully developed plan and shared the experience of the work that preceded their efforts, their contributions are taken as the basic fieldwork of the collection. As such, the data-gathering phase of this program is most realistically evaluated in terms of this research. The evaluation reported here includes first a brief outline of interview styles, then the identifi-

cation of ten considerations that reflect the full range of skills as understood in this project, and, finally, the 17 fieldworkers are graded in each of these categories by the two scribes, Leas and Pederson, who transcribed 650 of the LAGS protocols.

As suggested earlier, the experience of the project leads one to reject the generally-accepted notion that excellence of interviewing can be correlated positively with the informality of the setting in which the conversation is developed. LAGS fieldwork demonstrates unequivocally that native intelligence is the sine qua non of effective fieldwork, and, when this gift is combined with solid training and reinforced by a rigorous discipline that can only come from within the fieldworker, outstanding fieldwork can be produced in any of four clearly differentiated conversational modes. In the descriptive terms of Martin Joos, these registers or styles include the consultative, the consultative/informal, the informal, and the informal/intimate modes of discourse. No fieldworker invariably remained in a single register throughout the course of any interview, so the following discussion and classification of fieldworker style is at best suggestive. As in every other evaluative aspect of the field records, the reader is urged to become an auditor and to determine for himself the context and the implications of remarks that can only generalize such features in conventional orthography.

The principal conversational modes of LAGS interviews are the middle and lower registers of a continuum that ranges from oratorical (or "frozen"), through the deliberative (or "formal"), to the consultative, informal, and intimate styles. With the exception of a few very

weak student interviews, all LAGS records can be described in the contexts of the consultative and informal styles. Several students produced records for the Georgia survey in a formal style, and the practice was strongly discouraged in the LAGS program. Unfortunately, the formal approach was sustained with uniformly bad results in a few LAGS records, and all of these are designated secondary forms in the collection.

The strictly consultative style is established in a businesslike manner by the fieldworker, who recognizes the natural social barriers of the situation created by a conversation between strangers, based on a printed questionnaire and recorded on tape. The words of both the fieldworker and the informant tend to be chosen with care, frequently resulting in responses that in some cases range from formal to informal. Effectively implemented, however, interviews conducted in this style have yielded results of very high value. The ablest fieldworkers in this mode were Crist and Leas. Especially in Upper Mississippi, Crist developed several extremely good interviews in this register, records that include extended conversational passages that are particularly useful in their preservation of a variety of spoken forms. In many instances, especially among folk speakers, the style of the interviewer's speech has virtually no bearing on the informant's response, most frequently among folk informants whose stylistic range seems limited to the middle and lower registers. Leas' fieldwork differs sharply from the records produced by Crist in both form and content. Always working under the pressures of short field trips that had been organized to fill gaps in the sample, Leas approached the work sheets from the perspective of an experienced scribe and placed the acquisition of natural responses to work-sheet

items as her highest priority. The work of both Crist and Leas reflects the status of the investigation when their respective tasks were undertaken. Whereas Crist took great liberties in reorganizing the order of work sheet items, gathered a large number of partial interviews, and produced comparatively few records that can be properly designated as complete, the wide range of informational content of those recorded discussions provided a large number of leads that were pursued in later research. Conversely, the needs of the project were quite different when Leas undertook her work. At that time, significant inadequacies in the early sampling had been observed in a preliminary review of the corpus, and all her fieldwork in Alabama, Georgia, and Tennessee, as well as the interviewing of natives of other states in Atlanta, was aimed to improve the collection. Two other less experienced fieldworkers were Smith and Starwalt, and, although both were effective in coverage of work-sheet items, neither had time to develop the flexibility and ease with which Crist and Leas conducted their interviews.

Two other factors should also be noted here. All registers from frozen to intimate are modified by many other variables, most of which can be summarized under the rubrics of regional and social considerations. None of these four fieldworkers could be properly identified as typical speakers of any Southern dialect. Only Leas was a lifelong resident of the South, and her speech has been heavily conditioned through travel and teaching. Further, all four of these fieldworkers had considerable experience in classroom teaching or other offices of responsibility, and all were seasoned veterans of graduate schools of English.

The transitional consultative/informal style was frequently introduced by all four of those fieldworkers of the preceding set, most frequently by Crist and Leas, less commonly by Starwalt, and most rarely by Smith. This style, however, is much more characteristic of the interviewing of Bailey, Baird, Bassett, Frazer, Rawlings, and Tucker. This group also produced some of the best field records in the LAGS collection, here often breaking through the aforementioned barriers of the interview situation to produce conversations that reflect informal talks between casual acquaintances and fairly close friends. The work of Bailey, Bassett, Rawlings, and Tucker was sometimes impaired by their deference to the informants, on occasion preserving levels of formality rarely found in the records of Crist and never in the work of Leas. This seems to have resulted from these younger interviewers having difficulty in pursuing suggestions and often accepting tacitly acknowledgments, a recurrent characteristic of Crist's work and a feature distinctive in its absence in the records of Leas and Rutledge. Both Bailey and Bassett significantly improved their work by minimizing this tendency, but Rawlings and Tucker, both of whom were younger with experience limited to a single tour of concentrated fieldwork, left the project before they were able to develop interrogational skills that would take them past a tentative response. Conversely, both Baird and Frazer were able to modulate their styles according to the needs of the situation. Like the members of the preceding set, however, these six interviewers can be classified in two clearly distinctive groups that reflect their experience. Whereas Bailey and Bassett brought considerable scribal experience to their later fieldwork, Frazer, Rawlings, and Tucker lacked experience with the requisites of protocol composition.

During the course of her later work with DSRG data, Baird learned much of this. As a result, her early work shares much with that of Frazer, Rawlings, and Tucker, but her final interviews are much closer to those of Bailey and Bassett.

Regional and social factors are particularly interesting as they apply to the work of these six investigators. All are native Southerners, and all are speakers of distinctive regional dialects. Although Baird is a Kentuckian, she is a native of the Lexington area and a speaker of an old-fashioned variety of that regional pattern, a dialect that shares more features with Gulf States Southern than it does with the mountain forms of East Tennessee and Upper Georgia. Frazer, a native of the Texas Panhandle, confined all of her work to that state, although it extended as far south as San Antonio. Bailey and Bassett are natives of Lower Alabama, and both of them did considerable work in that area before continuing their research into other subregions. Rawlings is a native of the Georgia Piedmont, who spent most of his time in Lower Alabama and South Texas. Tucker, a native of Memphis, however, conducted all of her interviews in West Tennessee, with the first half of them confined to Shelby County.

The strictly informal style was quite frequently sustained by Bassett, Frazer, and Tucker, but never to the extent that it was preserved in the records of Herrington, Moran, Rutledge, and Shaffer. All four of these young interviewers were virtually oblivious of social barriers, although Moran and Rutledge were quite sensitive to the needs of the situations. Conversely, Herrington and Shaffer tended to approach the interview with a lightheartedness that disarmed

most informants but raised the hackles on a few others. No fieldworker in the recorded history of linguistic geography entered a project at age 16 with credentials possessed by Rutledge, and before she was 21 she had completed 200 field records from East Tennessee to Texas. With a rare intelligence and understanding for her years, she was consistently able to establish a nearly familial interview situation, producing interviews again and again that seemed the work of a granddaughter, daughter, or niece who made the most of a patient relative. This same talent was shared by Moran, whose effort was limited only by the narrowness of her field experience.

All four of these fieldworkers were young native Southerners, but none of them spoke a distinctively regional idiolect. If a dialect emerges from the analysis of LAGS material that can be called "young, urban, general Southern," all four of these investigators will share that descriptor. Those native speech habits made them all effective participants in the urban survey, with Herrington and Moran conducting research in Nashville, Birmingham, and Mobile, Rutledge in New Orleans and Houston, and Shaffer in Tampa.

The mixed informal/intimate style was frequently realized by Rutledge, but there was a detachment that distinguished her work from that of McCall, McKemie, and Wellborn. All three of these younger fieldworkers shared an uncommon interest in the informants themselves. McKemie and Wellborn entered the interview in a spirit of congeniality, found elsewhere only in the work of Shaffer, but distinguished from his interviewing by a general detachment. Some of that is also apparent in the work of Wellborn, but McKemie regularly involved himself so fully in the activities of the community--once participating in a formal

basketball game, where he joined the team in an Arkansas village to be soundly defeated by a touring team of professional women. The problem with the fieldwork of both McKemie and Wellborn reflects their stylistic habits. Neither consistently pursued a full exploration of the worksheet items; instead, both frequently depended upon extended conversation, and often that was not successful. Although both interviewers produced the greatest number of long interviews of any of the fieldworkers, few of these are comprehensive records. McCall was by far the most effective fieldworker to operate consistently in the informal/intimate mode. Sharing McKemie's enthusiasm and often matching Rutledge in thoroughness of coverage, McCall had a remarkable affinity for rural culture, especially in Arkansas, where she had conducted all but one of her records. This ability is apparent in most of her interviews, in many of which it is almost impossible to determine which participant is the fieldworker. Although on occasion, she was drawn off the course of the investigation by these discussions, the evidence suggests that her work, however uneven, includes some of the most valuable records in the collection.

With McCall a few years older than McKemie and Wellborn, all three were young fieldworkers. McCall and McKemie had rural and small-town backgrounds, respectively, and this is well-preserved in their idiolects. Wellborn had less familiarity with rural culture and represents that same "young, urban, general Southern" pattern mentioned above in the discussion of the styles of Herrington, Moran, Rutledge, and Shaffer. Despite their distinctive orientations, all three of these fieldworkers demonstrated the strengths and weaknesses of the highly informal style in atlas interviewing. At the heart of the matter seems to be the fact that this approach cannot be established without full participation of

the fieldworker, and under such circumstances, conditions make it virtually impossible for the interviewer to attend to all of the complicated operations of interrogation without some genuine detachment. For that reason, the work of all three of these fieldworkers was best when they were able to break out of the informal/intimate mode and maintain steady attention to the work at hand. McCall was most successful at this modulation of styles; McKemie seemed to have the greatest difficulty in style shifting.

To provide the reader of the protocols with a general guide to the investigative skills of the 17 principal fieldworkers, ten scales are introduced here for consideration. These include two sets of skills related to basic preparation: 1) understanding the research design and 2) operation of the tape recorder. Four other skills relate directly to the formal requirements of the work sheets: 3) general coverage of the work sheets, 4) range of lexical and semantic investigation, 5) coverage of grammatical and idiomatic items in the work sheets, and 6) exploration of supplementary material, especially from the perspective of the "shotgun" questions. The final four skills relate to the general conduct of the interview: 7) development of conversational situations and the ability to sustain them, 8) the ability to extend those conversations in a productive way in the collection of useful information, 9) patience, and 10) perception of the informant's feelings and recognition of the possibilities and limitations inseparable from those feelings.

1 The Research Design: consistent with the essays of Pederson and McDavid in the Manual, fieldworkers were expected to reflect in their records an understanding of these six considerations:

- a) with respect to informant selection
 - 1) appropriate social characteristics
 - 2) appropriate psychological characteristics
- b) with respect to the work sheets
 - 1) mastery of the implications of all items
 - 2) familiarity with usual and/or expected contexts
- c) acquisition of full personal data and maximum background on the community itself, e.g., maps and records
- d) skillful introduction of the aims of the project to the informant
- e) recognition that strongly suggested forms are far less useful than those that are freely elicited
- f) recognition that acknowledgments made with a nod of the head, a grunt, or even a fully developed statement of affirmation is of no use whatsoever unless the form itself is articulated.

Of all these considerations, none is more important than the ability of the fieldworker to evaluate successfully the psychological characteristics of the informant before the interview is conducted. The inability of some fieldworkers to recognize in advance that an informant had little interest in and no intention of completing the interview comes through quite clearly in a number of the field records from the first opening conversation. Although a very few fieldworkers, notably Bassett, McCall, and Rutledge, were able to turn some of these improbable situations into productive records, carelessness of informant selection based on psychological factors probably accounted for the largest number of incomplete records in the collection.

2) The Tape Recorder: by the time the basic fieldwork of the survey was undertaken in 1973, all fieldworkers understood that the field record for LAGS was a tape-recorded interview. For that reason, all were instructed on the proper use of the machine, but some proved to be far better technicians than others in the development of these considerations:

- a) technical skills in recording an interview of good audial quality
 - 1) careful attention to volume and tone control
 - 2) attention to feedback problems resulting from the microphone having been placed too closely to the machine
 - 3) attention to battery level when operating the machine with the independent power pack
 - 4) attention to CB, local, and other kinds of interference created within the machine and by its receiver
 - 5) attention to microphone placement with respect to the position of the informant
 - 6) attention to machine placement to avoid unnecessary distraction to the informant
- b) maintenance of the machine during the course of the interview
 - 1) keeping the informant at ease
 - 2) skillful replacement of reels
 - 3) attention to information lost during the exchange of reels
 - 4) attention to background noise created in or near the room where the interview is conducted
 - 5) attention to overprint, i.e., speaking simultaneously with the informant and obliterating his message.

However commonplace each of these considerations may seem, many fine passages were obscured by carelessness with the tape recorder. Fortunately, Crist, McCall, and Rutledge were among the very best technicians with the machine, although McCall too often lost material by walking away from the microphone and conducting casual conversations at remote distances from the instrument. Of all the LAGS fieldworkers, Crist was surely the most diligent in his attention to these technical details, and his records preserve the very best sound quality in the entire collection.

3) General Administration of the Work Sheets: here, the details outlined fully by McDavid were to be realized. Specifically, these included:

- 1) skillful conversational presentation of the material
 - a) selection of appropriate frames
 - b) understanding the full implication of each item in the context of the discussion as it developed
- 2) thorough coverage of all items, including material in virgules
- 3) effective use of "shotgun" questions in the collection of basic information.

In this skill, Bassett, Leas, and Rutledge distinguished themselves from all other interviewers in their management of the work sheets. All profited from extensive experience in the program, but, as auditors of the records will see, experience is no assurance of improvement among fieldworkers.

4) Range of Lexical and Semantic Coverage included the investigation of these areas:

- a) general variants
- b) shades of meaning

c) regional and social usage.

In addition to Bassett, Leas, and Rutledge, Bailey, Frazer, and Rawlings were also remarkably effective in pursuing the implications of this component of the investigation. Sometimes through direct interrogation and occasionally through relaxed conversation, informants provided essential information on the implications of forms when they were given an opportunity to express themselves. This was a point strongly emphasized in the instruction of McDavid, but it was too often overlooked in the actual conduct of LAGS interviews.

5) Coverage of Grammatical and Idiomatic Items in the Work Sheets is graded with four considerations:

- a) thoroughness of coverage
- b) elicitation in natural contexts
- c) skillful elicitation of forms through conversation
- d) regional and social usage

In this complicated operation Bailey and Leas were probably the ablest of all LAGS fieldworkers. Rutledge also showed great skill in eliciting forms in their natural contexts and in pursuing the implications of regional and social distribution. If she was unable to get the forms in that way, she passed them by rather than disturb the general conduct of the interview. For that reason, however admirable the rest of her work in this area, many of her records lack the desired thoroughness, especially in the awkward and improbable items which are virtually impossible to elicit without strong suggestion. Of all the scales outlined here, none is more difficult to apply than this one because the aims of the investigation always remained ambiguous with the matter of thoroughness standing at variance with the goal of natural conversation.

6) Exploration for Supplementary Material: all fieldworkers were instructed from the outset of the program to investigate all aspects of regional speech irrespective of the relationship of forms to work-sheet items. This directive placed a heavy responsibility upon the investigators, and only a few were able to sustain such research throughout the course of their work. Among the most successful of these were Bailey, Bassett, Crist, Frazer, Leas, Rutledge, and Starwalt.

7) Skill in Developing a Conversational Situation and Sustaining It: this scale, like the three that follow it, is difficult to describe because it is intimately tied to the personality and style of the fieldworker. Although no interviewer ranked lower than good in this category because all were selected on the basis of their general abilities in dealing with people, some fieldworkers who were less effective in other respects significantly strengthened their work on the basis of this natural ability. Most notable of these are the records of McKemie, Shaffer, Tucker, and Wellborn.

8) Skill in the Extension of the Conversational Situation to Include the Requisites of the Investigation. This scale is closely tied to the preceding one, but effectiveness in the latter was not always sustained after establishing a good interview situation. This conversational skill, however, was one of those most broadly distributed among the fieldworkers whose work encompassed the full range of conversational registers, from the consultative style of Crist and Starwalt to the informal/intimate style of McCall, McKemie, and Wellborn.

9) Patience was perhaps the simplest of all the attributes of effective fieldwork, but this was often the most difficult to realize in the press of time and sheer fatigue that accompanies all extensive interviewing. Properly sustained, patience allowed the informant time to contribute significantly to the development of the conversation, to speak fully on all matters of concern to both himself and the interviewer, and to think, organize his thoughts, and express himself in his own way. In this category, the best demonstrations of good results that reflect patient fieldwork are found in the records of Bailey, Baird, Bassett, Crist, Frazer, McCall, Moran, and Tucker.

10) Perception of the Implications of the Interview Situation includes five general areas of concern:

- a) a balanced sensitivity to the feelings of the informant to avoid rudeness on the one hand, but, at the same time, to eschew an unrealistically slavish politeness that might be equally unproductive in the development of effective communication
- b) a steady awareness of the incidence of work-sheet items as they occur in free conversation
- c) a recognition of the possibilities for conversational investigation and the development of such dialogue in accordance with the responsiveness of the informant
- d) the full exploitation of an informant with expertise of any semantic set, whether cotton-farming, oystering, or hog-butchering, allow such experts to continue so long as the discussion remains productive
- e) the recognition of a point of diminishing returns in such discussions and the ability to move along toward a more productive line.

The work of each of the 17 regular fieldworkers is evaluated here by Leas and Pederson on the basis of their experience with the field records and protocols. Leas transcribed 306 protocols, prepared all of the idiolect synopses, composed a preliminary summary of findings from the Urban Supplement (WP #7), and proofread the entire collection of protocols. Pederson transcribed 344 protocols after planning and directing the fieldwork since 1968. Each fieldworker is graded Excellent (E), Good (G), or Fair (F) in each of the 10 categories. In the following table, these 340 (170 x 2) judgments are entered with the evaluations of Leas appearing before the virgule and those of Pederson appearing after the virgule. In 99 of 170 instances, these evaluations are in agreement; in 67 instances, they vary by a single grade; in four instances, they are in disagreement. In all four of those, however, explanations are available. In ranking the skills of both Herrington and Moran, Pederson marked them both Fair because they had not prepared themselves for difficulties encountered with the machine in Chattanooga. Leas marked them both Excellent on the basis of the overall quality of the records they produced. Elsewhere, the editors disagree in their evaluation of Shaffer's extended conversational skills, with Leas reflecting her transcription of his Tampa records and Pederson reflecting his transcription of Shaffer's Lower Alabama records. A more effective development of conversation in the rural interviews was a distinctive characteristic of Shaffer's style, and this feature is clearly represented in the scoring. Finally, Leas ranked Smith Fair with respect to work sheet coverage; Pederson ranked him Excellent. Leas' scoring reflects a more limited experience with Smith's actual

performance on tape, but her observations report the limited effectiveness of Smith in eliciting basic items that appear in the synopses. Conversely, Pederson was impressed with Smith's coverage of work-sheet items, but this was based on a recollection of overall performance in five different interviews.

Although similar explanation might be provided for each instance of variance in the table, it seems sufficient to note here that each is a value judgment based on experience with the records, the protocols, and, especially with the training and direction of the fieldworkers themselves. To indicate the range of experience with the records produced by each fieldworker, the number of field records actually transcribed by each editor is entered after the name of each, e.g., Bailey, Guy (34: 7/9), indicating that of Bailey's 34 field records seven were transcribed by Leas and nine were transcribed by Pederson.

Table 1: Evaluation of Fieldworkers

Fieldworker	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Bailey, Guy (34: 7/9)	E/E	G/E	G/G	E/E	G/E	E/E	E/E	E/E	E/E	E/E
Baird, Allyne (12: 5/2)	G/G	E/G	E/G	G/G	G/G	G/F	E/G	F/G	E/E	G/G
Bassett, Marvin (103: 27/27)	E/E	G/E	E/E	E/G	G/G	E/E	E/E	E/E	E/E	E/E
Crist, Edward (58: 10/20)	G/F	E/E	F/F	G/G	F/F	G/E	E/E	E/E	G/E	E/E
Frazer, Shirley (27: 7/5)	E/G	G/E	G/G	G/E	G/G	G/E	E/E	E/E	E/E	E/G
Herrington, Elizabeth (12: 6/2)	G/G	E/F	G/F	F/G	F/G	F/G	E/G	F/G	G/F	G/G
Leas, Susan (24: 22/2)	G/E	G/E	E/E	E/E	E/E	E/E	G/G	G/G	E/G	E/E
McCall, Mary (48: 13/13)	G/G	E/G	G/G	G/G	F/G	G/G	E/E	G/E	E/E	E/G
McKemie, Gordon (111: 25/36)	G/F	F/F	F/F	G/F	F/F	G/G	E/E	E/E	E/G	F/F
Moran, Margaret (11: 5/1)	G/G	E/F	G/G	G/G	G/G	G/G	E/G	F/G	E/E	G/G
Rawlings, Joe (22: 3/4)	G/E	G/E	G/E	G/E	G/G	G/G	G/G	G/G	G/G	G/G
Rutledge, Barbara (200: 31/60)	E/E	E/E	E/E	E/E	E/G	E/E	E/E	G/E	E/G	E/E
Shaffer, Gene (18: 4/5)	G/G	F/F	G/G	G/G	F/G	F/G	G/E	F/E	G/G	G/F
Smith, William (9: 1/5)	G/F	G/E	F/E	F/G	F/G	F/G	G/G	G/G	G/F	G/G
Starwalt, Donald (14: 2/6)	G/E	E/E	G/G	G/G	G/G	G/E	G/E	G/E	F/G	G/G
Tucker, Jeannie (16: 6/3)	G/G	F/F	E/G	G/G	G/G	G/G	G/E	F/G	E/E	G/G
Wellborn, John (20: 4/6)	G/G	G/G	G/F	F/F	F/G	F/F	G/E	G/E	F/G	G/F

APPENDIX

LAGS FIELDWORKERS

LAGS REGULAR FIELDWORKERS

31

Barbara Rutledge (200)	Grace Rueter (15)
Gordon McKemie (111)	Christine W. Unger (15)
Marvin Bassett (103)	Donald Starwalt (14)
Edward Crist (58)	Allyne Baird (12)
Mary McCall (48)	Elizabeth Herrington (12)
Lee Pederson (42)	Margaret Moran (11)
Guy Bailey (34)	Anne Malone Fitts (9)
Shirley Frazer (27)	William H. Smith (9)
Susan Leas (24)	Tom Clotfelter (7)
Joe Newsom Rawlings (22)	Joan Hall (6)
John Wellborn (20)	Louise DeVere (2)
C. W. Foster (19)	Gail Richardson (1)
Gene Shaffer (18)	
Jean Tucker (16)	

LAGS VOLUNTEER FIELDWORKERS

William J. Barnette (5)	Michael Montgomery (3)
Barbara C. Respass (5)	David B. Taylor (3)
Bethany Dumas (3)	Linda R. Reed (2)
Judy Fogwell (3)	John Stanley Rich (2)

STUDENT FIELDWORKERS PROVIDING MORE THAN ONE RECORD

Peter Gerkin (4)	Paula Engeman (2)
Frederick W. Ball (3)	James M. Fitzsimons (2)
Shawn Beaty (3)	Yvonne Foster (2)
Mary Norwood (3)	Lynn B. Friedman (2)
Nancy S. Boren (2)	Richard Hall (2)

LAGS FIELDWORKERS

Barbara Rutledge (200)

ET - 7
 UG - 1
 LG - 3
 EF - 18
 MT - 26
 UA - 2
 LA - 4
 WF - 14
 LM - 25
 GM - 3
 EL - 19
 WL - 33
 UT - 28
 LT - 17

Gordon McKemie (111)

LG - 8
 UM - 9
 LM - 8
 GM - 10
 EL - 31
 AR - 18
 WL - 25
 UT - 2

Marvin Bassett (103)

ET - 1
 UG - 1
 LG - 2
 EF - 1
 UA - 7
 LA - 19
 WF - 2
 GA - 7
 WT - 7
 UM - 15
 LM - 8
 GM - 2
 AR - 13
 WL - 6
 UT - 8
 LT - 3

Edward Crist (58)

ET - 1
 LG - 3
 WT - 15
 UM - 32
 AR - 7

Mary McCall (48)

ET - 3
 UG - 1
 AR - 44

Lee Pederson (42)

ET - 36
 UG - 6

Guy Bailey (34)

ET - 5
 EF - 9
 UA - 1
 LA - 15
 WF - 4

Shirley Frazer (27)

UT - 13
 LT - 14

Susan Leas (24)

ET - 1
 UG - 5
 LG - 5
 EF - 1
 MT - 1
 UA - 6
 LA - 3
 AR - 1
 UT - 1

Joe Newsom Rawlings (22)

LG - 1
 LA - 5
 WL - 1
 UT - 8
 LT - 7

John Wellborn (20)

LG - 12
 EF - 8

C. W. Foster (19)

ET - 1
 MT - 1
 UA - 17

Gene Shaffer (18)

LG - 1
 EF - 8
 LA - 9

Jean Tucker (16)

WT - 16

Christine W. Unger (15)

UG - 2
 LM - 12
 GM - 1

Grace Rueter (15)

UG - 5
 LG - 10

Donald Starwalt (14)

EF - 11
 LA - 3

Allyne Baird (12)

UG - 3
 LG - 9

Elizabeth Herrington (12)

ET - 1
 MT - 3
 UA - 4
 GA - 4

Meg Moran (11)

MT - 4
 UA - 4
 GA - 3

Anne Malone Fitts (9)

UA - 3
 LA - 6

William H. Smith (9)

LG - 9

Tom Clotfelter (7)	Nancy S. Boren (2)	Student Interviews (212)
ET - 6	UA - 2	ET - 3
UG - 1		UG - 113
	Louise DeVere (2)	LG - 32
Joan Hall (6)	ET - 2	EF - 9
		MT - 4
UG - 3	Paula Engeman (2)	UA - 27
LG - 3	LA - 2	LA - 16
		WT - 2
William J. Barnette (5)	James M. Fitzsimons (2)	UM - 1
		LM - 2
MT - 5	UG - 2	EL - 1
		AR - 1
Barbara C. Respass (5)	Yvonne Foster (2)	WL - 1
LG - 4	UA - 2	
EF - 1		
	Lynn B. Friedman (2)	
Peter Gerkin (4)		
	UG - 1	
LG - 4	LG - 1	
Frederick W. Ball (3)	Richard Hall (2)	
EF - 2	UG - 2	
UA - 1		
	Linda R. Reed (2)	
Shawn Beaty (3)		
	MT - 2	
ET - 1		
MT - 2	John Stanley Rich (2)	
Bethany Dumas (3)	UA - 2	
AR - 3	Gail Richardson (1)	
Judy Fogwell (3)	EF - 1	
UG - 1		
LT - 2		
Michael Montgomery (3)		
EF - 1		
AR - 2		
Mary Norwood (3)		
MT - 1		
UA - 2		
David B. Taylor (3)		
ET - 2		
UG - 1		

STUDENT FIELDWORKERS PROVIDING ONE RECORD EACH

34

Ruth Adams AJ 106.04 (2/78)
Margaret Anderson Z 069.05 (3/73)
W. Anderson Y 067.06 (12/73)
Brenda Armbrecht DW 387.06 (7/77)
Don Bacigalupi AT 141.02 (11/79)
Pam Bailey T 053.09 (11/73)
Elinor Baker DG 324.10 (11/71)
Anthony Balch BP 230.01 (6/71)
Clinton Bancroft AC 083.01 (11/71)
Susan Barsh X 063.02 (8/70)
Melanie Bast CE 277.01 (10/79)
Mary Anne Bates BQ 233.02 (7/73)
Linda Batty O 037.01 (11/73)
W. T. Beckner BU 243.11 (11/79)
Mary Belk AE 087.01 (2/67)
David A. Blackwell AY 166.01 (11/77)
Eloise W. Blaker T 052.04 (7/73)
Jan Bloom P 038.02 (7/72)
Shirley Boddie BO 299.02 (7/73)
Ritchie Boyette CE 278.03 (10/79)
Claudia Bradley P 038.03 (11/71)
Jann Bradley AP 126.01 (7/70)
Rose Anne Brasington R 046.01 (7/74)
Kevin Briggs CG 282.03 (10/79)
Janice P. Brill BZ 260.01 (11/73)
Rose Merry Brock AD 086.05 (7/77)
Linda H. Brogdon U 054.03 (7/74)
Barbara Brooks BY 254.02 (11/79)
Jean W. Brown Z 069.01 (2/73)
Maria Brown AD 086.01 (11-12/74)
Vivian W. Brown CD 273.03 (7/73)
James L. Bulman BN 255.02 (12/72)
Latrelle Burcher L 030.01 (7/72)
Beverly Burroughs Q# 006.01 (7/73)
Judy Callaway X 064.01 (11/71)
Marlene K. Caplan AI 103.02 (2/77)
Oletha Carter T 053.14 (4/75)
Anne Cheek S# 012.01 (11/73)
Elaine Clark CD 273.01 (12/73)
Sally Clark AK# 064.02 (7/77)
Grace Clements Y 067.02 (6/72)
Enid Cobb BS 238.01 (7/73)
Rachel Cole W 062.02 (3/73)
Carol Collins AO 123.02 (2/76)
Donald A. Cooper A 002.01 (11/71)
Martha Crews AK 112.01 (2-3/77)
Susan Cunningham ED 413.02 (7/72)
Ruby Daffin T 053.08 (8/75)
Donna Daniel AF 094.01 (10/73)
Myra Daniel Z 068.02 (3/73)
Diana Daughtridge S# 013.01 (10/72)
Carol S. Davis R 045.01 (1/78)
Susan Davis FT 523.01 (7/72)
Karen Day Y 066.01 (2/72)
J. William Deen AL 114.01 (3/73)
Donna Diehl S# 015.03 (7/76)
Johnnie N. Dorsey Q# 006.03 (7/76)
Eddie Lynn Dowell BN 226.05 (3/76)
Kathryn E. Duggleby Q 043.01 (7/77)
Libby Dye S# 014.01 (7/77)
Andrea Eason W 062.01 (3/73)
Sandy Edwards AQ 130.01 (11/73)
Kathy Elliott Y 067.04 (10/72)
Sarah S. Ellison Z 069.03 (3/73)
Janet Evans BN 226.01 (4/72)
Maureen FitzGerald DG 324.02 (12/74)
Myra Folsem Y 065.03 (2/73)
Margaret W. Foster CC 269.01 (7/72)
Judy Franks V 059.04 (2/77)
Nancy Franzén S# 013.02 (10/72)

Gloria Frayser T 053.02 (1/71)
 Eva Frink AB 076.01 (7/76)
 Steve Gardinier AK 111.01 (3/74)
 Larry Gardner Y# 037.01 (11/72)
 Katie Glenn W 060.01 (3/73)
 Jay Goodner BR 234.02 (12/79)
 Carolyn Griffin AU 144.01 (3/74)
 Charlene Griffin AO 125.02 (7/74)
 Don Griffith BY 256.01 (7/74)
 Cherry Haisten Y 065.04 (3/73)
 *Sue Haley BW 248.01 (12/71)
 Lynnel Harden Z 071.02 (3/73)
 Linda Harris Z 069.02 (3/73)
 Sandra W. Harris T 052.03 (7/70)
 Carol Head Y 067.05 (10/72)
 *John Heisel BW 248.01 (12/71)
 Susan Henderson BS 239.05 (10/74)
 Ann H. Herrington BV 244.01 (8/70)
 Claire Hicks S# 008.01 (11/75)
 Jenny Higginbotham BR 234.01 (12/74)
 Donovan Hodges Y# 036.01 (8/75)
 Betty H. Holcombe V 059.02 (7/74)
 Eleanor Hoomes CH 284.01 (7/76)
 Marilyn Hopkins T 053.16 (5/75)
 Nancy Houghtaling Y 065.02 (3/73)
 Steven M. Howard AG 098.02 (11/77)
 Constance B. Hunt AC 082.01 (8/77)
 Elsie Hunter O# 001.01 (7/73)
 Jackie Hutcheson Y 065.01 (2/73)
 Connie Inman BP 231.01 (10/74)
 Beverly Jo Jackson Y# 037.02 (8/70)
 Carolyn Jackson R 047.04 (7/76)
 Geraldine M. Jackson Z 069.06 (3/73)
 Lois W. Jackson AA 072.01 (7/72)
 Gamelia Jennings DZ 399.03 (6/74)
 **May Jessup AK 109.02 (8/74)
 George Jeter AA 073.01 (11/72)
 Joy Johns R 045.02 (11/73)
 Harriet Johnson Q 044.05 (7/77)
 Jimmy Jones Q 044.03 (7/76)
 Nell H. Jones BV 244.03 (7/73)
 Randy Jones AN 122.01 (9/72)
 *Beth Karassik AW 153.03 (12/77)
 Joan Kealy S 050.02 (10/73)
 James Keen AZ 181.01 (11/79)
 Glen A. Keenan BO 227.02 (7/73)
 David Kelley BT 240.01 (12/78)
 Jean Kennedy Z 068.03 (2-3/73)
 Ernest Keown S# 011.01 (8/70)
 Marion R. Kriwanek BW 249.02 (3/73)
 †Lois Kunselman G 017.07 (5/77)
 Mary H. Lackie U 054.01 (7/74)
 Kathryn G. Lance W 061.02 (3/73)
 Karen M. Lanning T 053.03 (12/76)
 Cindy Larsen CG 279.08 (10/79)
 Kathleen Levinsky BT 241.02 (12/78)
 Marilyn Light AF 093.01 (2/77)
 Faye E. Lindly BP 230.04 (7/73)
 June Lisle Z 069.07 (3/73)
 Martha Scott Lue R 047.05 (7/77)
 Mike Lund AF# 058.01 (5/68)
 Wanda Machacek X 063.05 (7/74)
 Connie L. McCrary AB 076.02 (7/77)
 H. Timothy McKane AF# 063.04 (11/73)
 Andrew Martin Q# 005.01 (11/79)
 B. Jane Martin BH 207.03 (8/76)
 Jane Martin W 062.04 (9/77)
 Craig Massey AK 111.03 (8/72)
 Carolyn Mayo Z 071.01 (3/73)
 Ronald Midkiff P 039.01 (2/69)

*Joint interview

**with William H. Smith

†Urban Supplement only

Brenda Minnifield W# 022.01 (2/78)
 Judy E. Mitchell CC 268.01 (11/72)
 Beverly Molander T 053.06 (7/73)
 Mary Jean Moore AZ 176.01 (11/73)
 Mary Anne Mount V 057.01 (3/73)
 Anne Murphy AA 074.02 (5-6/71)
 Patsy Musgrove Q 044.01 (7/77)
 Barbara A. Myers DO 356.02 (2/78)
 Helen B. Myers Z 069.04 (3/73)
 Anita Nelson S 051.02 (8/76)
 Judy Nuss V 059.03 (1/76)
 Lisa Odham AX 157.01 (11/73)
 Annette Olive CF 279.10 (10/79)
 Ann M. Oliver BQ 232.01 (11/79)
 *Ron Pace BH 206.01 (6/74)
 Patricia C. Patterson AA 073.02 (7/76)
 †Mike Pendergrass M 032.06 (75)
 Chuck Penuel S# 015.01 (3/74)
 Kathy Perrault CE 275.01 (7/76)
 Lutricia Phillips Z 069.08 (3/73)
 Gena Pittman Q 044.04 (7/77)
 Melanie Pittner Q 044.02 (3/72)
 Pat Pope U 054.02 (7/74)
 Vicky Powers AC# 051.01 (8/72)
 Vivian E. Preston AP 128.01 (12/71)
 Gerre Price BT 242.01 (2/76)
 Diane Pryor Z 071.03 (3/73)
 Martha Ramsey W 062.03 (2/73)
 Susan E. Reed AA 074.01 (3/73)
 Barbara Reynolds T 052.02 (3/73)
 W. Richard AA 072.02 (5/76)
 India Richardson S# 009.01 (11/73)
 Doris Richmond X 063.04 (7/76)
 Yvonne Robertson BN 225.01 (11/72)
 Carol Rodenhiser Y 067.03 (7/73)
 Charles T. Rogers T 053.15 (8/75)
 *John Rubadeau BH 206.01 (6/74)
 Vicki Rubin BX 250.03 (12/75)
 Gale Rudisill O 036.01 (7/77)
 Harvey Sax AC# 059.02 (1/73)
 Greg Seale AE 088.02 (11/79)
 Betty A. Shackelford V 059.01 (7/74)
 Janice Shakleton X 063.03 (7/70)
 Bill Sharpe Z 068.01 (3/72)
 Marie Sheahan M 032.08 (11/73)
 Sharry Shepard S 050.01 (11/73)
 Elena Sheppa AX 160.03 (11/79)
 Thomas E. Shoemate BJ 212.01 (7/76)
 Karen Sisk Y# 028.01 (7/70)
 *Andrew Slater AW 153.03 (12/77)
 Michael E. Smith AG 098.03 (11/77)
 Phronia Smith Y 065.05 (2/73)
 Breck Speer W 062.05 (3/73)
 Brenda S. Stanford CF 281.03 (10/79)
 Virginia Stein W 061.03 (3/73)
 Joan Stutts BP 230.03 (10/75)
 Janice Taylor Z 070.03 (2/77)
 Rebecca Taylor BO 229.03 (10/75)
 Richard N. Taylor BM 224.01 (12/78)
 Patricia Thigpen O# 003.01 (12/72)
 Mary Nell Thomas T 053.11 (1/76)
 Rose Thomason AJ 105.01 (7/71)
 Sara Thrift AK 112.02 (12/79)
 Dana P. Tiburski AC 083.02 (7/76)
 Pearl Todd W 061.01 (1-3/73)
 Mary Lou Toohy R 047.03 (11/71)
 Susan Wallace S 049.01 (8/70)
 Sue Walter Q# 006.02 (7/73)
 Joan Warriner FF 456.01 (12/73)
 Jane White T 053.05 (7/73)

*Joint interview

†Urban Supplement only

Luvania Whitmore AM 116.01 (8/77)
Ann Williams BO 229.01 (2/75)
David Williford AI 103.01 (8/74)
Karl Wingard, Jr. S# 007.02 (7/73)
Joannie Woodford S# 015.02 (8/72)
J. Diane Woods T 052.01 (3/73)
Rhea Yarbrough CF 279.09 (10/79)
Linda Young AO 123.03 (2/78)

Lee Pederson (36)

A 001.01 (8/71)
 A 001.02 (8/71)
 A 001.03 (8/71)
 A 001.04 (8/71)
 B 004.01 (5/72)
 B 004.02 (5/72)
 B 005.01 (5/72)
 B 005.02 (5/72)
 C 006.01 (8/71)
 C 006.02 (8/71)
 C 006.03 (8/71)
 C 006.04 (8/71)
 C 007.01 (5/72)
 D 009.01 (4/72)
 D 009.02 (4/72)
 D 009.03 (4/72)
 D 010.01 (4/72)
 E 014.01 (5/72)
 E 014.02 (5/72)
 F 015.01 (7/73)
 F 015.02 (7/73)
 F 016.01 (8/71)
 F 016.02 (8/71)
 G 017.01 (3/72)
 G 017.04 (3/72)
 G 017.05 (3/72)
 G 017.06 (3/72)
 G 017.07 (3/72)
 H 019.01 (5/72)
 H 019.02 (5/72)
 I 021.01 (6/71)
 I 023.01 (6/71)
 K 028.01 (6/71)
 K 028.02 (6/71)
 L 031.01 (7/71)
 L 031.02 (7/71)

Barbara Rutledge (7)

J 026.01 (3/72)
 J 026.02 (4/72)
 M 032.03 (4/73)
 M 032.04 (4/73)
 M 032.05 (4/73)
 N 034.01 (4/73)
 N 034.02 (4/73)

Tom Clotfelter (6)

A 002.02 (8/72)
 A 002.03 (8/72)
 G 017.02 (7/72)
 G 017.03 (7/72)
 M 032.02 (9/72)
 M 032.06 (9/72)

Guy Bailey (5)

D 011.01 (6/78)
 H 020.01 (8/78)
 H 020.02 (8/78)
 H 020.03 (8/78)
 J 025.02 (6/78)

Mary McCall (3)

A 001.05 (6/75)
 G 017.08 (6/75)
 J 026.03 (6/75)

Louise DeVere (2)

C 006.05 (1/75)
 D 010.02 (11/74)

David Bruce Taylor (2)

M 032.07 (8/72)
 M 032.09 (8/72)

Marvin Bassett (1)

M 032.11 (4/78)

Shawn Beaty (1)

J 024.01 (6/73)

Ed Crist (1)

J 025.01 (11/73)

C. W. Foster (1)

M 032.01 (8/70)

Betsy Herrington (1)

M 032.10 (7/75)

Susan Leas (1)

K 028.03 (7/78)

Student Interviews (3)

L 030.01 (Latrell Burcher) (7/72)
 A 002.01 (Donald A. Cooper) (11/71)
 M 032.08 (Marie Sheahan) (11/73)

Susan Leas (5)	Tom Clotfelter (1)
T 053.04 (10/80)	P 038.04 (2/72)
T 053.07 (11/79)	
T 053.12 (7/80)	Judy Fogwell (1)
T 053.13 (10/80)	
AA 075.01 (1/80)	T 052.06 (7/76)
Lee Pederson (6)	Lynn B. Friedman (1)
Q#004.01 (8/80)	
T 052.05 (1/68)	Y# 038.01 (1/70)
T 053.10 (6/70)	
V 058.01 (5/70)	Mary McCall (1)
X 063.01 (6/70)	
Y 067.01 (6/68)	O 036.01 (6/74)
Grace Rueter (5)	Barbara Rutledge (1)
S# 019.01 (9/68)	S 051.01 (2/72)
Y# 026.01 (5/68)	
Y# 033.01 (12/70)	David B. Taylor (1)
Y# 034.01 (12/70)	
AB 078.01 (11/70)	P 038.01 (8/73)
Allyne Baird (3)	Student Interviews (113)
Z 070.01 (6/71)	O 036.02 Gale Rudisill (7/77)
Z 070.02 (9/71)	O 037.01 Linda Batty (11/73)
AA 074.03 (7/74)	O# 001.01 Elsie Hunter (7/73)
Joan H. Hall (3)	O# 003.01 Patricia Thigpen (12/72)
	P 038.02 Jan Bloom (7/72)
	P 038.03 Claudia Bradley (11/71)
W# 025.01 (5/69)	P 039.01 Ronald Midkiff (2/69)
Y# 029.01 (5/69)	Q 043.01 Kathryn E. Duggleby (7/77)
Y# 031.01 (5/69)	Q 044.01 Patsy Musgrove (7/77)
James M. Fitzsimons (2)	Q 044.02 Melanie Pitner (3/72)
	Q 044.03 Jimmy Jones (7/76)
O 037.02 (3/68)	Q 044.04 Gena Pittman (7/77)
R 048.01 (2/68)	Q 044.05 Harriet Johnson (7/77)
Richard Hall (2)	Q# 005.01 Andrew Martin (11/79)
	Q# 006.01 Beverly Burroughs (7/73)
S# 007.01 (2/69)	Q# 006.02 Sue Walter (7/73)
W# 022.02 (2/69)	Q# 006.03 Johnnie N. Dorsey (7/76)
Christine W. Unger (2)	R 045.01 Carol S. Davis (1/78)
	R 045.02 Joy Johns (11/73)
R 047.01 (11/70)	R 046.01 Rose Anne Brasington (7/74)
R 047.02 (11/70)	R 047.03 Mary Lou Toohey (11/71)
Marvin Bassett (1)	R 047.04 Carolyn Jackson (7/76)
	R 047.05 Martha Scott Lue (7/77)
T 053.01 (4/78)	S 049.01 Susan Wallace (8/70)
	S 050.01 Sharry Shepard (11/73)
	S 050.02 Joan Kealy (10/73)
	S 051.02 Anita Nelson (8/76)
	S# 007.02 Karl Wingard, Jr. (7/73)

UPPER GEORGIA FIELDWORKERS (continued)

40

S# 008.01 Claire Hicks (11/75) Y 066.01 Karen Day (2/72)
S# 009.01 India Richardson (11/73) Y 067.02 Grace Clements (6/72)
S# 011.01 Ernest Keown (8/70) Y 067.03 Carole Rodenhiser (7/73)
S# 012.01 Anne Cheek (11/73) Y 067.04 Kathy Elliott (10/72)
S# 013.01 Diana Daughtridge (10/72) Y 067.05 Carol Head (10/72)
S# 013.02 Nancy Franzén (10/72) Y 067.06 W. Anderson (12/73)
S# 014.01 Libby Dye (7/77) Y# 028.01 Karen Sisk (7/70)
S# 015.01 Chuck Penuel (3/74) Y# 036.01 Donovan Hodges (8/75)
S# 015.02 Joannie Woodford (8/72) Y# 037.01 Larry Gardner (11/72)
S# 015.03 Donna Diehl (7/76) Y# 037.02 Beverly Jo Jackson (8/70)
T 052.01 J. Diane Woods (3/73) Z 068.01 Bill Sharpe (3/72)
T 052.02 Barbara Reynolds (3/73) Z 068.02 Myra Daniel (3/73)
T 052.03 Sandra W. Harris (7/70) Z 068.03 Jean Kennedy (2-3/73)
T 052.04 Eloise W. Blaker (7/73) Z 069.01 Jean W. Brown (2/73)
T 053.02 Gloria Frayser (1/71) Z 069.02 Linda Harris (3/73)
T 053.03 Karen M. Lanning (12/76) Z 069.03 Sarah S. Ellison (3/73)
T 053.05 Jane White (7/73) Z 069.04 Helen B. Myers (3/73)
T 053.06 Beverly Molander (7/73) Z 069.05 Margaret Anderson (3/73)
T 053.08 Ruby Daffin (8/75) Z 069.06 Geraldine M. Jackson (3/73)
T 053.09 Pam Bailey (11/73) Z 069.07 June Lisle (3/73)
T 053.11 Mary Nell Thomas (1/76) Z 069.08 Lutricia Phillips (3/73)
T 053.14 Oletha Carter (4/75) Z 070.03 Janice Taylor (2/77)
T 053.15 Charles T. Rogers (8/75) Z 071.01 Carolyn Mayo (3/73)
T 053.16 Marilyn Hopkins (5/75) Z 071.02 Lynnel Harden (3/73)
U 054.01 Mary H. Lackie (7/74) Z 071.03 Diane Pryor (3/73)
U 054.02 Pat Pope (7/74) AA 072.01 Lois W. Jackson (7/72)
U 054.03 Linda H. Brogdon (7/74) AA 072.02 W. Richard (5/76)
V 057.01 Mary Anne Mount (3/73) AA 073.01 George Jeter (11/72)
V 059.01 Betty A. Shackelford (7/74) AA 073.02 Patricia C. Patterson (7/76)
V 059.02 Betty H. Holcombe (7/74) AA 074.01 Susan E. Reed (3/73)
V 059.03 Judy Nuss (1/76) AA 074.02 Anne Murphy (5-6/71)
V 059.04 Judy Franks (2/77) AB 076.01 Eva Frink (7/76)
W 060.01 Katie Glenn (3/73) AB 076.02 Connie L. McCrary (7/77)
W 061.01 Pearl Todd (1-3/73)
W 061.02 Kathryn G. Lance (3/73)
W 061.03 Virginia Stein (3/73)
W 062.01 Andrea Eason (3/73)
W 062.02 Rachel Cole (3/73)
W 062.03 Martha Ramsey (2/73)
W 062.04 Jane Martin (9/77)
W 062.05 Breck Speer (3/73)
W# 022.01 Brenda Minnifield (2/78)
X 063.02 Susan Barsh (8/70)
X 063.03 Janice Shakleton (7/70)
X 063.04 Doris Richmond (7/76)
X 063.05 Wanda Machacek (7/74)
X 064.01 Judy Callaway (11/71)
Y 065.01 Jackie Hutcheson (2/73)
Y 065.02 Nancy Houghtaling (3/73)
Y 065.03 Myra Folsem (2/73)
Y 065.04 Cherry Haisten (3/73)
Y 065.05 Phronia Smith (2/73)

LOWER GEORGIA FIELDWORKERS

John Wellborn (12)	Gordon McKemie (8)	Marvin Bassett (2)
AC 080.01 (11/74)	AI 103.03 (3/78)	AG 098.01 (10/77)
AL 114.01 (8/75)	AJ 106.01 (4/78)	AH 100.01 (8/80)
AL 114.02 (8/75)	AJ 106.02 (4/78)	
AL 114.03 (8/75)	AJ 106.03 (3/78)	Lynn B. Friedman (1)
AM 117.05 (8/75)	AJ 107.01 (2/78)	
AN 122.02 (9/75)	AJ 107.02 (4/78)	AC# 044.01 (1/70)
AO 125.01 (9/75)	AJ 108.01 (4/78)	
AP 127.01 (7/75)	AN 121.01 (3/78)	Joe Newsom Rawlings (1)
AP 127.02 (8/75)		
AP 127.03 (7/75)	Susan Leas (5)	AC# 051.02 (12/75)
AP 127.04 (7/75)		
AP 127.05 (7/75)	AC# 059.03 (6/78)	Gene Shaffer (1)
	AC# 059.04 (6/78)	
Grace Rueter (10)	AC# 059.05 (6/78)	AO 123.01 (11/75)
	AE 088.03 (6/80)	
	AM 117.06 (8/78)	Student Interviews (32)
AC# 046.01 (4/70)		
AC# 049.01 (10/68)	Peter Gerkin (4)	AC 082.01 Constance B. Hunt (8/77)
AC# 050.01 (6/69)		AC 083.01 Clinton Bancroft (11/71)
AC# 056.01 (8/72)		AC 083.02 Dana P. Tiburski (7/76)
AC# 056.02 (5/72)	AE 088.01 (1/76)	AC# 051.01 Vicky Powers (8/72)
AC# 059.01 (4/72)	AE 089.01 (1/76)	AC# 058.01 Mike Lund (5/68)
AC# 059.06 (9/69)	AE 091.01 (1/76)	AC# 059.02 Harvey Sax (1/73)
AF 092.01 (8/68)	AE 091.02 (1/76)	AD 086.01 Maria Brown (11-12/74)
AF# 0621.01 (7/69)		AD 086.05 Rose Merry Brock (7/77)
AK 111.02 (8/69)	Barbara C. Respass (4)	AE 087.01 Mrs. Mary Belk (2/67)
		AE 088.02 Greg Seale (11/79)
Allyne Baird (9)	AM 117.01 (1/72)	AF 093.01 Marilyn Light (2/77)
	AM 117.02 (12/71)	AF 094.01 Donna Daniel (10/73)
AD 086.02 (6/74)	AM 117.03 (8-11/71)	AF# 063.04 H. Timothy McKane (11/73)
AD 086.03 (7/74-5/75)	AM 117.04 (8-11/71)	AG 098.02 Steven M. Howard (11/77)
AD 086.04 (7/74)		AG 098.03 Michael E. Smith (11/77)
AH 101.01 (7/77)	Edward Crist (3)	AI 103.01 David Williford (8/74)
AI 102.01 (10/77)		AI 103.02 Marlene K. Caplan (2/77)
AI 102.02 (10/77)	AC# 054.01 (5/70)	AJ 105.01 Rose Thomason (7/71)
AI 102.03 (9/77)	AG 096.01 (5/70)	AJ 106.04 Ruth Adams (2/78)
AM 118.01 (9/78)	AO 124.01 (6/70)	AK 111.01 Steve Gardinier (3/74)
AM 118.02 (9/78)		AK 111.03 Craig Massey (8/72)
	Joan Hall (3)	AK 112.01 Martha Crews (2-3/77)
William H. Smith (9)		AK 112.02 Sara Thrift (12/79)
	AF 093.02 (9/69)	AK#064.02 Sally Clark (7/77)
AF# 060.01 (9/74)	AK 109.01 (6/72)	AL 114.01 J. William Deen (3/73)
AF# 063.01 (9/74)	AL 114.04 (6/75)	AM 116.01 Luvania Whitmore (8/77)
AF# 063.02 (9/74)		AN 122.01 Randy Jones (9/72)
AF# 063.03 (9/74)	Barbara Rutledge (3)	AO 123.02 Carol Collins (2/76)
AK 109.02 (8/74)		AO 123.03 Linda Young (2/78)
AK# 064.01 (9/74)	AC# 042.01 (10/72)	AO 125.02 Charlene Griffin (7/74)
AK# 064.03 (9/74)	AC# 042.02 (9/72)	AP 126.01 Jann Bradley (7/70)
AK# 064.04 (9/74)	AP 129.01 (10/73)	AP 128.01 Vivian E. Preston (12/71)
AK# 064.05 (9/74)		

EAST FLORIDA FIELDWORKERS

Barbara Rutledge (18)

AR 134.01 (9/73)
 AR 134.02 (9/73)
 AR 134.03 (9/73)
 AR 134.04 (9/73)
 AS 139.01 (9/73)
 AS 139.02 (9/73)
 AT 142.01 (10/73)
 AT 142.02 (10/73)
 AT 142.03 (9/73)
 AU 144.02 (4/74)
 AU 145.01 (4/74)
 AV 150.01 (4/74)
 AV 150.02 (4/74)
 AV 150.03 (4/74)
 AW 154.01 (9/73)
 AW 154.02 (9/73)
 AX 156.01 (4/74)
 AX 156.02 (4/74)

Donald Starwalt (11)

AZ 183.01 (7/75)
 AZ 183.02 (7/75)
 AZ 183.03 (8/75)
 AZ 183.04 (7/75)
 AZ 183.05 (8/75)
 AZ 183.06 (7/75)
 AZ 183.07 (7/75)
 AZ 183.08 (7/75)
 AZ 184.01 (8/75)
 AZ 184.02 (8/75)
 AZ 184.03 (8/75)

Guy Bailey (9)

AU 146.01 (6/77)
 AU 146.02 (6/77)
 AV 148.01 (5/77)
 AX 160.01 (6/77)
 AX 160.02 (6/77)
 AX 162.01 (6/77)
 AZ 171.01 (6/77)
 AZ 173.01 (6/77)
 AZ 184.04 (6/77)

Gene Shaffer (8)

AY 167.01 (7/76)
 AY 167.02 (7/76)
 AY 167.03 (7/76)
 AY 167.04 (7/76)
 AY 167.05 (7/76)
 AY 167.06 (7/76)
 AY 167.07 (6/76)
 AY 167.08 (7/76)

John Wellborn (8)

AQ 130.02 (7/75)
 AQ 130.03 (7/75)
 AQ 130.04 (7/75)
 AQ 130.05 (7-8/75)
 AQ 130.06 (7/75)
 AQ 130.07 (6/75)
 AQ 130.08 (6/75)
 AQ 130.09 (6/75)

Frederick W. Ball (2)

AW 153.01 (11/77)
 AW 153.02 (11/77)

Susan Leas (1)

AX 158.01 (11/78)

Marvin Bassett (1)

AT 141.01 (11/78)

Michael H. Montgomery (1)

AU 143.02 (12/78)

Barbara C. Respass (1)

AU 143.01

Gail Richardson (1)

AZ 180.01 (1/78)

Student Interviews (9)

AQ 130.01 (Sandy Edwards) (11/73)
 AT 141.02 (Don Bacigalupi) (11/79)
 AU 144.01 (Carolyn Griffin) (3/74)
 AW 153.03 (Andrew Slater and
 Beth Karassik) (12/77)
 AX 157.01 (Lisa Odham) (11/73)
 AX 160.03 (Elena Sheppa) (11/79)
 AY 166.01 (David Blackwell) (11/77)
 AZ 176.01 (Mary Jean Moore) (11/73)
 AZ 081.01 (James Keen) (11/79)

Barbara Rutledge (26)

BA 185.01 (4/73)
 BA 185.02 (4/73)
 BB 191.01 (6/73)
 BB 191.02 (5/73)
 BC 192.01 (6/73)
 BC 192.02 (6/73)
 BD 195.01 (7/73)
 BD 196.01 (7/73)
 BD 196.02 (7/73)
 BE 198.01 (4-5/73)
 BE 198.02 (5/73)
 BF 202.02 (6/73)
 BF 202.03 (4/73)
 BH 207.01 (7/73)
 BH 207.02 (7/73)
 BI 209.01 (5/73)
 BI 209.02 (5/73)
 BI 209.03 (5/73)
 BJ 214.01 (5/73)
 BJ 214.02 (5/73)
 BK 217.02 (5/73)
 BK 217.03 (5/73)
 BL 219.01 (6/73)
 BL 219.02 (6/73)
 BM 222.01 (7/73)
 BM 222.03 (7/73)

William J. Barnette (5)

BB 191.03 (12/78)
 BB 191.04 (12/78)
 BC 193.01 (12/78)
 BD 194.01 (1/79)
 BH 205.01 (1/79)

Meg Moran (4)

BG 204.01 (7/75)
 BG 204.02 (7/75)
 BG 204.03 (7/75)
 BG 204.04 (7/75)

Betsy Herrington (3)

BG 204.05 (7/75)
 BG 204.06 (7/75)
 BG 204.07 (7/75)

Linda Rummel Reed (2)

BI 211.01 (1/79)
 BK 217.04 (1/79)

C. W. Foster (1)

BK 217.01 (8/70)

Susan Leas (1)

BG 204.08 (7/78)

Mary Norwood (1)

BM 222.02 (7/73)

Shawn Beaty (2)

BF 202.01 (6/73)
 BM 221.01 (7/73)

Student Interviews (4)

BH 206.01 (Ron Pace and
 John Rubadeau) (6/74)
 BH 207.03 (J. Martin) (8/76)
 BJ 212.01 (Thomas G. Shoemate) (7/76)
 BM 224.01 (Richard N. Taylor) (12/78)

UPPER ALABAMA FIELDWORKERS

C. W. Foster (17)	Meg Moran (4)	Student Interviews (27)
BN 225.03 (12/72)	BU 243.05 (8/75)	BN 225.01 (Yvonne Robertson) (11/72)
BN 226.02 (1/73)	BU 243.06 (8/75)	BN 225.02 (James L. Bulman) (12/72)
BN 226.03 (5/73)	BU 243.09 (8/75)	BN 226.01 (Janet Evans) (4/72)
BN 226.04 (6/73)	BU 243.10 (9/75)	BN 226.05 (Eddie Lynn Dowell) (3/76)
BO 227.01 (10/70)		BO 227.02 (Glen A. Keenan) (7/73)
BO 228.01 (7/71)	Anne Malone Fitts (3)	BO 229.01 (Ann Williams) (2/75)
BP 230.06 (6/73)		BO 229.02 (Shirley Boddie) (7/73)
BP 230.07 (11/70)	BX 251.01 (7/70)	BO 229.03 (Rebecca Taylor) (10/75)
BQ 233.03 (1/73)	BX 251.02 (7/70)	BP 230.01 (Anthony Balch) (6/71)
BS 238.02 (12/72)	BX 251.03 (10/71)	BP 230.03 (Joan Stutts) (7/73)
BS 239.02 (4/73)		BP 230.04 (Faye E. Lindly) (7/73)
BS 239.04 (5/73)	Nancy S. Boren (2)	BP 231.01 (Connie Inman) (10/74)
BT 241.01 (1/73)		BQ 232.01 (Ann M. Oliver) (11/79)
BU 243.04 (8/72)	BU 243.01 (11/73)	BQ 233.02 (Mary Anne Bates) (7/73)
BV 244.04 (8/70)	BU 243.02 (11/73)	BR 234.01 (Jenny Higginbotham) (12/72)
BV 244.05 (8/72)		BR 234.02 (Jay Goodner) (12/79)
BW 249.03 (6/73)	Yvonne Foster (2)	BS 238.01 (Enid Cobb) (7/73)
		BS 239.05 (Susan Henderson) (10/74)
Marvin Bassett (7)	BS 239.01 (8/73)	BT 240.01 (David Kelley) (12/78)
	BS 239.03 (7/73)	BT 241.02 (Kathleen Levinsky) (12/78)
BN 225.04 (7/80)		BT 242.01 (Gerre Price) (2/76)
BN 226.07 (7/78)	Mary Norwood (2)	BU 243.11 (W. T. Beckner) (11/79)
BW 249.01 (7/80)		BV 244.01 (Ann H. Herrington) (8/70)
BW 249.04 (7/80)	BP 230.02 (11/72)	BV 244.03 (Nell H. Jones) (7/73)
BX 250.04 (7/80)	BP 230.05 (11/72)	BW 248.01 (Sue Haley and John Heisel) (11/71)
BX 250.05 (7/80)		BW 249.02 (Marion R. Kriwanek) (3/73)
BX 250.06 (7/80)	John Stanley Rich (2)	BX 250.03 (Vicki Rubin) (12/75)
Susan Leas (6)	BV 245.01 (12/78)	
	BV 246.01 (12/78)	
BN 226.06 (3/78)		
BR 235.01 (7/80)	Barbara Rutledge (2)	
BS 236.01 (1/80)		
BS 237.01 (12/78)	BX 250.01 (11/73)	
BS 237.02 (12/78)	BX 250.02 (11/73)	
BS 237.03 (12/78)		
	Guy Bailey (1)	
Betsy Herrington (4)		
	BV 244.06 (3/78)	
BU 243.03 (7/75)		
BU 243.07 (8/75)	Frederick W. Ball (1)	
BU 243.08 (7/75)		
BU 244.02 (11/74)	BQ 233.01 (11/78)	
	Les Pederson (1)	
	BU 243.01 (8/73)	

LOWER ALABAMA FIELDWORKERS

Marvin Bassett (19)

BZ 260.02 (8/78)
 CA 261.02 (8/78)
 CA 261.03 (8/78)
 CA 263.01 (12/78)
 CA 263.02 (12/78)
 CC 270.01 (12/76)
 CC 271.01 (12/76)
 CD 272.01 (5/78)
 CE 274.01 (12/76)
 CE 274.02 (12/76)
 CE 278.01 (12/76)
 CF 279.01 (11/76)
 CF 279.04 (12/76)
 CF 279.05 (12/77)
 CG 282.01 (12/76)
 CG 282.02 (12/76)
 CH 285.01 (8/78)
 CI 287.01 (11-12/78)
 CI 289.01 (8/78)

Guy Bailey (15)

CA 261.01 (3/78)
 CA 262.01 (3/78)
 CA 262.02 (12/76)
 CD 272.02 (12/76)
 CD 272.03 (12/76)
 CD 272.04 (12/76)
 CD 272.05 (3/77)
 CD 272.06 (12/76)
 CD 273.02 (8/76)
 CF 279.02 (9/76)
 CF 279.03 (9/76)
 CF 281.01 (8/76)
 CF 281.02 (8/76)
 CG 283.01 (9/76)
 CG 283.02 (9/76)

Gene Shaffer (9)

BY 255.01 (3/76)
 BY 255.02 (3/76)
 BZ 257.01 (4/76)
 BZ 257.02 (4/76)
 CB 264.01 (5/76)
 CB 265.01 (5/76)
 CB 265.02 (5/76)
 CB 267.01 (5/76)
 CF 279.07 (4/76)

Anne Malone Fitts (6)

BZ 258.01 (7/70)
 BZ 258.02 (8/70)
 BZ 258.03 (8/70)
 BZ 258.04 (8/71)
 BZ 259.01 (10/71)
 BZ 259.02 (7/77)

Joe Rawlings (5)

CE 276.01 (1/76)
 CE 276.02 (1/76)
 CE 276.03 (1/76)
 CE 276.04 (1/76)
 CE 278.02 (1/76)

Barbara Rutledge (4)

CH 286.01 (12/74)
 CH 286.02 (12/74)
 CI 288.01 (11/71)
 CI 288.02 (11/71)

Susan Leas (3)

BY 252.01 (12/78)
 BY 254.01 (6/78)
 CF 279.06 (4-5/78)

Donald Starwalt (3)

CC 268.02 (5/75)
 CC 268.03 (6/75)
 CC 268.04 (6/75)

Paula Engeman (2)

CC 269.02 (11/79)
 CC 269.03 (11/79)

Student Interviews (16)

BY 254.02 (Barbara Brooks) (11/79)
 BY 256.01 (Don Griffith) (7/74)
 BZ 260.01 (Janice P. Brill) (11/73)
 CC 268.01 (Judy E. Mitchell) (11/72)
 CC 269.01 (Margaret W. Foster) (7/72)
 CD 273.01 (Elaine Clark) (12/73)
 CD 273.03 (Vivian W. Brown) (7/73)
 CE 275.01 (Kathy Perrault) (7/76)
 CE 277.01 (Melanie Bast) (10/79)
 CE 278.03 (Ritchie Boyette) (10/79)
 CF 279.08 (Cindy Larsen) (10/79)
 CF 279.09 (Rhea Yarbrough) (10/79)
 CF 279.10 (Annette Oliver) (10/79)
 CF 281.03 (Brenda S. Stanford) (10/79)
 CG 282.03 (Kevin Briggs) (10/79)
 CH 284.01 (Eleanor Hoomes) (7/76)

WEST FLORIDA FIELDWORKERS

Barbara Rutledge (14)

CJ 292.01 (10/73)
 CJ 292.02 (10/73)
 CJ 292.03 (10/73)
 CJ 292.04 (10/73)
 CK 296.01 (10/73)
 CK 296.02 (10/73)
 CK 296.03 (10/73)
 CL 299.01 (11/73)
 CL 299.02 (11/73)
 CL 299.03 (11/73)
 CM 301.01 (12/74)
 CM 301.02 (12/74)
 CM 301.03 (12/74)
 CM 301.04 (12/74)

Guy Bailey (4)

CJ 290.01 (5/77)
 CK 294.01 (5/77)
 CL 298.01 (5/77)
 CM 300.01 (5/77)

Marvin Bassett (2)

CK 294.02 (7/79)
 CL 298.02 (7/79)

GULF ALABAMA FIELDWORKERS

Marvin Bassett (7)

CN 302.01 (12/77)
 CN 302.02 (12/77)
 CN 302.03 (8/78)
 CN 302.04 (10/78)
 CN 302.05 (7-8/79)
 CN 303.08 (9/77)
 CN 303.09 (12/77)

Betsy Herrington (4)

CN 303.03 (8/75)
 CN 303.04 (8/75)
 CN 303.05 (8/75)
 CN 303.07 (8/75)

Meg Moran (3)

CN 303.01 (8/75)
 CN 303.02 (8/75)
 CN 303.06 (8/75)

WEST TENNESSEE FIELDWORKERS

Jeannie Tucker (16)

DA 306.01 (8/75)
 DA 306.02 (8/75)
 DA 308.01 (8/75)
 DC 314.01 (8/75)
 DC 314.02 (8/75)
 DD 317.01 (8/75)
 DD 317.02 (8/75)
 DD 319.02 (8/75)
 DG 324.01 (7/75)
 DG 324.03 (6/75)
 DG 324.04 (7/75)
 DG 324.05 (7/75)
 DG 324.06 (7/75)
 DG 324.07 (7/75)
 DG 324.08 (7/75)
 DG 324.09 (7/75)

Ed Crist (15)

DA 304.01 (10/74)
 DA 304.02 (10/74)
 DB 310.01 (6/74)
 DB 310.02 (7/74)
 DC 312.01 (11/74)
 DC 316.01 (11/74)
 DC 316.02 (11/74)
 DD 319.01 (6/74)
 DE 321.01 (6/74)
 DE 321.02 (6/74)
 DE 321.03 (6/74)
 DF 322.01 (7/74)
 DF 322.02 (10/74)
 DF 322.03 (7/74)
 DF 322.04 (11/74)

Marvin Bassett (7)

DA 307.01 (7/77)
 DB 309.01 (6/77)
 DB 311.01 (6/77)
 DB 311.02 (6/77)
 DE 320.01 (6/77)
 DE 320.02 (6/77)
 DE 320.03 (6/77)

Student Interviews (2)

DG 324.02 (Maureen FitzGerald) (12/74)
 DG 324.10 (Elinor Baker) (11/71)

Edward Crist (32)

DH 325.01 (11/73)
DH 325.02 (11/73)
DI 330.01 (12/73)
DI 330.02 (2/74)
DI 330.03 (2/74)
DJ 333.01 (2/74)
DJ 334.01 (4/74)
DK 340.01 (3/74)
DK 340.02 (3/74)
DK 340.03 (3/74)
DK 340.04 (12/73)
DL 346.01 (4/74)
DL 346.02 (3/74)
DL 346.03 (2/74)
DL 346.04 (4/73)
DL 346.05 (4/74)
DM 350.01 (10/74)
DN 351.01 (4/74)
DN 351.02 (4/74)
DN 351.03 (4/74)
DN 352.01 (4/74)
DN 352.02 (5/74)
DN 352.03 (5/74)
DO 356.01 (10/74)
DO 359.01 (4/74)
DO 259.02 (4/74)
DO 359.03 (5/74)
DP 361.02 (11/74)
DP 363.01 (11/74)
DP 363.02 (11/74)
DP 363.03 (11/74)
DP 363.04 (4/74)

Marvin Bassett (15)

DH 327.01 (6/78)
DH 328.01 (6/78)
DH 328.02 (6/78)
DK 338.01 (6/78)
DK 338.02 (6/78)
DK 339.01 (5/77)
DK 339.02 (5/77)
DL 347.01 (5/79)
DM 348.01 (7/78)
DM 349.01 (7/78)
DN 354.03 (5/79)
DO 359.04 (6/80)
DO 359.05 (6/80)
DP 359.06 (6/80)
DP 361.01 (7/78)

Gordon McKemie (9)

DI 332.01 (1/77)
DJ 335.01 (1-2/77)
DJ 335.02 (2/77)
DL 343.01 (8/77)
DL 345.01 (8/77)
DL 345.02 (8/77)
DM 350.02 (8/77)
DN 354.01 (8/77)
DN 354.02 (8/77)

Student Interview (1)

DO 356.02 (Barbara A. Myers)
(2/78)

Barbara Rutledge (25)

DR 371.01 (11/73)
 DR 371.02 (11/73)
 DR 371.03 (11/73)
 DR 371.04 (12/73)
 DS 372.01 (12/73)
 DS 372.02 (12/73)
 DS 372.03 (12/73)
 DT 377.01 (1/74)
 DT 377.02 (1/74)
 DT 378.01 (1/74)
 DV 381.01 (12/73)
 DV 381.02 (12/73)
 DV 381.03 (1/74)
 DW 387.01 (8/73)
 DW 387.02 (8/73)
 DW 387.03 (8/73)
 DW 387.04 (8/73)
 DW 387.05 (8/73)
 DW 387.07 (8/73)
 DX 388.01 (8/73)
 DX 388.02 (8/73)
 DZ 399.04 (1/74)
 DZ 400.02 (1/74)
 DZ 400.03 (1/74)
 DZ 400.04 (1/74)

Christine W. Unger (12)

DQ 364.01 (2/72)
 DQ 365.01 (2/72)
 DU 379.01 (4/72)
 DU 379.02 (4-5/72)
 DU 379.03 (4/72)
 DU 379.04 (4/72)
 DU 379.05 (4/72)
 DV 382.01 (8/73)
 DY 396.01 (5/72)
 DY 396.02 (8/73)
 DY 396.03 (8/73)
 DZ 400.01 (5/72)

Marvin Bassett (9)

DT 375.01 (6/80)
 DU 379.06 (6/78)
 DU 379.07 (6/78)
 DW 384.01 (12/78)
 DW 386.01 (6/78)
 DW 386.02 (6/78)
 DX 392.01 (12/78)
 DX 392.02 (12/78)
 DY 394.01 (12/78)

Gordon McKemie (8)

DQ 367.01 (7/77)
 DQ 367.02 (7/77)
 DQ 367.03 (7/77)
 DS 374.01 (8/77)
 DS 374.02 (8/77)
 DS 374.03 (8/77)
 DZ 399.01 (4/77)
 DZ 399.02 (4/77)

Student Interviews (2)

DW 387.06 (Brenda Armbrecht) (7/77)
 DZ 399.03 (Gamelia Jennings) (6/74)

Gordon McKemie (10)

EA 401.01 (8/76)
 EA 401.02 (7/76)
 EA 401.03 (6/76)
 EA 401.04 (6/76)
 EA 402.02 (7/76)
 EA 402.03 (7/76)
 EA 402.04 (6/76)
 EA 402.05 (7/76)
 EB 405.01 (7/76)
 EB 405.02 (7/76)

Barbara Rutledge (3)

EB 406.01 (3/74)
 EB 406.02 (3/74)
 EB 406.03 (3/74)

Marvin Bassett (2)

EA 402.06 (7/79)
 EA 404.01 (7/79)

Christine Unger (1)

EA 402.01 (7/72)

EAST LOUISIANA FIELDWORKERS

Gordon McKemie (31)

EC 407.01 (4/77)
 EC 407.02 (3/77)
 EC 407.03 (4/77)
 EC 408.01 (9/77)
 EC 408.02 (9/77)
 ED 410.01 (8/77)
 ED 412.01 (9/77)
 ED 412.02 (9/77)
 ED 413.06 (8/77)
 ED 413.07 (8/77)
 ED 414.01 (4/77)
 EE 417.05 (5/77)
 EE 417.06 (5/77)
 EE 417.07 (5/77)
 EE 417.08 (5/77)
 EE 417.09 (5/77)
 EE 417.10 (5/77)
 EE 418.01 (5/77)
 EE 418.02 (7/77)
 EF 422.01 (8/77)
 EF 423.01 (8/77)
 EF 425.01 (8/77)
 EF 425.02 (8/77)
 EG 427.01 (7/76)
 EG 427.02 (7/76)
 EG 429.01 (8/77)
 EG 429.04 (8/77)
 EG 429.05 (8/77)
 EG 429.06 (8/77)
 EG 431.01 (3/77)
 EG 431.02 (4/77)

Barbara Rutledge (19)

EC 409.01 (2/74)
 EC 409.02 (3/74)
 ED 413.01 (1/74)
 ED 413.03 (1/74)
 ED 413.04 (1/74)
 ED 413.05 (1/74)
 EE 416.01 (3/74)
 EE 416.02 (3/74)
 EE 416.03 (3/74)
 EE 417.01 (6/75)
 EE 417.02 (7/75)
 EE 417.03 (7/75)
 EE 417.04 (8/75)
 EF 421.01 (3/74)
 EF 421.02 (3/74)
 EF 421.03 (3/74)
 EG 428.01 (2/74)
 EG 429.02 (2/74)
 EG 429.03 (2/74)

Student Interview (1)

ED 413.02 (Susan Cunningham) (7/72)

Mary McCall (44)

FA 432.01 (12/74)
 FA 432.02 (12/74)
 FA 434.01 (12/74)
 FA 434.02 (12/74)
 FA 434.03 (12/74)
 FA 435.01 (8/75)
 FA 435.02 (8/75)
 FA 435.03 (8/75)
 FC 444.01 (8/74)
 FC 444.02 (8/74)
 FC 444.03 (8/74)
 FC 444.04 (9/74)
 FD 448.01 (9/74)
 FD 448.02 (9/74)
 FD 450.01 (7/76)
 FD 450.02 (7/76)
 FE 453.01 (8/74)
 FE 453.02 (8/74)
 FG 458.01 (9/75)
 FG 458.02 (8/75)
 FG 458.03 (7/75)
 FG 458.04 (8/75)
 FG 458.05 (8/75)
 FG 458.06 (9/75)
 FG 458.07 (7/75)
 FG 458.08 (10/75)
 FH 459.01 (7/74)
 FH 462.01 (7/74)
 FI 463.01 (7/74)
 FI 465.01 (6/74)
 FI 465.02 (6/74)
 FI 465.03 (6/74)
 FI 465.04 (6/74)
 FI 468.01 (6/74)
 FJ 470.01 (8/74)
 FJ 471.01 (8/74)
 FJ 471.03 (8/74)
 FJ 473.01 (7/74)
 FK 477.01 (7/74)
 FJ 477.02 (7/74)
 FK 479.01 (7/74)
 FK 479.02 (7/74)
 FL 483.01 (9/75)
 FM 488.01 (10/75)

Gordon McKemie (18)

FB 439.01 (3/77)
 FB 439.02 (2/77)
 FB 439.04 (2/77)
 FB 441.01 (3/77)
 FB 441.02 (3/77)
 FE 452.01 (1/77)
 FE 453.03 (2/77)
 FE 454.01 (2/77)
 FF 455.01 (2/77)
 FF 455.02 (2/77)
 FO 501.01 (3/77)
 FO 501.02 (3/77)
 FO 501.05 (3/77)
 FP 503.01 (2/77)
 FP 503.02 (2/77)
 FP 503.03 (2/77)
 FP 506.01 (2/77)
 FP 506.02 (2/77)

Marvin Bassett (13)

FH 459.02 (6/77)
 FJ 469.01 (6/77)
 FJ 471.02 (6/77)
 FJ 475.01 (6/77)
 FK 479.03 (6/77)
 FL 483.02 (7/77)
 FM 488.02 (7/77)
 FN 491.01 (7/77)
 FN 491.02 (7/77)
 FN 494.01 (7/77)
 FN 497.01 (7/77)
 FO 501.03 (7/77)
 FO 501.04 (7/77)

Ed Crist (7)

FK 480.01 (6/75)
 FK 481.01 (6/75)
 FK 481.02 (6/75)
 FK 481.03 (6/75)
 FK 481.04 (6/75)
 FN 494.02 (6/75)
 FN 495.01 (6/75)

Bethany Dumas (3)

FB 439.03 (8/76)
 FB 440.01 (8/76)
 FJ 471.04 (9/76)

Michael Montgomery (2)

FG 458.09 (10/78)
 FL 483.03 (10/78)

Susan Leas (1)

FP 503.04 (3-4/78)

Student Interview (1)

FF 456.01 (Joan Warriner) (12/73)

WEST LOUISIANA FIELDWORKERS

Barbara Rutledge (33)

FQ 507.01 (8/75)
 FQ 507.02 (8/75)
 FR 514.01 (5/75)
 FR 514.02 (5/75)
 FR 514.03 (5/75)
 FR 515.01 (5/75)
 FR 515.02 (5/75)
 FR 515.03 (5/75)
 FR 515.04 (5/75)
 FR 515.05 (5/75)
 FT 523.02 (4/75)
 FT 523.03 (4/75)
 FT 523.04 (4/75)
 FT 523.05 (4/75)
 FT 523.06 (4/75)
 FU 526.01 (4/75)
 FU 526.02 (4/75)
 FU 526.03 (4/75)
 FU 526.04 (4/75)
 FW 531.01 (5/75)
 FW 533.01 (4/75)
 FW 533.02 (4/75)
 FW 533.03 (4/75)
 FX 536.01 (8/75)
 FX 536.02 (8/75)
 FY 539.01 (11/74)
 FY 539.02 (11/74)
 FY 540.01 (2/74)
 FY 540.02 (2/74)
 FY 540.03 (2/74)
 FZ 544.01 (11/74)
 FZ 544.02 (11/74)
 FZ 544.03 (11/74)

Gordon McKemie (25)

FQ 509.01 (9/77)
 FQ 509.02 (9/77)
 FQ 510.01 (8/76)
 FQ 510.02 (8/76)
 FS 518.01 (8/76)
 FS 518.02 (8/76)
 FS 521.01 (8/76)
 FU 524.01 (8/76)
 FU 527.01 (8/76)
 FV 528.01 (8/76)
 FV 528.02 (8/76)
 FV 528.03 (8/76)
 FV 529.01 (7/76)
 FV 529.02 (8/76)
 FX 535.01 (8/77)
 FX 537.01 (9/76)
 FX 537.02 (9/76)
 FX 537.03 (9/76)
 FX 538.01 (4/77)
 FX 538.02 (4/77)
 FY 539.03 (4/77)
 FY 541.01 (4/77)
 FY 541.02 (4/77)
 FY 542.01 (4/77)
 FY 542.02 (4/77)

Marvin Bassett (6)

FQ 508.01 (12/78)
 FT 523.07 (5/79)
 FT 523.08 (5/79)
 FU 525.01 (12/78)
 FU 525.02 (12/78)
 FW 532.01 (12/78)

Joe Rawlings (1)

FZ 545.01 (1/76)

Student Interview (1)

FT 523.01 (Susan Davis) (7/72)

UPPER TEXAS FIELDWORKERS

Barbara Rutledge (28)

GA 547.01 (10/74)
 GA 547.02 (10/74)
 GA 547.03 (10/74)
 GB 558.01 (10/74)
 GB 558.02 (10/74)
 GB 558.03 (10/74)
 GB 558.04 (10/74)
 GC 560.01 (9/74)
 GC 560.02 (9/74)
 GC 560.03 (9/74)
 GC 567.01 (9/74)
 GC 567.02 (9/74)
 GC 567.03 (9/74)
 GC 567.04 (9/74)
 GD 570.01 (9/74)
 GD 570.02 (9/74)
 GD 576.01 (9/74)
 GD 576.02 (9/74)
 GI 616.01 (10/74)
 GI 616.02 (10/74)
 GI 616.03 (11/74)
 GJ 618.01 (6/75)
 GJ 618.02 (6/75)
 GJ 618.03 (6/75)
 GJ 618.04 (6/75)
 GJ 618.05 (6/75)
 GJ 618.06 (6/75)
 GJ 618.07 (6/75)

Shirley Frazer (13)

GE 583.01 (6/77)
 GE 584.01 (5/76)
 GF 586.01 (6/75)
 GF 586.02 (11/75)
 GF 586.03 (6/75)
 GF 586.04 (6/75)
 GF 586.05 (7/75)
 GF 586.06 (6/75)
 GG 594.01 (9/78)
 GG 598.01 (8/77)
 GG 598.02 (8/77)
 GH 600.01 (8/77)
 GH 600.02 (8/77)

Marvin Bassett (8)

GD 573.01 (7/77)
 GE 579.01 (7/77)
 GE 582.01 (7/77)
 GF 585.01 (8/77)
 GG 593.01 (8/77)
 GG 595.01 (8/77)
 GH 604.01 (8/77)
 GJ 619.01 (8/77)

Joe Rawlings (8)

GG 591.01 (3/76)
 GH 611.01 (2/76)
 GH 611.02 (2/76)
 GH 611.03 (2/76)
 GH 611.04 (2/76)
 GH 611.05 (2/76)
 GH 611.06 (2/76)
 GH 611.07 (2/76)

Gordon McKemie (2)

GI 616.04 (8/77)
 GI 616.05 (8/77)

Susan Leas (1)

GJ 618.08 (5/78)

LOWER TEXAS FIELDWORKERS

Barbara Rutledge (17)

GK 623.01 (8/75)
GK 623.02 (8/75)
GK 623.03 (8/75)
GL 625.01 (8/75)
GL 625.02 (8/75)
GL 625.03 (8/75)
GO 651.01 (5/74)
GO 651.02 (5/74)
GO 651.03 (5/74)
GO 655.01 (5/74)
GO 655.02 (5/74)
GP 660.01 (5/74)
GP 660.02 (5/74)
GP 660.03 (6/74)
GQ 665.01 (5/74)
GQ 665.02 (5/74)
GQ 665.03 (5/74)

Shirley Frazer (14)

GM 636.01 (12/78)
GM 636.02 (12/78)
GM 638.01 (5/77)
GM 638.02 (8/76)
GM 640.01 (5/77)
GM 640.02 (8/76)
GN 645.01 (7/75)
GN 645.02 (7/75)
GN 645.03 (8/75)
GN 645.04 (7/75)
GN 645.05 (7/75)
GN 645.06 (8/75)
GN 645.07 (7/75)
GN 645.08 (7/75)

Joe Rawlings (7)

GO 652.01 (1/76)
GO 652.02 (1/76)
GO 653.01 (2/76)
GO 653.02 (2/76)
GQ 664.01 (2/76)
GQ 664.02 (2/76)
GQ 664.03 (2/76)

Marvin Bassett (3)

GL 629.01 (8/77)
GO 647.01 (8/77)
GP 659.01 (11/77)

Judy Fogwell (2)

GL 628.01 (8/76)
GP 660.04 (8/76)