flection on some core issues in academia: its peculiar culture of judging academic worth; the almost celestial status of peer reviewing; the fact that established journals still have retained their position of power; and the difference in status between "field disciplines" and "lab disciplines." In the Netherlands the academic staff is paid according to fixed salary scales based on rank. Publication performance is rewarded in research time and money, so negotiations about pay raises are unknown. This does assuage some of the peer-review publication stress and renders the large teaching investment in field supervision less risky.

My point here is that it should not be that risky. The crucial issue for Hawkins, copublishing, is an excellent idea, but not just in peer-reviewed form. We should, indeed, copublish much more, but the exclusive insistence on peer-reviewed publication runs perpendicular to teaching efficiency. In this day and age, a host of publication venues are open, from online in a long uphill gradient to peer reviewed, and that variety fits in well with the echelons of field experience: climbing the ladder of publications would be a major learning opportunity and incentive during one's progress in academia. In the Netherlands we also have to write in a foreign language, somewhere up that ladder. The same holds for our own publications, as we publish to account for multiple obligations, to our colleagues, our hosts, and the general public. Hawkins found a practical and important way out of an academic conundrum, but his labor-intensive solution should not detract from critical reflection on academic culture. Somehow we tend to bite our own tail: the exigencies of personal survival run counter to our raising a next generation—not a good evolutionary strategy.

Sjaak van der Geest
Professor Emeritus, University of Amsterdam (S.vanderGeest@uva.nl). 28 II 14

It is hard to disagree with John Hawkins's plea for in situ training in anthropological research. Few people would object to the didactic axiom that—in Nietzsche's eloquent quote—one has no ear for what one has no access to through experience. The only "objection" to this lengthy argument could be that it may be belaboring the obvious.

The question is not so much, Should we teach the art of fieldwork in the classroom or in the field, but rather: Should we as teachers follow our students into the field or should we allow them to discover for themselves what works and what does not? Should we allow them to learn by trial and error or should we help them to do everything right from the beginning and prevent them from making mistakes? Before answering the last question, let me recount the history of experimenting with in situ teaching at my own university.

In the second half of the 1960s, anthropology students at the University of Amsterdam went as a group to a "field station" in a rural area of northwest Tunisia to learn and do fieldwork, which eventually was intended to result in a master's thesis. Anthropology was then a small discipline in Amsterdam and the number of students participating in field training varied from six to ten per year. Students who preferred not to go to Tunisia for fieldwork had to write a convincing letter before they were allowed to follow another path. Two, sometimes three, supervisors joined the students in Tunisia. They taught the students research methods and background information about the area, discussed and negotiated their research topics and divided the students across various villages. During the first few weeks, the students received intensive supervision and assistance; later the supervisors visited only once every 2 weeks. The entire field school experience was about 3 months (Jongmans and Van der Veen 1968).

For some students, the Tunisian experience proved valuable; however, others felt that the program was not useful and listed several points of critique, some of which I will turn to shortly. The fact is that the Tunisian field station was closed after about 5 years. A new program was set up in Italy, however, that too was abandoned after a few years (nevertheless, in situ teaching of anthropological research and writing skills is still practiced in other Dutch universities). Since the collapse of both field school programmes, anthropology students at the University of Amsterdam have been conducting their fieldwork individually. After a classroom course in methodology—with practical exercises in their local environment—the majority of students (about 60%) fly out over the globe to do their fieldwork (the rest remain in the Netherlands for fieldwork). Most teachers emphasise that real learning begins at that moment. Jan van Baal, anthropology professor in Utrecht in the 1960s, was quoted as saying, "You don't enter the field with a question; you leave it with a question." Before the internet/e-mail era, students were obliged to find a local supervisor for "emergency help," but that proved to be mainly a token arrangement. When e-mail and other new media became available, the students' Amsterdam supervisors could handle emergencies.

Why were the Tunisian and Italian stations abandoned if the advantage of learning in the field seems obvious? Cursory exploration of what happened more than 40 years ago (before I started work at the University of Amsterdam) and conversations with colleagues who had participated as students suggest that a growing number of students disliked being restricted in their personal preferences and choices regarding area, topic and style of research. Going to do fieldwork is a crucial moment for a student; it is a step that has repercussions for the rest of his or her life, not so different from choosing a partner or a place to live. It is a decision that marks the student's autonomy and personal vision. Supervision interferes with that moment of "freedom."

Supervisors today agree that the best guarantee for successful learning and writing a good thesis is the student's personal curiosity and fascination, often rooted in autobiographic experience. Colleagues in the 1960s indicated that

This content downloaded from 146.50.98.28 on Wed, 26 Nov 2014 11:17:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

students who opted for the locally supervised collective fieldwork were those who lacked such a "vision" and had no clear idea of what they wanted to do; they felt insecure and hesitant. Whether this was an accurate description or not, it did diminish the popularity of the field school among students as well as teachers.

A related complaint among some students was their uneasiness about arriving with a group of students in a relatively small community. Meeting villagers and appointed interpreters for whom the appearance of foreign students had become near routine took away the thrill of fieldwork and diminished the "realness" of the field. People had—as it were—lost their "innocence" and learned how to respond to the students' presence.

I admit that the students' reaction perpetuates the soloist trend of anthropological research, which Hawkins attempts to break and change into a more collective and collaborative approach. I am afraid, however, that the type of in-depth communication that anthropologists favor needs the more personal style of the "lonely" field-worker. A team of researchers "invading" a community discourages the intimacy and trust that anthropologists like to claim as their hallmark.

Tim Wallace
Anthropology Program, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, 220 1911 Building, CB 8107, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina 27695-8107, U.S.A. (twallace@ncsu.edu). 2 III 14

John Hawkins has done us a real service with this article. There are many points he covers worthy of prolonged debate; but there is little space here to expand on all of them. So, I will talk about only a few of them. First, as Hawkins demonstrates, field experiences are important for undergraduate cultural anthropology majors. Unfortunately, there is little discussion in anthropology departments about methodological training for undergraduate students. The focus is always on graduate study. Only a very small percentage of our students will pursue a PhD in anthropology. Undergraduates are drawn to cultural anthropology because of the ethnographies they read in introductory courses and from the stories we tell them in the classroom. Yet, when they get to the end of their degree work, they have little to no real world experience in methods. Hawkins reminds us that it is essential for departments to get behind the idea of pushing students to do an ethnographic field school, because of its value to them for whatever career they do move on to after graduation.

Second, anthropology programs need to clearly define the essentials of what an ethnographic experience should be for their students. Study abroad and ethnographic field experiences are not synonymous. Study abroad programs where students spend time in a classroom and doing excursions on the weekend have their place in the undergraduate curriculum, but not in an ethnographic field school. An ethnographic field school that finds participants spending 3 or more days per week in a class setting or on a vehicle is wasting time when the students could be learning through project work. Furthermore, the project work should be for their own project, not as field assistants for a field director's own research project. Students need to have a meaningful commitment to learning by engaging in their own work.

Third, faculty who develop and carry out field schools must be given the recognition for tenure and promotion they deserve. Most faculty believe that a field school is a paid vacation for the director. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Some faculty who have led field schools do it once and quit, realizing it is demanding and time-consuming work. Those of us who have done field schools for a while recognize that fact, but also find them to be some of the most rewarding work they have ever done. Graduates of my ethnographic field school program are now doctors, lawyers, engineers, architects, and professional anthropologists, some with PhDs and some with MAs. There is nothing better than working with struggling students hit their stride and then doing excellent work, gaining a confidence that ushers them onto to bigger achievements after their return. Who will succeed the best is never very predictable, so the faculty director has to work individually with each student to determine where their pressure points are, what skills they have, and what they need to work on. Directors must be mentors, but also nurturers, nurses, needs analysts, parental figures, and psychologists, among other roles. The role is challenging but also extraordinarily satisfying. Yet, the work of the field school goes unheralded at home. This is a reflection of the low emphasis today on undergraduate education in the institutions from whence most of our new assistant professors emerge. The program director exchanges her summer for research and writing for a summer of service. It is here that departments can intervene to give recognition, financial and status, to successful field school directors.

Fourth, one of the most vexing issues for Hawkins's model is that of IRB approval. Issues surrounding IRBs are frequently mentioned in the ethnographic field school workshops I have led at American Anthropological Association meetings as one of the most problematic. IRB attitudes toward student projects vary widely. Usually, the field school director receives little to no help from their department. Hawkins's suggests taking an active role on IRBs and working closely with them to develop acceptable solutions to the problem of students not being able to decide specifically what they will study until after they arrive to the field. In my own case, about 50% of field school students study at universities other than my own. So, there is no opportunity to work closely with most students prior to arrival to produce a viable plan of study, especially in the middle of a semester. Hawkins's own ethnographic field program is excellent in concept and implementation. I appreciate his persistence in developing a workable field school training model. Yet, it is a demanding model that not all programs

This content downloaded from 146.50.98.28 on Wed, 26 Nov 2014 11:17:17 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions