Section A: Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Applicant Gender Composition" /></td>
<td>This figure gives pool composition primarily by gender and secondarily by the portion of that gender category that characterized itself as belonging to a minority sexual orientation. One sees over the three years a move to a nearly even representation between the two sexes. The portion of the male respondents of a minority sexual orientation has remained nearly constant, whereas the portion of female respondents has increased from approximately 1% to 5% of the pool, due perhaps to an evolving climate in which it is less threatening to identify oneself as such, even in an anonymous survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Applicant Age Composition" /></td>
<td>This figure gives a cumulative distribution function (CDF) plot of candidate age. One observes relatively little difference in candidate ages over the three-year period: about 20% of the applicants are under 30, 40 to 45% of the candidates are between 30 and 35, 5 to 10% of the candidates are between 35 and 40, and the remaining 20% are over 40. A slightly older candidate pool was observed in 2007; it became slightly younger and remained that way for 2008 and 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Applicant Relationship Composition" /></td>
<td>This figure gives the domestic status of the candidate pool, which remains virtually unchanged over the three years. In 2009 there is a very slight increase in single applicants (2%), at the expense of both married and permanent relationship categories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This figure gives the racial composition of the candidate pool. This is shown as a log plot so that the lightly-represented race statistics can be represented in more detail. The $10^0$ line represents 1%, the $10^1$ line 10%, &c. White candidates represent about 90% of the pool over all three years, with the remaining 10% vacillating among Asian, African-American, and Hispanic candidates. Asians represent the largest sub-group (4-6%, depending on year); African-American and Hispanic hover around the 1% line.
Section B: Employment

### Figure

#### Job Offers by Gender and Race: 2006

- **None**: Male, Female, White, Non-White
- **One**
- **> 1**

**Comment:** In order to show job offers broken down by gender and racial composition, a different graph for each year is necessary. In the three graphs at left, each group of bars represents the number of job offers received (none, one, or more than one), and the y-axis gives the percent of candidates within that category (so that the none, one, and more-than-one designations will all add up to 100 for a single category). These data are displayed as raw counts on the next page to bring context to situations in which the percentage values are large or unexpected.

#### Job Offers by Gender and Race: 2007

- **None**: Male, Female, White, Non-White
- **One**
- **> 1**

**Comment:** As concerns gender issues in placement, the success rates for men and women do not differ appreciably, although one might be able to draw a tentative conclusion that women have been faring slightly better than men in the last two years. Concerning the placement of minority group candidates, it is also difficult to draw durable conclusions because the sample size is so small (about ten individuals each year). In 2007 these groups did better in placement than their non-minority counterparts, and in 2008 they fared worse.

#### Job Offers by Gender and Race: 2008

- **None**: Male, Female, White, Non-White
- **One**
- **> 1**
These three graphs give raw numbers for each of the categories; this level of insight can be helpful in explicating percentage performance when the raw numbers are small.
This figure gives applicant pre-existing employment information. The blue bars indicate the percent of applicants who held an academic position at the time of application; this quantity varies little over the three-year period. The red bars give the percentage of the applicants holding a pre-existing position who will continue the next year in that position (i.e., did not prevail in new employment): for example, in 2009 just over half of those who applied already holding a position will continue in that position. This quantity is notably higher in 2009, implying that a larger portion of job searches were not successful.

This figure shows, in blue bars, the percent of candidates who accepted a new appointment; this value hovered around 60% in 2007 and 2008 but dropped below 50% in 2009. For those neither accepting a new appointment nor retaining their old appointment, one observes their substitute professional area. Even these decreased across the board in 2009.

This figure shows, in blue bars, the percent of accepted academic appointments that are full time; this value is bounded between 80 and 90% but at its lowest level in 2009. Of these full-time appointments, the number of tenure-track appointments is decreasing at a disturbing rate: from almost 50% in 2007 to about 30% last year; this decrease is offset somewhat by about a 15% increase in one-year appointments, to almost 50%.
This figure shows, of the academic appointments accepted each year, the highest Classics degree granted by the employing department. *Prima facie* it would appear encouraging to see the Ph.D. percentage increasing from ca. 36% to about 43%, but this trend may be governed more by the particular institutions that happen to be hiring in this depressed economy rather than an overall increase in Ph.D.-granting programs.

Tenure-track starting salaries have fallen slightly but not significantly over the three-year period. For this last year, some statistics of interest are 25% of positions pay between $35,000 and $50,000/year, 40% pay between $50,000 and $60,000, and the remainder pay between $60,000 and $70,000.

One-year salaries are lower than tenure-track salaries for 2007 and 2009, although largely the same as tenure-track salaries for 2008; and overall one-year salaries fell for 2009. For this last year, some statistics of interest are 30% of positions pay less than $30,000; 30% pay between $30,000 and $40,000; and 30% pay between $40,000 and $50,000.
This figure shows, in blue bars, the percent of accepted positions that were advertised in *Positions for Classicists and Archaeologists*, a figure that dropped precipitously in 2009 (by 25 percentage points). The number of candidates interviewed at the APA also declined, although by only ten percentage points or so. Finally, it appears that in about 20% more of the cases, only one candidate was interviewed (this was the perception of the successful candidates, at least).

In 2009, other methods for disseminating information about positions took market share from what was previously the main source, *Positions for Classicists and Archaeologists*, which has fallen to below 40% of first-contact situations. Word-of-mouth now accounts for 20% of the first-contact situations.
**Section C: APA/AIA Convention**

This figure gives the percentage of respondents who actually attended the APA convention in the specified year; this value is somewhat lower in 2009 but still close to 90%. The next several bars give stated reasons why the ca. 15% of respondents who were non-attendees elected not to attend. The sample size is too small to form satisfactory conclusions, but the lack of interviews has been a significant factor in the last three years.

Of the conference attendees, interview allotment was worse in 2009 than in the previous two years (which were similar). In this last year, 25% of attendees received no interviews, another 25% received one interview, and the remainder received more than one.

The number of follow-up, on-campus interviews was notably smaller in 2009. About two-thirds of APA interviewees received no follow-up interviews on campus; about 20% received one follow-up interview, and the remaining 15% received more than one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![Interviewing at Convention](image1.png) | **Figure**  
Interviewing at Convention  
- Attending APA  
- Decided not to Apply  
- Applied Selectively  
- Not Enough Interviews  
- Change of Plans  
- Other  

This figure gives the percentage of respondents who actually attended the APA convention in the specified year; this value is somewhat lower in 2009 but still close to 90%. The next several bars give stated reasons why the ca. 15% of respondents who were non-attendees elected not to attend. The sample size is too small to form satisfactory conclusions, but the lack of interviews has been a significant factor in the last three years. |
| ![Number of Interviews for Conference Attendees](image2.png) | **Comment**  
Of the conference attendees, interview allotment was worse in 2009 than in the previous two years (which were similar). In this last year, 25% of attendees received no interviews, another 25% received one interview, and the remainder received more than one. |
| ![Number of On-Campus Interviews](image3.png) | **Comment**  
The number of follow-up, on-campus interviews was notably smaller in 2009. About two-thirds of APA interviewees received no follow-up interviews on campus; about 20% received one follow-up interview, and the remaining 15% received more than one. |
Section D: Placement Service Guidelines Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Unprofessional Conduct During Interview" /></td>
<td>This figure gives instances of unprofessional conduct during the interview process proper. Most of the “canonical” violations have disappeared by the 2009 convention. The large “other” bar represents one instance of an overheard discussion of another candidate’s situation and an enquiry concerning what other applications a candidate had tendered (a third was for inappropriate questions, but this is properly accounted for in a subsequent question).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Unprofessional Conduct Outside of Interview" /></td>
<td>A few complaints about behavior outside of the interview process were advanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Delicate Subjects: Indirectly Broached" /></td>
<td>Marital status questions, more common in the past, are declining. Religion questions continue, although for several institutions this is part of their protected charter, and such questions are thus considered legitimate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions about children seem to be on the rise; it is not clear whether this is to assess “tenure track encumbrances” or simply an attempt to get to know the candidate better.

Religion is the stand-out item here, and it is interesting that for the majority of candidates (see graph below as well) it is seen to work to their advantage rather than disadvantage.
No formal reports of violations were reported for any of the three years examined.

This figure shows the reason for non-reporting, as a percentage of those who claimed to have experienced a violation. The “other” reason category, which predominates in the statistics here, mostly consists of respondents testifying that they were not offended by the “violation.” When joined with the formal “indifference” category, it becomes clear that most of these violations, especially in the last year, were not seen to be particularly problematic.