

---

## *Aegean Prehistory in 1994: Results of the IDAP Survey Questionnaire*

*John F. Cherry & Jack L. Davis*

---

The second edition of the *International Directory of Aegean Prehistorians* [IDAP], completed this fall, is now in the process of being sent out to those who placed advance orders. All the information included in the *Directory* has also been mounted on a file server at the University of Michigan and is freely available to users of the Internet via anonymous FTP (rome.classics.lsa.umich.edu).

Those who submitted entries for the *Directory* may recall, however, that its editors hoped to be able to use this large-scale polling of their colleagues to correct some shortcomings in our collective knowledge about the current state of Aegean Prehistory. By this we mean not only systematically collected and quantifiable information about who we are and where our principal research interests lie (data to be found in the pages of the *Directory* itself), but also about how and where we were trained, what jobs we hold and how we found them, what we teach and to whom, and so on. At a time when (in North American universities, at least) archaeology and Classical studies —indeed, the humanities at large — are increasingly coming under siege and require active defense, information of this sort is vital, if we are to structure and justify our educational programs over the coming years to fit the demands of the job market and the needs of the field itself. These issues, therefore, were addressed in a detailed supplemental survey questionnaire, the analysis of the data from which we promised to report in *Nestor* towards the end of 1994. This is the report we promised.<sup>1</sup>

In respect of such disciplinary self-knowledge, it is worth noting that Aegean Prehistory — and, for that matter, Classical Archaeology in general — lags well behind certain other archaeologies. The Society for American Archaeology, for example, has for several years been engaged in detailed, systematic surveys of its members, whereas the Archaeological Institute of America's first basic directory of its membership has only just been assembled in 1994. The short survey now completed by the AIA had aims rather like ours: to begin to collect data on numbers, research interests, employment, and "other statistical information that is vital for understanding and planning for the future of the discipline." The AIA's questionnaire covered little more than address, institutional affiliation, research interests, undergraduate and graduate institutions, and geographical specializations. The editors regarded their initial effort merely as a start toward accumulating the sorts of information now needed.

If we have been a little more ambitious in *our* first effort for Aegean Prehistory, it is principally because we do not anticipate a follow-up survey for some years. This was the reason, at any rate, we risked trying colleagues' patience by soliciting from them data in reply to some 21 additional questions, chosen (or so we hoped) to provide maximum information with minimum inconvenience. The response to this request was far better than we had anticipated: 299 respondents returned IDAP forms to us, 295 of them having completed all or part of the survey questionnaire. We have tried to present the results here in a straightforward fashion, at the same time keeping in mind that the goal of the survey was broadly to characterize our field in terms of those who are currently active in it.

We confess, however, to having a special interest in conducting this survey and in analyzing its results — namely, to examine the state of the American job market for Aegean prehistorians. While the academic market for Aegean prehistorians in the USA and Canada is much the largest and employs

---

<sup>1</sup> We must thank various individuals and institutions who have made this report possible: at the University of Cincinnati, Susan Wallrodt, John Wallrodt, Ada Kalogirou, Sharon Stocker, and Michael Sage; at the University of Michigan, Sebastian Heath and Sue Alcock; and at Indiana University, Kaddey Vitelli, Mihalis Fotiadis, and Olga Kalentzidou. We are especially grateful to the Semple Fund of the University of Cincinnati for a generous subvention.

graduates not only of programs in North America but worldwide, during the past two decades Aegean prehistorians have found it increasingly difficult to find academic jobs. It may be a positive contribution, then, to establish a clearer picture of those who *have* been successful in finding employment in North America, and thus to appreciate somewhat better the constraints within which academic programs in Aegean prehistory must be developed, if we are to produce employable graduates. (This is hardly to suggest that the *status quo* should be preserved, or that we should not strive to change conditions in academia so as to improve Aegean Prehistory, in whatever way we think best; it is only to accept the reality of all the pressures currently affecting us.) These considerations have led us to divide our report into two sections: in **Part I** we summarize data for *all* respondents, whereas **Part II** considers *only* those who teach or reside in North America or who have Ph.D. degrees from North American institutions.

As with most surveys, there will undoubtedly be those who question the adequacy of the sample, and we concede immediately that the information is obviously incomplete. How many Aegean prehistorians chose not to be listed in *IDAP* or to complete the questionnaire we can only guess. Some comparative figures may help. 514 copies of *Nestor* are distributed to subscribers each month, 176 of them to institutions and 28 to students; this leaves a total of 297 individual non-student subscribers worldwide, 151 of these in the United States. Clearly, not all subscribers to *Nestor* would consider themselves to be professional Aegean prehistorians, and, conversely, an unknown number of professionals do not subscribe to *Nestor* personally, using a library copy instead. But even if we cannot be precise, these numbers at least suggest that a substantial proportion of all Aegean prehistorians *did* respond to the survey. Scanning the entries in the revised edition of *IDAP* may be one way of assessing the completeness of coverage. For the moment, however, these are the best, and only, data that we have to characterize our field.

## PART I: Characterization of Aegean Prehistorians Worldwide

### DATA

#### (a) Sex [295 respondents]

	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Total</i>
Worldwide	155 (53%)	140 (47%)	295
USA	53 (47%)	59 (53%)	112

#### (b) Nationalities [288 respondents]

	<i>1st</i>	<i>2nd (Dual)</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>(%)</i>
American	4	3	115	(40%)
Australian	6	1	7	(2%)
Austrian	4		4	(1%)
Belgian	7		7	(7%)
British	33	1	34	(12%)
Canadian	10	5	15	(5%)
Cypriot	2		2	(.5%)
Czech	1		1	(.25%)
Dutch	4		4	(1%)
Finnish	1		1	(.25%)
French	15	2	17	(6%)
German	9		9	(17%)
Greek	50	4	54	(19%)
Hungarian		1	1	(.25%)
Irish		1	1	(.25%)
Israeli	1	1	1	(.25%)
Italian	6		6	(2%)
Lithuanian	1		1	(.25%)
Norwegian	1		1	(.25%)
Polish	6		6	(2%)
Russian	1		1	(.25%)
Spanish	1		1	(.25%)
Swedish	14		14	(5%)
Swiss	1		1	(.25%)
Turkish	1	1	1	(.25%)

#### (c) Training in ancient languages [292 respondents]

<i>Greek</i>			
Competence to teach at introductory level		79	(27%)
Competence to teach at advanced level		99	(34%)
Some familiarity		82	(28%)
<i>Latin</i>			
Competence to teach at introductory level		92	(32%)
Competence to teach at advanced level		56	(19%)
Some familiarity		87	(30%)

#### (d) Qualifications to teach in related fields [291 respondents]

Classical art history	168	(57%)
Archaeological theory and methods	164	(56%)
Ancient history	145	(50%)
Classical literature in translation	113	(39%)
World prehistory	86	(30%)
Ancient Near Eastern history	75	(26%)
Ancient Near Eastern art	62	(21%)

Social anthropology	19	(7%)
Physical anthropology	14	(5%)

**(e) Academic positions held now or most recently**

at a university offering higher degrees	167	(89%)
at a university not offering higher degrees	15	(8%)
at a junior college	1	(0.5%)
at a secondary school	6	(3%)
a permanent post, with tenure	98	(51%)
tenure-track post, but not yet tenured	13	(7%)
post without tenure, but renewable	29	(15%)
temporary post, non-renewable	32	(17%)
adjunct status	20	(10%)

**(f) Length of time to find an academic appointment** [167 respondents]

Those with academic appointments reported the number of years that it took to find them:

<i>Decade</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Max.</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
1940s	3	0	0	0	0
1950s	10	2.5	0	16	5
1960s	36	0.5	0	7	1.5
1970s	40	1.0	0	15	2.5
1980s	59	1.5	0	11	2.0
1990s	19	0.5	0	2	0.5

Twelve respondents who began to look for a position reported that they had never (or not yet) found one, as follows: three in the 1970s (1 British, 1 French, 1 German); two in the 1980s (1 Belgian, 1 Greek); and seven in the 1990s (3 Americans, 1 Australian, 1 French, 1 Greek, 1 Swedish).

**(g) Type of academic department in which respondents teach (now or previously)** [202 respondents]

	<i>Current</i>		<i>Previous</i>		<i>Earlier</i>	
Classics	55	(27%)	45	(22%)	25	(12%)
Anthropology	18	(9%)	9	(4%)	4	(2%)
Ancient History	30	(15%)	12	(6%)	3	(1%)
History	6	(3%)	2	(1%)	1	(0.5%)
Classical Archaeology	53	(26%)	25	(12%)	13	(6%)
Archaeology	64	(32%)	24	(12%)	11	(5%)
Prehistory	51	(25%)	15	(7%)	10	(5%)
Art History	33	(16%)	20	(10%)	8	(4%)

Other types of departments/programs specified by two or fewer individuals include the following: Aegean prehistory; ancient Mediterranean civilizations; American archaeology; ancient Mediterranean linguistics; ancient religions; art; architecture; arts and letters; Assyriology; Byzantine archaeology; Byzantine archaeology and art; Classical studies; computer applications; divinity and religious studies; economic history; education; extra-mural studies; foreign languages; freshman studies; geology; humanities; humanities and languages; Indo-european linguistics; interdisciplinary studies; modern languages; Mycenaean studies; nautical archaeology; near eastern studies; philosophy; physical and chemical sciences; physics; study abroad program; values, science, and technology.

**(h) Opportunities to teach Aegean Prehistory** [207 respondents]

176 (85%) of the respondents who now hold, or have held, academic positions also reported their opportunity to teach Aegean prehistory, as follows:

	<i>% of those in academic positions</i>
undergraduate/lower-level courses with significant element	145 (70%)
undergraduate/lower-level courses devoted entirely to Aegean prehistory	121 (58%)
post-graduate/higher-level courses in Aegean prehistory	112 (54%)

**(i) Highest degree supervised in Aegean Prehistory** [207 respondents]

M.A. level (or equivalent) but no higher	25 (12%)
at the Ph.D. level (or equivalent)	77 (37%)
total supervising graduate degrees	102 (49%)

**(j) Positions outside academia** [109 respondents]

Those reporting that they now hold, or once held, an archaeological position outside academia described their current or most recent posts as follows:

Museum administrator	11 (11%)
Museum curator	22 (21%)
Conservator	1 (1%)
Contract archaeologist	12 (11%)
Other archaeological post	39 (36%)

Other archaeological fields included:

administrative posts in ministries of culture; administrative posts at research institutes and foreign schools; administrative secretaries; archivists; editorships of scholarly journals and other archaeological publications; free-lance consultancies; freelance lectureships; independent researchers; lab managers; librarians; museum research assistants; posts in antiquities services; and research fellowships.

Non-archaeological fields included:

administration of government agencies; administration of non-profit organization; business; ceramicist; chemical research and development; civil service; computing; editing; health services administration; industry; journalism; library administration; military; music/ opera; pediatrics; publishing; restaurant waiter; secondary education; translating; university administration; word-processing.

48 (44%) of these 109 respondents reported that they would have preferred an academic post.

**(k) Length of time to find a non-academic appointment** [74 respondents]

Those with non-academic appointments reported the number of years that it took to find them:

<i>Decade</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Max.</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
1940s	-	-	-	-	-
1950s	3	5.5	0	17	10
1960s	3	1.5	0	5	3
1970s	19	1	0	6	1.5
1980s	32	1	0	6	2
1990s	17	0.5	0	2	.5

**(l) Close relationship with a foreign school or research institution**

Most respondents claimed an association of some sort with a foreign school or research institution, but there was considerable confusion in definitions; many took the word "school" literally and replied that they had gone to school in a foreign country. The data consequently are not worth reporting in detail.

**(m) General orientation of research interests in Aegean Prehistory** [291 respondents]

art historical	122 (42%)
anthropological/ sociological	186 (64%)
linguistic	35 (12%)
historical	171 (59%)

**(n) Countries in which respondents have engaged in archaeological fieldwork or study**  
[291 respondents]

<i>Country</i>	<i>Excavation</i>		<i>Survey</i>		<i>Study</i>	
Greece	220	(76%)	129	(44%)	223	(77%)
Italy	43	(15%)	14	(5%)	44	(15%)
Turkey	31	(11%)	15	(5%)	52	(18%)
Cyprus	59	(20%)	29	(10%)	68	(23%)

Other countries mentioned included:

Afghanistan (1); Albania (3); Bosnia (1); Bulgaria (5); Ceylon (1); China (1); Crimea (1); Czech Republic (1); Egypt (16); France (7); Georgia (2); Hungary (1); Iran (1) Iraq (1); Israel (19); Jordan (5); Lebanon (1); Nepal (1); Poland (1); Portugal (2); Puerto Rico (1); Spain (1); Syria (12); Tunisia (2); United Kingdom (4); USA (4); former Yugoslavia (6).

**(o) Countries in which respondents have directed archaeological fieldwork [291 respondents]**

Country	Excavation	Survey
Greece	84 (29%)	69 (24%)
Italy	8 (3%)	3 (1%)
Turkey	9 (3%)	7 (2%)
Cyprus	18 (6%)	14 (5%)

Other countries mentioned included:

Afghanistan (1); Albania (3); Bulgaria (6); Ceylon (1); China (1); Crimea (1); Czech Republic (1); Egypt (6); France (1); Georgia (2); Hungary (1); Iran (1); Israel (8); Jordan (1); Malta (1); Nepal (1); Poland (1); Portugal (1); Puerto Rico (1); Syria (4); United Kingdom (5); USA (4); former Yugoslavia (2).

**(p) Geographical area(s) in which respondents believe their greatest expertise lies [291 respondents]**

Greek mainland	204 (70%)
Crete	141 (48%)
Aegean islands	102 (35%)
Cyprus	47 (16%)
Balkans	30 (10%)
Near East	30 (10%)
Anatolia	21 (7%)

**(q) Period(s) in which respondents believe their greatest expertise lies [291 respondents]**

Palaeolithic	9 (3%)
Neolithic	92 (32%)
Earlier Bronze Age	152 (52%)
Later Bronze Age	209 (72%)
Dark Ages	78 (27%)

**(r) Institutional association(s) especially important in helping find employment [291 respondents]**

respondents' postgraduate university	99 (34%)
respondents' undergraduate university	42 (14%)
professional societies	36 (12%)
foreign research institutions	34 (12%)
domestic non-university research institutions	21 (7%)

**SUMMARY**

We offer the following generalizations about Aegean prehistorians on the basis of the data presented in tables above. There is a fairly even gender balance among respondents. Their nationalities reflect the traditional domination of Aegean prehistory by scholars from Greece, the USA and Canada, the United Kingdom, France, Sweden, Germany, and Italy, as well as the regrettable absence of involvement in the field by Turkish prehistorians. As a group, more than half claim the credentials to teach ancient languages, and broadly speaking the majority of Aegean prehistorians seem to think of themselves as students of Classical antiquity, offering specializations other than Aegean prehistory in Classical art history and ancient history. Although a majority expressed expertise in the teaching of archaeological theory and methods, a surprisingly low percentage report expertise in the ancient Near East, in world prehistory, and especially in anthropology; the latter is particularly odd, in that more respondents claimed to have anthropological/sociological interests than art historical or historical. Perhaps not surprisingly, there are few Aegean prehistorians who claim to be knowledgeable about the Palaeolithic (a traditional domain of anthropologists in North America or prehistorians in Europe), or about the Dark Ages (a very strong growth area within Ancient History in recent years).

Such a characterization may well lend support to the stereotype of Aegean Prehistory as a field that is geographically insular and methodologically isolated. This picture is only reinforced by the strong research bias toward Greece itself and by the very small percentage of Aegean prehistorians (in this survey, at least) who have conducted research of any sort in Turkey, Cyprus, or Italy. Within the Aegean, more scholars claimed expertise in the prehistory of the Greek mainland than of Crete or the Aegean islands; the Near East, Turkey, and Cyprus again appear much neglected. Although we sometimes like to imagine that Aegean prehistory is a broad field that embraces the entirety of the eastern Mediterranean, few of our abilities and practical experiences appear to measure up to these expectations.

An overwhelming majority of professional Aegean prehistorians teach at universities offering graduate programs, and a majority of them hold permanent or semi-permanent posts. Of those not employed in academic posts or in museums, a bewildering array of positions seem to have provided opportunity for employment — although with what degree of job satisfaction or security, we cannot say (many would have preferred traditional academic employment). Most of us teach in Classics, Classical Archaeology, Archaeology, or Prehistory programs. History and Anthropology programs are decidedly under-represented. A large percentage of those who hold academic positions have had the opportunity to teach Aegean prehistory in some or other form, but relatively few have the chance on a regular basis to teach at the graduate level or to supervise graduate research. The statistics do not provide any evidence that it is taking those who are looking for academic positions today appreciably longer to find those positions than it did in the past. This should not be construed to mean that it is no more difficult now for a new Ph.D. to find a job than it used to be, but only that those who are likely to find academic jobs at all find them reasonably quickly. Most significant among institutions in helping candidates find employment appear to be their post-graduate universities.

## PART II: Characterization of Aegean Prehistorians in North America

### DATA

**(a) Academic positions now held** [includes respondents with current posts in North America]

at a university offering higher degrees	79	(79%)
at a university not offering higher degrees	13	(13%)
at a junior college	1	(1%)
at a secondary school	2	(2%)
a permanent post, with tenure	52	(52%)
tenure-track post, but not yet tenured	9	(9%)
post without tenure, but renewable	9	(9%)
temporary post, non-renewable	16	(16%)
adjunct status	13	(13%)

**(b) Nationalities** [61 respondents with tenured or tenure-track jobs in North America]

The North American job market is dominated by U.S. and Canadian citizens:

American	45	(74%)	Swedish	1	(2%)
Canadian	7	(12%)	Australian	1	(2%)
Greek	2	(3%)	Cypriot	1	(2%)
British	4	(7%)			

**(c) Sex ratios** [61 respondents with tenured or tenure-track jobs in North America]

There is a considerable gender imbalance in the US and Canadian job market: men are disproportionately represented among those who hold, or have held, tenured and tenure-track jobs in North America.

	<i>Tenured</i>	<i>Tenure-Track</i>	<i>All</i>
<i>Men</i>	40 (65%)	6 (67%)	46 (75%)
<i>Women</i>	12 (19%)	3 (33%)	15 (25%)

**(d) North American universities and the job market**

119 respondents completed Ph.D.s in the USA and Canada at a total of 27 different universities, only eight of which (listed below) produced more than three Ph.D.s. A small number of university programs appear to have dominated the job market in Aegean Prehistory, and several universities have found tenured and tenure-track jobs for a much higher percentage of their Ph.D.s than have other programs.

<i>University/ College</i>	<i>No. Tenured</i>	<i>No. Tenure-track</i>	<i>No. of Ph.D.s in this survey</i>	<i>% Tenured or Tenure-Track</i>
Bryn Mawr	5 (11%)	2 (28%)	11 (9%)	64%
Columbia	2 (4%)	2 (28%)	6 (5%)	66%
Cincinnati	8 (17%)	1 (14%)	14 (12%)	64%
Harvard	6 (13%)		8 (7%)	75%
Indiana	3 (6%)		14 (12%)	21%
Minnesota	2 (4%)	1 (14%)	5 (4%)	60%
NYU	1 (2%)		5 (4%)	20%
Pennsylvania	5 (11%)	1 (14%)	17 (15%)	35%

**(e) Length of time to find an academic appointment** [81 respondents]

Those with Ph.D.s from U.S. and Canadian universities reported the number of years that it took to find them:

<i>Decade</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Max.</i>	<i>S.D.</i>
1940s	3	0	0	0	0
1950s	3	0.5	0	1	0.5
1960s	19	0	0	1	0.5



1970s	24	1.0	0	15	3.0
1980s	24	1.5	0	11	2.5
1990s	8	0.5	0	2	0.5

**(f) Training in ancient languages** [121 respondents with mailing addresses in the USA and Canada]*Greek*

Competence to teach at introductory level	45	(37%)
Competence to teach at advanced level	37	(31%)
Some familiarity	36	(30%)

*Latin*

Competence to teach at introductory level	45	(37%)
Competence to teach at advanced level	25	(21%)
Some familiarity	36	(30%)

**(g) Type of academic department in which respondents teach (now or previously)**

[99 respondents in the USA and Canada]

	<i>Current</i>	<i>Previous</i>	<i>Earlier</i>
Classics	40 (40%)	28 (28%)	17 (17%)
Anthropology	11 (11%)	7 (7%)	3 (3%)
Ancient History	9 (9%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)
History	3 (3%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Classical Archaeology	13 (13%)	6 (6%)	7 (7%)
Archaeology	16 (16%)	8 (8%)	3 (3%)
Prehistory	5 (5%)	4 (4%)	3 (3%)
Art History	19 (19%)	14 (14%)	7 (7%)

**(h) Opportunities to teach Aegean Prehistory** [100 respondents in North America]

86 (86%) of the respondents who now hold, or have held, academic positions also reported their opportunity to teach Aegean prehistory, as follows:

	<i>% of those in academic positions</i>
undergraduate/lower-level courses with significant element	78 (78%)
undergraduate/lower-level courses devoted entirely to Aegean prehistory	61 (61%)
post-graduate/higher-level courses in Aegean prehistory	56 (56%)

**(i) Supervision of degrees in Aegean Prehistory** [100 respondents in North America]

M.A. level (or equivalent) but no higher	11	(11%)
at the Ph.D. level (or equivalent)	29	(29%)
total supervising graduate degrees	40	(40%)

**(j) Positions outside academia** [38 respondents]

38 respondents with North American Ph.D.s who now hold, or once held, an archaeological position outside academia described their current or most recent posts as follows:

Museum administrator	3	(8%)
Museum curator	8	(21%)
Conservator	1	(3%)
Contract archaeologist	4	(11%)
Other archaeological	11	(29%)
Non-archaeological	11	(29%)

19 (50%) of these respondents noted that they would have preferred a post in academia.

**(k) Countries in which respondents have directed archaeological fieldwork**

[127 respondents who were US or Canadian citizens]

<i>Country</i>	<i>Excavation</i>	<i>Survey</i>
Greece	20 (16%)	22 (17%)
Italy	6 (5%)	4 (3%)

	<i>Page 10</i>			
Turkey	5	(4%)	6	(5%)
Cyprus	8	(6%)	10	(8%)

## SUMMARY

The profile of Aegean prehistorians in North America is similar to that of all Aegean prehistorians worldwide, yet differs from it in several important respects. As in Europe, posts for Aegean prehistorians in America and Canada are largely in universities offering highly degrees. A majority of these positions are tenured, but there seem to be fewer tenurable and renewable jobs and more temporary positions. Fewer individuals holding American or Canadian Ph.D.s appear to have had the opportunity to direct fieldwork in Greece than is the trend worldwide. North American respondents and Aegean prehistorians worldwide are remarkably similar in language credentials, and in geographical, temporal, and pedagogical specializations, although somewhat more North Americans claim expertise in the teaching of Classical art history.

One unexpected outcome of this survey was the discovery that there exists a very considerable gender imbalance among the holders of permanent positions and positions capable of being made permanent. Another was the lack of any statistically meaningful difference in language competence or in specializations between those who hold tenured or tenure-track positions in North America and those who do not. Also something of a surprise was the extent to which only a few universities have seemingly dominated the North American academic job market in this field. Indeed, the eight institutions producing the most Ph.D.s in Aegean Prehistory also account for 64% of the holders of tenured and tenure-track positions. But the data from the survey conflate information from several decades, and table (d) above should not be treated as an accurate snapshot of the current position. Lastly — and contrary to the sometimes popular belief — most positions in Aegean Prehistory in North America are, in fact, held by North Americans.

---

We invite reaction to these survey questionnaire results, whether by e-mail or letter to us individually, by comments sent to *Nestor*, or by public discussion on the *AegeanNet* computer list.

Professor John F. Cherry  
 Dept. of Classical Studies  
 University of Michigan  
 Ann Arbor, MI 48109  
 USA

*E-mail:* jcherry@umich.edu

Professor Jack L. Davis  
 Dept. of Classics  
 University of Cincinnati  
 Cincinnati, OH 45221  
 USA

*E-mail:* jack.davis@uc.edu