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Executive Summary

Background: The Committee on the Status of Women in Anthropology (COSWA) is committed to equal opportunity for anthropologists in all work settings. Recognizing that a significant number of anthropology PhDs and nearly all alumni from master’s programs are employed in positions other than as full-time university and college professors, in 2004 COSWA expanded its mission to become more inclusive of and to seek ways to connect to practicing anthropologists. To this end, COSWA designed and administered two work climate surveys to assess the gendered dimensions of anthropological work practice. This report contains the findings from COSWA’s 2007 survey to assess the work climate of non-university and college-based practicing anthropologists. This document explores the gendered dimensions of the work environments of applied and practicing anthropologists, and provides the American Anthropological Association (AAA) with recommendations to make the AAA, in general, and COSWA, in particular, more inclusive of non-academically based anthropologists.

Methods: The survey instrument was developed by a nine person team that included a mix of full-time practitioners employed outside of academia and faculty members of applied anthropology departments. The survey was administered online through Zarca in the late fall and early winter of 2007. Because the AAA does not have a database of practicing anthropologists employed outside of academia, we needed to use a variety of resources to obtain the sample. Invitations were emailed to 6086 members of the American Anthropological Association’s Applied Anthropology email proxy group, and the survey advertised to a snowball sample through list serve postings and personal contacts, and through applied anthropology departmental alumni networks. The survey consisted of 78 questions, 20 of which were open-ended. Content analysis was aided by Atlas-ti, a qualitative data management program, and quantitative analyses were conducted in SPSS 14.0.

The Sample: 437 respondents participated in the survey. Overall, the sample was predominantly characterized by white women holding the PhD between the ages of 30 and 69. These respondents most typically lived in domestic partnerships (without dependent children), were employed in private/for-profit organizations or in government, and earned $50,000-$79,000 a year. Many of them (49% of the sample) earned income through two or more sources over the previous two year period. While this demographic profile reflects the majority of respondents, the sample included a range of other individuals enabling some comparisons by gender, ethnicity, and work sector.

Work Climate: Signs of positive work climate include reported gender equality in hours worked and mentoring by survey respondents. Areas for improvement included the ratio of men to women employed in management and administration positions, and mentoring practices. Certain sectors of employment are particularly male top-heavy, including engineering, international development organizations, fisheries, military, national park services, and CRM. Being a young
woman, in particular, remained challenging in work spheres where white, heterosexual, men continued to dominate. This observation is compounded by race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation.

Minorities also tend to be underrepresented in top administrative and managerial positions, and are perceived to be more often relegated to field work, tech, or support roles. However, minority respondents reported very similar fields of employment as non-minority respondents. Mentoring relationships are less often developed for women practitioners than for men. Moreover, many practicing anthropologists work for organizations that do not offer formal mentoring programs, and therefore employees rely on informal networks to develop mentor-mentee relationships.

In addition to gender, a variety of factors influence perceptions of work climate for practicing anthropologists, including family status, race and ethnicity, age, and disciplinary background. Age is a factor that can cut both ways; at times and in certain fields of employment (e.g., international development, national park service, the military), older and more experienced employees are preferred, whereas in other fields (e.g., advertising), younger employees are preferred. Young women, however, are singled out more so than young men as faced with a “chilly climate” in a variety of employment fields. Disciplinary background can also impact negatively one’s work climate, especially in sectors dominated by hard sciences, economics, or business.

**Work and Family:** With respect to a “family-friendly” work environment, practicing anthropologists report this area to be weak both in policy and practice. Less than half of the practitioners in the sample were employed in organizations with formal leave policies, and therefore the majority of employees relied on informal practices to attend to familial responsibilities. Moreover, while managers are reported to schedule work activities at times that do not conflict with care giving, practicing anthropologists perceive animosity from co-workers without such responsibilities. Observations about the impact of family responsibilities on hours worked or perceptions of work climate were not gendered; both women and men are reported as facing the same issues in achieving a work-family balance.

**Reflections on Practicing Anthropology:** For practicing anthropologists, linear career trajectories are the exception rather than the norm. This aspect of career development distinguishes many practitioners from their colleagues who work in full-time academic positions, where career paths tend to be highly proscribed. In planning their careers, practicing anthropologists in the survey reported that obtaining job security, opportunities for professional advancement, searching for on-the-job satisfaction, and the pursuit of work-family balance are very important in making their professional decisions. In some circumstances, career options are limited by structural forces such as company reorganizations or budgetary cutbacks. Practitioner respondents reported that their initial entry into the world of anthropological practice (beyond the academy) was facilitated by networks that typically originated in their home anthropology
departments when they were students. It is of interest to note that “teaching” was reported by this many practitioners as a primary work activity. Thus, while many practitioners are not full time academically employed, they are contributing to the education of anthropology students. In essence, networking through faculty, previous employment, or internships was essential for most respondents as they searched for positions as practicing anthropologists. This pattern suggests that anthropology programs should emphasize networking skills with students and help facilitate their learning to expand their professional contacts during the time they are students.

Practicing anthropologists do not feel valued by the anthropology profession or discipline, both of which are perceived as catering primarily to academic anthropologists. Negative experiences with the broader discipline are perpetuated through mentoring relationships between faculty and students. Reportedly, anthropology students are advised into academic careers as priority positions, with non-academic placements treated as second class, or not even acknowledged as a possibility. The devaluing of practicing anthropology is reflected in lack of training and preparation for applied research.

Reflections on the AAA: Practitioners report that they are largely dissatisfied with programs and services provided by the AAA, although there is some recognition of change. Principally, the organization is perceived as catering to academic anthropologists, and lacking relevance to the work experiences of practitioners. Continued efforts to expand sessions and workshops focused on the practical dimensions of anthropology were reported as very much needed to improve the divide. Despite the overwhelming sentiment that the AAA and anthropological profession do not value the work of practicing anthropologists, a vast majority of respondents write with great passion about the work they do, and report that they would not alter their career paths should they have an opportunity to start over.

Recommendations: Based on survey responses, we suggest that the AAA (1) increase sessions at the AAA meetings that address the career interests and research expertise of practicing anthropologist; (2) expand opportunities for students to build professional skill sets; (3) support career services and interviewing for nonacademic positions at the AAA meetings and online; and (4) increase the representation in articles and reviews of books by practitioners within the American Anthropologist and other AAA publications. Specific to COSWA, we recommend that COSWA (1) publicizes its mentorship program in the Anthropology News and online, and diversify mentors by sector of employment; (2) sponsor sessions (or webinars) for employers and coworkers on strategies to mitigate and improve perceptions of work climate, as related to gender, age, ethnicity, and familial status; (3) offer seminars in mobile work technology as a strategy to facilitate work-life balance or ease care giving responsibilities; and (4) sponsor networking hours at the AAA meetings for women practitioners.
INTRODUCTION

This report presents findings from a survey of practicing anthropologists about their work climate, their perceptions of the anthropology discipline, and their views of the American Anthropological Association’s (AAA) success at addressing the concerns of practicing anthropologists with particular attention to gender differences. The survey was conducted by the Committee on the Status of Women in Anthropology (COSWA), a committee of the AAA. The label “practicing anthropologist” is used to “refer to anthropologically trained individuals who use their applied skills and knowledge, full time, outside of academic settings, for practical purposes” (Ervin 2005: 4). This term includes anthropologists employed in business, government, for-profit and non-profit organizations, and as consultants. Beyond its characterization of gendered dimensions of practicing anthropology, the survey was intended to support recommendations to the American Anthropological Association to better serve practicing anthropologists, both female and male.

This report has five major sections. Part 1 provides the background and context for this study, including a review of the growing attention to practicing anthropologists within the AAA and the extent of existing data on practitioner anthropologists. Part 2 presents the methodology, from survey design and administration to methods of data analysis. Part 3 provides a summary of the sample demographics and description of their sector of employment and primary work activities. Part 4 explores comparisons in work climate issues for university-based and practicing anthropologists, including topics of career satisfaction, mentoring, advancement, and work and family. Part 5 focuses on understanding practicing anthropologists and the challenges specific to their work environments. Topics of exploration include the career trajectories of practicing anthropologists, the perceived "rift" between academics and practitioners within the discipline, and perceptions by survey respondents about the AAA and its level of engagement with practicing anthropologist. Part 6 draws conclusions and provides suggestions for how the AAA and COSWA can better serve practicing anthropologists.
1 BACKGROUND

COSWA is committed to equal opportunity for anthropologists in all work settings. Recognizing that a significant number of anthropology PhDs and nearly all alumni from master’s programs are employed in positions other than as full-time university and college professors, in 2004 COSWA expanded its mission to become more inclusive of and seek ways to connect to practicing anthropologists. To this end, COSWA designed and administered two work climate surveys to assess the gendered dimensions of anthropological work practice. In 2005, COSWA conducted a climate survey of academically-based anthropologists. The results of this survey are available at: http://www.aaanet.org/cmtes/coswa/COSWASurveys.cfm. In the spring of 2007, COSWA created a sub-committee to develop a comparable survey to assess the work climate of non-academically based practicing anthropologists. In addition to being useful for exploring the gendered dimensions of the work environments for applied and practicing anthropologists, the survey seeks to provide the AAA with recommendations on how to make the AAA, in general, and COSWA, in particular, more inclusive of non-academically based anthropologists.

1.1 American Anthropological Association and Practicing Anthropologists

In the early 1980s, the AAA was faced with the need to restructure itself to maintain its not-for-profit corporate tax status. Up until this point, practicing anthropologists often were members of the AAA while also maintaining membership in the Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA), an independent professional society that was founded in 1941 and maintained close ties to the AAA. The SfAA recognized the need to address the needs of both “academic and non-academically employed anthropologists to recognize the benefits in identifying themselves as ‘Professional Anthropologists’ (www.sfaa.net). Presented with the choice of becoming a part of the AAA during the 1980s restructuring, the SfAA elected to retain its independence, and in effect, the AAA lost an organizational affiliate whose mission was to attend specifically to the interests of the practicing community. After an open discussion at the 1982 AAA Annual Meeting, the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA) was founded. Jim Downs served as its first president (1982-1983); Barbara Pillsbury, as its first elected president (1984-1986); and Marietta Baba, its second elected president (1986-1988). For a complete listing of past NAPA presidents see: http://www.practicinganthropology.org/about/?section=past_presidents

Throughout the two-and-a-half decades of NAPA’s history, its leaders and members have accomplished a great deal to bring practicing anthropologists more center-stage in the life of the AAA and its members. We note four especially critical junctures: First, in 1993 under the leadership of President-Elect Elizabeth Briody, NAPA raised the funds for and produced the “Anthropologists at Work: Careers Making a Difference” video that was published and disseminated for the next decade by the AAA and drew attention to the rich range of careers
available to anthropologists at the PhD, MA, and BA level. Second, in 1998, in another reorganization of the AAA, at which time Units became Sections, the Executive Board designated a practitioner/professional seat on the EB, which gave greater voice and visibility to practicing anthropology in the governance of the AAA. Third, in May 2003 on behalf of NAPA, Dennis Wiedman (who held the Practicing/Professional Seat on the Executive Board) submitted the Practicing and Professional Employment Services Initiative. NAPA’s resolution stipulated, “Any employer who wants to hire an anthropologist should be able to economically and efficiently use the assistance of the American Anthropological Association.” Fourth, as a result of a series of recommendations from NAPA, the Practicing Advisory Work Group (PAWG) was established in July 2004. 

From 2004-2007, PAWG members conducted two studies of practitioners via telephone interviews and solicited extensive recommendations from 19 expert panelists who were non-academically based practitioners. Several reports were submitted and presented to the AAA EB. PAWG’s Final Report can be found at: http://www.aaanet.org/cmtes/copapia/PAWG.cfm.

The key finding of its research that provided the foundation for PAWG’s recommendations is: the “AAA should become a more inclusive professional organization that welcomes, values, and serves all anthropologists equally.” Specific recommendations focused on (1) education, training, and development; (2) improving the annual meeting to make it more relevant for practicing anthropologists; (3) considering participation with other organizations in regional and specialized meetings; (4) enhancing the career development of anthropologists; (5) increasing the visibility of the AAA and more effectively publicizing the benefits of membership; (6) improving the Internet interface by which the AAA presents itself to practicing anthropologists and the public interested in anthropological research; (7) providing improved group rates for health and liability insurance; and (8) integrating practicing anthropologists into AAA publication programs.

Since PAWG was established with a 3-year tenure, and since members felt strongly that much more work could and should be accomplished to achieve the recommendations it submitted, PAWG recommended that a standing committee be established to continue the work. As a result, in December 2007 the AAA EB established a Committee on Practicing, Applied, and Public Interest Anthropology (CoPAPIA). The Committee’s first teleconference meeting was

---

1 The EB Practicing/Professional Seat was established in 1999 with Shirley Fiske as its first member. Dennis Wiedman (2002), J. Anthony Paredes 2005), and T. J. Ferguson (2008) have served in this capacity.

2 Members of PAWG included Linda Bennett, Chair, T. J. Ferguson, J. Anthony Paredes, Susan Squires, Judy Tso, Dennis Wiedman, and Kathleen Terry-Sharp, AAA Staff Liaison.

3 Members include Linda Bennett, Chair, Chip Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Patricia Ensworth, T. J. Ferguson, Shirley Fiske, Robert Hahn, Susan Squires (2007-08), Niel Tashima, and Kathleen Terry-Sharp, AAA Staff Liaison.
held in December 2007 and its first face-to-face meeting at the AAA 2008 November meetings (Bennett and Fiske 2008). CoPAPIA’s charges include:

1. Fostering the reciprocal relationship between anthropological theory and practice.
2. Establishing relationships with Sections across the AAA.
3. Developing recommendations for training and development and specific member benefits to encourage non-members to join the AAA.
4. Maintaining a corporate presence in the on-going dialogue regarding anthropological ethics as they affect and relate to practicing anthropologists.
5. Increasing the visibility and engagement with outside organizations and employers. An ultimate goal is to increase the membership in AAA from among disengaged practitioner and applied anthropologists and organizations who employ anthropologists.

Based upon PAWG recommendations, the AAA Staff was reconfigured at the end of 2007 to reflect the AAA’s increased commitment to address the traditionally underserved segment of anthropology, practicing anthropologists. Kathleen Terry-Sharp is now Director of Practicing and Applied Programs and Academic Relations.

### 1.2 Existing Data on Gender and Work Climate for Practicing Anthropologists

Parallel to these developments within committees were a series of AAA-sponsored surveys and surveys initiated by other institutions that focused on work climate issues for anthropologists in and outside of academia. These include:

5. The American Anthropological Association’s 2008 survey of department chairs, producing a power-point report to the Department Chairs Breakfast entitled “What Counts for Tenure: Preliminary Survey Results” by Kathleen Terry-Sharp.
6. In 2009, CoPAPIA in collaboration with The Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs (COPAA) will conduct a survey of alumni from Master’s programs regarding career trajectories and reflections on their educational preparation.
2 METHODS

2.1 Survey Design

The survey instrument went through an eleven month development process (from January to November 2007), guided by a team of five full-time practitioners employed outside of academia (C. Anne Claus, Carol Colfer, Micki Iris, Ed Liebow, and Eve Pinsker), four faculty members of applied anthropology departments (Linda Bennett, Keri Brondo, Carla Guerron-Montero, and Christina Wasson), and Kathleen Terry-Sharp, the Director of Practicing and Applied Programs and Director of Academic Relations for the American Anthropological Association. The survey was piloted in the summer of 2007 with approximately twenty-five non-academic based practitioners, and we made additional edits to our questions drawing from their insights. The principal change was to reduce the survey by 25 questions, as our pilot pool indicated it took between 45 minutes and one hour to complete. The final version of the survey consisted of a total of 78 questions, 58 of which were closed-ended and 20 were open-ended questions. There were eight topical areas covered in the survey, each of which generated data related to perceptions of work climate and the anthropological profession. These included:
- Demographic information
- Educational history and advancement
- Household composition and benefits
- Employment
- Current work environment
- Work and family
- Sexual harassment
- Reflections on the profession

The survey took between 15-30 minutes to complete, depending on the degree to which respondents answered the open-ended questions. See Appendix B for a complete list of survey questions.

2.2 Administration of Survey

The survey was administered online through Zarca in the late fall and early winter of 2007. Invitations were emailed to 6086 members of the American Anthropological Association’s Applied Anthropology email proxy group, sent from applied@aaanet.com November 6-7, 2007 with a reminder on December 14, 2007. In an effort to expand the potential respondent pool, the survey was advertised to a snowball sample through list serve postings and personal contacts. A link to the survey was posted to a handful of list serves known to host conversations by practicing anthropologists, with reminders sent on December 10, 2007. A call for participation was sent to the twenty-six member departments of the Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs (COPAA) and members were asked to circulate the survey with their
alumni. Additionally, members of COSWA and the survey steering committee each distributed the survey to their personal networks, encouraging dissemination to other practicing anthropologists. As a result of these efforts, 437 respondents participated in the survey.

2.3 Sample Limitations

Because the AAA does not have a database of practicing anthropologists employed outside of academia, we needed to use a variety of resources to obtain the sample. Moreover, the AAA’s Applied Anthropology email list and list serves to which our survey was advertised contain both university and college-based anthropologists and anthropologists practicing outside of the academy. Despite explicit instruction in the cover letter asking full-time academic faculty members to exclude them from taking the survey, qualitative responses suggest that a significant number of academically-based respondents responded to the survey. Therefore, we decided in reporting the results of this survey to both present the entire sample and then the results for the subsample of practitioners only.

14.8% (n=65) respondents were academically-based (this is the minimum number of individuals whose qualitative responses offered firm evidence of their current employment status). The unanticipated receipt of such a high number of academically-based respondents helped shape the direction of the analysis. Analysis objectives were expanded to look beyond differences in perceptions of work climate for practicing anthropologists and to include comparisons between academically-based and practicing anthropologists. Academically-based respondents were filtered out in the analysis to be compared with practitioner respondents.

2.4 Qualitative Methods

The survey included 20 open-ended questions covering a range of topics including narrations of career transitions, work climate perceptions and experiences, work-family policies, benefit provision, and opinions of the AAA and the anthropological profession. Content analysis was aided by Atlas-ti, a qualitative data management program. Recommendations for the AAA and comments on the structure of the survey were not included in the qualitative analysis (i.e., Questions 77 and 78 of the survey instrument), but are summarized in Part 5.

The grounded theory approach was used in coding and analyzing the survey responses. First, we read through all of the responses multiple times, before beginning the formal text analysis and coding. Next, we identified analytic categories/themes, memoing as we went along to later discuss the themes in team meetings (i.e. recording observations of the coding to develop new themes and connections (Bernard 2006: 492)). The process was iterative, and our interpretive framework for interpreting the data shifted.
Deductively, we explored relationships between gender, work-family balance, work climate, sector and field of employment, and perceptions of practicing anthropology. In coding, we actively sought out data to support and explain these relationships. During the process of deductive coding, some unexpected themes emerged, such as the effects of areas of research. This, in addition to other findings, led us to code inductively as well. By utilizing both deductive and inductive coding, we were able to become well grounded in the data and capture the full range of themes that emerged.

Due to the richness of the responses, we employed in vivo coding. For instance, the concept “rift” came up again and again in regards to the perceived professional divide between practicing and academic anthropologists. Rather than detracting from the respondents’ meaning by substituting our own choice of words to capture this theme, we used the respondents’ words and labeled the theme “rift.”

Qualitative data leaned more heavily toward women’s perspectives, as reflected by (a) the number of female respondents compared to male respondents (69% versus 31%); and (b) the tendency for more women to respond to open-ended questions. This skewing of a female voice should be kept in mind in reading the analysis. The gender distribution by topic for open-ended questions is given in Table 1. The table demonstrates that female respondents offered qualitative feedback more often than men, although not by a huge percentage margin.

Table 1: Gender Distribution of Qualitative Responses Among Practicing Anthropologists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Topic</th>
<th>Number of Female</th>
<th>Number of Male</th>
<th>Percent of All Female</th>
<th>Percent of All Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gendered Distinctions in Hours Worked (#42)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendered Distinctions in Mentoring (#44)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors Impacting Work Climate (more than Gender) (#50)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/Family Balance (#64)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections on the Profession (#72)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections on the AAA (#74)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections on Career Path (#76)</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These figures are for practicing anthropologists only (n=373). There were 255 female practicing anthropologists and 117 male practicing anthropologists in the sample.

“Rift” addresses the marginalization of practitioners both within the discipline and the AAA.

The figures reported in the table reflect the total number of male and female respondents that chose to write in comments. These figures are for the 373 practicing anthropologists only.
2.5 Quantitative Methods

Exploratory analyses were conducted to examine statistical associations among the variables. All analyses were conducted in SPSS 14.0 for Windows using a chi-square test for independence. This test determines if two categorical variables are related. In the case of two-by-two contingency tables, Yates’ Correction for Continuity (Fisher’s Exact Test) was used to compensate for an overestimate of the chi-square value. Statistical significance of the chi-square tests was determined at the $\alpha = .05$ level. All post-hoc evaluations to determine the direction and magnitude of statistically significant relationships were based on the standard residuals of each cell. Statistics for each contingency table were based on all cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in the table.

Assumptions for non-parametric techniques such as chi-square include random samples and independent observations. Randomness is assumed only within the population of survey respondents. Additionally, the chi-square assumption concerning the minimum expected cell frequency of five was met for each test.

Where necessary, variables of interest in the quantitative analyses were re-coded to quantify qualitative responses (e.g. a response of “no” was converted to 0 and a response of “yes” was converted to 1). In the case of the questions asking about the previous and last career transitions, a response of “upward” was coded as 1, “lateral” as 0, and “backward” as –1. Additional variables were created based on combinations of responses to survey questions. A variable, “terminal degree,” was created by selecting the highest degree from responses to the question asking for all degrees completed. A similar variable, “PhD/Non-PhD,” was created based on whether or not the respondent indicated that they held a PhD.
3 THE SAMPLE AND EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES

This section provides a summary of the sample’s demographics and place of employment. Variables discussed include gender, age, racial, ethnic, educational level, and marital status, and income distribution for the sample, as well as the sector and field of employment, and work activities.

3.1 Sample Demographics

3.1.1 Gender

Our respondent pool reflected a trend the American Anthropological Association has noted elsewhere regarding the feminization of anthropology. Of the 437 respondents to the survey, 300 were females (69%) and 135 (31%) males; two either reported “other” or did not answer. Statistics on AAA membership show a similar gender distribution. As reported in the 2007-08 AAA Guide, of the 699 Ph.D. degrees granted in 2006-07 (reported for the U.S., Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, Mexico, and Finland), 58.7% were females and 41.3%, males. Among AAA members surveyed in 2006, 57% reported they were females, 40.1% males, .1% intersex, 1% other, and 1.8% declined to answer.

3.1.2 Age

Respondent age range was broadly distributed from twenty to over eighty years of age, with the majority of respondents being between 30 and 69 years of age (Table 2).

3.1.3 Ethnicity

Eighty-four percent (n=365) of respondents reported a Caucasian heritage, with 7% (n=35) reporting an African-American, a Hispanic or Latino, or an Asian/Pacific Islander background (8% chose “other” or did not answer the question). The 2006 Census Bureau statistics report this ethnic breakdown of US residents: 80.1% White, 14.8% Latino, 12.8% African American, 4.4% Asian, 1% American Indian or Native Alaskan, and 0.2% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. Additionally, 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total equals more than 100% due to rounding. 421 reflects the number of survey respondents who answered this particular question.
countries were represented in the sample, revealing the extent to which the survey reached a
global base of practicing anthropologists.

3.1.4 Marital Status and Household Composition

Seventy percent (n=306) of the respondents indicated that they were married or had a domestic partner. Another 19% (n=83) were single and another 9% (n=40) were divorced or separated. Looking at these figures by gender, we found that 63% (n=193) of respondents in a partnership were female and 37% (n=113) were male. 84% (n=102) of respondents who were single, divorced or separated were women and 16% were men. While it is the case that the sample was skewed more heavily towards women, the same patterns appear for men and women. Eighty-five percent of male anthropologists were married or in a domestic partnership, 4% were divorced, and 11% were single. Comparatively, 65% of female anthropologists were married or in a domestic partnership, 12% were divorced, and 23% were single.

When we separated practitioners from the academically-based anthropologists who answered the survey, we found that 56% (n=165) of women practitioners were married, 11% (n=31) were divorced, and 18% (n=54) were single. Comparatively, 86% of male practitioners were married, 3% (n=3) were divorced, and 11% were single. In general, male practitioners were more likely than female practitioners to be married. In the 2005 survey, COSWA found a similar pattern for academically-based anthropologists. In particular, men were more likely than women to have spouses or partners (88% vs. 71%, p<.001, n=908) (Wasson et. al., 56: 2008).

The majority (74%) of all respondents lived in households with a partner or a partner and dependent minors. Forty-three percent (n=187) lived with another adult, 31% (n=137) lived with additional adults and dependent minors or children. More male practitioners than female practitioners had dependent children (43% or n=50 vs. 31% or n=79). This gender distribution mirrors that found among anthropologists in COSWA’s academic survey, which reported that men were more likely to have children than women (75% vs. 56%) (p<.001, n=908) (Wasson et. al., 56: 2008). Comparing the two surveys, more practicing anthropologists than academically-based anthropologists reported parenting. However, the questions in each survey were phrased differently: COSWA’s 2008 survey of practicing anthropologists asked about household composition (i.e., did respondents have dependent children living in the household?), whereas COSWA’s 2005 survey of academics asked respondents if they had children. The former did not capture grown children.

Twenty-one percent of respondents (n=90) headed their own household, 3% (n=12) reported heading single-parent households, and another 3% did not answer the question.

---

6 Comparing the two surveys, more practicing anthropologists than academically-based anthropologists reported parenting. However, the questions in each survey were phrased differently: COSWA’s 2008 survey of practicing anthropologists asked about household composition (i.e., did respondents have dependent children living in the household?), whereas COSWA’s 2005 survey of academics asked respondents if they had children. The former did not capture grown children.
3.1.5 **Education**

With regard to education, 64% (n=280) reported that they had completed the PhD. This figure drops to 60% for practitioners only. Eighty-three percent of all respondents held masters degrees; this figure includes those who also completed their doctoral degree. Responses were recoded to pull out individuals whose highest degree was a masters by separating those who reported masters and PhD versus those who reported only a masters degree. The recode process revealed that of the 437, 30% of respondents (n=131) held a masters and 6% held a BA/BS as their highest degree. As a point of comparison, the number of anthropology degrees granted in 2006-07 (US, Canada, UK, Australia, Mexico, and Finland as reported in the 2007-08 AAA Guide) included 10,276 BA/BS degrees (81%); 1709 MA/MS/MAA degrees (13%), and 699 PhD degrees (6%). By way of comparison, in the SMA survey (sample size 224), 70% of the respondents held the PhD or a comparable degree and another 19% held a master’s degree (IMA., MS, or MPH).

3.1.6 **Income**

Personal income levels were normally distributed amongst the entire respondent pool (Table 3), with the largest group, 28% (n=120), earning $50,000-$79,000 (Table 3).7 Significantly more non-PhDs are represented in the $30,000 - $49,999 salary bracket (p<.05), and fewer women than men without a Ph.D. are in the $125,000-$149,999 salary bracket (p=.001). Those in the highest salary bracket ($150,000 +) are significantly more likely (p<.001) to work in the for-profit sector. With respect to ethnic status, of the 46 respondents who identified themselves as non-Caucasian (“Minority”), the majority of the 33 women (66%) are in the $30,000-$79,000 income brackets. In contrast, the 13 non-Caucasian males are broadly spread across income categories from $10,000 to $150,000+. For the practitioners only (Table 4), very similar income patterns are evidenced for men and women as for the entire sample.

---

7 Isolating practitioners did not reveal significant differences in income patterns. The distribution followed the same percentage breakdown as that of the entire sample.
Table 3. Personal Annual Earned Income, Full Sample (n=432)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female Minority</th>
<th>Male Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $79,999</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $124,999</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 +</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 432 of the 437 respondents answered the question about their personal annual earned income.

Table 4. Personal Annual Earned Income, Practicing Anthropologists Only (n=331)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female Minority</th>
<th>Male Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $79,999</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $124,999</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 +</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 331 of the 372 practicing anthropologists responded to the question about their personal annual earned income. Percents do not equal 100% due to rounding.

The majority of respondents in the full sample were the principal contributors to their household income: 40% contributed 81-100% to the total household income; 23% contributed 51-80%; and, 17% contributed approximately half of the total household income. Thus, 63% of respondents
reported contributing over half of the total household income. The income breakdown is the same when looking at the full sample and for practicing anthropologists only.

Nearly half of the respondents (49%, n=212) earned income through two or more sources at the same time over a two year time period (2005-2007); for practitioners only, 48% held earned income from more than one source. Forty-one percent held additional employment to enhance their overall income; 24% held two positions to piece together full-time employment; 7% reported holding two positions due to an overlap in jobs when they made a career transition; and 4% held two positions in order to obtain health insurance. A full 25% listed “other,” the bulk of who explained qualitatively that their multiple income sources were due to the nature of their work as freelance consultants working multiple contracts simultaneously.

Twenty-nine percent of respondents (n=125) provided financial support to individuals not living in their households, with the majority of support (83%) going to a relative. Adult children and elderly parents were the top two categories of people being supported, with 37% of respondents supporting adult children and 31% supporting elderly parent(s).

### 3.2 Employment

#### 3.2.1 Sector of Employment

Thirty-seven percent (n=148) of all respondents were employed in the private or for-profit sector, followed by 32% (n=134) in government, 22% (n=88) in non-profit, 11% (n=44) marked “other” (Tables 5 and 6). With respect to the entire sample, a majority of both men and women worked in the Private/For-profit and Non-profit sectors (59% of the women and 55% of the men) with substantial numbers of both men (34%) and women (29%) working for federal and state government. We should note here that since these respondents include those who are full time academically-based anthropologists, sector of employment would reflect the variation of financial support for institutions of higher education (e.g., State Government for state universities and Non-profit for private universities). For minority respondents, females tended to cluster in the Private/For-profit, Non-profit, and State Government sectors and males were most often represented in Private/For-profit and Federal and State Government sectors.

Among the practitioners, both men and women are spread throughout employment sectors. Minority respondents are more often found in the Private/For-profit, Non-profit, or State Government sectors than in the other employment sectors, but the numbers are so small that it is difficult to make meaningful comparisons with non-minority respondents.

---

8 For the majority of respondents, their primary place of employment served as the main supplier of health insurance: 55% (n=401) provided household health insurance through their employment; 20% (n=81) relied on their spouse or partner; 13% (n=51) shared provision of health insurance with their spouse or partner; 9% (n=38) purchased health insurance; and, 2% (n=9) did not have health insurance.
Table 5. Sector of Employment by Gender and Ethnic Minority, Full Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female Minority</th>
<th>Male Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private/For-profit</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>414</td>
<td></td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Data is reported for 414 cases. Missing cases were deleted.*

Table 6. Sector of Employment by Gender and Ethnic Minority, Practitioners Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female Minority</th>
<th>Male Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private/For-profit</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Data is presented for 356 valid cases.*

In the SMA survey, the 224 respondents reported that they worked in the following employment sectors: 25% government; 18% non-profit organizations; 15% hospitals and similar institutions; 14% consultants; 5% private corporations; and 43% “other” in places such as universities, colleges of public health, and colleges of nursing.

Looking at the associations between sector of employment, income and gender, we found that among all survey respondents, those in the non-profit sector were more likely than those in other sectors to earn less than $10,000, and less likely to earn $125,000 to $149,999 (p<.001). Those in the state and local sectors were more likely than those in other sectors to earn in the mid-range salary bracket ($50,000 - $79,999) (p<.001). Those in the highest salary bracket ($150,000 +) were most likely to be in the for-profit sector (p<.001). Ten percent of survey respondents (n=42) were sole-proprietors. These business owners were most likely to work in the for-profit sector than the non-profit and federal sectors (p<.001). Those who indicated that they worked in the “other” sector were most represented in the 70-79 age group; qualitative responses suggested that these individuals were retired and/or working as consultants (p=<.021).
Among the practitioners, minority women were employed primarily in nonprofit and for-profit sectors. Minority men were employed predominantly in the for-profit sector, yet none were employed by nonprofits or in local government.

Respondents were asked to identify their primary field of employment and work activities (Tables 7 and 8). The results for all respondents presented in Table 7 indicate that most were engaging in multiple fields at once, with those fields reported by at least 10% of respondents to be in education (27%), archeology (23%), cultural resource management (19%), evaluation research (15%), healthcare (14%), environment and natural resources (12%), community development (11%), and organizational training/development (10%). A significant number of respondents (i.e., the third most checked category or 21%) checked “other.” Alternate responses to field of employment were wide and diverse with some respondents reporting employment in a variety of fields. With regard to gender differences for the entire sample, relatively more males than females worked in the field of Archaeology (32% versus 18%). The area where women tended to focus on more often, relative to men is Organizational development and training (12% versus 7%). Very similar percentages of men and women worked in the other fields of employment. Minority males’ fields of employment were widely spread across the categories while minority women reported most often working in Education (14 individuals), Evaluation research (10 individuals), and Organizational development and training (9 individuals).

For practitioners only (Table 8), similar patterns in fields of employment were reported as they were for the entire sample. One difference, however, is that many more fields of employment are reported by at least 10% of the male and female respondents combined among the practitioners. It would appear on the basis of these data that practitioners are employed in highly eclectic areas of employment. As in the entire sample, a larger percentage of men than women worked in the area of Archaeology (31% versus 18%), and a larger percentage of women than men worked in Organizational development and training (12% versus 7%). Minority males were, again, broadly spread across many fields of employment, and minority females tended to cluster in the areas of Education (11 individuals), Evaluation research (9 individuals), Healthcare (9 individuals), and Organizational development and training (9 individuals). Thus, minority respondents reported very similar fields of employment whether they were part of the practitioner sub-sample or the entire sample.
Table 7. Field of Employment by Gender and Ethnic Minority Status, Full Sample: (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>All (n=414)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female (n=292)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male (n=122)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female Minority</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male Minority</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)⁹</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural resource management</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Research</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Natural Resources</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational development/training</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International development</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Consulting</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Impact Assessment</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Banking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹ Reported fields include: administration, advocacy, community, environment, agriculture, health, architecture, business/marketing, technology, design, academia, history, communication (with film and photography), policy, geography, human rights, and planning.
Table 8. Field of Employment by Gender and Ethnic Minority Status, Practitioners Only (check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>All (n=356)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female (n=249)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male (n=107)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female Minority</th>
<th>Male Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural resource management</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Research</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational development/training</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Natural Resources</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International development</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Consulting</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Impact Assessment</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human services</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Banking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Top fields of employment for ethnic minorities were education (n=16), evaluation research (n=12), organizational development (n=10), healthcare (n=11), business (n=9) and community development (n=9).
3.2.2 Work Activities

Among the entire sample, the top five areas of work activity included Research (68%), Planning/program development (34%), Administration (30%), Management (28%), and Evaluation (26%) (Table 9). The fact that Teaching (25%) constitutes the sixth most frequently checked work activity suggested to us that a significant number of academically-based anthropologists completed the survey despite instructions to opt out. The re-coding process to pull out academically-based anthropologists drew upon responses to field of employment (Education) and primary activities (Teaching), as well as qualitative responses.

For the entire sample (Table 9), men and women evidenced similar predominant work activities: Research (70% females and 61% males); Planning/program development (34% females and 32% males); Administration (28% females and 34% males); and Management (25% females and 33% males).

Female minorities most often worked in Research (26 individuals), Teaching (16 individuals), Evaluation (12 individuals), Planning/program development (12 individuals), or Assessment (11 individuals), while minority males were spread throughout the primary work activity areas.

**Table 9. Primary Work Activities by Gender and Ethnic Minority, Full Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>All (n=414)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female (n=292)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male (n=122)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female Minority</th>
<th>Male Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare delivery</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational change</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Program development</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)(^\text{10})</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Multiple answers per participant were possible. As a result, percentages total more than 100%.*

\(^{10}\) Other primary activities included advising, artistry, management, writing, training, directing, development, analysis, fieldwork, fundraising, evaluations, research, and outreach.
For practitioners only, the five most reported primary work activities (Table 10) were Research (67%), Planning/program development (46%), Management (30%), Administration (29%), and Evaluation (28%). This is very similar to the entire samples’ primary work activity emphases, with the exception of “Teaching” (25% versus 18% among the practitioners). It is interesting, however, that Teaching was reported by this many practitioners as a primary work activity. This quite possibly reflects the involvement of practitioners in adjunct faculty positions while holding non-higher education positions. Among the practitioners, both men and women reported working about the same percentage in Administration, Evaluation, and Research, but men reported more often than women that they worked in Planning/program development (64% males versus 37% females) and in Management (37% males versus 27% females). Among minority respondents, males tended to be spread across primary work activities, while female minorities clustered in Research (20 individuals), Assessment (11 individuals), planning/program development (11 individuals), Evaluation (10 individuals), and Teaching (10 individuals).

Table 10. Primary Work Activities by Gender and Ethnic Minority, Practitioners Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>All (n=356)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female (n=249)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Male (n=107)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female Minority</th>
<th>Male Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare delivery</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational change</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Program development</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Multiple answers per participant were possible. As a result, percentages total more than 100%.

"Other primary activities included advising, artistry, management, writing, training, directing, development, analysis, fieldwork, fundraising, evaluations, research, and outreach."
3.3 Summary

In sum, our full sample was predominantly characterized by white women holding the PhD between the ages of 30 and 69. These respondents most typically lived in domestic partnerships (without dependent children), were employed in private/for-profit organizations or in government, and earned $50,000-$79,000 a year. Many of them (49% of the sample) earned income through two or more sources over the previous two year period. While this demographic profile reflects the majority of respondents, the sample included a range of other individuals enabling some comparisons by gender, ethnicity, and work sector. These comparisons are addressed in Parts 4 and 5 of this report.
4 WORK CLIMATE FOR PRACTICING ANTHROPOLOGISTS

This section explores work climate issues for practicing anthropologists, including topics of career satisfaction, mentoring, advancement, and work and family. Where appropriate, comparisons are made with findings about work climate from COSWA’s 2005 survey of academically-based anthropologists. The tables and findings in this section reflect the 373 sample respondents identified to be practitioners (i.e., the 65 academically-based anthropologists were deleted for these analyses).

4.1 Workplace Equity

Respondents were asked to assess gender differences that contributed to work climate at their place of employment which generated their primary source of earned income. Respondents reflected on the number of hours employees work, levels of mentoring, and gender balances in management and administration.

4.1.1 Hours Worked

The majority of respondents (62%) reported equality in the number of hours employees work, with 11% reporting that women worked more hours than men, and only 4% stating that men worked more hours than women. 10% checked “other” (Table 11).

Chi square analyses (with significance determined at $\alpha=.01$) were used to explore distinctions between gender and perceptions of hours worked (as a measure of work climate), with a focus on associations between gender, hours worked, and other variables. While the descriptive statistics indicate relative gender equality in hours worked (62% reported that men and women worked equal number of hours), significant associations were found between gender and sector of employment and gender and age.

---

12 Respondents who checked “other” explained that either a) their workplace consisted of all women employees; b) they were an independent employee (without coworkers); c) their workplace conditions and hours worked varied; or, d) they did not know or thought it was irrelevant/inapplicable (retirees fell into this category as well). Interestingly, while there were 7 (of 37) cases where the employees were all women, zero cases reported all male workgroups.
For example, male practitioners were significantly less likely than women to report that women worked more hours than men in their current work environment, while women were significantly more likely to report that women work more hours than men \( (p<.001) \). Additionally, men and women who are 20-29 years old were more likely to report that women worked more hours than men (significant at the .05 level).

Among women practitioners, one’s employment sector most significantly affected how they reported the equality of work hours for men and women. Those in the federal or state sectors were more likely to report that men worked more hours, while those in the “other” sector were more likely to report that women worked more hours \( (p<.001) \). Women practitioners were also less likely to report that men and women worked equal hours if they work part-time or owned their own business \( (p<.001) \).

Eighty-nine practitioners offered qualitative comments regarding the gendered perceptions about hours worked. These 89 respondents represented 10% of all male and 12% of all female respondents identified as practicing anthropologists. The respondents suggested that while there is variation among the hours men and women work, in the majority of cases, this variation was not due to gender itself, but rather to (1) individual employment responsibilities (83% of responses coded for theme); (2) the domination of one gender in workplace (19% of responses coded for theme); or, (3) familial status (11% of responses coded for theme). Explanation and examples of each theme follow.

**Employment Responsibilities.** The requirements of one’s position and the level of responsibility associated with that position may require that men or women work more hours. While more men appeared to hold higher level management and administration positions, the extent to which this translated into hours worked is not substantiated through qualitative analysis. Both women and men reported, qualitatively, that hours worked were not cleanly associated with gender.

“*Staff levels differ. In big organizations you need to look at who is in management, senior or junior positions, etc. as well as departments. The time worked is not necessarily a function of gender but of position, ambition, and sufficiency of departmental staffing.*”  
(Female, 50-59, Market Research)
“At our office, we don’t see gender as a dividing factor in terms of hours worked. There are other issues that are more important, concerning work experience and how long you’ve been at the firm.” (Male, 30-39, Business, Architecture/Design)

“In international development projects, number of hours worked varies with project. I haven’t perceived major differences in industriousness by gender, although there is a great deal of individual variation.” (Male, 40-49, Archaeology, CRM, Environment)

“People work what they are going to work - doesn't have to do with gender. It has more to do with how committed you are to your job.” (Female, 30-39, Business, Technology)

“I work for an organization where people are committed to the mission. Lots of smart people who could be making a lot more money in the private sector but choose to work here instead. This shows in their dedication and work hours. I have never noticed a gender bias in terms of who works longer hours.” (Female, 30-39, Archaeology, CRM)

**Domination of Workplace by One Gender.** In cases where one’s place of employment was comprised of either mainly men or mainly women, the question of hours worked was irrelevant. Overall, there were more cases where work organizations were staffed solely by women than cases where male employees were the norm.

“There are only two men in the home office; the rest of us are women so it's hard to compare.” (Female, 60-69, Education)

“In the environment where I work, all the employees/workers are women.” (Female, 60-69, Education)

“My office of approx. 30 anthropologists is 80% men. It's hard to compare the work of males and females here because there are so few females.” (Female, 30-39, Archaeology, Forensics)

Interestingly, a handful of respondents indicated that regardless of the gender breakdown of employees, women still appeared to work more time than men. These observations emerged from women respondents.

“The industry in which I am currently employed is dominated by men. I find the women tend to work longer hours and produce more as a means of showing their abilities.” (Female, 50-59, Business, Management Consulting, Technology)

“We are a women-only company at this time. However, we do hire men as consultants and on average believe they do not work as hard.” (Female, 50-59, Consulting)
**Familial Status.** Childcare responsibilities were linked to absence from a formal office environment for both men and women, yet these observations were made solely by women respondents.

“There are very few employees with children. Those who work part time or have flex-time and/or work from home arrangements are those people who either a) have children, or b) are in school. This does not really sway one way or the other.” (p228) (Female, 40-49, Public Health)

“The difference in work among men and women in the company seems very tied to child care commitments. Men and women at the company seem to be fairly egalitarian in their child care practices.” (Female, 40-49, Archaeology, CRM)

Overall, the particular work duties associated with one’s employment position and/or familial responsibilities were considered the greatest factors influencing the number of hours an employee worked, and neither of these was linked clearly to one gender.

### 4.1.2 Mentoring

Similar to number of hours worked, professional mentoring patterns also reveal perceptions of approaching gender parity. Fifty percent of respondents indicated that women and men received an equal amount of mentoring, and 15% indicated that women received less mentoring than men, while only 6% reported that men received less mentoring than women (Table 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women and men receive an equal amount of mentoring, on average</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women receive less mentoring than men, on average</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men receive less mentoring than women, on average</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a sole-proprietor without employees</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td>373</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, despite the reported overall perception that there was gender parity in mentoring, chi-square analyses (significance determined at \(\alpha=.01\)) demonstrate significant associations between balanced mentoring and gender, marital status, business ownership, and sexual harassment.
Women were more likely to report that women received less mentoring than men (p<.001). Divorcees, who were more often women (11% of female respondents vs. 3% of male respondents), were more likely to report that women received less mentoring (p<.01). Employees of state agencies were more likely to report that women received less mentoring (p<.05), while those who worked in the for-profit sector were less likely to report that women received less mentoring (p<.05). This finding applies to both male and female respondents.

Sixty practitioners offered explanatory comments in response to the question about the gendered pattern of mentoring. Twenty-five percent of all female practicing anthropologists and 18% of all male practicing anthropologists chose to provide qualitative data. In cases where respondents indicated (quantitatively) that one gender received more mentoring than the other, qualitative responses often indicated that this was due to the workplace being comprised of one gender or one gender actively seeking mentorship more often than the other. Some respondents observed that mentoring practices were varied by job type (e.g., “Project Directors receive more attention from the boss than do Analysts...”). Others indicated that their work organizations did not offer formal mentoring programs, and therefore employees relied on informal mentoring, which often developed outside of the workplace:

“There is no formal mentoring - some women (like myself) choose to seek this out. I have also been fortunate to secure positions working with female executives - and as a result have long-term relationships with senior executives”. (Female, 40-49, Archaeology, CRM)

“In general, there is very little official mentoring that goes on at my place of employment. Most mentoring is done informally.” (Female, 20-29, Evaluation Research, Healthcare)

Additional content analysis of comments about levels of mentoring points toward reasons why one gender might seek out formal versus informal mentoring. Some suggested that women and men require different forms of mentorship:

“Because of frequently interruptions to their crooked career ladder and life-courses, women need diverse mentoring not necessarily quantitatively but qualitatively different from mentoring for men. For example, they need to learn how to handle POWER and to be effective in powerful positions.” (Female, 30-39, Education)

---

13 COSWA’s 2005 survey of academics found similar gendered patterns for university-based anthropologists. Within academic institutions, men were more likely to have positive experiences in the areas of mentoring and collegiality. Likewise, men were more likely to report that their departments were supportive, providing help in areas such as grant applications, course design and advising.
The above comment hints at gendered differences in negotiating power within work environments. The language used in other responses—and associations of particular behavioral characteristics and allowances afforded to one gender over another—suggests the persistence of subtle forms of gender discrimination within the workplace.

“We still tend to stress making sure that our female staff members assert themselves appropriately. Men and Women are not trained differently, but we tend to pay closer attention to the women.” (Male, 40-49, PhD in Public Health, Private/For-Profit, Health and International Development)

“My experience is that some younger women use subtle flirting to achieve a personal edge in male dominated workplaces. If there were more women in middle/upper positions this might decrease” (Male, 40-49, MA in Anthropology, For-Profit Technology)

“In general I have observed that men work more hours than women. Time off for childcare and mental health leave is more readily given to women. Women get more mentoring than men and are hired with lower qualifications and less experience. Much of the discrimination in favor of women would be unthinkable were it in favor of men.” (Female, Unknown Age, MA in Environmental Archaeology, Nonprofit)

“Our director seems more comfortable giving women direct advice, but with men couching advice in more negotiated terms. The result is that men are at more risk of failing, but are also judged to be more ready for leadership roles because they have demonstrated ‘independent’ decision.” (Female, 40-49, BA in Sociology, For-Profit, Community Development)

Overall, women, divorcees, and employees of state agencies were more likely to report that women received less mentoring than men. Many work organizations did not offer formal mentoring programs, and therefore practitioners had to rely on informal networks to develop mentor-mentee relationships. Finally, women practitioners appeared to benefit from different forms of advice from a mentoring relationship, especially with regard to negotiating power and discriminatory acts (subtle and obvious) that surrounded assumptions of female behavior and qualifications in male-dominated work environments.

4.1.3 Management and Administration

Patterns of gender parity shift when we move from questions of perception (i.e., average hours worked by employees and levels of mentoring) to gender differences in managerial and administrative positions. Of 294 respondents who responded to a question about leadership
positions\textsuperscript{14}, 49\% reported that the majority of top managers and administrators were men, 35\% stated top administration was relatively balanced in terms of gender parity, and 16\% reported that women filled the majority of such positions (Table 13). These findings are consistent with reports on gender distribution in administration and leadership positions within academe as well. A theme that cut across questions of gender parity in management and administration in COSWA’s 2005 survey of academic anthropologists was the continued strength of an “old boy’s network”\textsuperscript{15} (Wasson et. al., 2008). Institutional support in academia as measured by research space also tended to favor male over female academics (p<.001) (Wasson et. al., 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The majority of top managers and administrators are men</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top administration is relatively balanced in terms of gender parity</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of top managers and administrators are women</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>294</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Note: This question (#45) was phrased as a multiple choice that included the three statements listed in the table, an option for sole-proprietors without employees (excluded from analysis), and a write-in “other” category.}

The factors most associated with balanced management at the organizational level include degree earned, income, and business ownership status. Those with a terminal masters degree were more likely to report that the majority of top managers and administrators were women (p<.01). Those earning less than $10,000 were less likely to report that administration was relatively balanced (p<.001). Respondents earning $80,000 to $99,999 were less likely to report that top management was mostly women (p<.001), whereas those with incomes of $150,000 or more were more likely to report that their organization’s top management was mostly women (p<.001).

Business ownership was the strongest predictor of how balanced the management is at both the organizational and division levels (chi square analyses, $\alpha$=.01). Those who owned their own business were less likely to report that management was mostly men (p<.001). Conversely, those who did not own their own business were more likely to report that management was mostly men

---

\textsuperscript{14} 31 respondents either checked the “other” box or left the question blank, and 48 indicated they were sole-proprietors and did not respond further

\textsuperscript{15} Within academic settings, male anthropologists experienced a more positive work environment as measured by perceptions of the effectiveness of university programs and policies, departmental support, and experiences with mentoring and collegiality. The persistence of an “old boys' network” whereby men were more likely to be found in positions of power and to develop relationships primarily with other men appeared to be linked to male’s positive work experiences (Wasson et. al., 2008:8, 78).
(p<.001). It is important to note that more than half of those answering “yes” to questions of sole-proprietorship were women.

Qualitative analysis of 66 responses offered some insight into the gendered dimensions of parity in managerial and administrative positions. While men were overwhelmingly reported to dominate such positions (37 instances), responses indicate a shift toward more women becoming employed in top management roles (20 instances). Certain sectors of employment were mentioned as being particularly male top-heavy, such as engineering, international development organizations, fisheries, military, national park services, and cultural resource management.

At the department or division level, while top positions were reported to be held more often by men (36%) than women (28%), reports of gender equality (35%) were nearly equivalent to those of male-dominance (see Table 14).

### Table 14. Gender Parity In Division or Department Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management is relatively balanced in terms of gender parity</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of managers are men</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of managers are women</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td>280</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This question (#47) was phrased as a multiple choice that included the three statements listed in the table, an option for sole-proprietors without employees (excluded from analysis), and a write-in “other” category.

At the division level, men were more likely to report that management was relatively balanced and less likely to report that management was mostly women (p<.05). Also, those with multiple income sources were less likely to report that management was mostly male, and those with single income sources were more likely to report that management was mostly male. Qualitative data suggests that while men are continuing to dominate senior administration and management, women are moving in larger numbers into middle management. Respondents were split on whether work climate was changing along with increased women in key work positions. Some reported that overt gender discrimination has declined over the last 10-15 years, while others noted its persistence:

“I should point out that while the numbers suggest parity, the male senior managers browbeat the female ones and basically order them around. The male managers are additionally pretty much out of touch with what their largely female middle managers are struggling with on a daily basis: they just do not seem to see the problems and what the women are saying is largely perceived as complaining as opposed to valuable self-critical perspectives on our institution.” (Female, 20-29, Land Conservation)
Overall, sole-proprietors, who were mostly women, were less likely to report men filling senior positions in management and administration, whereas in other types of work organizations, men more often held such positions. While the survey analysis demonstrates that men were continuing to dominate senior positions, women were moving in larger numbers into middle management. Despite rising numbers of women in managerial positions, perceptions of mistreatment (of women by men) continued, although older female respondents suggested significant changes had occurred over the last 10-15 years.

4.1.4 Other Factors Impacting Work Environment

Respondents were asked to report on factors that had impacted their work environment as much or more than gender had. Figures for the entire sample (n=437) show that the two topmost factors reported were age (25%) and family responsibilities (25%), followed by race/ethnicity (13%), sexual orientation (4%), and religion (3%) (Table 15). 12% noted “other” and wrote in factors including education level, background, and seniority/experience as having as much or more impact on one’s current work environment as gender.\(^\text{16}\)

A majority of women and men elaborated their response to the above question: 54% of all male and 60% of all female respondents offered qualitative data across 205 comments. Qualitative data maps onto the top selected categories in the closed-ended question, with most respondents elaborating on family responsibilities (65 responses), age (51 responses), and race/ethnicity (22 responses) as factors that influence work climate. Negative experiences could be intensified given a respondent’s gender, sexual orientation, and/or job type.

\(^{16}\)To a lesser degree, respondents noted that nationality/citizenship, interests or philosophies, disability, flexibility (concerning personal obligations, mobility, and work hours) and specific occupation/specialization/discipline responsibilities had more impact than gender on work environment.
**Family Responsibilities.** The impact of family responsibilities on work environment tended not to be gendered. That is, both women and men were credited with attending to family responsibilities.

“As a single parent, I must juggle family and work responsibilities, and sometimes need to take time off to deal with my children's needs and activities. Other parents in my workplace (male and female, married and unmarried) have similar issues.” (Female, 50-59, Environment and Natural Resources)

“My current company is a small firm headed by an older man with no children (and an unstable personality), and largely staffed by very young men and women with no children. As a father in my mid-30s, I find juggling work with family very, very stressful at times”. (Male, 30-39, Design Research)

“...family responsibilities probably impact my work environment and performance reviews more than gender---I try to limit my work hours as much as possible so I have more time to be with my family and take care of my children. Typically, people who don't work 50-60-70 hours/week don’t get rewarded as well as those who do in my organization. Anthropology itself may hold a stigma.” (Male, 40-49, Education, Health Care)

**Age and Seniority.** Particular fields of employment were noted as giving preferential treatment to older and more experienced employees (e.g., business, military), while other fields (e.g., advertising) were identified as privileging younger employees.

“In international development, often age and the number of years of experience are more valued than level of education or gender.” (Female, 30-39, International Development, Social Impact Assessment)

“This is an organization with a lot of young people (both civilian and military) and that does affect the working environment in subtle ways. Sometimes it is easier for me to get things done simply because I am older. The civilian/military divide in the office makes some differences in terms of treatment. Military folks are valued for their "been there, done that" experience automatically, whereas some of the young analysts who may have just as much overseas experience have to prove themselves. Given that this is a military environment, I suspect it would be uncomfortable for somebody who was outside the middle-American norms for gender roles and sexual orientation. I think the mgt would try hard to squelch any harassment, but I am not sure how successful they could be when half the work force is under the 'don't ask, don't tell' rule.” (Female, 40-49, National Security)
“Some of the conflicts that arise between employees are age related, in the sense that some of the younger employees have not yet learned how to interact in a business environment.” (Female, 50-59, Archaeology)

**Race and Ethnicity.** The third most noted factor impacting work environment was race/ethnicity. Minorities are reported to be underrepresented in top administrative and managerial positions, designated to field work, tech, or support roles.

“The majority of the administration is white while most of the field workers are of color.” (Female, 20-29, Evaluation Research, Healthcare)

“Most senior staff members are White; most admin and support staff are racial/ethnic minorities.” (Female, 30-39, Applied Health Research)

“None of the top managers are non-white, though many middle managers are. I don't know that they won't be able to ascend to top management positions.” (Male, 30-39, Education, Evaluation Research)

“The president of the elected governing body is an African American man, but there are no minority department heads. Some departments are still all white and the growing Latino population in our jurisdiction is not represented on staff.” (Female, 50-59, Archaeology, Community Development, CRM, Museums, Planning)

**Gender.** While the question respondents were answering asked for reflections “other than gender,” gender still emerged as a significant factor influencing one’s work environment, with women facing continued discrimination within the workplace. Being a young woman, in particular, remained challenging in work spheres where white, heterosexual, men continued to dominate. Again, this is compounded by race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation.

“I believe that age and gender equally impact my current work environment. None of my managers are younger than 45 years of age, and none of them are female. I believe that being a young woman impacts the way that my managers respond to me on a professional level.” (Female, 20-29, Archaeology)

“... young, good-looking women are hired and retained even if they don't perform to company standards.” (Female, 50-59, Archaeology)

“... it is very hard for young women to move up. That said, the work environment at this organization is pretty positive. I feel valued and supported inside the organization. Some of our funding, however, is based on partnership with organizations that have very
regressive (hostile) attitudes and behaviors toward women.” (Female, 30-39, Community Development)

“... It took me a long time to assert myself with my (male) supervisor to get a higher wage and to have my requests and opinions acknowledged. He is apparently intimidated by my other supervisor, our PI, who is a woman, about 8 years older than him and has more experience and education than him. He personally doesn't care to be questioned or corrected, especially by women.” (Female, 20-29, Archaeology, CRM, Environment, Business)

**Disciplinary Background.** Disciplinary background is also a source of contention in the workplace, especially when practicing anthropologists become employed in sectors dominated by hard sciences, economics, or business.

“The fact that I am an anthropologist has much more impact on how people see me than my gender, age or sexual orientation (I'm a lesbian). I have had to struggle for respect in my company not because I am a woman, gay, or over 30...I have had to struggle because I am an anthropologist, a social scientist, a person who is not an engineer. This is understandable, and I have earned my colleagues' respect, even from those who doubted me highly when I first joined the organization. But I have done this not by whining or complaining about not being respected - I have earned respect by proving I am useful and the research I do is useful. My colleagues have recognized and value my contributions.” (Female, 40-49, Design Anthropology)

“Basically, if you are not an economist in the Bank, it's up hill all the way -- especially if your field is non quantitative. To deal with this I have learned to "mix narratives with numbers" or in other words, I have become good at using statistics to back up my arguments.” (Female, 60-69, Policy and Country Level Social Analysis)

“Disciplinary orientation - hard sciences and quantitative business and economic approaches from the social sciences are overwhelmingly dominant, humanities and anthropology (though I'm hired AS an anthropologist) are in generally seriously under-represented and disregarded.” (Female, 40-49, Business, Technology)

**Reverse Discrimination.** Some respondents noted ‘reverse discrimination’ based on their organization’s mission, an observation that could apply to race/ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation. Notably, there was only one mention of negative repercussions due to sexual orientation. Comments surrounding the privileging of lesbian or gay employees outweighed comments of discrimination.
“There seems to be a special preference for people with same sex partners.” (Female, 50-59, Archaeology)

“In an organization devoted to AIDS prevention research, sexual orientation was an implicit issue. The route is easiest for gay white males. Racial minorities have the most challenging time succeeding in this environment, though it is possible.” (Female, 40-49, Healthcare)

“I work at [a museum] and feel (quite strongly) that the museum is effectively creating a racialized atmosphere by not allowing non-Indians any possibility of advancement.” (Female, 40-49, Museums)

“Ours is a values based organization, a wonderful place to work, with the world-wide mission of, "Helping people live safer more secure lives", but with a past which did not promote women at the same rate as men. Changing that: First women got jobs as heads of human resources, then operational departments, then of individual businesses, finally some of the heads of human resources are men again (as the reverse discrimination decreases).” (Male, 60-69, Business)

Overall, a variety of factors influence perceptions of work climate for practicing anthropologist. Key factors include gender, family status, race and ethnicity, age, and disciplinary background. In this survey, the impact of family responsibilities reportedly did not fall more on women than men (in contrast to what COSWA found among academics), whereas age did (with young women facing a “chilly climate” more so than young men). Disciplinary background can also impact negatively one’s work climate, especially in sectors dominated by hard sciences, economics, or business. Finally, minorities tended to be underrepresented in top administrative and managerial positions, and were perceived to be more often relegated to field work, tech, or support roles.

4.2 Work and Family

The majority of our sample (66%, n=289) did not have dependent children living in their household. The 34% (n=148) of respondents with dependents, however, offered a significant degree of insight into the topic of work-family balance through 177 qualitative quotations across eleven questions17, which ranged from direct questions about family-friendly work environments to factors contributing to career transitions to questions about healthcare and benefits.

---

17 Questions 15, 17, 23, 25, 42, 51, 55, 58, 64, 66, and 76. Refer to Appendix for complete questions.
4.2.1 Childbirth, Adoption, and Fostering Policy and Practice

Of the 373 practitioners in the sample, less than half (45%, n=168) were employed in organizations with formal policies that allowed employees with infants, newly adopted, or newly fostered children temporary relief from work responsibilities (as compared to 64% for the entire sample). Thirteen percent of practitioners (n=48) worked for organizations without such policies, and a full 42% (n=147) either did not know, or did not respond due to inapplicably of the question to their work situation. Twenty-five % (n=94) of practitioners’ organizations had formal policies granting spouses or partners to pregnant women at least six weeks of paid leave to be taken prior to, during or after childbirth, while 27% did not, and 52% (n=193) of practitioner respondents did not know or did not answer the question.

A small number of work environments had informal practices that enabled employees with infants, newly adopted, or newly fostered children temporary relief (9%, n=33), and some enabled spouses unpaid leave as well (6%, n=21).

4.2.2 Caregiving Policy and Practice

Forty-six percent (n=171) of practitioners worked in organizations where employees were granted unpaid leave to care for family members (i.e., a child, spouse, domestic partner, or elderly parent). Thirty-one percent did not work for organizations with formal policies, and 46% did not respond to the question.

Employment in the federal sector was more likely to provide a family leave policy to both women and men (p<.01), while women employed in the local sector were less likely to have a family leave policy (p<.001).

Informally, 10% of practitioners (n=36) could take time off by drawing on their personal time or sick leave, while 3% (n=11) were unable to do so. Eighty-seven percent of practitioner respondents did not know or did not answer the question.

The above figures suggest that the majority of practitioners in our sample did not have formal care giving policies and practices in their place of employment and therefore must rely upon informal practices to accommodate familial responsibilities. The lack of formality may be associated with sector of employment, sole proprietorship, and/or familial status (without children).
4.2.3 Family-friendly Work Climate

Respondents were asked a series of questions scored on a Likert scale about the degree to which their place of employment accommodated their caregiving responsibilities. Table 16 reflects the percentage breakdown of these questions.

Table 16. Statements Regarding Management of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to manage my responsibilities as a parent with my work obligations.</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am often unable to attend conferences or meetings because of my work responsibilities as a parent or caregiver.</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings and research activities are scheduled in a way that accommodate my responsibilities as a parent or caregiver</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to work from home if I have a sick child without feeling as though my coworkers perceive me as uncommitted.</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99%*</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not equal 100% due to rounding.

While 62% (n=91) reported difficulty in managing responsibilities as a parent given their work obligations, the majority of respondents stated that their employers scheduled meetings and research activities in a way that accommodated their caregiving responsibilities (61%). Qualitative data supports this conclusion:

“We try to make concessions in scheduling, etc. for employees' family responsibilities...”
(Female, 50-59, Archaeology)

“We accommodate the needs of people in terms of child care responsibility, care for sick spouses, etc. At times this is burdensome but people recognize its necessity and avail themselves of such flexibility when necessary.”
(Male, 50-59, Archaeology, CRM)

Qualitative data suggest that although employers scheduled work activities at times that were amendable to their caregiving schedules, some practitioners with dependent children or aging
parents were subject to discrimination by management or coworkers without familial responsibilities.

“Top management in the organization do not have children and do not take care of elderly or ill family members. Neither do I (as yet), but from observation of other co-workers who do, it seems that those individuals with dependents are constantly insinuated to work less hard and less well than others. For instance, one co-worker becomes the butt of snide remarks made by management during staff meetings when she takes sick time off to take her mother to the doctor. Another co-worker is constantly accused of having ‘baby brain’ any time he forgets to do something or makes a minor mistake—these were the same types of minor mistakes he made prior to having the baby a few months ago, but now he is incapable of doing them correctly due to his new status as father. “(Female, 20-29, Community and Organizational Development)

Depending on one’s direct supervisor, there can be a tacit prioritization of personal time off and flexibility in work scheduling for employees w/young children. Those of us w/o small children work longer hours and take on some tasks (or devote higher quality time to some tasks) than co-workers who work definitive hours due to child care. While this can be considered a personal choice, and we are free to take personal leave and exercise time management (discipline) as our co-workers do, it’s undeniable that employers get more value for their employee dollar from those of us who are not parents, even if it’s just in terms of the number of hours logged. (Female, 40-49, Environment)

Those staff members with young families and responsibilities have been slightly ‘outcasted’ (because of their unwillingness to work weekends and evenings). (Male, 30-39, Community Organization, CRM, Environment, Law, Social Impact Assessment)

For the most part, practitioners with dependent children did not work in environments open to children accompanying their parents to the office. Of the 32 quotations coded for content regarding children in the workplace, 84% (n=27) suggested a chilly climate, and 16% (n=5) classified their work environments as “family-friendly.”

Sixty-seven percent of respondents in their comments stated that they were able to work from home to care for a sick child without feeling that their coworkers perceived them as uncommitted. However, among the remaining 33% many reported that neither co-workers nor management were supportive of their working from home to care or taking time off for childcare responsibilities. Some reported that there was variability among coworkers regarding parenting needs:
“Some colleagues are very supportive regarding my children. Some clearly do not like it when I have to bring my child in to work or when I have to take time to deal with my parenting responsibilities.” (Female, CRM and Museums)

Overall, practitioners reported that having children in the workplace was unprofessional and impeded productivity. A work alternative that some practitioners with children sought was employment in organizations that would allow for flexible work schedules, part-time hours, or telecommuting from home (n=12).

“I work primarily from home, which gives me flexibility in regards to my time. If I need to take care of family responsibilities during the day, I put in more hours in the evening or weekend.” (Female, 40-49, Software Process Improvement)

Others had partners who either led or shared caregiving responsibilities (n=8).

“Never having had good childcare at work and personal commitments have meant that my partner and I have always shared childcare. This has been a great experience but one with definite impacts.” (Male, 30-39, Education)

As noted in the last section, and in contrast to what COSWA found with academic anthropologists, we found that constraints on career mobility resulting from parenting were not gender specific.

“The break down is not men versus women--it is family person versus single/no family person. Those of us here past 5 PM are always almost all either single people no kids or senior folks with grown kids. This was the same case in Washington. Men who were family oriented found themselves hitting the proverbial ‘glass ceiling’ as much as family oriented women did. (Family oriented = leave work on time to pick up kids, stay home when they are sick, etc.)” (Female, 40-49, International Development)

Comparatively, for academic women, the ‘glass ceiling’ was often linked to women carrying a ‘double burden’ of work plus childcare and household responsibilities, which was cited as hindering professional advancement. Academic men, on the other hand, were not observed to be disadvantaged as a result of family obligations (Wasson, et. al., 2008).

Overall, both male and female practicing anthropologists did not report “family-friendly” work environments, as reflected in both policy (e.g., less than half were employed in organizations with formal leave policies) and practice (e.g., a perceived “chilly climate” for employees who take time off to attend to familial responsibilities). However, practicing anthropologists did report that the scheduling of work activities was amendable to caregiving schedules, and
alternatives to the traditional 9-5 office work model were available that enabled an improved work-family balance, such as telecommuting and flexible hours.

4.3 Summary

In sum, while the descriptive statistics report relative gender equality in hours worked and mentoring – signs of a positive work climate - qualitative data suggest some areas needing improvement.

Qualitative data suggest that mentoring relationships are less often developed for women than for men. Moreover, many practicing anthropologists work for organizations that do not offer formal mentoring programs, and therefore employees rely on informal networks to develop mentor-mentee relationships. Finally, women practitioners may benefit from different forms of advice from a mentoring relationship, especially with regard to negotiating power and discriminatory acts (subtle and obvious) that surround assumptions of female behavior and qualifications in male-dominated work environments.

The distribution of women and men in management and administration also showed a gendered pattern. Certain sectors of employment are considered particularly male top-heavy, including engineering, international development organizations, fisheries, military, national park services, and CRM. Minorities tend to be underrepresented in top administrative and managerial positions, and are perceived to be more often relegated to field work, tech, or support roles. While the survey analysis demonstrates that men are continuing to dominate senior positions, women are moving in larger numbers into middle management. Finally, despite rising numbers of women in managerial positions, perceptions of mistreatment (of women by men) continue, although older women respondents suggest significant changes have occurred over the last 10-15 years.

In addition to gender, a variety of factors influence perceptions of work climate for practicing anthropologists, including family status, race and ethnicity, age, and disciplinary background. Age is a factor that can cut both ways; at times and in certain fields of employment (e.g., international development, national park service, the military), older and more experienced employees are preferred, whereas in other fields (e.g., advertising), younger employees are preferred. Young women, however, are singled out more so than young men as faced with a “chilly climate” in a variety of employment fields. Disciplinary background can also impact negatively one’s work climate, especially in sectors dominated by hard sciences, economics, or business.

With respect to a “family-friendly” work environment, practicing anthropologists report this area to be weak both in policy and practice. Less than half of the practitioners in the sample were employed in organizations with formal leave policies, and therefore the majority of employees
relied on informal practices to attend to familial responsibilities. Moreover, while managers are reported to schedule work activities at times that do not conflict with caregiving, practicing anthropologists perceive animosity from co-workers without such responsibilities. Observations about the impact of family responsibilities on hours worked or perceptions of work climate were not gendered; both women and men are reported as facing the same issues in achieving a work-family balance.
5 PRACTICING ANTHROPOLOGY

This section is focused on understanding practicing anthropologists: Who are they? What do their career trajectories look like? What are their needs as a general group, and how do these differ from the needs of academically-based anthropologists? How do they perceive their work is received by the discipline of anthropology in general, and within the AAA in particular? What could the AAA do to better serve practicing anthropologists? Across all of these questions, our focus is on gendered distinctions between female and male practitioners. There are 3 subsections. First, we trace the career trajectories of practicing anthropologists. Second, we explore perceptions of the value the work of practicing anthropologists is given within our discipline and largest professional organization (AAA). The results of our qualitative data analysis reveal a perceived "rift" between academically-based and practicing anthropologists within the discipline. This rift is explored in the third section. Sprinkled throughout are ten profiles of practicing anthropologists, selected to represent the diversity of experiences within our sample.

5.1 Career Transitions

The 2006 NAPA Bulletin, *Making History at the Frontier: Women Creating Careers as Practicing Anthropologists* and COSWA’s 2006 AAA invited session “Critical Intersections: Women Practicing Anthropology Beyond the Ivory Tower” initiated a conversation about women practitioners. Contributors clearly pointed out the AAA’s knowledge gap about the career trajectories of practitioners in general. The stories shared by the female practitioners in the Bulletin and AAA session were connected by one commonality: that of practitioners taking a “spiral path” (Wali 2006) of creative navigation into the world of practice. In short, linear career trajectories are the exception rather than the norm for practicing anthropologists; this is a fundamental distinction from the expectations and experiences of academically-based anthropologists. In an effort to contribute to our understanding of the varied paths of practicing anthropologists, respondents were asked to share how they secured their first position as well as to characterize their last two career moves (as being upward, lateral, or backward).

5.1.1 Initial Job Searching

When asked about helpful contacts in obtaining an initial job, respondents attributed assistance from faculty members in anthropology departments (20% of the cases); connections from previous jobs (17%); internships or volunteer work (13%); alumni of anthropology departments (10%); alumni or faculty of university/college programs outside of anthropology (9%); family connections (7%); and membership of non-anthropological professional organizations (6%). Thirteen percent indicated “other,” and qualified their responses with (a) contacts made through work (e.g., informants, colleagues, scholars, other professionals, mentors, and Internet postings), (b) attendance at workshops and colloquiums, (c) friends, or (d) they did not have any contacts (Table 17). In essence, networking through faculty, previous employment, or internships was
essential for most respondents as they searched for positions as practicing anthropologists. This pattern suggests that anthropology programs should emphasize networking skills with students and help facilitate their learning to expand their professional contacts during the time they are students.

Table 17. In getting initial jobs when starting a career as a practicing anthropologist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty from anthropology departments</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections from previous jobs</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship or volunteer work</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni of anthropology departments</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni or faculty of university/college programs outside of anthropology</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family connections (including friends or business associates of family or spouse connections)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of non-anthropological professional organizations</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology LPOs (i.e., local practitioner organization, such as WAPA)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPA members and/or the NAPA mentorship system</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td>877</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple answers per participant were possible. As a result, percentages total more than 100%.

The above figures demonstrate that networking contributes significantly to securing a position as a practicing anthropologist, a point reinforced in respondent narratives of their career paths (e.g., “…connections have been key to every new job I have secured”). Moreover, keeping anthropology departments linked into employment opportunities beyond the academy appears to be as critical as maintaining relationships that derive from work experiences.

5.1.2 Transitions

Respondents were asked to categorize their last career transition as “upward,” “lateral,” or “backward.” Fifty-nine percent of respondents characterized their last career transition as an upward move in terms of their professional trajectory, while 27% reported a lateral

Table 18. Last Career Transition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upward</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backward</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other / did not answer</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td>373</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
move, 5% moved backward, and another 9% indicated “other” or left the question blank (Table 18).

Statistical analyses resulted in some expected findings with regard to career transitions. For instance, respondents in the older age groups (60-69 and 70-79) were less likely to make upward career transitions (p<.01), which probably is an indication of approaching or active retirement age.

Three hundred and twenty-two respondents offered qualitative narrations about their more recent career transition. Four general thematic categories emerged in the qualitative analysis which shed light on career moves: (1) job security and advancement (36%, n = 115); (2) on the job quality of life (36%, n=115); (3) work-family balance (9%, n=29) and, (4) limited career options (11%, n=36). The first two categories received significant attention (of equivalent weight) by respondents; while the final two code families were mentioned less often. While the latter two were mentioned less often in narrations about most recent career transitions, these themes emerged in the analysis of other questions as important factors that also impact the career paths of anthropologists and, therefore, warrant attention.

(1) Job Security and Advancement refers to one’s ability to move up the career ladder, either within an organization or throughout one’s entire career (i.e., moving up within the discipline). This code family captures the significance of increased salary, benefits, and full-time work in making career decisions, as well as the pursuit of employment opportunities that are deemed to bring greater prestige or status. The following quotations are illustrative of this theme.

“I wanted to move up in the company I was already working at and make more money. I also wanted to utilize my minor degrees in English and Studio Art. I am still with the same company 9 years later. They have treated me and my family wonderfully. (Female, 30-39, Archaeology, ” CRM)

“I have worked for the federal government since completing my Ph.D. The upward move was a promotion, which involved a pay raise in recognition of duties I was already doing.” (Female, 40-49, Environment and Natural Resources, Social Impact Assessment)

“I decided to accept a full-time position with the company I was working with seasonally because it was unusual to be offered such an advanced position, given my short professional experience. The benefits were pretty good, too. It kept me working for this company. If I hadn't been offered the position, I would have gone to work with other CRM firms. It was an opportunity to get a lot of experience, to make connections and to beef up my CV.” (Female, 20-29, Archaeology, CRM)
According to these data, practicing anthropologists can accomplish advancement through professional development (e.g., acquiring additional skills, expanding the scope of established skills, continuing education); networking within their current organization and/or the discipline; increasing one’s level and breadth of experience; influencing public policy, the discipline, theory, or the wider society; or increasing one’s level of job responsibility and/or achieving greater job security. The pursuit of these skills is linked to the next code family, which in contrast cuts across respondents who classified their last career move as “upward” and those who classified their last move as “lateral” or “downward.”

(2) Quality of Work Life refers to the relationship between work environment, the level of satisfaction with one’s professional trajectory, and how well one’s work environment suits his/her personal life. Career decisions based on quality of work life encompass finding an even distribution of pros and cons within one’s career. They also take into account working with compatible colleagues, flexibility in control over projects, work schedules, and the ability to work from home. Additional considerations for a positive quality of work life include employment in a desired geographic location, working within one’s field of interest, working for a reputable organization, access to professional development opportunities, and increased level of responsibility. Many personal career narrations illustrated the variety of factors that go into making an employment move, such as the following example from an individual who balanced her skill set and interests, workplace environment and organization’s prestige, with salary and benefit considerations (thus cutting across two thematic coding areas: quality of work life and job security and advancement).

“I was working in survey research for the federal government and found it particularly unsatisfying. I wanted a job that would allow me to blend my anthropological skills with my quantitative/survey research background. I also wanted to work in a field that I used to work in, program evaluation, working on cross-site evaluations of government programs, utilizing qualitative methods. I found a job at a program evaluation firm focusing on public health and child welfare. This move was upward because my salary increased, although not by a lot. My position is about at a similar level. I consider this move to be upward because I work in a better office environment with great benefits in a firm with a very respectable reputation.” (Female, 20-29, Evaluation Research)
Within the quality of life code family, pursuing employment that maps onto one’s interests was the single most-cited reason for transitioning jobs (n=57), be it classified as an “upward,” “lateral,” or “backward” transition. Examples include:

“After co-operating a small business primarily focused on spatial analysis for land use planning, I had the opportunity to combine my business and professional interests as a projects manager for a private cultural resources consulting firm.” (Female, 50-59, CRM)

“After finishing my M.A., I moved from temporary-worker status at a Federal agency to a staff position at a state agency. The state position afforded me stability, a specific area of geographical focus, and an opportunity to work on research projects in my specific area of expertise and interest.” (Female, 20-29, Archaeology)

(3) **Work-family balance** refers to family issues that may affect one’s professional trajectory and how professional demands may affect family life. Responses coded for this theme reflect career choices where individuals made decisions regarding their careers as members of a household unit (as opposed to individual agents). Obtaining a work-family balance is accomplished through maintaining geographic proximity to family members (including one’s spouse or partner), obtaining a flexible work schedule, and the possibility of telecommuting to accommodate childcare responsibilities. Overall, the work-family theme revealed that a multitude of factors are simultaneously at play when job-seeking as a member of a familial unit, exemplified by the following quotation:

“Family circumstances dictated that dissertation fieldwork in Africa (as was planned) would not be possible. The position would allow me to practice anthropology, pay the bills, have health insurance and live in our preferred region of the country, while continuing work on my PhD part time.” (Female, 30-39, Medical Research)

Similar to COSWA’s survey of academic anthropologists, female practicing anthropologists were more likely than men to make career choices to accommodate caregiving, spousal employment, and/or to maintain a familial support network. Academic anthropologists reported slower professional progression and a higher likelihood that their careers would be interrupted due to familial obligations (p<.001) (Wasson et. al., 2008).
(4) **Limited Options** refers to taking a work position as first-time employment, as a result of structural reorganizations, or due to other forces that limit one’s ability to choose between career opportunities. This code theme brought out factors influencing practicing career fluidity such as the instability of positions funded through soft money, the potential for private companies to reorganize and phase out lines, and the effects of one’s supervisor moving research teams to new organizations. For example:

“I went directly from graduate school into a well-paying federal job as a forensic anthropologist and have kept this position for over eight years. I got very lucky.” (Female, 30-39, Archaeology and Forensics)

“I was laid off from a demographic research organization due to lack of funding for qualitative research.” (Female, 40-49, Healthcare)

“[My] position with [the company] was eliminated. (Female, 50-59, Archaeology, CRM)

“[I] followed my manager to a new position within the same corporation.” (Female, 30-39, Business, Technology)

“I had lost my previous position through budget cuts.” (Female, 40-49, Archaeology, CRM)

This theme also captured recent anthropology PhDs who enter practicing environments due to the lack of academic positions, such as the following:

“I had applied for many academic jobs with no success, and I was offered a senior position at a CRM firm that would allow me to conduct substantive research. I accepted the position, even though it meant moving to another state, because there were so few opportunities for me.” (Male, 40-49, Archaeology, CRM)

As the above discussion demonstrates, practicing anthropologists face a variety of constraints that influence their career paths, from structural forces to personal levels of satisfaction. In negotiating one’s professional development, these balancing acts may also be understood as tradeoffs.

5.1.3 **Tradeoffs**

While the statistical analyses did not reveal any surprising significant patterns for upward and lateral career moves, significant relationships between backward transitions and other variables were found, especially for women. For instance, respondents who classified their most recent
career transition as “backward” stated that “if they could do it all over again,” they would not make the same choice to become a practicing anthropologist (p<.001), a relationship that is more significant among women. Chi-square analysis showed that women who made a backward transition are much more likely to be without a family leave policy (especially a formal policy) (p<.05), a significant association for women, but not for men. This finding raises questions around the relationship between gender, economic autonomy, and dependency on a partner for benefits.

In some cases practicing anthropologists were willing to make backward or lateral transitions to gain a benefit they perceived to outweigh the cons. Common reasons for such career transitions included access to better benefits, working for an organization that is more ethical than the previous employer, more flexibility, and area of research. At times, one would take a pay cut in order to take work that is more rewarding, such as leaving a government organization to work for a NGO. For instance, the following respondents suggested their moves brought higher job satisfaction:

“I moved from being the CEO of a state historical society to being the president of a small non-profit developing a grassroots visitor center in my community. I was motivated to move because of the community redevelopment aspect of the project. I had been working in an adjacent state and the new project was in my home community.” (Female, 50-59, Education, International Development, Museums)

“In moving from university teaching to consulting, it was backward in terms of pay, benefits, and job security. It was upward in terms of job satisfaction.” (Female, 60-69, Evaluation, International Development, Social Impact Assessment)

Overall, the main factors impacting the career paths of practicing anthropologists included obtaining job security, professional advancement, the search for on-the-job satisfaction, or the pursuit of a work-family balance. In some circumstances, career options were limited by structural forces like company reorganizations or cutbacks. For our sample, initial entry into the world of anthropological practice (beyond academia) was facilitated by networks that began in anthropology departments. Keeping anthropology departments linked into employment opportunities beyond the academy was a critical factor.

5.2 Perceptions of Respect of Practicing Anthropology

This section reviews respondent perceptions of the respect their work is afforded by the anthropology profession in general, and the AAA in particular. Respondents often conflated “profession” with “discipline” and “the AAA.”
5.2.1 Does the Profession Take Practicing Work Seriously?

In response to a Likert scale question about the extent to which the anthropology profession takes the work they do seriously, 39% (n=148) felt their work was not taken seriously, 21% (n=80) were neutral on the topic, and 44% (n=145) felt their work was taken seriously (Table 19).

Table 19. The anthropology profession takes seriously the work that I do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>373</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square analyses were used to explore associations among sentiments about how seriously the profession took their work and other variables, with significant findings appearing with the relationship between perceptions of the profession and income level, sector of employment, marital status, presence of dependent children, and sexual harassment.

Those who reported that the profession did not take their work seriously were in higher salary brackets (p<.05). At the same time, we found a significant relationship between those who felt the profession did take their work seriously and employment in the federal sector (p<.05). Those neutral on this question were more likely to hold only a bachelor’s degree (p<.01), which may be because these individuals had not had as much experience working in the field and did not feel as qualified to respond.

Significantly, familial status was associated with whether or not respondents felt the discipline took their work seriously. Divorced women were more likely to feel that the discipline did not take their work seriously (p<.05) than were all men and women respondents (including both those who were divorced and those in partnerships). Practitioners with dependent children strongly agreed that they were taken seriously (p<.05). This latter finding is even more significant among women (p<.01).

In their comments, respondents gave broad overviews of their sense of how anthropology as a profession views the work that they do. With regard to organizational support, positive remarks were made about NAPA, SfAA, COSWA, and LPOs. For example, NAPA was described by a female community-based researcher as “doing yeoman’s work to promote applied work.” Other than these organizations, however, relatively little positive is said about support from the AAA itself (a theme developed in the next section).
Respondents identified several negative consequences of the profession (or “discipline” as some respondents prefer as a term) historically at least not recognizing the importance of the work of practitioners. These consequences fall into many categories: (1) misdirection in the education and training of students; (2) the profession of anthropology becoming outdated; (3) elitism in the discipline; (4) lack of a focus on collaboration; (5) relatively little impact of the discipline on the wider society; (6) academic career being a model of success, compared to a practicing career; and, (7) lack of equitable opportunities for practitioners.

(1) Misdirection in the education and training of student:
A concern of respondents is that undergraduate and graduate anthropology students are not being prepared for careers when they graduate because most programs do not focus on or encompass applied and practicing anthropology within their curricula.

“As a practitioner I found it impossible to get the type of research training in my MA in Public Anthropology program that would enable me to find a position as a social science analyst. My attempts to get quantitative research courses were met with ‘we do participant observation not numbers.’ Unfortunately, nobody hires participant observers.”
(Female, 50-59, Human Services)

(2) The profession of anthropology becoming outdated:
Connected to the prior concern about education and training of students, some respondents saw the discipline as too tied in with the way in which anthropology was practiced and taught many decades ago and has not caught up with the times.

“Anthropology as a profession is still chained to a grossly outdated model of university-driven behavior.”
(Male, 40-49, Human Services)

“The anthropology profession is academicentric.”
(Female, 60-69, State Government)

(3) Elitism:
Respondents addressed problems of restricting students’ vision of where they might study and what kinds of careers they might enter.

PROFILE #3
is a US citizen in her 50s, married, holds a PhD in cultural anthropology, and worked as an associate research scientist before forming her own consulting company in business and management. She feels that academic anthropologists do not take the time to learn and teach their students about applied anthropology when anthropological training can provide a unique and valued perspective in understanding programs, organizations, and policies. Feeling that the AAA is dominated by academic interests and slow to serve practicing anthropologists, she dropped her membership but has missed her NAPA colleagues.
“Stop telling your student that they’ve failed if they don’t end up at Berkeley, Chicago, or Harvard.” (Female, 30-39, Business, Technology)

“The attitude of the profession toward applied, practicing or practical research is dismal and actually worse in 2007 than in 1987, 1977, or 1967 (when I started). Oddly this is in inverse proportion to the opportunities and benefits of working outside the academy or the traditional career paths defined by so much of anthropological ‘education.’” (Female, 50-59, Market Research)

(4) Lack of focus on collaboration: Most students, according to respondents, do not learn how to do collaborative work, and that is a major drawback in both getting jobs and in being effective in those positions. This is a reflection of the discipline itself being so rooted in individualized field work and lack of experience conducting team based research and projects.

“The anthropology profession is insular and, in general, has trouble collaborating with other disciplines.” (Female, 30-39, Museums)

(5) Little impact on the wider society: As with the discipline—or profession—being outdated, it was recognized that because anthropology does tend to be so insular and self-focused, it has less impact on wider developments in the society than could be possible if it were not so insular.

“The anthropology profession values academic achievement, but this is not really where the action is. The ability to get out of this sheltered environment, into the real working world, is where anthropology can have broadest impact – not just talking amongst ourselves.” (Female, 30-39, Geography)

(6) Academic career being the model of success, in comparison with a practicing career: This results often times in very unpleasant experiences for practicing anthropologists when they interact at meetings, for example, with academic anthropologists. The “academic model” as being the preferred career trajectory is often communicated to students who are in the midst of making long-term career decisions.

PROFILE #4
is a US citizen in his 30s, married, holds a PhD in anthropology, and works as an administrator and teacher in the fields of archaeology and education. He took on a position directing a research and development group and now focuses on research management and strategic influence. While he enjoys working outside of academia and having an impact on his company, he feels that instead of respect he receives scorn and skepticism from the AAA and academically located anthropologists because of his nonacademic position and that his industry affiliation marks him as “immoral.” Nevertheless, he feels that his work allows more fieldwork, more intellectual freedom, and more impact than any academic position would offer.
“The ways range from obvious snubs to lack of respect for equivalent credentials to structural decision, to lack of understanding of what applied/practicing anthropologists do, to failure to even seek out that information (especially professors).” (Female, 50-59, Business, Management Consulting)

“I was surprised at negative comments and attitudes I observed at the recent AAA conference regarding practitioners and the work that they do. Those comments and attitudes came primarily from doctoral students who hope to go into academia.” (Female, 30-39, International Development, Social Impact)

“I dropped out of the AAA and most of the Anthropology groups long ago as they are so oriented towards academics that they didn’t apply to a woman who owned a small business. There is a huge gap between academic and practicing anthropologists.” (Female, 60-69, Community Development, Evaluation Research)

(7) Lack of equitable opportunities for practicing anthropologists: All the way from publication possibilities, access to publications, and representation within the AAA, respondents saw a strong theme of inequality for practitioners within the discipline.

“I think those of us who work solely outside of academia are often “forgotten” at conferences, etc. We are the true practitioners,” (Female, 50-59, Evaluation Research, Healthcare)

“I have to struggle for things like access to anthropology literature since I do research at an institution without a university affiliation. Academic based anthropologists don’t know how easy they have it in terms of research, peer support, etc.” (Female, 50-59, Evaluation Research, Healthcare)

“It looks like we practicing anthropologists have moved from an almost pariah state to one that is somewhat grudgingly and under economic pressure given space at the meetings and in publications.” (Male, 30-39, Evaluation Research, Healthcare)

Overall, practicing anthropologists did not feel valued by the anthropology profession or discipline, which were perceived as catering primarily to academic anthropologists. Negative experiences with the broader discipline were perpetuated through student mentoring relationships. Anthropology students were advised into academic lines as priority positions, with non-academic placements treated as second class, or not even acknowledged as a possibility. The devaluing of practicing anthropology was reflected in lack of training and preparation for applied research. Practicing anthropologists in the highest income brackets reported the most
uneasiness with the extent to which the profession values the work that they do. This may relate to the historical divide between applied and “pure” anthropology, the discipline’s ties to colonialism and debates over conducting anthropological research for private industry (Baba forthcoming). In contrast, anthropologists employed in the federal sector did feel that their work is valued by the profession.

5.2.2 AAA Service to Practitioners and Academicians: How Balanced Is It?

Respondents were asked their opinion of the degree to which the AAA treats academic and practicing anthropologists equally. 63% (n=228) of respondents felt there was a lack in equity in the treatment of academic and practicing anthropologists by the AAA, and 28% (n=94) were neutral in their response. Only 12% (n=42) felt there was equity in AAA treatment (Table 20).

As the data in Table 16 demonstrate, overwhelmingly respondents did not view the AAA as serving the two constituencies equally well: 63% indicated that they either strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement that the “AAA served the two groups equally.” While the numerical responses and supporting comments were predominantly critical of the AAA in terms of its service to practicing anthropologists, analysis of the 118 respondents who qualified their responses with text revealed that some respondents did see some positive changes in the AAA whereby the needs of practicing anthropologists were being met or on the way to being met, and others identified needs that the AAA could address. Forty percent of all female practicing anthropologists and 34% of all male practicing anthropologists in the sample offered qualitative comments. In total, qualitative analysis revealed 9 themes, five of which contained negative content (64% of respondents, n=76), two contained positive content (20% or n=24 respondents), and 15% of respondents (n=18) identified needs that the AAA could address.

**Table 20. The AAA serves academic and practicing anthropologists equally**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>364</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Total equals 364 rather than 373 due to 9 missing values.*

**Positive Themes:** Two themes emerged that indicated some, albeit limited, positive views of the AAA with regard to services for practicing anthropologists: that the AAA treats all anthropologists equally (6 responses), or that the AAA is changing to become more inclusive in recent years (24 responses).
(1) **Viewing the AAA as treating all members equally:** Some respondents felt all anthropologists belong equally to the AAA.

“We are the AAA at some level, and I think any individual gets what they give.” (Female, 60-69, Education)

(2) **Positive changes in recent years:** The AAA was acknowledged for recent changes to better incorporate the work of practicing anthropologists in publications, sessions, and leadership.

“The AAA is by and large moving in the right direction. It is most noticeable in the contents of the Anthropology News over the past several years and more papers along those lines as well.” (Female, 30-39, Management Consulting)

“I do think there is a slightly greater degree of attention and interest more recently as witnessed by sessions at the AAA, AAA leadership, intersections between more mainstream and theoretical anthropological works (e.g., journals) and the interests of engaged/practicing realms of work.” (Female, 40-49, Business, Technology)

**Critiques:** In critiquing the AAA in a more negative light, many different types of observations of the AAA were offered by respondents. Of the 100 quotations coded for critiques, the main themes to emerge are: (1) the AAA’s academic orientation (59 responses); (2) the organizational structure of the AAA (17 responses); (3) discrimination regarding area of specialization in anthropology and focus of research (11 responses); (4) the cost of membership in the AAA and the expense of attending the annual meeting (9 responses); and (5) the AAA as an organization and the discipline in general being insular (4 responses).

(1) **AAA’s academic orientation:** Similar to the profession as a whole, the AAA was cited for being oriented largely to academic anthropologists.

“The AAA is primarily a scholarly research organization. Its members are primarily academics.” (Male, 50-59, Archaeology, Environment)

**PROFILE #5**

is a US citizen in his 50s, holds a PhD in anthropology, and worked for thirty years as a researcher in the fields of archaeology and cultural resource management. He then accepted a teaching position that allowed him to continue his practice while sharing experiences with students. He feels that the AAA has made positive steps in order to provide more services to practicing anthropologists, yet there is still more to be done.
“The historical and current hostility of academic anthropologists to practicing anthropologists will continue to undermine the field as a whole.” (Female, 40-49, Healthcare)

“The AAA…is deeply committed to the perspective and issues of traditional academic anthropology. Period. There is little knowledge of, or interest in, how anthro/social science can inform professional work outside of the university setting.” (Female, 40-49, Environment)

(2) **AAA’s organizational structure:** AAA sections and committees were described as lacking sufficient representation from practicing anthropologists in leadership positions.

“How many members of the Executive Board of the AAA are non-academically located? How about on the editorial board on AE or CA? … If the majority of our graduates are bound for non-university appointments, when will our governing body reflect that?” (Male, 30-39, Archaeology, Education)

“The AAA is still very much an academic focused organization. Practitioner interests are only voiced by a single section.” (Female, 30-39, for-profit, technology field)

“I have discontinued my membership this year because I feel like the AAA is moving way, way too slowly in addressing the needs of practicing anthropologists.” (Female, 40-49, Archaeology, CRM)

(3) **Discrimination regarding area of research:** The AAA was depicted as including certain fields of practicing anthropology, while neglecting others (e.g., physical, business, and CRM).

“I think the AAA serves practicing CULTURAL anthropologists, although not as well as academic cultural anthropologists. However, practicing PHYSICAL anthropologists are not on the association’s radar at all.” (Male, 50-59, for-profit, physical anthropology)

“Rarely do CRM research results get much in the way of attention.” (Female, 30-39, Education)

“I have seen very little for practicing anthropologists in business consulting” (Male, Archaeology, CRM)

(4) **Cost of membership and attendance of the annual meeting:** Membership fees and costs associated with attending annual conferences were seen as being unaffordable for many practicing anthropologists who may not have professional development funds to cover such expenses.
“The AAA is a waste of time, too expensive and disorganized.” (Female, Age unknown, non-profit, Healthcare)

“For most practicing anthropologists, there is no outside economic support to attend meetings and do professional service.” (Female, 50-59, International Development, Human Rights)

“Many practicing anthropologists don’t have professional development funds to use for membership fees.” (Female, 30-39, Public Health)

(5) **Insularity of the AAA and the discipline:** The AAA’s public reach was depicted as limited and meeting sessions were perceived to lack relevance to broader societal issues.

“Talking amongst ourselves means we do not always talk with others—but this is the only way we can make anthropology truly relevant and take advantage of our expertise and understanding of how culture works to impact and change the world around us.” (Female, 30-39, Geography)

“The AAA sessions I did attend seemed so ivory-tower and divorced from reality.” (Female, 60-69, Education)

**Needs:** Some respondents (n=18) addressed the needs of practicing anthropologists that could be met by the AAA and some saw real possibilities for the future. In particular, they noted (1) the need to clarify the identification of practitioners; (2) the need to emphasize and value interdisciplinary work; (3) the need to promote equal representation in publications and access to publications; and (4) the potential to provide better guidance to students:

**Profile #6**

is a US citizen in her 40s, married, is working on obtaining a PhD in socio-anthropology, and worked as a planning/program developer for healthcare and organizational development. She took on this position after relocating with her husband and finding it difficult to obtain a position with room to grow without a PhD. She now works as a consultant in public health. She feels that the AAA had a history of favoring academics but now shows a greater emphasis on practitioner careers. Joining a local practitioner group sparked her interests and she is now an enthusiastic AAA member.

“The need to clarify the identification of practitioners:

There was a lack of clarity on the range of occupational roles that practicing anthropologists find themselves in.

“Academic anthropologists often don’t truly understand what practitioner anthropologists do.” (Female, 30-39, Museums)
“Since the realm of practicing anthropology is so broad, what counts for some would be meaningless for others.” (Female, 40-49, Business, Technology)

(2) The need to emphasize and value interdisciplinary work: Interdisciplinary work and accessibly of research results were reported as being critical to broadening the reach of practicing anthropologists.

“If anthropologists really want to have more of an effect on cross-cultural understanding, and the policies and practices that affect the people we work with (especially indigenous peoples and members of subcultures within industrialized countries), then more of the results of ethnography and theoretical and ethical paradigms need to be readily accessible to practitioners of other fields.” (Female, 40-49, Healthcare)

“I think that applied anthropologists should be encouraged to write articles and create sessions that are centered on cross-disciplinary theory, that embed anthropology in a broader theoretical framework.” (Female, 30-39, Museums)

(3) The need to promote equal representations in publications and access to publications: AAA publications appeared to prioritize publication of non-applied work and articles written by university-based anthropologists.

“There doesn’t seem to be much interest in publishing experiences/research of applied anthropologists within the anthropology literature.” (Female, 40-49, Human Services)

“Non-affiliated anthropologists (not affiliated with a university), that is, have difficulty getting access to scholarly journals, current research, AAA resources.” (Female, 40-49, Business)

(4) The potential to provide better guidance to students: Students did not receive adequate methodological training, or guidance in applied research.

PROFILE #7
is a US citizen in her 30s, married, holds a PhD in geography and urban ecology, and worked as a researcher and teacher. Her interest in the human side of business led her to a position of strategic human resources after gaining experience in systems implementation and international payroll. She feels that anthropologists fail to make more of a contribution to corporate culture when the anthropological perspective can offer something new and influential. She feels that anthropologists can use their skills instead of relying on publications to shape and impact life.
“Why do so many academic anthropologists who are AAA members not take the time to learn about and teach their students about applied anthropology even though the majority who get doctorates (or masters) don’t enter academia on a full-time basis? Rather, they refer students to practitioners for unpaid counseling and advice (which faculty are PAID to provide).” (Female, 50-59, Business, Management Consulting)

“It remains shocking that many anthropology students are not trained in basic research methods; talking with new graduates is also disturbing since many are widely discouraged from doing applied work still.” (Female, 60-69, Community-Based Research)

Overall, practicing anthropologists reported very similar perceptions of the value the AAA places on their work as they did for the profession as a whole. The critiques of the AAA that respondents provided can help shape recommendations that will enable the AAA to better reach and serve practicing anthropologists. These recommendations are offered in section 5.4.

5.3 A Perceived Rift Between Academic and Practicing Anthropology

This survey provided an opportunity for practicing anthropologists as well as academically-based anthropologists who completed the survey to evaluate the climate for practicing anthropologists in the early years of the twenty-first century. Many respondents were quite vociferous in their written responses to the statement, “The anthropology profession takes seriously the work that I do.” Based upon the extent, range, and tone of these comments, we concluded that a “continuing, but improving rift” exists between full time academically-based and full time practicing anthropologists with regard to the place of practicing anthropology within the discipline. One such strong statement in support of the “rift” position:

“There is still what I consider a ridiculous rift between the academic and the practicing anthropologists. It’s time anthropology decides that it really wants to make a difference in the world or just pontificate about it.” (Female, 30-39, Archaeology, CRM)

At the same time, many respondents (41% who either somewhat agreed or strongly agreed) did see the anthropology profession as taking the work they did seriously. One respondent wrote:

“The academic anthropologists with whom I deal as part of my job appear to respect what I do. They recognize the importance of my position, as well as my ability to help generate and pay for new research and related work that both can contribute to anthropology and improve the management of natural resources in the U.S.” (Female, 20-29, Business)
Similarly, an academically-based 30-39 year old female anthropologist working in organizational development wrote, “There are a lot of applied practitioners in my area, and we all respect each other as professionals.”

Reviewing the entire corpus of comments to this question, we conclude that many of the practitioner anthropology respondents have had very negative experiences over their careers with regard to being fully accepted and respected within the discipline. At the same time, many respondents reported a positive shift in the direction of greater and more positive recognition of the value of applied and practitioner work. In particular, there was an appreciation of the importance of encompassing applied and practice information and experience in the education of anthropology students, especially at the graduate level.

5.3.1 The Choice to Practice Anthropology

Despite the perceived “rift” between academic and practicing anthropology and the strong opinion that the AAA does not treat practitioners and academics equally (only 12% felt that it did) and that work of practitioners is not taken seriously by the discipline (just 41% stated that it was), an overwhelming 76% of respondents reported that “knowing what they know now, they would still choose to become a practicing anthropologist.” Another 16% were neutral and only 9% stated they would not choose to become a practicing anthropologist (Table 21).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 21. Would you Choose the Same Career Path?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant percentage of both male and female respondents offered comments regarding their choice to practice anthropology: 52% of all male and 64% of all female respondents from the practicing anthropology pool of respondents (n=373) provided comments. In reviewing the 222 qualitative explanations offered by practitioners as to whether s/he would choose to become a practicing anthropologist again, we found the responses clustered into pull factors and push factors. In other words, for those individuals who reported that they would still choose to become a practicing anthropologist in light of his/her experience, many “pull factors” went into drawing this conclusion. Eighty-one percent of respondents (n=179) were coded for “pull” factors across 237 code instances.

Similarly, for those individuals who expressed lackluster enthusiasm for becoming a practicing anthropologist again, several “push factors” were identified as reasons for either ambivalence or negativity for choosing this career path again. Nineteen percent of respondents (n=43) were coded for “push” factors across 50 code instances.

**Push factors:** Beginning with the “push factors” arguing against the wisdom of choosing to become a practicing anthropologist again, these are the main explanations for ambivalence or
pessimism about following the same career path: (1) career limitations; (2) feeling undervalued as a practicing anthropologist; (3) inadequate salary; (4) negative feelings about being an anthropologist in general; and (5) disconnect between anthropological identification and requirements and perceptions of employers.

(1) **Career limitations:** Employment possibilities for anthropologists are limited.

“It is fairly difficult to get employment in the field.” (Male, 20-29, Archaeology, CRM, Environment)

(2) **Feeling undervalued:** Practicing anthropologists feel undervalued both in the work setting and in the profession of anthropology:

“It’s a constant battle to explain how my academic training relates to the kinds of work I am capable of doing and to be valued for these skills.” (Female, 30-39, Environment, Evaluation Research)

“In the current environment practicing anthropologists and independent scholars are not perceived to be as ‘credible’ (i.e. worthy of respect) as academic anthropologists and scholars.” (Female, 60-69, Writing)

(3) **Low Salaries.** Practicing anthropologists make low salaries, taking into account their education.

“And like monks and nuns, sometimes effectively take vows of poverty in order to pursue our chosen profession.” (Male, 80+, Archaeology, CRM)

“I spent far too much time and money on an education for the salary that I make as a practicing anthropologist.” (Female, 20-29, Archaeology)

PROFILE #8
is a US citizen in her 40s, married, holds a PhD in anthropology, and is an organizational researcher in business and technology. Recently, she moved from a senior researcher role to a director role in order to lead the anthropological practice within a commercial enterprise. She feels that practicing anthropology affords more opportunities but has its own trade-offs. In the last five years, she feels that the AAA and practicing anthropologists are together making strides to explore and understand the needs and requirements in the realm of practicing anthropology.

(4) **Lack of Employer Awareness of Anthropology’s Value:** There is a disconnect between an anthropological identification and requirements and perceptions of employers.
“Anthropology is not understood by many employers—that is, they don’t understand what anthropologists can do and how our skills can contribute.” (Female, 20-29, Evaluation Research)

Pull factors: At the same time, many more pull factors than push factors were identified by respondents as incentives to enter practitioner careers (232 responses coded for pull factors vs. 50 push factors). In fact, some of the same factors were identified as reasons for and against becoming a practicing anthropologist. For example, salary was included as a pull factor, with some respondents (n=9) commenting on how their salary is better than it would be in academia.

“My pay is better than my academic peers, my stress level is lower, my schedule is acceptable, and as I was trained as an applied anthropologist, I feel that I am contributing to the world by applying my skill set in a very practical way.” (Male, 20-29, Education)

The other pull factors for entering careers as practicing anthropologists in order of highest number of responses to least include: (1) love for practicing anthropology; (2) potential to have an impact on the “real world”; (3) use of anthropological skills; (4) diversity and interdisciplinary nature of work activities; (5) intrinsically interesting nature of the work; (6) diversity of activities in the work setting; (7) teamwork opportunities; and, (8) absence of academic politics.

(1) Love for practicing anthropology: Many respondents expressed great passion for practicing anthropology.

“I absolutely adore what I do, and I can’t imagine having more fun AND making more of a contribution in other posts.” (Female, 50-59, Community Development, Education)

(2) Potential to have an impact on the real world: Careers in practicing anthropology offer opportunities to impact society.

“Applying anthropology honors the potential and the value of the field, to make real changes in communities for the betterment of society.” (Female, 30-39, Public Health, Research, Translation Services)

PROFILE #9
is a US citizen in her 40s, married, holds a PhD in anthropology, and works as a researcher and program developer in the fields of social impact assessment and policy. She began working for the federal government after completing her PhD and enjoys doing research, influencing policy, and mentoring students. She feels that her position is ideal in that she was able to create her own job description within her agency.
(3) **Use of anthropological skills**: Respondents report job satisfaction in careers that utilize their anthropological training.

   “I have managed to have a fulfilling career that draws on my skills and training in anthropology.” (Female, 30-39, Applied Health Research)

(4) **Diversity and interdisciplinary nature of work activities**: Careers in practicing anthropology offer diversity in work opportunities.

   “My work environment is constantly challenging and presents endless opportunities to learn about what’s going on in other disciplines. I love being a practitioner.” (Male, 50-59, Evaluation Research, Healthcare)

   “I am more known as a practicing field biologist and environmental conservationist with a strong background in anthropology, which allows me to include human dimensions in my research and other work.” (Female, 50-59, Environment)

(5) **Intrinsically interesting nature of the work**: Careers in practicing anthropology involve researching interesting topics.

   “It’s not a mundane job, but one that has interesting and changing elements to it” (Female, 60-69, Archaeology, CRM)

   “I have had continuing opportunities to pursue interesting research.” (Male, 50-59, Archaeology, CRM)

(6) **Teamwork opportunities**: Practicing anthropologists may find great satisfaction working in teams.

   “I have been fortunate to work with bright, energetic, and wonderful researchers from whom and with whom I have learned.” (Male, 50-59, Environment)

---

**PROFILE #10**

is a US citizen in her 40s, holds a PhD in medical anthropology, and worked various positions as a teacher, assessor, and as a legal assistant/office manager for six years at a private law-firm before becoming a health service research director of a nonprofit organization. She feels that her new position utilizes her skills and creativity more than her previous positions as she now researches patient health outcomes and writes grants for capacity building and health intervention. Her work became personal when she struggled to afford health insurance with a “pre-existing condition.”

Questioning the sustainability of her current employment and its group insurance, she is now lobbying for single-payer health in the US.
(7) Absence of academic politics: Employment in academia is an unattractive alternative.

“While there are things about my position I do not like, the academic world looks to me to be less and less like a garden and more like a snake-pit.” (Female, 40-49, Community Development)

Overall, practicing anthropologists write with great zeal about the work they do, finding tremendous value in the diversity in work activities and interdisciplinary nature of their research teams.
6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents the major conclusions drawn from the survey in the following areas: career paths, mentoring practices, influences on work climate, work and family issues, and perceptions of the profession and AAA. The report closes with recommendations to the AAA and COSWA to increase the organizations’ service to practicing anthropologists.

6.1 Career Paths of Practicing Anthropologists

For practicing anthropologists, linear career trajectories are the exception rather than the norm. This aspect of career development distinguishes many practitioners from their colleagues who work in full-time academic positions, where career paths tend to be highly proscribed. In planning their careers, practicing anthropologists in the survey reported that obtaining job security, opportunities for professional advancement, searching for on-the-job satisfaction, and the pursuit of work-family balance are very important in making their professional decisions. In some circumstances, career options are limited by structural forces such as company reorganizations or budgetary cutbacks. Practitioner respondents reported that their initial entry into the world of anthropological practice (beyond the academy) was facilitated by networks that typically originated in their home anthropology departments when they were students.

Employment experiences of practitioner anthropologists can be very complex in terms of job security and stability. Forty-nine percent of practicing anthropologists earned income through two or more sources at the same time over a two year time period (2005-2007). This finding suggests that practitioners either change jobs more frequently than full time academically-based anthropologists, or work multiple positions simultaneously to bolster their annual income.

6.1.1 Gender and Careers

Practitioner respondents suggest that while there is variation between men and women in the number of hours worked, this variation is not due to gender itself. Rather, number of hours worked was associated with the requirements of one’s position and the level of responsibility associated with that position or to childcare responsibilities which required absences from a formal office environment. Both men and women experienced variation in hours worked for these two reasons.

The distribution of women and men practitioners in management and administration shows a gendered pattern. Men most often reported as filling senior positions in management and administration. More women appear to be moving into middle management positions. Despite rising numbers of women in managerial positions, perceptions of mistreatment (of women by men) continue, although older women respondents suggest significant changes have occurred over the last 10-15 years. Some sectors of employment indicate slower change. For example,
men continue to fill top positions in the state and federal sectors, including the National Park Services, fisheries, and international development organizations, the military, engineering organizations, and CRM. In contrast, women report holding top positions in high income generating sectors of employment (private/for profit), and more often report being business owners. These findings are consistent with reports on gender distribution in administration and leadership positions within academe as well (Wasson et. al., 2008).” Minorities tend to be underrepresented in top administrative and managerial positions, and are perceived to be more often relegated to field work, tech, or support roles.

6.2 Mentoring and Gender

Survey respondents indicated that mentoring relationships are less often developed for women than for men, although professional mentoring programs are reported to be equally available to men and women. Many practicing anthropologists work for organizations that do not offer formal mentoring programs, and therefore employees rely on informal networks to develop mentor-mentee relationships. According to survey respondents, in general women tend to get mentored through more informal networks. Respondents suggest that women practitioners benefit from different forms of advice from a mentoring relationship, especially with regard to negotiating power and discriminatory acts (subtle and obvious) that surround assumptions of female behavior and qualifications in male-dominated work environments.

6.3 Work Climate and Practicing Anthropologists

In addition to gender, a variety of factors influence perceptions of work climate for practicing anthropologists, including family status, race and ethnicity, age, and disciplinary background. Age is a factor that can cut both ways: at times and in certain fields of employment (e.g., international development, national park service, the military), older and more experienced employees are preferred, whereas in other fields (e.g., advertising), younger employees are preferred. In some circumstances, young women were highlighted as favored employees, yet lacking respect from their co-workers, and often subject to a “chilly climate.” One’s disciplinary background in anthropology can also negatively impact one’s work climate, especially in organizations where the majority of employees come from backgrounds in hard sciences, business, or economics.

6.4 Work/Family and Gender

With respect to a “family-friendly” work environment, practicing anthropologists report this area to be weak both in terms of policy and practice. The lack of formality may be associated with sector of employment, sole proprietorship, and/or familial status (without children). Less than half the practitioners in the sample were employed in organizations with formal leave policies. Therefore, the majority of employees had to rely on informal practices to attend to
Moreover, while managers were reported to schedule work activities at times that did not conflict with care giving, practicing anthropologists with such responsibilities perceived animosity from co-workers without such responsibilities. There exists a perception that employees without care giving responsibilities not only work longer hours, but do better quality work. Observations about the impact of family responsibilities on hours worked or perceptions of work climate were not gendered; both women and men are reported as facing the same issues in achieving a work-family balance.

In short, the impact of family responsibilities on work environment tended not to be gendered. That is, both women and men were credited with attending to family responsibilities. In contrast to what the earlier COSWA survey of academic anthropologists, constraints on career mobility resulting from parenting did not appear to be gender specific in this survey.

6.5 Perceptions of the Profession / American Anthropological Association

Practicing anthropologists do not feel valued by the anthropology profession or discipline, both of which are perceived as catering primarily to academic anthropologists. Negative experiences with the broader discipline are perpetuated through mentoring relationships between faculty and students. Reportedly, anthropology students are advised into academic career lines as priority positions, with non-academic placements treated as second class, or not even acknowledged as a possibility. The devaluing of practicing anthropology is reflected in lack of training and preparation for applied research. Practicing anthropologists in the highest income brackets report the most uneasiness with the degree to which the profession values the work that they do. This may relate to the historical divide between applied and “pure” anthropology, the discipline’s ties to colonialism and debates over conducting anthropological research for private industry (Baba forthcoming). This may also relate to the lack of education and experience of most academically-based anthropologists that would prepare them to teach and guide their students to careers outside of academia. In contrast to many sectors of employment reported by respondents, anthropologists employed in the federal sector do feel that their work is valued by the profession.

Respondents are also largely dissatisfied with programs and services provided by the AAA, although there is some recognition of change. Principally, the organization is perceived as catering to academic anthropologists, and lacking relevance to the work experiences of practitioners. Continued efforts to expand sessions and workshops focused on the practical dimensions of anthropology were reported as very much needed to improve the divide.

Despite the overwhelming sentiment that the AAA and anthropological profession do not value the work of practicing anthropologists, a vast majority of respondents write with great passion about the work they do, and report that they would not alter their career paths should they have
an opportunity to start over. Rather, practicing anthropologists find great value in the interesting and diverse work activities in which they are engaged in their interdisciplinary research teams.

6.6 Recommendations for the American Anthropological Association

Survey respondents were asked to provide recommendations to the AAA to increase the organizations’ service to practicing anthropologists. Recommendations clustered into ten general patterns represented across 197 responses. From the most commonly cited to least, recommendation patterns included:

1. Increase sessions at the AAA meetings that address the career interests and research expertise of practicing anthropologist.

2. Increase representation in articles and reviews of books by practitioners within the *American Anthropologist* and other AAA publications.

3. Increase networking opportunities at the AAA meetings and through other venues (e.g., online networking, LPO support).

4. Support career services and interviewing for nonacademic positions at the AAA meetings and online.

5. Create forums and encourage visibility and discussion of anthropologists working in applied settings.

6. Increase the visibility of NAPA and practitioner seats on AAA committees.

7. Increase exposure of applied training programs and expand opportunities for students to build professional skill sets.

8. Expand resources available to members, ranging from curriculum development services encouraging practitioner-oriented programs to benefits services, such as group health insurance options.

9. Invest in a public relations campaign to improve the image of the AAA, which is perceived of as a bureaucratic and academically-oriented organization.

10. Revisit cost of membership and conference registration fees to accommodate practicing anthropologists whose organizations do not offer travel reimbursements.
6.7 Recommendations for the Committee on the Status of Women in Anthropology

Note that the above recommendations represent only those offered by respondents in response to a question of how the AAA can better serve practitioners. There were no recommendations offered with regard to the gendered dimensions of practicing anthropology. Based on the analysis of the entire survey dataset our committee makes the following recommendations specific to COSWA:

a. Publicize COSWA’s mentorship program in the *Anthropology News* and online, and diversify mentors by sector of employment.

b. Sponsor sessions (or webinars) for employers and coworkers on strategies to mitigate and improve perceptions of work climate, as related to gender, age, ethnicity, and familial status. The existence of formal policies (e.g., FMLA, flexible hours) does not necessarily change behavior and perception.

c. Offer seminars in mobile work technology as a strategy to facilitate work-life balance or ease care giving responsibilities.

d. Sponsor networking hours at the AAA meetings for women practitioners. Networking contributes significantly to securing employment in practicing work environments.
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COSWA is committed to equal opportunity for anthropologists in all work settings. The purpose of this survey is to assess the work climate of practicing anthropologists.

One of our goals is to provide the American Anthropological Association with recommendations to better serve practicing anthropologists, both female and male. In addition to its focus on the gendered dimensions of practicing anthropology, this survey is designed to gather valuable data on the experiences of practicing anthropologists.

If you are a practicing anthropologist, we would greatly appreciate your completing this survey!

If your main occupation is a full-time faculty member at an academic institution, please exit now.

The survey will take about 15-20 minutes to complete. Thank you for your participation!

**Demographics**

1. **Gender:**  □ Female □ Male □ Other

2. **Age:**
   □ 20-29    □ 60-69
   □ 30-39    □ 70-79
   □ 40-49    □ 80+
   □ 50-59

3. Please mark which U.S. census category you feel best applies to yourself:
   □ Caucasian
   □ African-American
   □ Hispanic or Latino
   □ Asian/Pacific Islander
   □ Other:____________________
4. Ethnic/Cultural identity you feel applies to yourself (write in):_______________

5. Current country of residency____________________

6. Country(ies) in which you hold citizenship____________________

7. Marital Status:
   □ Single
   □ Married/domestic partner
   □ Widow
   □ Divorced / separated
   □ Other

**Educational History and Advancement**

Please complete the following grid based on your educational experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) B.A./B.S.:      
(b) MA/MS.:         
(c) PhD:            
(d) Additional Degree 1
(e) Additional Degree 2
(f) Additional Degree 3

12. Please list any other areas in which you received substantial training or experience.  
_______________________________
13. In getting initial jobs when starting a career as a practicing anthropologist, which of the following contacts were helpful? (check all that apply):

- alumni of anthropology departments
- faculty from anthropology departments
- alumni or faculty of university/college programs outside of anthropology
- family connections (including friends or business associates of family or spouse connections)
- anthropology LPOs (i.e., Local Practitioner Organizations, such as WAPA)
- NAPA members and/or the NAPA mentorship system
- internships or volunteer work
- membership of non-anthropological professional organizations
- connections from previous jobs
- other: ________________

14. Thinking about the last career transition you have made, please describe this move in terms of your professional trajectory. Was this move upward, lateral, or backward?

- upward
- lateral
- backward
- other ________________

15. Please narrate this experience (i.e., what factors contributed to your decision to make this move?): ____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

16. Thinking about the previous career transition you made, please describe this move in terms of your professional trajectory. Was this move upward, lateral, or backward?

- upward
- lateral
- backward
- other ________________

17. Please narrate this experience (i.e., what factors contributed to your decision to make this move?): ____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
Household Composition and Benefits Information

18. My household is currently composed of: (Check whichever options below best apply to your situation)
   □ Myself only
   □ Myself with partner only, or another non-dependent adult(s), no minors
   □ Myself and minor dependents [no partner]
   □ Myself with additional adult(s) (>21 yrs), including dependent adult(s), and/or minor children.

19. Do you provide care or financial support for anyone else not currently living in your household?
   □ Yes
   □ No

20. What is their relationship to you? (check all that apply)
   □ Adult child
   □ Elderly parents
   □ Other relative
   □ Close friend
   □ Other _______________________

21. What is the source of your household’s health insurance?
   □ My place of employment (i.e., the source of the majority of my earned income)
   □ My spouse or partner’s employment
   □ Both equally
   □ Our household does not have health insurance
   □ I purchase health insurance
   □ Other _________________________________
22. Looking towards the future, on a scale of 1-5, how concerned are you about your ability to provide health coverage for yourself and/or your household.

1= not at all concerned; 2=somewhat unconcerned; 3=neither concerned nor unconcerned; 4=somewhat concerned; 5=very concerned; 6=N/A

1 □  2 □  3 □  4 □  5 □  6 □

23. If you have any comments regarding the previous question, please write them here:
______________________________________________________________________

24. Looking towards the future, on a scale of 1-5, how concerned are you that you will have sufficient savings to draw on in retirement?

1= not at all concerned; 2=somewhat unconcerned; 3=neither concerned nor unconcerned; 4=somewhat concerned; 5=very concerned; 6=N/A

1 □  2 □  3 □  4 □  5 □  6 □

25. If you have any comments regarding the previous question, please write them here:
______________________________________________________________________

26. In the past two years, did you earn income through two or more sources at the same time?

□ Yes
□ No

27. In the past two years, what is the maximum number of income-earning positions that you have held at the same time? ____

28. Why do/did you have more than one source of income? (check all that apply)

□ Income
□ Insurance
□ Do/did not hold full-time employment
□ Changed jobs
□ Other __________

Comments:
29. Please report your total **personal** annual earned income. Respondents who have more than one source of income should provide a sum of all paid work. Please report personal salary, not household salary. International respondents should convert into $US.

- □ Less than $10,000
- □ $10,000-$29,999
- □ $30,000-$49,999
- □ $50,000-$79,999
- □ $80,000-$99,999
- □ $100,000-$124,999
- □ $125,000-$149,000
- □ $150,000+

30. Over the last five years, on average, what percentage did your earned income contribute to your total household income?

- □ between 81-100%
- □ between 51-80%
- □ approximately 50%
- □ less than 50%

The next series of questions ask you about your **primary source** of earned income (i.e., based on where you earned the majority of income in the past year). *Respondents with more than one source of earned income will be asked to report on additional sources of earned income in later questions.

31. What sector of employment best describes your **primary source** of earned income?

Federal Government
State Government
Local Government
Non-profit (e.g., NGO, non-profit research institution)
Private / For-profit
Other _______
32. **Field of employment:** (check all that apply)

- Archaeology
- Community development
- Cultural resource management
- Education
- Environment and Natural Resources
- Evaluation Research
- Business
- Finance and Banking
- Forensics
- Healthcare
- Human services
- International development
- Law
- Management Consulting
- Museums
- Organizational development/training
- Social Impact Assessment
- Technology
- Other: ____________

33. **Your primary activities in this position:** (check all that apply)

- Administration
- Assessment
- Evaluation
- Healthcare delivery
- Management
- Organizational change
- Planning / Program development
- Research
- Social services
- Teaching
- Translation services
- Other ________
34. Your employment status in this position:

   Full time
   Part time
   Other ______

35. On average, how many hours a week do you work in this position? ____

36. Is this source of employment a business that you own?

   Yes (If yes, please answer the following questions about your business.)

   No

37. Are you a sole-proprietor?

   Yes
   No

38. Are you incorporated?

   Yes
   No

39. Is the business for-profit or non-profit? (check one)

   for-profit
   non-profit

40. As of [date of survey], 2007, approximately how many employees are there in your organization? ______

Your Current Work Environment

Please respond to the questions in this section by reflecting on the current work environment for the position you reported to be your primary source of earned income.
41. With regard to **total amount of hours** employees work: (Check only one)

- Men and women tend to work equal number of hours on average.
- Women work more hours than men, on average.
- Men work more hours than women, on average.
- I am a sole-proprietor without employees.
- Other __________________________

42. If you have any comments regarding the previous question, please write them here:
______________________________________________________________________

43. With regard to **mentoring**: (Check only one)

- Women and men receive an equal amount of mentoring, on average.
- Women receive less mentoring than men, overall.
- Men receive less mentoring than women, overall.
- I am a sole-proprietor without employees.
- Other __________________________

44. If you have any comments regarding the previous question, please write them here:
______________________________________________________________________

45. With regard to the **senior management / administration in your organization as a whole**: (Check only one)

- Top administration is relatively balanced in terms of gender parity.
- The majority of top managers and administrators are women.
- The majority of top managers and administrators are men.
- I am a sole-proprietor without employees.
- Other __________________________

46. If you have any comments regarding the previous question, please write them here:
______________________________________________________________________

47. With regard to the **management in your division or department**: (Check only one)

- Management is relatively balanced in terms of gender parity.
- The majority of managers are women.
- The majority of managers are men.
- I am a sole-proprietor without employees.
- Other __________________________
48. If you have any comments regarding the previous question, please write them here: ____________________________________________________________

49. Which of the following impacts your current work environment as much or more than gender? (check all that apply).

- Age
- Race/Ethnicity
- Religion
- Sexual Orientation
- Family responsibilities
- Other __________
- None of the above

50. Please explain your response. ____________________

51. If you had to come up with one or two changes that could improve your current professional environment, what would they be?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Work and Family

The following set of questions ask about work and family policies within formal organizations. If you reported that your primary source of earned income is generated through consultancy or work as a sole proprietor then these questions will not apply to you.

52. Are you a sole proprietor or a consultant ? (Yes or No) ______

53. Does your place of employment have a formal policy that provides employees who have infants, newly adopted or newly fostered children with temporary relief from work responsibilities?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
54. Does your place of employment have an informal practice that provides employees who have infants, newly adopted or newly fostered children with temporary relief from work responsibilities? (*No formal policy exists in your organization).
   
   Yes
   No
   Don’t know

55. If you have any comments regarding the previous question, please write them here:______________________________

56. Does your place of employment have a formal policy that grants spouses or partners to pregnant women at least six weeks of paid leave to be taken prior to, during, and/or after childbirth?
   
   Yes
   No
   Don’t know

57. Does your place of employment have an informal practice that grants spouses or partners to pregnant women at least six weeks of paid leave to be taken prior to, during, and/or after childbirth? (*No formal policy exists in your organization).
   
   Yes
   No
   Don’t know

58. If you have any comments regarding the previous question, please write them here:______________________________

59. Does your place of employment have a formal policy that grants employees unpaid leave to care for their family members (child, spouse, domestic partner, or elderly parent)?

   Yes
   No
   Don’t know
60. Does your place of employment have an informal practice that grants employees unpaid leave to care for their family members (child, spouse, domestic partner, or elderly parent)? (*No formal policy exists in your organization).

   Yes
   No
   Don’t know

61. If you have any comments regarding the previous question, please write them here:

62. Do you have dependent children living in your household? (Yes or No) ______
63. With regard to the place of employment that you reported to be your primary source of earned income, please indicate on a scale of 1-5 how strongly you agree with the following statements.

1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree, 6=Don’t know, 7=N/A

a) It is difficult to manage my responsibilities as a parent or caregiver with my work obligations.  
   1 □  2 □  3 □  4 □  5 □  6 □  7 □

b) I am often unable to attend conferences and meetings because of my responsibilities as a parent or caregiver.  
   1 □  2 □  3 □  4 □  5 □  6 □  7 □

c) Meetings and research activities are scheduled in a way that accommodates my responsibilities as a parent or caregiver.  
   1 □  2 □  3 □  4 □  5 □  6 □  7 □

d) I am able to work from home if I have a sick child without feeling as though my coworkers perceive me as uncommitted.  
   1 □  2 □  3 □  4 □  5 □  6 □  7 □

64. If you have any comments regarding the previous question, please write them here: 
______________________________________________________________________
65. Reflecting on your entire career as a practicing anthropologist, please indicate on a scale of 1-5, how accurate the following statement is.

1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree, 6=Don’t know, 7=N/A

a) My career advancement has **not** been slowed down by my parenting obligations.

*b) I do not feel that I have had to make sacrifices in my career advancement because of my parenting responsibilities.***

<box>(c) My work responsibilities have **not** kept me from attending important events in my children’s lives.

<box>(d) My coworkers do **not** question my commitment to our work when I take time off to attend important events in my children’s lives.

<box>(e) I did **not** feel pressured to come back to work sooner than I would have liked after having, adopting, or fostering a child for fear that I wouldn’t be taken seriously in my organization or workplace.

<box>(f) My daily schedule is flexible, which is helpful in raising children.

<box>(g) My career timing has meshed well with my family timing.

<box>(h) I feel comfortable having my children visit me at work.

<box>(i) My coworkers do **not** think it is unprofessional for me to bring my children to work on occasion when I do not have childcare.

<box>(j) I feel comfortable making and receiving calls that relate to my children while at work.
66. If you have any comments regarding the previous question, please write them here: 

______________________________________________________________________

**Sexual Harassment**

Questions 67-70 pertain to the place of employment that you reported to provide your primary source of earned income. Skip to Question 71 if you are a sole-proprietor or consultant and/or not working within a formal organization, or without staff or coworkers.

67. Are you a sole proprietor or a consultant? (Yes or No) (If you have not experienced any of these unwanted behaviors, please skip to question 71). ____

Have you personally experienced any of the following unwanted behaviors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unwanted Behavior</th>
<th>68. Frequency</th>
<th>69. Were these actions reported Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual teasing, jokes, remarks, questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual looks, gestures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate touching, leaning, cornering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for dates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters, emails, calls, sexual materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for sexual favors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual/attempted rape, assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70. How effectively, on a scale of 1-5, do you feel that your place of employment handles claims of sexual harassment in accordance with federal law?

1=very poorly, 2= somewhat poorly, 3= neither poorly nor effectively, 4= somewhat effectively, 5= very effectively, 6= don’t know

1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □
Reflections on the Profession

Reflecting on a scale of 1-5, how strongly do you agree with the following statements about the anthropology profession?

1=strongly disagree, 2=somewhat disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=somewhat agree, 5=strongly agree

71. The anthropology profession takes seriously the work that I do.

1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □

72. If you have any comments regarding the previous question, please write them here:
______________________________________________________________________

73. The American Anthropological Association serves academic and practicing anthropologists equally.

1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □

74. If you have any comments regarding the previous question, please write them here:
______________________________________________________________________

75. Knowing what you know now, would you still choose to become a practicing anthropologist?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Maybe

76. Please explain your response_________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________

77. If you have any additional comments or suggestions on the form or content of the survey, please write them below.
___________________________________________________________________________________
78. What can the AAA do to help serve practicing anthropologists better?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much for your participation! The data collected through this survey will be analyzed and results will be posted on the COSWA website, published in Anthropology News, and disseminated as widely as possible through other means as well.

If you are interested in providing the Committee on the Status of Women in Anthropology with additional information, please contact Keri Brondo at kbrondo@memphis.edu.
APPENDIX C
LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>American Anthropological Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>American Ethnologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Current Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRGE</td>
<td>Center for Innovation and Research in Graduate Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPAA</td>
<td>Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoPAPIA</td>
<td>Committee on Practicing, Applied, and Public Interest Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSWA</td>
<td>Committee on the Status of Women in Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Executive Board of the American Anthropological Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMLA</td>
<td>Family and Medical Leave Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPO</td>
<td>Local Practitioner Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPA</td>
<td>National Association for the Practice of Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAWG</td>
<td>Practicing Advisory Work Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SfAA</td>
<td>Society for Applied Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>Society for Medical Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAPA</td>
<td>Washington Association of Professional Anthropologists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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