

# **Annual Report on Membership Demographics**

Society for Music Theory

October 2017

## Table of Contents

- I. Preface
- II. Demographics of SMT membership
  - A. Membership total
  - B. Gender
  - C. Race/ethnicity
  - D. Rank
  - E. Employment status
  - F. Employment status by gender
  - G. Rank by gender
  - H. Employment status by race/ethnicity
  - I. Rank by race/ethnicity
- III. Comparison between the demographics of SMT members and the following datasets: College Music Society, National Association of Schools of Music (from the Higher Education Arts Data Services Data Survey), Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, Survey of Earned Doctorates, American Musicological Society, and the Society for Ethnomusicology
  - A. Gender
  - B. Race/ethnicity
  - C. Rank and employment status

## I. Preface

The purpose of this document is to:

- Report the demographics of SMT members using data collected when members renew their membership
- Compare the demographics data of SMT members with other datasets
- Identify data trends to support strategies to improve the diversity among SMT membership

There were a few issues in making comparisons between SMT demographics and other datasets. The problem is twofold. First, SMT's categories for race/ethnicity and also for employment status are not the same as the categories collected by other organizations. Second, some organizations do not collect demographics data each year, like we do. For example, CMS's latest report is from 2015. Similarly, the SEM data is from 2014, and their next year of demographics data collection is not until 2020. Even though our society's demographics have not changed significantly since annual data collection began in 2014, the validity of these comparisons can be questioned. Nevertheless, I have included other datasets because they may be useful to demonstrate broad differences between the demographics of SMT and other organizations.

In previous years, demographics data from CMS and NASM were compared with the demographics of SMT members. Datasets from SED, AMS, and SEM have not been included in the Statistician's annual report until this year. My aim for including additional datasets is to provide more comparisons for the Executive Board, and others, to consider.

I am grateful for the help of many in making this report. Victoria Long provided SMT membership information and much appreciated advice. Gabe Fankhauser, previous SMT Statistician, helped me learn the ropes of the position and encouraged me to make use of additional datasets. Steve Stuempfle graciously provided the demographics data for SEM. Finally, I am indebted to John McKay, whose 2017 statistician report for AMS served as the guide for making this report. I am extremely grateful for his excellent research.

Please contact me if you have recommendations or suggestions for future reports.

Respectfully submitted,

Jenine Brown  
Jenine.Brown@jhu.edu  
Full-time continuing faculty  
Department of Music Theory  
Peabody Institute of the Johns Hopkins University

## II. Demographics of SMT Membership

The following reports the demographics makeup of the Society for Music Theory, obtained from a membership list as of September 30, 2017. So as to observe any potential trends over the past few years, I have included demographics information since 2014 (no demographics information is posted online for 2012 and 2013). The categories below come from the responses indicated on each member's "My SMT Profile" on the society's webpage (<https://societymusictheory.org/smtprofile/profile>).

In May 2015, the My SMT Profile page was updated to include the following categories within gender, employment status, rank, and race/ethnicity. Demographics information obtained in 2014 used different categories, and those differences are indicated below.

In the entries below, percentages were derived from the number of members in that particular category divided by the membership total. The percentage is followed by the raw counts in parentheses.

Two of the categories below do not require members to make a selection on the My SMT Profile page (the categories for employment status and also for rank). Blank responses were left out of the membership total when deriving the percentages, but those who selected "prefer not to answer" were included in the membership total when calculating percentages.

### A. Total number of members of SMT

The membership total in 2017 is lower than that observed in 2014-16, although the Executive Director reports that the membership totals in previous years were calculated later in the year (shortly after October 15), rather than on September 30.

	2017	2016	2015	2014
Membership total	1133	1299	1220	1164

### B. Gender

The number of females in the SMT membership is lower than last year, but the proportion is similar to the distribution reported in 2014-2016. Generally, females make ~30% of the SMT population.

	2017	2016	2015 <sup>1</sup>	2014 <sup>2</sup>
Man	66.4% (752)	64.7% (841)	66.6% (812)	69.4% (808)
Woman	31.6% (358)	33.5 % (435)	32.1% (392)	30.6% (356)
Prefer not to answer	1.6% (18)	1.5% (19)	0.1% (1)	Not collected
Trans/Transgender	0.3% (3)	0.2% (3)	0.1% (1)	Not collected
Another identity	0.2% (2)	0.1% (1) <sup>3</sup>	0.0% (0)	Not collected

<sup>1</sup> The raw numbers in this column sum to 1206, whereas the membership total for the year 2015 was 1220. My speculation is that these individuals left the question blank. It is no longer possible to leave this field blank in My SMT Profile.

<sup>2</sup> The 2014 collection did not include additional gender categories other than "woman" and "man."

<sup>3</sup> The 2016 data collection included one person reporting as Woman Man, of which I've added to the category titled "Another identity."

C. Race/ethnicity

The race/ethnicity information obtained in 2017 is to that in previous years: non-white members comprise 15% of the SMT population. Due to the large number of blank responses from 2014 and 2015, it is difficult to make any claims as to trends over the years. Nevertheless, the percentage of non-white members has slightly increased since 2015.

	2017	2016	2015 <sup>4</sup>	2014 <sup>5</sup>
White	85.3% (965)	87.3% (1132)	88.6% (957)	83.1% (771)
Asian/Pacific Islander	6.3% (71)	6.4% (83)	5.3% (57)	4.4% (41)
Prefer not to answer	3.9% (44)	2.5% (32)	2.0% (22)	
Hispanic	1.9% (21)	1.6% (21)	2.3% (25)	3.7% (34)
Mixed Race	1.8% (20)	1.1% (14)	0.5% (5)	
Black	0.8% (9)	0.9% (12)	1.2% (13)	1.2% (11)
Race/Ethnicity unknown	0.1% (1)	0.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	
Native American	0.0% (0)	0.1% (1)	0.2% (2)	0.3% (3)
First Nation	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	
2014 category: Other				6.9% (64)
2014 category: Mexic. Am.				0.4% (4)
(blank)	(2)	(3)	(140)	(236) <sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> The raw numbers in this column sum to 1221, one over the 1220 membership total reported in 2015.

<sup>5</sup> The 2014 categories for race and ethnicity were: White, Other, Asian Am., Hispanic, Afric. Am., Mexic. Am., Nativ. Am. These categories are different from those collected from 2015 until the present.

<sup>6</sup> Note that the raw numbers from the 2014 report do not sum to the membership total. The 236 missing members likely did not respond to this category and thus I have included them in the “blank” row.

D. Rank

The number of graduate students seems to be declining from recent years, whereas the number of members reporting employment as “other” has increased from 46 members in 2015 to 82 members in 2017. This could mean that recent graduates are not gaining employment in in a limited term position or as an assistant professor. This potential trend should be monitored.

	2017	2016	2015 <sup>7</sup>	2014
Graduate student	30.9% (342)	30.0% (382)	33.0% (374)	37.5% (372)
Professor	17.3% (191)	18.7% (238)	16.1% (183)	14.0% (139)
Associate Professor	15.9% (176)	15.1% (192)	16.7% (190)	16.3% (162)
Assistant Professor	14.8% (164)	14.9% (190)	14.9% (169)	17.7% (176)
Other	7.4% (82)	6.7% (85)	4.1% (46)	N/A
Limited term, continuing	4.8% (53)	6.3% (80)	7.2% (82)	N/A
Retired	3.7% (41)	2.9% (37)	3.3% (37)	N/A
Undergraduate	2.8% (31)	3.2% (41)	3.0% (34)	3.6% (36)
Limited term, 1-yr position	2.4% (26)	2.2% (28)	1.7% (19)	N/A
2014 category: Lecturer				7.9% (78)
2014 category: Emeritus				3.0% (30)
(blank)	(27)	(26)	(85)	(171)

<sup>7</sup> The raw numbers in this column sum to 1219, which is one person less than the membership total.

E. Employment status

The employment status category is not populated enough to make any substantial claims. In 2017, 44% of members did not respond in this category. While this is an improvement from the 82% that did not respond in 2015, there is not enough data to make any other conclusions other than SMT's members are largely full time (as opposed to part time, unemployed, or other).

	2017	2016 <sup>8</sup>	2015	2014
Full Time	92.0% (589)	No data	76.8% (172)	Not collected
Part Time	4.1% (26)	No data	15.6% (35)	Not collected
Other	3.6% (23)	No data	5.8% (13)	Not collected
Unemployed	0.3% (2)	No data	1.8% (4)	Not collected
(blank)	(493)	No data	(996)	Not collected

F. Employment status by gender

Raw counts of 2017 SMT members are provided in the following table. There is a gender imbalance among part-time employees: female members of SMT are more likely to work as part time.<sup>9</sup> Females make up 57.7% of part-time employees, whereas they comprise 31.6% of all SMT members. To contrast, females only make up 28.5% of full-time employees.

Because the SMT members reporting as unemployed are small in number, these findings are excluded from this report in an effort to protect the privacy of those individuals. The rank of trans and other gender identities were also not included for similar reasons.

	Female	Male
Full Time	166	416
Part Time	15	11
Other	7	16
Unemployed	excluded	excluded

<sup>8</sup> According to the previous SMT Statistician (Gabe Fankhauser), data collection regarding employment status in 2016 had irregularities due to a glitch in data collection. Those numbers were omitted from his 2016 report.

<sup>9</sup> AMS reported similar findings in their February 2017 report.

G. Rank by gender

Raw counts of 2017 SMT members are provided in the following table. Males far outnumber females in all ranks, and the percentage of females decreases as academic rank increases. On the other hand, females make up 38.0% of all graduate students and 40% of all assistant professors; these percentages are higher than the 31.6% that females occupy of the entire SMT membership.

	Female	Male
Graduate student	126	206
Professor	44	144
Associate Professor	50	125
Assistant Professor	64	98
Other	24	57
Limited term, continuing	17	36
Retired	6	34
Undergraduate	10	20
Limited term, 1-yr position	9	15

H. Employment status by race/ethnicity

Raw counts of 2017 SMT members are provided in the following table. Of the SMT members who reported their employment status, non-white members comprise 10.5% of full-time employees. A disproportionate number of non-white members are employed part time: they make up 19.2% of part-time employees.

	White	Asian/Pac. Islander	Hispanic	Mixed Race	Black	Native American	Race unknown	Prefer not to answer
Full Time	527	32	5	2	4	0	0	19
Part Time	21	2	0	3	0	0	0	0
Other	22	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unemployed	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



### I. Rank by race/ethnicity

Raw counts of 2017 SMT members are provided in the following table. Non-white members are less likely to have attained higher academic ranks, and no non-white SMT member identified as retired. The most diverse population within SMT membership is in its graduate students, as 75.8% of graduate students identify as white, whereas the overall white population of SMT is 85.3%.

	White	Asian/Pac. Islander	Hispanic	Mixed Race	Black	Native American	Race unknown	Prefer not to answer
Graduate student	259	33	12	15	3	0	1	19
Professor	180	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
Associate Professor	158	13	3	0	1	0	0	1
Assistant Professor	143	12	0	1	1	0	0	7
Other	69	2	2	2	1	0	0	6
Limited term, continuing	43	4	1	2	0	0	0	3
Retired	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Undergraduate	28	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Limited term, 1-yr position	23	2	0	0	0	0	0	1

### III. Comparison between the demographics of SMT members and other datasets

The categories within gender, race and ethnicity, employment status, and rank were compared to the most recent datasets available from other organizations, specifically College Music Society (CMS),<sup>10</sup> National Association of Schools of Music (NASM),<sup>11</sup> the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS),<sup>12</sup> the Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED),<sup>13</sup> American Musicological Society (AMS),<sup>14</sup> and the

<sup>10</sup> As of October 2017, the most recent CMS information on demographics comes from their July 2015 report: [https://www.music.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=2311&Itemid=2192](https://www.music.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2311&Itemid=2192). The only annual reports available on the CMS webpage are from the years 2013, 2014, and 2015. CMS members are mostly music academics (73%) and students (20%). Music theorists makeup 16% of the CMS membership; other disciplines include composition, ethnomusicology, music education, musicology, music business, general music studies, and performance.

<sup>11</sup> Recent NASM datasets on demographics were not available at the time of this report. I used data from the 2012-2013 Higher Education Arts Data Services survey, which was last included in the 2014 SMT Statistician's report ([https://societymusictheory.org/files/SMT\\_Demographics\\_Report\\_2014.pdf](https://societymusictheory.org/files/SMT_Demographics_Report_2014.pdf)). This report collects demographic data of both faculty and students of participating schools.

<sup>12</sup> The most recent IPEDS report comes from 2015, which includes data collected for all full-time faculty and instructional staff at postsecondary institutions. Their 2015 report contains data on rank, gender and race/ethnicity for the years 2009, 2011, and 2013. The database is maintained by the National Center for

Society for Ethnomusicology (SEM).<sup>15</sup> As stated in the footnotes, each organization does not necessarily collect data on an annual basis, and even if they do, most recent dataset may not yet be available. For example, CMS collects on an annual basis, but the most recent data available is from 2015. SEM only collects data every six years, with the year 2014 as the most recent collection.

The SMT data below captures the demographics as of September 30, 2017. While I have hesitations comparing the 2017 SMT data with data from earlier years, such as the 2015 CMS data and 2014 SEM data, it has already been noted in Part II (above) that there have not been significant demographic changes in SMT's membership from 2014 to present. The following tables have been created to illustrate broad comparisons between the demographics of the Society for Music Theory and other populations.

There are complications in comparing datasets, as some organizations allowed participants not to respond to particular questions and others did not. This naturally will create differences in percentages. Rather than omitting those who preferred not to respond, I have included the data true to how it was reported by the individual organizations.

For the ease of reading the tables below, the blank entries are indicative that these categories were not options to members of those organizations. I left these boxes blank to encourage your eyes to compare the actual numbers. The tenth decimal place was provided when known.

---

Education Statistics, and the data I drew from comes from the following table:

[https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15\\_315.20.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_315.20.asp)

<sup>13</sup> The Survey of Earned Doctorates provides data from doctorate recipients from U.S. colleges and universities from 1957-2015 (<https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2017/nsf17306/data.cfm>). Data on gender, race/ethnicity, and other information is provided. The tables herein include data for 2015 doctorate recipients for a variety of populations, specifically doctorate recipients across all fields, all who received a doctorate in the humanities disciplines, all who received a doctorate in music (which includes the following categories: music education, musicology and ethnomusicology, music theory and composition, music performance, and music (general)), and finally those who received a doctorate in the specific category called “music theory and composition.”

<sup>14</sup> Data for AMS was obtained from a 2017 demographic report prepared by AMS Statistician John McKay, derived from November 2016 data (<http://www.ams-net.org/administration/demographics/DemographicsReport-2017-02.pdf>).

<sup>15</sup> SEM's Executive Director provided data from a 2014 survey of SEM members. SEM conducts surveys of its membership every six years and thus we can expect the next SEM data collection in 2020. In 2014, 32% of their members responded to the membership survey.

A. Gender

The number of female members in SMT is more disproportionate than most other datasets.

Columns are organized from left to right in order of increasing female membership, with the exception of the SMT column, which is fixed in the left-most column.

	<b>SMT</b>	SED: music theory and composition	CMS <sup>16</sup>	IPEDS	NASM	SED: all fields	SED: all music	SED: all humanities	AMS <sup>17</sup>	SEM <sup>18</sup>
Female	<b>31.6%</b>	28.7%	36.5%	44.8%	45%	46.2%	47.8%	50.6%	51.2%	52.2%
Male	<b>66.4%</b>	71.3%	58.2%	55.2%	55%	53.8%	52.2%	49.4%	48.5%	46.5%
Transgender	<b>0.3%</b>								0.3%	
Another identity	<b>0.2%</b>									0.0%
Prefer not to answer	<b>1.6%</b>		5.7%							1.3%

B. Race and ethnicity

The table below demonstrates greater imbalances within diversity amongst members of SMT than most other datasets. If the 44 SMT members who preferred not to answer the question on race/ethnicity were not included in the number of total SMT members in 2017 (3.9% of respondents), SMT’s non-white membership is 11.2%.

The rows in the table below reprise the categories collected by SMT, with the addition of an “other” category for the organizations that used this category.

CMS does not collect the race/ethnicity of its members and was not included in the following table.

<sup>16</sup> The CMS, NASM, SED, and IPEDS reports do not include additional gender categories.

<sup>17</sup> AMS uses a free response in the gender field, and thus many replies were collated into the categories of “female,” “male,” and transgender.” The “female” category represents responses including “f,” “fem,” “female,” “cis female,” and “woman.” Any response indicating a variant of “trans” was included under “transgender.”

<sup>18</sup> The SEM 2014 survey also included “intersexed” and “third sex” response options, but no respondents selected these categories. I’ve tried to indicate this by including the entry of 0% in the “another identity” category used by SMT.

Columns are organized from left to right in order of increasing diversity, with the exception of the SMT column, which is fixed in the left-most column.

	<b>SMT</b>	AMS	SED: music theory and composition	SED: all music	SED: all humanities	IPEDS	SEM	SED: all fields <sup>19</sup>	NASM
White	<b>85.3%</b>	89.7%	88.2%	79.7%	78.9%	78.5%	77.0% <sup>20</sup>	72.3%	69%
Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>6.3%</b>	3.5% Asian <sup>21</sup>	5.9%	5.5%	4.4%	9.9%	6.1% Asian, 0.8% Pac. Islander	8.7%	5% Asian, 0% Pac. Islander <sup>22</sup>
Hispanic	<b>1.9%</b>	3.2%	4.7%	4.7%	8.1%	4.5%	6.4%	7.0%	8%
Mixed Race	<b>1.8%</b>	2.9%	0.0%	2.5%	2.5%	0.7%		2.6%	
Black	<b>0.8%</b>	1.1%	0.0%	4.0%	3.1%	5.9%	4.8%	6.5%	7%
Race/ethnicity unknown	<b>0.1%</b>								
Native American	<b>0.0%</b>	0.2%	0.0%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	3.1%	0.4%	0%
First Nation	<b>0.0%</b>								
Other	<b>N/A</b>	2.7%	1.2% <sup>23</sup>	1.7%	0.8%		9.4% <sup>24</sup>	0.7%	11% <sup>25</sup>
Prefer not to answer	<b>3.9%</b>		0.0%	1.5%	1.6%			1.8%	

<sup>19</sup> The Survey of Earned Doctorates only reports the race/ethnicity of U.S. citizens and permanent residents. Of the 55,006 recipients of doctorates in 2015, the SED reported the race/ethnicity for a total of 35,117 U.S. citizens and permanent residents.

<sup>20</sup> Within this category, 75.5% identified as “Euro-American” and 1.5% identified as “Middle Eastern American,” which were added together in this row.

<sup>21</sup> AMS uses the category “Asian” rather than SMT’s “Asian/Pacific Islander.” This could potentially explain the larger number in the category “Other.”

<sup>22</sup> The HEADS survey has separate categories for Asian and Pacific Islander. Five percent identified with Asian, and 0% with Pacific Islander.

<sup>23</sup> The Survey of Earned Doctorates includes the category “Other race or race not reported.” I added this percentage to this row, despite the fact that a portion of this percentage also belongs in the “prefer not to answer” category below.

<sup>24</sup> Of the 9.4% who indicated “other,” some SEM members entered such terms in the free responses such as “white,” “Caucasian,” “Jewish-American,” or specific European national groups. Nevertheless, they are reported here as “other,” just as they are in the SEM membership report.

<sup>25</sup> The HEADS survey combines the categories of “other” and “unknown” together, so some of this percentage belongs in the SMT category “Race/ethnicity unknown.”

### C. Rank and employment status

Different organizations report on rank and employment status in varying ways, making comparisons difficult. IPEDS only lists information for full-time faculty, for example, whereas SMT asked whether members were full time, part time, other, or unemployed. In looking at the data provided by other organizations, one of the more encouraging findings is that SMT has a more robust student population than other societies:

- SEM is comprised of students (27.1%), those employed in a college/university (63.6%), and those employed outside of a college/university (9.3%). SMT's student membership (graduate students 30.9% and undergraduates are 2.8% of the SMT membership) is slightly higher than found in SEM.
- Similarly, SMT has a higher proportion of student members than AMS, whose students comprise 27.6% of its membership.
- Unlike SMT, CMS does not distinguish between full-time and part-time members, so it is difficult to make any comparisons with the data collected by SMT. Their categories are: regular (72.5%), retired (3.4%), student (19.6%), and life members (4.5%). SMT has 33.7% student membership, and thus has more student members than CMS.