

Annual Report on Membership Demographics

Society for Music Theory

October 2018

Table of Contents

- I. Preface

- II. Demographics of the SMT's 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 SMT's demographics and other datasets: College Music Society, National Association of Schools of Music (from the Higher Education Arts Data Services Data Survey), the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, the Survey of Earned Doctorates, the American Musicological Society, and the Society for Ethnomusicology
 - A. Gender
 - B. Race/ethnicity
 - C. Rank and employment status

- IV. Contents of previous reports on the SMT's demographics

I. Preface

The purpose of this document is to:

- Report the demographics of the Society for Music Theory's members using data collected when members renew their membership
- Compare the demographics data from the SMT's members with other datasets
- Identify data trends to support strategies to improve the diversity among the SMT's membership

This report will be initially shared with SMT's Executive Board, and then posted to SMT's website. Please contact me if you have recommendations and/or suggestions for future reports.

Respectfully submitted,

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

II. Demographics of the SMT's Membership

The following reports the demographics makeup of the Society for Music Theory, obtained from a membership list as of September 30, 2018. Also included are the demographics of the SMT membership since 2014 (no demographics data is posted online for 2012 and 2013).

The categories listed below are derived from the responses indicated on each member's "My SMT Profile" on the society's webpage (<https://societymusictheory.org/smtprofile/profile>).¹

Raw numbers in the charts below are taken from the demographics reports posted online here: <https://societymusictheory.org/administration/demographics>. Percentages given below are derived from the number of members in that particular category divided by the membership total. The percentage is followed by raw counts in parentheses. Note that two of the categories below (employment status and rank) do not require members to make a selection on the My SMT Profile page, whereas the gender and race/ethnicity categories do force a choice. Blank responses were left out of the membership total when deriving percentages, but those who selected "prefer not to answer" were included in the membership total when calculating percentages.

Rows in the charts below are organized such that the first row in the chart contains the highest percentage of the 2018 SMT population in that particular category.

A. Total number of members in the Society for Music Theory

	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
Membership total	1154	1133	1299	1220	1164

B. Gender

	2018	2017	2016	2015 ²	2014 ³
Man	62.5% (721)	66.4% (752)	64.7% (841)	66.6% (812)	69.4% (808)
Woman	33.4% (385)	31.6% (358)	33.5% (435)	32.1% (392)	30.6% (356)
Prefer not to answer	3.8% (44)	1.6% (18)	1.5% (19)	0.1% (1)	Not collected
Trans/Transgender	0.2% (2)	0.3% (3)	0.2% (3)	0.1% (1)	Not collected
Another identity	0.2% (2)	0.2% (2)	0.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	Not collected

¹ In May 2015, the My SMT Profile page was updated to include the following categories within gender, employment status, rank, and race/ethnicity. The 2014 data uses different categories, and these differences are indicated throughout this report.

² The raw numbers in this column sum to 1206, whereas the membership total for the year 2015 was 1220.

³ The 2014 collection did not collect additional gender categories other than "woman" and "man."

C. Race/ethnicity

	2018	2017	2016	2015 ⁴	2014 ⁵
White	84.2% (972)	85.3% (965)	87.3% (1132)	88.6% (957)	83.1% (771)
Asian/Pacific Islander	6.2% (72)	6.3% (71)	6.4% (83)	5.3% (57)	4.4% (41)
Prefer not to answer	4.5% (52)	3.9% (44)	2.5% (32)	2.0% (22)	
Hispanic	2.2% (25)	1.9% (21)	1.6% (21)	2.3% (25)	3.7% (34)
Mixed Race	1.7% (20)	1.8% (20)	1.1% (14)	0.5% (5)	
Black	0.7% (8)	0.8% (9)	0.9% (12)	1.2% (13)	1.2% (11)
Race/Ethnicity unknown	0.3% (4)	0.1% (1)	0.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	
Native American	0.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.1% (1)	0.2% (2)	0.3% (3)
First Nation	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	
2014 category: Other					6.9% (64)
2014 category: Mexic. Am.					0.4% (4)
No data ⁶	0	2	3	140	236 ⁷

D. Rank

	2018	2017	2016	2015 ⁸	2014
Graduate student	30.0% (327)	30.9% (342)	30.0% (382)	33.0% (374)	37.5% (372)
Professor	17.5% (190)	17.3% (191)	18.7% (238)	16.1% (183)	14.0% (139)
Associate Professor	16.3% (177)	15.9% (176)	15.1% (192)	16.7% (190)	16.3% (162)
Assistant Professor	15.8% (172)	14.8% (164)	14.9% (190)	14.9% (169)	17.7% (176)
Other	6.4% (70)	7.4% (82)	6.7% (85)	4.1% (46)	N/A
Limited term, continuing	4.8% (52)	4.8% (53)	6.3% (80)	7.2% (82)	N/A
Retired	3.6% (39)	3.7% (41)	2.9% (37)	3.3% (37)	N/A
Undergraduate	3.2% (35)	2.8% (31)	3.2% (41)	3.0% (34)	3.6% (36)
Limited term, 1-yr position	2.5% (27)	2.4% (26)	2.2% (28)	1.7% (19)	N/A
2014 category: Lecturer					7.9% (78)
2014 category: Emeritus					3.0% (30)
No response ⁹	65	27	26	85	171

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

⁵ 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.

⁶ Despite the fact that the “My SMT Profile” on the SMT website forced a choice in this category, past years did not have data on some members.

⁷ Note that the raw numbers from the 2014 report do not sum to the membership total. The 236 missing members may have not responded to this category and I have included them in the row titled “no data.”

⁸ The raw numbers in this column sum to 1219, which is one person less than the membership total.

E. Employment status

As of 2018, members reporting their employment status as “other” slightly outnumber those reporting as “part time.”

	2018	2017	2016 ¹⁰	2015	2014
Full Time	86.9% (603)	92.0% (589)	No data	76.8% (172)	Not collected
Other	5.9% (41)	3.6% (23)	No data	5.8% (13)	Not collected
Part Time	5.6% (39)	4.1% (26)	No data	15.6% (35)	Not collected
Unemployed	1.6% (11)	0.3% (2)	No data	1.8% (4)	Not collected
No response ¹¹	460	493	No data	996	Not collected

F. Employment status by gender

Raw counts of 2018 SMT members are provided in the following table. The 460 members who did not give an employment status in the “My SMT Profile” webpage are not included below, as well as the 44 members who did not provide their gender. (There was some overlap between these cohorts.)

Women comprise 30.7% of those employed in full-time positions and make up 34.7% of the total membership. Similarly, women are 34.4% of non-full-time positions, also mirroring the demographics of the total membership.

	Men	Women	Trans/ Transgender	Another Identity
Full Time	415	184 (30.7% of all full timers)		
Other	30	11 (26.8% of those reporting employment as “other”)		
Part Time	24	14 (36.8% of part timers)		
Unemployed	5	6 (54.5% of unemployed)		

⁹ The “My SMT Profile” webpage allows members to leave this field blank.

¹⁰ According to the SMT Statistician in 2016 (Gabe Fankhauser), data collection regarding employment status in 2016 had irregularities due to a glitch in data collection. He omitted this data from his 2016 report.

¹¹ The “My SMT Profile” webpage allows members to leave this field blank.

G. Rank by gender

Raw counts of 2018 SMT members are provided in the following table, excluding the 65 members who did not provide a rank and the 44 members who did not provide a gender (there was some overlap between these two groups).

Men outnumber women in all ranks, although this discrepancy is less prominent in the lower ranks. For example, women make up 39.2% of those reporting as graduate students in 2018, a higher percentage than the 38.0% of women graduate students in 2017 and also higher than the percentage of women in the total SMT membership in 2018 (34.7%). In contrast, women only make up 26.3% of retirees and 25.9% of full professors.

	Men	Women	Trans/ Transgender	Another Identity
Graduate student	191	125 (39.2% of all graduate students)	1	2
Professor	140	49 (25.9% of professors)		
Associate Professor	124	51 (29.1% of assoc. profs.)		
Assistant Professor	103	66 (39.1% of asst. profs.)		
Other	49	20 (29.0% of those reporting rank as "other")	1	
Limited term, continuing	34	18 (34.6% of cont. limited term employees)		
Retired	28	10 (26.3% of retirees)		
Limited term, 1-yr position	14	12 (46.2% of 1-yr limited term employees)		
Undergraduate	13	16 (55.2% of undergrad students)		

H. Employment status by race/ethnicity

Raw counts of 2018 SMT members are provided in the following table, which excludes the 460 members who did not provide their employment status. Of the 694 SMT members who reported their employment status in 2018, white members comprise 90.4% of full-time employees (also excluding those who preferred not to answer the race/ethnicity field), whereas the total number of non-white members in the SMT is 84.2%. All unemployed members reported their race/ethnicity as white.

	White	Asian/Pac. Islander	Hispanic	Mixed Race	Black	Native American	Race unknown	Prefer not to answer
Full Time	529 (90.4% of full-timers)	35	8	5	6	1	1	18
Other	37 (94.9% of those reporting rank as "other")	1		1				2
Part Time	31 (83.8% of part-timers)	1	1	3	1			2
Unemployed	10 (100% of the unemployed)							1

I. Rank by race/ethnicity

Raw counts of 2018 SMT members are provided in the following table, which excludes the 65 members who elected to leave their rank blank. When making the percentages shown below, totals for each rank excluded the 65 members who left their rank field empty and also those who preferred not to provide their rank/ethnicity. The ranks within SMT membership with the highest percentages of non-whites are limited term (continuing) faculty, undergraduate students, and graduate students, demonstrated by the percentages in the table below. For example, 80.9% of graduate students identify as white, whereas the overall white population of the SMT is 84.2%. No non-white SMT members identified as retired in 2018, and non-white members are less likely to hold higher ranks.

	White	Asian/Pac. Islander	Hispanic	Mixed Race	Black	Native American	Race unknown	Prefer not to answer
Graduate student	250 (80.9%)	35	10	11	1		2	18
Professor	179 (96.2%)	3	1	1	2			4
Associate Professor	159 (91.4%)	10	4		1			3
Assistant Professor	150 (90.4%)	10	2	1	2	1		6
Other	58 (89.2%)	3		2	1		1	5
Limited term, continuing	36 (72.0%)	7	2	5				2
Retired	36 (100.0%)							3
Undergraduate	24 (80.0%)	1	5					5
Limited term, 1-yr position	26 (96.3%)	1						

III. Comparison between the SMT's demographics 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),¹² National Association of Schools of Music (NASM),¹³ the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS),¹⁴ the Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED),¹⁵ American Musicological Society (AMS),¹⁶ and the Society for Ethnomusicology (SEM).¹⁷ As discussed in the footnotes, each organization does not necessarily collect data on an annual basis, and even if they do, most recent data is not yet available. For example, CMS collects data 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, 2018. While I have hesitations comparing the 2018 SMT data with the data from earlier years, such as the 2015 CMS data and 2014 SEM data, it can be 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 additional complications in comparing datasets, as some organizations allowed participants not to respond to particular questions and others did not.

For the ease of reading the tables below, the blank entries are indicative that these categories were not options to members of those organizations. The tenth decimal place was provided when known.

¹² As of October 2018, the most recent CMS data comes from their July 2015 report: 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.

¹³ Recent NASM data was not available at the time of this report. I used the 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). This report collects demographic data of both faculty and students of participating schools.

¹⁴ The most recent IPEDS report comes from the 2017 Digest of Education Statistics, which includes data collected for all full-time faculty and instructional staff at postsecondary institutions. The database is maintained by the National Center for Education Statistics, and I drew data from charts at this website: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/2017menu_tables.asp

¹⁵ The Survey of Earned Doctorates provides annual data from doctorate recipients from U.S. colleges and universities from 1957-2016 (<https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2018/nsf18304/data.cfm>) that was released in December 2017. Data on gender, race/ethnicity, and other information is provided. The tables herein include data for 2016 doctorate recipients for a variety of populations, specifically all 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 used in their survey called "music theory and composition."

¹⁶ 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>).

¹⁷ 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

Columns are organized from left to right in order of increasing women in the membership, with the exception of the SMT column, which is fixed in the left-most column. The number of members identifying as women in the SMT is more disproportionate than most other datasets. Note that some organizations, such as the SMT, allow members to select “prefer not to answer,” whereas other datasets do not. I have included those who preferred not to respond with their gender when calculating the percentages below, as there were two other datasets that also used “prefer not to answer” as well: CMS and SEM (see below).

	SMT	SED: music theory and composition ¹⁸	CMS ¹⁹	NASM	IPEDS: FT only ²⁰	SED: all fields ²¹	SED: all music ²²	IPEDS: FT and PT ²³	SED: all humanities	AMS ²⁴	SEM ²⁵
Women	33.4% ²⁶	26.1%	36.5%	45%	45.9%	46.0%	47.9%	49.3%	51.9%	51.2%	52.2%
Men	62.5%	73.9%	58.2%	55%	54.1%	54.0%	52.1%	50.7%	48.1%	48.5%	46.5%
Trans.	0.2%									0.3%	
Another identity	0.2%										0.0%
Prefer not to answer	3.8%		5.7%								1.3%

¹⁸ Gender data on the 2016 doctorate recipients in “music theory and composition” are sourced from the following table: <https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2018/nsf18304/datatables/tab16.htm>

¹⁹ The CMS, NASM, SED, and IPEDS reports do not include additional gender categories.

²⁰ The percentages for gender in full-time faculty came from this table:

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d17/tables/dt17_315.20.asp

²¹ Information on gender of 2016 doctorate recipients in all fields and also within the humanities comes from this table: <https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2018/nsf18304/datatables/tab06.htm>

²² Information on gender of 2016 doctoral recipients in all music fields comes from this table:

<https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2018/nsf18304/datatables/tab16.htm>, where I combined doctoral recipients in music education, music (general), musicology and ethnomusicology, music performance, and music theory and composition to determine the percentages in the column in my report.

²³ The percentages for gender in faculty were drawn from here:

https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d17/tables/dt17_315.10.asp. I used the percentages from 2016, as this was the most recent year reported in the chart, which includes all faculty in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, full time and part time, including faculty members with the title of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer, assisting professor, adjunct professor, or interim professor (or the equivalent). Excluded are graduate students with titles such as graduate or teaching fellow who assist senior faculty. Degree-granting institutions grant associate’s or higher degrees and participate in Title IV federal financial aid programs.

²⁴ 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.”

²⁵ The SEM 2014 survey also included “intersexed” and “third sex” response options, but no respondents selected these. I’ve tried to capture this by including the entry of 0% in the “another identity” category used by SMT.

²⁶ Note that this percentage includes all SMT members. As already illustrated in the table in II.F of this report, women make up only 30.7% of full-time employees in the SMT, drawing an even starker contrast with the other datasets provided in the table in III.A.

B. Race and ethnicity

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. The rows below reprise the categories collected by SMT, with the addition of a category called “other” category, used by some organizations. Note that some organizations allow members to select “prefer not to answer,” and others do not. Also note that CMS does not collect the race/ethnicity of its members and was not included in the following table.

	SMT	AMS	SED: music theory and composition ²⁷	SED: all humanities ²⁸	SED: all music ²⁹	SEM	IPEDS ³⁰	NASM	SED: all fields ³¹
White	84.2%	89.7%	82.7%	79.3%	77.2%	77.0% ³²	70.5%	69%	52.4%
Asian/Pacific Islander	6.2%	3.5% Asian ³³	2.7%	4.0%	7.8%	6.1% Asian, 0.8% Pac. Islander	9.7% Asian, 0.1% Pac. Islander	5% Asian, 0% Pac. Islander ³⁴	25.6%
Hispanic	2.2%	3.2%	5.3%	7.2%	5.1%	6.4%	4.6%	8%	6.5%
Mixed Race	1.7%	2.9%	4.0%	2.5%	3.5%		0.9%		2.0%
Black	0.7%	1.1%	1.3%	3.8%	4.3%	4.8%	5.5%	7%	5.2%
Race unknown	0.3%						2.7%		
Native American	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	0.3%	3.1%	0.4%	0%	0.3%
First Nation	0.0%								
Other		2.7%	1.3% ³⁵	0.6%	1.3%	9.4% ³⁶	5.5% ³⁷	11% ³⁸	0.9%
Prefer not to answer	4.5%		2.7% ³⁹	2.1%	0.5%				7.1%

²⁷ There were 92 doctorate recipients in music theory and composition in 2016. Race/ethnicity is provided for only 75 of these recipients, as data are not reported for the 17 temporary visa holders:

<https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2018/nsf18304/datatables/tab22.htm>.

²⁸ Race/ethnicity information on the 4,447 doctorate recipients in the humanities in 2016 (from all U.S. citizen and permanent residents) comes from this table: <https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2018/nsf18304/datatables/tab24.htm>.

²⁹ Data were compiled from all music doctorate recipients, which includes rows on music education, music, musicology and ethnomusicology, music performance, and music theory and composition from this table: <https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2018/nsf18304/datatables/tab22.htm>.

³⁰ Data on the race/ethnicity of all full-time faculty in degree-granting postsecondary institutions from the year 2016 are reported in this table: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d17/tables/dt17_315.20.asp.

³¹ Data describing the race/ethnicity of all 54,904 doctorate recipients in the year 2016 can be found here: <https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/2018/nsf18304/datatables/tab19.htm>.

³² Within this category, 75.5% of SEM members identified as “Euro-American” and 1.5% identified as “Middle Eastern American,” which were added together in this row.

³³ AMS uses the category “Asian” rather than SMT’s “Asian/Pacific Islander.” This could potentially explain the larger number in the AMS category titled “Other.”

³⁴ The HEADS survey has separate categories for Asian and Pacific Islander. Five percent identified with Asian, and 0% with Pacific Islander.

³⁵ The Survey of Earned Doctorates includes the category “Other race or race not reported.”

³⁶ Of the 9.4% who indicated “other,” some SEM members entered such terms in the free-response blank such as “white,” “Caucasian,” “Jewish-American,” or specific European national groups. The SEM membership report reported these members as “other.”

³⁷ The National Center for Education Statistics reports that there were 44,639 full-time faculty (5.5% of full-time faculty) who were non-resident aliens, and their race/ethnicity was not collected.

³⁸ The HEADS survey combines the categories of “other” and “unknown” together, so some of this percentage belongs in “Race/ethnicity unknown.”

³⁹ The SED collects “ethnicity not reported,” which was included here.

C. Rank and employment status

Organizations report on rank and employment status in varying ways, making comparisons difficult. Whereas the SMT asked whether members are full time, part time, other, or unemployed, IPEDS, for example, only lists information for full-time faculty.

Given these difficulties, I have chosen to focus this report solely on the student population within SMT and similar societies. Three organizations provide student data within its membership: CMS, SEM, and AMS.⁴⁰ The SMT has a more robust student population than these societies, shown below:

	SMT	SEM ⁴¹	AMS	CMS ⁴²
Percentage of students within the society	33.2% (30.0% grads, 3.2% undergrads)	27.1%	27.6%	19.6%

IV. Contents of previous reports on the SMT's demographics

A description of previous annual demographics reports is drawn from that posted here:

<https://societymusictheory.org/administration/demographics>.

- 2017: The 2017 report has the same format as the 2018 report: the report includes SMT demographics (total membership, gender, ethnicity, rank, employment status) as well as a comparison with other datasets (e.g., the College Music Society, the National Association of Schools of Music (from the Higher Education Arts Data Services Data Survey), the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, the Survey of Earned Doctorates, the American Musicological Society, and the Society for Ethnomusicology).
- 2016: The report includes SMT demographics only (total membership, gender, ethnicity, rank, country).
- 2015: The report includes SMT demographics only (total membership, gender, ethnicity, rank, employment, nationality, *Music Theory Spectrum* preference (print or no print)).
- 2014: The report includes SMT demographics (total membership, gender, ethnicity, rank) and also similar data from CMS and HEADS.
- 2013: No report is posted online.
- 2012: No report is posted online.
- 2009-2011: One comprehensive report was conducted for all three years. The report compares numbers for gender, ethnicity, and rank from 2009-2011. Data are then compared with similar data from CMS and IPEDS.
- 2001-2008: No gender or ethnicity information is available, as stated on the SMT demographics webpage.

⁴⁰ The SMT is the only organization that collects both undergraduate and graduate student categories. Other datasets simply use a category titled "student."

⁴¹ SEM reports three employment ranks within its membership: students (27.1%), those employed in a college/university (63.6%), and those employed outside of a college/university (9.3%).

⁴² CMS reports four types of members: regular (72.5%), retired (3.4%), student (19.6%), and life members (4.5%). Note that CMS does not distinguish between full time and part time faculty in their report.