

Annual Report on Membership Demographics

Society for Music Theory

October 2019

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
 - J. Summary: Percent of SMT members by gender and race identity, in each rank

- 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 in November 2019, and then posted to SMT's website. Please contact me if you have recommendations and/or suggestions for future reports.

Respectfully submitted,

Jenine Brown
Assistant Professor of Music Theory – Ear Training
The Peabody Conservatory – 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 October 3, 2019. 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>). In May 2015, the My SMT Profile page was updated to include categories within gender, employment status, rank, and race/ethnicity. The 2014 data uses different categories, and these differences are indicated throughout this report.

Raw numbers in the tables 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 tables below are organized such that the first row in the table contains the highest percentage of the 2019 SMT population in that particular category.

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

	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
Membership total	1173	1154	1133	1299	1220	1164

B. Gender

	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015 ¹	2014 ²
Man	63.9% (750)	62.5% (721)	66.4% (752)	64.7% (841)	66.6% (812)	69.4% (808)
Woman	33.2% (389)	33.4% (385)	31.6% (358)	33.5% (435)	32.1% (392)	30.6% (356)
Prefer not to answer	2.4% (28)	3.8% (44)	1.6% (18)	1.5% (19)	0.1% (1)	Not collected
Trans/Transgender	0.3% (3) ³	0.2% (2)	0.3% (3)	0.2% (3)	0.1% (1)	Not collected
Another identity	0.3% (3)	0.2% (2)	0.2% (2)	0.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	Not collected

¹ The raw numbers in this column sum to 1206, whereas the membership total for the year 2015 was 1220.

² The 2014 collection did not collect additional gender categories other than "woman" and "man."

³ Five of the six members who selected "Trans/Transgender" and "Another identity" in 2019 wrote "nonbinary" when prompted to specify their response.

C. Race/ethnicity

	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015 ⁴	2014 ⁵
White	83.7% (977)	84.2% (972)	85.3% (965)	87.3% (1132)	88.6% (957)	83.1% (771)
Asian/Pacific Islander	7.0% (82)	6.2% (72)	6.3% (71)	6.4% (83)	5.3% (57)	4.4% (41)
Prefer not to answer	3.9% (45)	4.5% (52)	3.9% (44)	2.5% (32)	2.0% (22)	
Hispanic	2.7% (31)	2.2% (25)	1.9% (21)	1.6% (21)	2.3% (25)	3.7% (34)
Mixed Race	1.5% (17)	1.7% (20)	1.8% (20)	1.1% (14)	0.5% (5)	
Black	1.0% (12)	0.7% (8)	0.8% (9)	0.9% (12)	1.2% (13)	1.2% (11)
Race/Ethnicity unknown	0.3% (2)	0.3% (4)	0.1% (1)	0.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	
Native American	0.1% (1)	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)	0.0% (0)	
2014 category: Other						6.9% (64)
2014 category: Mexic. Am.						0.4% (4)
No data ⁶	6	0	2	3	140	236 ⁷

D. Rank

	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015 ⁸	2014
Graduate student	29.8% (328)	30.0% (327)	30.9% (342)	30.0% (382)	33.0% (374)	37.5% (372)
Associate Professor	17.6% (194)	16.3% (177)	15.9% (176)	15.1% (192)	16.7% (190)	16.3% (162)
Assistant Professor	16.5% (182)	15.8% (172)	14.8% (164)	14.9% (190)	14.9% (169)	17.7% (176)
Professor	16.1% (177)	17.5% (190)	17.3% (191)	18.7% (238)	16.1% (183)	14.0% (139)
Other	7.1% (78)	6.4% (70)	7.4% (82)	6.7% (85)	4.1% (46)	N/A
Limited term, continuing	4.9% (54)	4.8% (52)	4.8% (53)	6.3% (80)	7.2% (82)	N/A
Retired	3.4% (37)	3.6% (39)	3.7% (41)	2.9% (37)	3.3% (37)	N/A
Limited term, 1-yr. position	2.6% (29)	2.5% (27)	2.4% (26)	2.2% (28)	1.7% (19)	N/A
Undergraduate	2.0% (22)	3.2% (35)	2.8% (31)	3.2% (41)	3.0% (34)	3.6% (36)
2014 category: Lecturer						7.9% (78)
2014 category: Emeritus						3.0% (30)
No response ⁹	72	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 to present.

⁶ Despite the fact that the “My SMT Profile” on the SMT website forced a choice in this category, some members have a blank response. Blank responses are not included in the membership total when deriving percentages.

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

Students make up 202 of the 357 members who did not provide a response. Some of the 350 students that makeup the 2019 membership also selected full-time and part-time employment status.

	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
Full Time	81.1% (662)	86.9% (603)	92.0% (589)	No data	76.8% (172)	Not collected
Part Time	10.2% (83)	5.6% (39)	4.1% (26)	No data	15.6% (35)	Not collected
Other	6.9% (56)	5.9% (41)	3.6% (23)	No data	5.8% (13)	Not collected
Unemployed	1.8% (15)	1.6% (11)	0.3% (2)	No data	1.8% (4)	Not collected
No response ¹⁰	357	460	493	No data	996	Not collected

F. Employment status by gender

Raw counts of 2019 SMT members are provided in the following table. The 357 members who did not give an employment status in the “My SMT Profile” webpage are not included below, as well as the 28 members who did not provide their gender (there was some overlap between these categories).

The table below lists the employment status with the largest percentage of women at the top of the table, and the employment status with the smallest percentage of women is at the bottom of the table.

Women make up 33.2% of the total SMT membership, and comprise 31.3% of those employed in full-time positions and 34.9% of those in non-full-time positions.

	Men	Women	Trans/ Transgender	Another Identity
Unemployed	7	7 (46.7% of all unemployed)	0	1
Other	34	21 (38.2% of those reporting employment as “other”)	0	0
Full Time	451	206 (31.3% of all full timers)	0	1
Part Time	55	25 (30.9% of all part timers)	0	1

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

¹⁰ The “My SMT Profile” webpage allows members to leave this field blank.

G. Rank by gender

Raw counts of 2019 SMT members are provided in the following table, excluding the 72 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: thirteen people did not provide a gender or a rank). Specifically, no gender was collected on two assistant professors, one associate professor, seven graduate students, two professors, one retired member, and two undergraduate students.

The table below lists the rank with the largest percentage of women at the top of the table, and the rank with the smallest percentage of women is at the bottom of the table.

Men outnumber women in all ranks. Women are least represented in ranks of associate and full professor.

	Men	Women	Trans/ Transgender	Another Identity
Limited term, 1-yr. position	17	12 (41.4% of 1-yr. limited term employees)	0	0
Graduate student	188	129 (40.2% of all grad. students)	3	1
Assistant Professor	110	69 (38.3% of asst. profs.)	0	1
Undergraduate	13	7 (35.0% of undergrad students)	0	0
Limited term, continuing	36	18 (33.3% of cont. limited term employees)	0	0
Other	54	23 (29.5% of those reporting rank as "other")	0	1
Retired	26	10 (27.8% of retirees)	0	0
Associate Professor	139	54 (28.0% of assoc. profs.)	0	0
Professor	132	43 (24.6% of professors)	0	0

H. Employment status by race/ethnicity

Raw counts of 2019 SMT members are provided in the following table, which excludes the 357 members who did not provide their employment status. Of the 816 SMT members who reported their employment status in 2019, non-white members only comprise 10.0% of full-time employees (this percentage excludes those who preferred not to answer the race/ethnicity field), whereas the total number of non-white members in the SMT is 16.3%.

The table below lists the employment status with the largest percentage of white members at the top of the table, and the employment status with the smallest percentage of white members is at the bottom of the table.

	White	Asian/Pac. Islander	Hispanic	Mixed Race	Black	Native American	Race unknown	Prefer not to answer
Full Time	579 (90.0% of full-timers)	40	10	5	7	1	1	19
Other	47 (87.0% of those reporting rank as "other")	6		1				2
Unemployed	13 (86.7% of the unemployed)		1	1				
Part Time	65 (82.3% of part-timers)	6	3	4	1			4

I. Rank by race/ethnicity

Raw counts of 2019 SMT members are provided in the following table, which excludes the 72 members who left their rank field blank. When making the percentages shown below, totals within each rank excluded the 72 members who left their rank field empty, the 45 members who did preferred to not provide their race/ethnicity, and the six members for which no data was collected in the race/ethnicity field.

The table below lists the rank with the largest percentage of white members at the top of the table, and the rank with the smallest percentage of white members is at the bottom of the table.

Non-white members are less likely to hold higher ranks. For example, 81.2% of graduate students identify as white, whereas 96.0% of full professors identify as white.

	White	Asian/Pac. Islander	Hispanic	Mixed Race	Black	Native American	Race unknown
Retired	34 (100.0%)						
Professor	168 (96.0%)	4	1		2		
Assistant Professor	159 (90.9%)	12	1	1	1	1	
Associate Professor	173 (90.6%)	10	5	1	2		
Other	63 (85.1%)	8		2			1
Limited term, 1-yr. position	24 (82.8%)	4			1		
Graduate student	251 (81.2%)	32	12	10	3		1
Limited term, continuing	40 (80.0%)	5	3	2			
Undergraduate	14 (66.7%)	2	2	1	2		

J. Summary: Percent of SMT members by gender and race identity, in each rank

The recent statement called an “Open Letter to the Music Theory Community,” written on October 1, 2019, by Clifton Boyd, Yayoi Uno Everett, Philip Ewell, Ellie Hisama, Rachel Lumsden, Noriko Manabe, and Joseph Straus, summarized information found in the tables above to include percentages of SMT professors by gender and race identity for 2017 and 2018.¹¹ The table in their letter inspired the table below: I added 2019 demographics data and included additional ranks beneath the three ranks discussed in the letter (these ranks are added in alphabetical order after the initial three ranks described in the Open Letter). The table below summarizes information presented in recent demographics reports so as to aid in future efforts and observe trends.

Non-white percentages do not include those who preferred not to answer the race/ethnicity field.

	Female			Non-white		
	2019	2018	2017	2019	2018	2017
Assistant professor	38.3	39.1	39.5	9.1	9.6	8.9
Associate professor	28.0	29.1	28.6	9.4	8.6	9.7
Professor	24.6	25.9	23.4	4.0	3.8	2.2
Graduate student	40.2	39.2	38.0	18.8	19.1	19.8
Limited term, 1-yr. position	41.4	46.2	37.5	17.2	3.7	8.0
Limited term, continuing	33.3	36.4	32.1	20.0	28.0	14.0
Other	29.5	29.0	29.6	14.9	10.8	9.2
Retired	27.8	26.3	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Undergraduate student	35.0	55.2	33.3	33.3	20.0	9.7

¹¹ https://docs.google.com/document/d/1R_d03OMOcIgTizr6h1-0j7bmd8gP5OFROnuwGwIX-IU/edit?fbclid=IwAR266qrdjl3o-njy3Q_oIjXmfjfpKiYfsgyv86G7ELwGkxV1zATTW05OA

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 October 3, 2019. While some may critique the comparison between 2019 SMT data with datasets of other organizations from previous years, 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 2019, 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 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015 (all reports can be found here: https://www.music.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=142&Itemid=3288). According to their 2015 report, CMS members are mostly music academics (73%) and students (20%). Music theorists make up 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 2018 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 this website: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/2018menu_tables.asp

¹⁵ The Survey of Earned Doctorates provides annual data from doctorate recipients from U.S. colleges and universities. The most recent data comes from those receiving a doctorate in the year 2017, and I drew data from this website: <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf19301/data>. Data on gender, race/ethnicity, and other information is provided. The tables herein include data 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 from survey responses by 41% of the society's membership (<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 (CMS and SEM) that also used “prefer not to answer.”

	SMT	SED: Music theory and composition ¹⁸	CMS ¹⁹	NASM	IPEDS: Full- time faculty only ²⁰	SED: All fields ²¹	IPEDS: FT and PT ²²	SED: All music ²³	AMS ²⁴	SED: All humanities and arts fields ²⁵	SEM ²⁶
Woman	33.2%	30.2%	36.5%	45%	46.3%	46.6%	49.6%	50.0%	51.2%	51.2%	52.2%
Man	63.9%	69.8%	58.2%	55%	53.7%	53.4%	50.4%	50.0%	48.5%	48.8%	46.5%
Trans.	0.3%								0.3%		
Another identity	0.3%										0.0%
Prefer not to answer	2.4%		5.7%								1.3%

¹⁸ Gender data on the 2017 doctorate recipients in “music theory and composition” are sourced from Table 16 here: <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf19301/data>

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

²⁰ The percentages for gender among the 821,168 full-time faculty members at degree-granting postsecondary institutions came from this table; I used data from Fall 2017, as this was the most recent year reported in the following table: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_315.20.asp

²¹ Gender data on the 2017 doctorate recipients in all fields are sourced from Table 16 here: <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf19301/data>

²² Percentages for gender in full-time and part-time faculty at all degree-granting postsecondary institutions were drawn from here: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_315.10.asp. Data represents 1,543,569 full-time and part-time faculty members. I used the percentages from 2017, as this was the most recent year reported in the table, 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 award associate’s or higher degrees and participate in Title IV federal financial aid programs.

²³ Gender data on the 2017 doctorate recipients in the music field are sourced from Table 16 here: <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf19301/data>. Data were compiled from rows on music education, music, musicology and ethnomusicology, music performance, and music theory and composition.

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 Gender data on the 2017 doctorate recipients in all humanities and arts subfields of study are sourced from Table 16 here: <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf19301/data>

²⁶ 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.

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 report the race/ethnicity of its members and was not included in the following table.

	SMT	AMS	SED: Music theory and composition ²⁷	SED: All music ²⁸	SED: All humanities ²⁹	SEM	IPEDS: FT faculty only ³⁰	SED: All fields ³¹	NASM
White	83.7%	89.7%	80.0%	79.7%	78.2%	77.0% ³²	69.8%	69.5%	69%
Asian/Pacific Islander	7.0%	3.5% Asian ³³	5.7%	5.6%	4.2%	6.1% Asian, 0.8% Pac. Islander	10.0% Asian, 0.1% Pac. Islander	9.8%	5% Asian, 0% Pac. Islander
Hispanic	2.7%	3.2%	2.9%	4.5%	7.2%	6.4%	4.8%	7.1%	8%
Mixed Race	1.5%	2.9%	4.3%	2.7%	2.7%		0.9%	2.8%	
Black	1.0%	1.1%	4.3%	2.7%	3.4%	4.8%	5.5%	6.7%	7%
Race unknown	0.3%						2.9%		
Native American	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.5%	0.4%	3.1%	0.4%	0.3%	0%
First Nation	0.0%								
Other		2.7%	1.4% ³⁴	2.4%	1.8%	9.4% ³⁵	5.5% ³⁶	1.3% ³⁷	11% ³⁸
Prefer not to answer	3.9%								

²⁷ There were 86 doctorate recipients in music theory and composition in 2017 (see Table 22 here: <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf19301/data>). Race/ethnicity is provided for only 70 of these recipients, as data are not reported for the 16 temporary visa holders, and percentages are out of the 70 recipients.

²⁸ Data were compiled from all music doctorate recipients in 2017 (excluding temporary visa holders), which includes rows on music education, music, musicology and ethnomusicology, music performance, and music theory and composition from Table 22.

²⁹ Percentages were calculated from the 4,290 doctoral recipients from which race/ethnicity was collected in 2017 (for example, race/ethnicity is not collected for temporary visa holders); see Table 22 at the website in footnote 27.

³⁰ Data on the race/ethnicity of all full-time faculty in degree-granting postsecondary institutions in Fall 2017 are reported in this table: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d18/tables/dt18_315.20.asp?current=yes.

³¹ Data describing the race/ethnicity of all doctorate recipients in the year 2017 can be found in Table 22.

Percentages omit temporary visa holders from the total and are taken from the 35,791 who reported their race.

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 Sourced from the row in Table 22 (<https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf19301/data>) titled “Other race or race not reported.”

³⁵ 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.”

³⁶ The National Center for Education Statistics reports that there were 45,222 full-time faculty (5.5% of full-time faculty) who were non-resident aliens, and their race/ethnicity was not collected; I have added this to the category entitled “other.”

³⁷ Sourced from the row in Table 19 (<https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf19301/data>) titled “Other race or race not reported.”

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

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.³⁹ The SMT has a slightly more robust student population than these societies, shown below:

	SMT	SEM ⁴⁰	AMS	CMS ⁴¹
Percentage of students within the society	31.8% (29.8% grads, 2.0% 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>.

- 2017–8: The 2017 and 2018 demographics report has the same format as the 2019 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.

³⁹ The SMT is the only organization that collects both undergraduate and graduate student categories. Other datasets simply use a category titled “student.”

⁴⁰ 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%).

⁴¹ 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.