

# Report on the Demographic Survey

American Musicological Society

February 2017

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Introductory Notes</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Privacy of Data . . . . .	4
2.2	Statistical Notes . . . . .	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Employment Status . . . . .	5
3.2	Employment Type . . . . .	5
3.3	Employment Sector . . . . .	6
3.4	Rank . . . . .	6
3.5	Appointment Type . . . . .	7
3.6	Number of Years in Current Employment or Student Status . . . . .	7
<b>4</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1	Highest Degree . . . . .	8
4.2	Degree Year . . . . .	9
4.3	Degree Institution . . . . .	10
<b>5</b>	<b>Study Groups and Societies</b>	<b>11</b>
5.1	AMS Study Group Participation . . . . .	11
5.2	Other Scholarly Societies . . . . .	11
<b>6</b>	<b>Personal Demographics</b>	<b>13</b>
6.1	Birth Year and Age . . . . .	13
6.2	Gender . . . . .	13
6.3	Race and Ethnicity . . . . .	14
6.4	LGBTQ . . . . .	15
6.5	Disability . . . . .	15
<b>7</b>	<b>Analysis by Demographic Subcategories</b>	<b>15</b>
7.1	Age . . . . .	16
7.2	Gender . . . . .	16
7.3	Race and Ethnicity . . . . .	17
7.4	LGBTQ . . . . .	18
7.5	Disability . . . . .	18
<b>8</b>	<b>Comparison of the AMS with Other Datasets</b>	<b>18</b>
8.1	Society for Music Theory . . . . .	18
8.2	College Music Society . . . . .	21
8.3	Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) . . . . .	22
8.4	Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED) . . . . .	25

# 1 Introduction

In August 2014, the American Musicological Society invited its members to fill out a brief online survey on the AMS website, following on initiatives begun under former President Christopher Reynolds. While the initial response rate was quite low, appeals from Past President Ellen Harris and reminders from Robert Judd resulted in nearly 1300 responses by the time of the 2016 Annual Meeting, roughly 41% of the AMS membership.

This report documents the initial findings of the demographic survey, using existing data as of November 2016. Members are strongly encouraged to complete the survey and to keep information updated so that we may have a more complete picture for future reports.

A summary of the basic demographic data was also published in the February 2017 newsletter. This report contains further details, correlations, and comparisons. After the introductory material, the first portion of the report provides analysis of the responses to individual questions within the survey in the order the questions were presented online. The final two sections include more detailed analysis (pairing responses to questions with various demographic categories) and a look at how the AMS data compares to other societies and academic datasets, including demographics from SMT and CMS as well as data from IPEDS and SED.

My hope is that this report may serve as a starting point for further inquiries to determine how to address questions of current employment opportunities in the field, to look closer at diversity of various kinds within our current membership and beyond, and to provide some guidance to AMS committees about what our numbers truly are. There are many notable trends shown here—for example, younger members of AMS are indeed more likely to be more diverse in all sorts of ways. But there is obviously still far to go and much work to be done.

I would encourage members with concerns about particular demographic questions not addressed here to contact me directly. If those questions cannot be answered through further analysis of our existing survey data, we can begin to think of new ways to gather the necessary information.

Finally, I'd like to acknowledge the efforts of Evan Cortens, who assisted greatly in the processing of the AMS survey data for this report and provided helpful feedback in sorting out ways to present the data with the greatest accuracy.

Respectfully submitted,

John Z. McKay  
AMS Statistician

## 2 Introductory Notes

### 2.1 Privacy of Data

Strict confidentiality of identities has been maintained in the database information. All respondents are identified in the aggregate data solely by anonymous tokens. All public reports of the data will only reveal aggregate numbers. In some cases in the following report, detailed breakdowns of subcategories are not shown to avoid the possibility of inadvertently identifying individuals when there are small numbers of responses.

### 2.2 Statistical Notes

Approximately 41% of the membership responded to the survey (1,289 responses), but a large number of respondents omitted answers for some questions. The number of responses is generally reported below with each individual question.

In cases where nearly all respondents answered a given question and the percentage is reported for the entire dataset, the margin of error is likely about plus or minus 2%.<sup>1</sup> There are many assumptions that come into play when estimating error, however. The 2% margin of error statistic here assumes a random sample, but some demographic groups may be more or less likely to respond to the survey or to particular questions, which could skew the data further.

In general, the smaller the number of respondents within any given question or category, the larger the potential error may be. Caution should thus be exercised in assuming significant differences when small numbers are reported. (Subcategories containing fewer than five responses and trends derived from them are generally omitted for privacy reasons. Such numbers are also problematic in terms of sampling bias, since just a few additional responses could greatly change the reported statistics.)

The word *significant* is generally used within the report to highlight discrepancies that are more than two standard deviations from the expected mean, as well as places where a chi-squared test may be satisfied with a  $p$  value less than 0.05. (Chi-squared tests were performed on potential correlates across multiple questions.) “Significance” should *not* be taken as a measure of concern or importance for a given finding, but in its technical sense of “less likely to be due to chance.”

---

<sup>1</sup>This statistic assumes a 95% confidence interval, which is standard in most polls that report margin of error. The 95% here refers to the fact that in roughly 5% of the listed statistics, the error is likely larger than 2%. To put it another way, the reported threshold is assumed to be accurate about 19 times out of 20.

### 3 Employment

#### 3.1 Employment Status

Employment status	Responses	Percentage
Full-time	625	48.6%
Student	355	27.6%
Retired	147	11.4%
Part-time	111	8.6%
Unemployed	35	2.7%
Other	13	1.0%
Total responses	1,286	100.0%

“Other” responses include various “independent scholars,” “free-lance,” and “self-employed.”

#### 3.2 Employment Type

Several of the following employment questions were asked only of “regular” AMS members, not student or retired members.

Employment type	Responses	Percentage
Academic teaching and/or administrative appointment	612	83.6%
Non-academic/professional	29	4.0%
Librarian	20	2.7%
Postdoctoral fellowship	19	2.6%
Performance	12	1.6%
Research position	11	1.5%
Non-academic administrative position	10	1.4%
Writing/editorial position	10	1.4%
Other	9	1.2%
Total responses	732	100.0%

“Other” responses include primarily independent scholars and various hybrid positions.

### 3.3 Employment Sector

Sector	Responses	Percentage
University	563	83.4%
Four-year college	73	10.8%
Community/two-year college	9	1.3%
Conservatory	9	1.3%
K-12	5	0.7%
Not applicable	7	1.0%
Other	9	1.3%
Total responses	675	100.0%

“Other” responses include research library, museum, and church, among others.

### 3.4 Rank

Rank	Responses	Percentage
Full professor	196	29.4%
Associate professor	179	26.9%
Assistant professor	126	18.9%
Adjunct/contingent	57	8.6%
Instructor/lecturer	44	6.6%
Staff	17	2.6%
Teacher	8	1.2%
Other	39	5.9%
Total responses	666	100.0%

“Other” responses here are quite varied, with most including variant academic titles (such as international system distinctions), “visiting” positions, “fellows,” and “scholars,” as well as notes about institutions with no formal ranking system.

### 3.5 Appointment Type

Appointment type	Responses	Percentage
Permanent	442	61.0%
Contractual	192	26.5%
Temporary	40	5.5%
Not applicable	51	7.0%
Total responses	725	100.0%

The highest proportions of “temporary” responses here came among those who identified their employment type as postdoctoral fellowships or research positions. Among the large majority of “Academic/teaching appointment” jobs, 68.3% called their position permanent, 25.4% contractual, and 4.5% temporary.

### 3.6 Number of Years in Current Employment or Student Status

Years in current status	Responses	Percentage
1	188	15.2%
2–4	293	23.7%
5–10	325	26.3%
11–20	258	20.9%
More than 20	170	13.8%
Total responses	1,234	100.0%

This question was asked of all respondents, including students and retirees. When coupled with the responses to the first question (see Section 3.1), the number of respondents by job status can be seen more clearly.

Years in current status	Full-time	Student	Retired	Part-time
1	75	51	20	22
2-4	104	124	24	32
5-10	125	125	45	23
11-20	174	13	44	22
More than 20	139	1	14	10
Total responses	617	314	147	109

Responses from the “unemployed” and “other” categories are not included in detail above, due to low numbers. Over half of the “unemployed” responses listed one year, and approximately three-quarters were less than five years.

## 4 Education

### 4.1 Highest Degree

Highest degree	Responses	Percentage
Doctorate (Ph.D.)	779	65.6%
Doctorate (D.M.A.)	25	2.1%
Other Doctorate	13	1.1%
Master of Arts	143	12.0%
Master of Music	105	8.8%
Other Masters	17	1.4%
Bachelor of Arts	49	4.1%
Bachelor of Music	41	3.5%
Other Bachelors	6	0.5%
Other	10	0.8%
Total responses	1,188	100.0%

Some of the listed options from the survey (viz., Ed.D., M.Ed., M.F.A., M.L.S., B.S.) are not reported separately because of the low numbers of responses. Degrees in the final

“other” category include international degrees and other degrees that do not correspond directly to an American academic degree classification.

## 4.2 Degree Year

Degree years varied from 1961 to 2016, with a median year of 2006 (first quartile 1991, third quartile 2012). Given that students represent over one-quarter of the AMS respondents (see Section 3.1), a large percentage of the “highest degrees” were awarded recently. But even among those who have completed a Ph.D., the median degree year is 2000, and a full quarter of respondents with a Ph.D. received their degree in 2009 or later.

When coupled with age data derived from birth year (see Section 6.1), we can also calculate average age at degree. (Only the most common degrees are listed here, to ensure adequate data for an estimated average.)

Degree	Median age	Mean age	St. dev.	Number of responses
Doctorate (Ph.D.)	33	34.2	6.3	687
Doctorate (D.M.A.)	34.5	37.2	9.0	22
Master of Arts	27	28.2	5.8	126
Master of Music	25	27.0	4.7	97
Bachelor of Arts	22	23.9	6.4	45
Bachelor of Music	22	22.9	2.8	38

Since the bachelor’s and master’s degrees mostly apply to recent graduates and graduate students here, they may not necessarily be indicative of the ages for these degrees historically. However, an analysis of Ph.D. ages over time shows a relatively constant mean age, rising from a mean of 32.0 years in the 1960s to a relative highpoint of 35.4 in the 1990s, falling back to 34.4 years in the 2010s. The recent number is in line with general doctoral trends: the SED (see Section 8.4) reports the 2015 median age at doctorate for Humanities and Arts fields to be 34.2 years.

### 4.3 Degree Institution

A wide variety of institutions were reported. Because of the free response nature of this question, it is difficult to standardize answers—and sometimes even to discern for certain what specific institution was meant—across the 1,201 responses. Using best guesses, the following table shows all institutions that ten or more graduates listed for their highest degree.<sup>2</sup>

Highest degree institution	Responses	Highest degree institution	Responses
University of Chicago	53	UT, Austin	20
Yale University	47	UI, Urbana-Champaign	19
UC, Berkeley	45	University of Pennsylvania	18
Harvard University	42	Stanford University	18
CUNY	40	King’s College London	16
UNC, Chapel Hill	37	Stony Brook University	15
Princeton University	33	Northwestern University	14
University of Michigan	33	University of Cincinnati	13
UCLA	32	UW, Madison	13
Cornell University	30	Boston University	12
U Rochester/Eastman	30	Ohio State University	12
Indiana University	29	University of Oregon	12
New York University	26	McGill University	11
Columbia University	24	UC, Santa Barbara	11
Brandeis University	23	University of Cambridge	11
University of Oxford	23	University of Toronto	10
Duke University	20		

<sup>2</sup>Please note that the cautions outlined in Section 2.2 regarding differences as significant apply even more so to such a disparate collection of responses. Since fewer than half of AMS members have responded to the survey, the distribution here should only be taken as a broad but incomplete sample.

## 5 Study Groups and Societies

### 5.1 AMS Study Group Participation

Members were asked to select all study groups in which they participate. Since multiple selections were possible, the following table lists the actual number of respondents who said they participate in each group.

Study Group	Responses
Cold War and Music	75
Ecocriticism	35
Ibero-American Music	34
Jewish Studies and Music	47
LGBTQ	97
Ludomusicology	18
Music and Dance	60
Music and Disability	39
Music and Philosophy	94
Pedagogy	132
Popular Music	100

### 5.2 Other Scholarly Societies

Respondents who are members in other academic societies:

Society	Responses
College Music Society	191
International Musicological Society	143
Society for American Music	302
Society for Ethnomusicology	101
Society for Music Theory	117

Nearly half of all respondents to the survey (601) checked the “other” box and included a list of further societies. Unfortunately, many of the early records here were truncated due to previous limitations in the database, so exact numbers are difficult to estimate. A list of common societies (with at least five responses) is given here:

---

American Bach Society  
American Guild of Organists  
American Handel Society  
American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies  
Canadian University Music Society  
Early Music America  
German Studies Association  
Gesellschaft für Musikforschung  
International Association for the Study of Popular Music  
International Association of Music Libraries  
Medieval Academy of America  
Modern Language Association  
Mozart Society of America  
Music Library Association  
North American British Music Studies Association  
Plainsong and Medieval Music Society  
Renaissance Society of America  
Royal Music Association  
Società Italiana di Musicologia  
Society for Seventeenth-Century Music  
Society for Eighteenth-Century Music

---

Members are encouraged to revisit the survey and update this question to ensure more accurate tabulation of responses is possible in the future.

## 6 Personal Demographics

### 6.1 Birth Year and Age

Reported dates ranged from 1922 to 1997, with a median of 1972 (first quartile 1955, third quartile 1983), which gives an age of respondents varying from 19 to 94, with the middle half between age 33 and 61.

Age (years)	Responses	Percentage
Less than 30	170	15.8%
30–39	277	25.7%
40–49	169	15.7%
50–59	157	14.6%
60–69	170	15.8%
70 and older	135	12.5%
Total responses	1,078	100.0%

Although this was a rather unpopular question (211 respondents skipped it), it can allow the AMS to track elements like age at degree (see Section 4.2) and the changing demographics of the society over time (see Section 7.1).

### 6.2 Gender

Gender	Responses	Percentage
Female	566	51.2%
Male	536	48.5%
Transgender	3	0.3%
Total responses	1,105	100.0%

Since this question allowed a free response, many replies were collated into the above categories. For example, the “female” category represents responses including “f,” “fem,” “female,” “cis female,” and “woman.” Any response indicating a variant of “trans” was included under “transgender.”

### 6.3 Race and Ethnicity

	Race/ethnicity	Responses	Percentage
One race		1,056	97.2%
	White	975	89.7%
	Asian	38	3.5%
	Black/African American	12	1.1%
	American Indian/Alaska Native	2	0.2%
	Other	29	2.7%
Two or more races		31	2.9%
Total responses		1,087	100.0%

The questions and available categories are based on the United States Census format and its standard presentation of data. The “other” responses included “Jewish,” “Mediterranean,” and various ethnicities from multiple continents. The U.S. Census does not treat Hispanic origin as a “race,” hence the separate question.

Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin	Responses	Percentage
Yes	35	3.2%
No	1,052	94.7%
Prefer not to answer	24	2.2%
Total responses	1,111	100.0%

Only 1,064 respondents answered both questions in this section. Of those, 933 identified as both White alone and non-Hispanic (87.7%).

## 6.4 LGBTQ

LGBTQ	Responses	Percentage
Yes	176	16.2%
No	848	78.2%
Prefer not to answer	60	5.5%
Total responses	1,084	100.0%

Of the 1,024 respondents who did provide a yes or no answer, 17.2% identified as LGBTQ.

## 6.5 Disability

Disabled	Responses	Percentage
Yes	36	3.3%
No	1,002	92.4%
Prefer not to answer	46	4.2%
Total responses	1,084	100.0%

Of the 1,038 respondents who did provide a yes or no answer, 3.5% identified as disabled.

## 7 Analysis by Demographic Subcategories

As discussed in the introductory notes, combinations of data from multiple questions should be treated with additional caution when drawing conclusions about demographic trends. Aside from the fact that fewer people often responded to all questions, the smaller numbers of responses in each subcategory can make statistical significance difficult to discern.

Detailed data summaries are thus omitted for much of this section. Many minor differences can also exist among subgroupings, but the findings below primarily report those which likely rise to a level of statistical significance. (See Section 2.2.) To protect privacy and to avoid inadvertently identifying any respondents, it is generally not possible to break down data for smaller groups of respondents in detail.

## 7.1 Age

### Employment

Not surprisingly, the vast majority of student respondents are younger (95% less than 40 years old), while retirees are older (all over 60). There are no major age distinctions among full-time and part-time employees. While unemployed respondents are slightly clustered in the 30–39 age group, the low number of AMS members who report as “unemployed” makes it difficult to draw specific conclusions.

Also, as expected, older respondents are likely to attain higher academic ranks. Younger members are more likely to identify their appointment as “temporary” or “contractual” rather than “permanent.”

### Demographic Changes over Time

Various demographic shifts are underway. Younger members are more likely to be female, have higher numbers identifying as non-White and/or Hispanic, and are more likely to identify as LGBTQ than older members. (All of these trends are statistically significant.)

Age	<30	30–39	40–49	50–59	60–69	70+
Female	57.2%	54.3%	52.7%	51.7%	37.8%	43.9%
Male	42.8%	45.7%	47.3%	48.3%	62.2%	56.1%
White, non-Hispanic	83.4%	83.3%	84.7%	91.1%	95.0%	93.0%
All other	16.6%	16.7%	15.3%	8.9%	5.0%	7.0%
LGBTQ	29.7%	20.6%	18.7%	12.8%	10.9%	7.9%
non-LGBTQ	70.3%	79.4%	81.3%	87.2%	89.1%	92.1%

There were no significant trends in the number of members who identify as disabled when grouped by age.

## 7.2 Gender

Following the trends in age reported above, student members are somewhat more likely to be female (54.7% female, 45.3% male), while retirees are more likely to be male.<sup>3</sup> The

<sup>3</sup>Other gender categories (specifically those grouped as “transgender” in Section 6.2) were omitted from the comparisons in this section due to low numbers that were insufficient for statistical comparison.

percentage of full-time employees is almost exactly equal by gender (49.4% female, 50.6% male), though there is a wider disparity for part-time employees (61.7% female, 38.3% male).

Among respondents with an “academic teaching and/or administrative appointment” (about 85% of all responses), 50.9% are female and 49.1% are male. Although there are some differences in other position types, the small numbers in each category cannot confirm any significant trends.

There are some disparities by rank, though some of this may be correlated with the general shifts by age noted above.

Rank	Female	Male
Full professor	43.5%	56.5%
Associate professor	48.5%	51.5%
Assistant professor	55.3%	44.7%
Instructor/lecturer	52.6%	47.4%
Adjunct/contingent	66.0%	34.0%

Women are also significantly more likely to identify their positions as “contractual” or “temporary.”

Appointment type	Female	Male
Permanent	46.3%	53.7%
Contractual	60.2%	39.8%
Temporary	57.6%	42.4%

### 7.3 Race and Ethnicity

Because of small numbers within subcategories and privacy concerns as discussed above, detailed race and ethnicity data are not reported here. Nevertheless, it is possible to discern several trends when comparing “White, non-Hispanic” members to those who identify with another race and/or ethnicity.

Following the demographic trends by age reported in Section 7.1, students are less likely to be White and non-Hispanic than the membership overall. Among White, non-Hispanic

members, 23.6% list “student” as employment status, compared to 36.4% of “student” respondents from all other races and ethnicities. Non-White and/or Hispanic members are also more likely to have part-time positions and less likely to have attained higher academic ranks.

## 7.4 LGBTQ

Again, following general age demographic trends reported above, student members are significantly more likely to identify as LGBTQ: 37.9% of LGBTQ respondents list “student” for employment status, compared to 22.1% of non-LGBTQ respondents.

Among employed respondents, LGBTQ respondents are slightly more likely to be full-time than part-time in comparison to non-LGBTQ respondents. However, they are also more likely to identify their positions as “contractual” or “temporary” rather than “permanent.”

## 7.5 Disability

Within the small number of respondents who identify as disabled, it is difficult to identify any specific trends that differ from the broader membership. While there are some apparent minor differences in job status, employment, and so forth, none of the disparities rises to a level of statistical significance. Furthermore, even the apparent trends are not suggestive of any general pattern. (For example, while there appear to be somewhat more part-time members who identify as disabled, the number of higher academic ranks among those who identify as disabled is greater proportionally than in the rest of the membership.)

# 8 Comparison of the AMS with Other Datasets

## 8.1 Society for Music Theory

SMT has collected data on gender, race and ethnicity, and employment status for several years. The following comparisons make use of the [2016 SMT demographics report](#). The SMT response rate is near 100% of its membership for all of its questions, though the few blank and “prefer not to answer” responses are omitted here. Note that some disparities between AMS and SMT demographics may be correlated to the different demographics of degree recipients in various subfields. (See the 2015 SED subfield comparison in [Section 8.4](#).)

## Gender

Gender	Responses		Percentages	
	AMS	SMT	AMS	SMT
Female	566	435	51.2%	34.0%
Male	536	841	48.5%	65.8%
Transgender	3	3	0.3%	0.2%

Note: Unlike AMS’s free gender response, SMT has three primary options: “Man,” “Woman,” and “Trans,” which were matched to the AMS categories used in Section 6.2.<sup>4</sup>

## Race and Ethnicity

Race and ethnicity	Responses		Percentages	
	AMS	SMT	AMS	SMT
White, non-Hispanic	933	1,132	87.7%	89.6%
Asian	37	83	3.5%	6.6%
Hispanic	23	21	2.2%	1.7%
Black/African American	11	12	1.0%	0.9%
American Indian/Alaska Native	1	1	0.1%	0.1%
Other/unknown	24	1	2.3%	0.1%
Two or more races/ethnicities/mixed	35	14	3.3%	1.1%

These data categories are problematic for several reasons.<sup>5</sup> Nevertheless this table is included to provide a detailed comparison with another major academic music society that

<sup>4</sup>SMT’s report also lists a single “Woman Man” response in its tabulation of gender.

<sup>5</sup>As noted in Section 6.3, the AMS survey follows the U.S. Census categories in separating out Hispanic origin from racial categories. SMT instead includes “Hispanic” as an option among the racial/ethnic categories. To try to line up the data categories, “Black/African American” above includes AMS respondents who selected that race but did *not* identify as of Hispanic origin. Responses that identified as “Black/African American” or “Other” *and* Hispanic origin are included in the “Two or more races/ethnicities” category above. (SMT labels this category “mixed.”) Furthermore, the free response option in the AMS survey likely led to a number of “Other” responses that would be classified within “White,” “Asian,” or “Hispanic” ethnicities if “Other” was not an option. (SMT has one response labeled “unknown,” presented here in the “Other” category.)

reports such statistics. A simpler comparison can be made for White, non-Hispanic and other races/ethnicities.

Race and ethnicity	Responses		Percentages	
	AMS	SMT	AMS	SMT
White, non-Hispanic	933	1,132	87.7%	89.6%
All other races/ethnicities	131	132	12.3%	10.4%

### Rank and Employment Status

SMT includes rank and general employment status in a single question. Responses thus include not only academic ranks, but options for retirees, graduate students, and undergraduate students. In the AMS survey, rank information is only asked of those who are “regular” members (not students or retirees), and the number of responses to these different sections of the survey make the question data incompatible.

The following table attempts to compare equivalent ranks from SMT to the responses reported in Section 3.4, though there is some problematic merging of categories.<sup>6</sup>

Rank	Responses		Percentages	
	AMS	SMT	AMS	SMT
Full professor	196	238	29.4%	29.3%
Associate professor	179	191	26.9%	23.5%
Assistant professor	126	190	18.9%	23.4%
Instructor/lecturer/“limited continuing”	44	80	6.6%	9.8%
Adjunct/contingent/“limited year”	57	28	8.6%	3.4%
Other	64	86	9.6%	10.6%

We can also make some broad comparisons with employment status of members.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup>“Limited continuing” and “limited year” are the SMT categories reported. They are taken here to be roughly equivalent to AMS options for non-tenured positions. The “Other” category here includes “Staff,” “Teacher,” and “Other” categories from the AMS survey. One SMT response category labeled “assoc” was also included in “Other.”

<sup>7</sup>“Employed” here includes all of the SMT categories from the previous table. The AMS “Employed” category includes “full-time,” “part-time,” and “other” responses to the employment status question in Section 4.1. Unemployed responses are omitted from this table, as are blank responses to the SMT question.

Employment Status	Responses		Percentages	
	AMS	SMT	AMS	SMT
Employed	749	813	59.9%	63.9%
Student	355	423	28.4%	33.2%
Retired	147	37	11.8%	2.9%

## 8.2 College Music Society

CMS collects demographic data on its membership, including discipline, rank, and gender. The latest [summary report from 2015](#) allows some comparisons with AMS data. CMS members come from a variety of music subdisciplines: the largest groups are performance and theory specializations.<sup>8</sup>

CMS member discipline	Responses	Percentage
Composition	584	8.9%
Ethnomusicology	256	3.9%
Music Business	114	1.7%
Music Education	578	8.8%
Music in General Studies	519	7.9%
Music Theory	1,096	16.6%
Musicology	612	9.3%
Performance	2,836	43.0%
Total responses	6,595	100.0%

Note that degrees in other music subdisciplines are likely to have somewhat different demographics compared to musicology (see Section 8.4). Students and retirees are also a smaller proportion of the CMS membership (19.6% and 3.4%, respectively) compared to AMS respondents.

<sup>8</sup>The CMS data linked reports a total of 6,816 members for the table by discipline, but only 6,595 responses are recorded in the presented data. The percentages are recalculated here for the 6,596 responses in the table.

## Rank

Rank	Responses		Percentages	
	AMS	CMS	AMS	CMS
Full professor	196	1048	29.4%	21.9%
Associate professor	179	1112	26.9%	23.2%
Assistant professor	126	1322	18.9%	27.6%
Instructor/lecturer	44	587	6.6%	12.3%
Adjunct/contingent	57	249	8.6%	5.2%
Other	64	468	9.6%	9.8%

There are some minor differences in listed categories for CMS.<sup>9</sup>

## Gender

Rank	Responses		Percentages	
	AMS	CMS	AMS	CMS
Female	566	3,941	51.4%	61.3%
Male	536	2,487	48.6%	38.7%

The reported CMS data does not list transgender or other gender categories; the analysis for AMS responses in this table thus omits these as well. CMS members who withheld gender information are not listed here.

### 8.3 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)

The IPEDS database is maintained by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Their most recent digest report of educational statistics from 2015 includes a [table](#) on faculty and instructional staff at postsecondary institutions. The latest 2013 data is broken down by rank, gender, and race/ethnicity.

<sup>9</sup>CMS lists “instructor,” “lecturer,” and “adjunct” as three categories. “Other” responses for AMS here include all other categories, as in the SMT comparison. (See Section 8.1.)

Caution is warranted in drawing specific conclusions from direct comparisons, as demographics can vary widely among different academic fields. AMS members also are not necessarily a representative sample of all academic faculty who teach musicology across the U.S. Nevertheless, comparison with the IPEDS information provides a sense of how the AMS demographics compare to academia broadly.

## Gender

Gender	Responses		Percentages	
	AMS	IPEDS	AMS	IPEDS
Female	566	354,935	51.4%	44.8%
Male	536	436,456	48.6%	55.2%

The IPEDS data does not include transgender or other gender categories; they are omitted in this comparison and the ones below.

## Race and Ethnicity

Race and ethnicity	Responses		Percentages	
	AMS	IPEDS	AMS	IPEDS
White, non-Hispanic	933	575,491	87.7%	78.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	37	72,246	3.5%	9.9%
Hispanic	23	33,217	2.2%	4.5%
Black/African American	11	43,188	1.0%	5.9%
American Indian/Alaska Native	1	3,538	0.1%	0.5%
Other	24		2.3%	
Two or more races/ethnicities	35	5,291	3.3%	0.7%

The IPEDS data includes Hispanic among the racial categories. The same procedure in grouping data is used here as was employed with the SMT comparison.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup>See Section 8.1 and its caveats in regrouping the data. The IPEDS data also separates out categories of “Race/ethnicity unknown” and “Non-resident alien.” Race/ethnicity data was not collected for the latter category. The IPEDS data also does not include the “Other” category; it is included with the AMS data here because, as noted in the previous section, many of the “Other” responses may have chosen one of the primary given options without the ability to list a free response.

## Rank

Rank	Responses		Percentages	
	AMS	IPEDS	AMS	IPEDS
Full professor	196	177,566	36.0%	27.9%
Associate professor	179	148,959	32.8%	23.4%
Assistant professor	126	171,622	23.1%	27.0%
Instructor/lecturer	44	137,926	8.1%	21.7%

The IPEDS table only lists information for full-time faculty, and comparisons here are therefore somewhat limited to specific rank categories.<sup>11</sup>

## Rank by Gender

Rank	Responses				Percentages			
	AMS		IPEDS		AMS		IPEDS	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Full professor	77	100	55,694	125,836	43.5%	56.5%	30.7%	69.3%
Associate professor	81	86	67,675	87,420	48.5%	51.5%	43.6%	56.4%
Assistant professor	63	51	83,714	82,331	55.3%	44.7%	50.4%	49.6%
Instructor/lecturer	20	18	76,567	59,465	52.6%	47.4%	56.3%	43.7%

Percentages here add up to 100% horizontally, showing percentage of female and male within each rank category. Note that the number of AMS responses is significantly lower in some places here compared to the previous table; only responses that answered both rank and gender questions were used.

<sup>11</sup>IPEDS has separate categories for instructor and lecturer, combined here. While the IPEDS list also has an “other” category, there is no clear correlate in the AMS data, which likely includes a subset of responses from the AMS “adjunct/contingent,” “staff,” “teacher,” and “other” categories. Since it is difficult to make a direct comparison, these responses are omitted from this table.

## Rank by Race/Ethnicity

Rank	Responses				Percentages			
	AMS		IPEDS		AMS		IPEDS	
	White	All other	White	All other	White	All other	White	All other
Full professor	162	7	148,577	29,111	95.9%	4.1%	83.6%	16.4%
Associate professor	142	18	116,817	32,580	88.8%	11.2%	78.2%	21.8%
Assistant professor	95	16	112,262	38,011	85.6%	14.4%	74.7%	25.3%
Instructor/lecturer	34	3	101,312	27,275	91.9%	8.1%	78.8%	21.2%

AMS members could not be broken down by individual race/ethnicity here, since many categories result in a number of responses too small for comparison. This table differentiates between White, non-Hispanic and all other responses for race/ethnicity, where rows add up to 100%. (Again, numbers here are limited to only those who provided information both about rank and race/ethnicity.)

## 8.4 Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED)

The Survey of Earned Doctorates contains data on the changing demographics of doctoral degrees over time. The [latest report from 2015](#) includes detailed tables on demographics for all years in the past decade and for selected years going back to 1985. The following sections compare AMS respondents who reported a Ph.D. and degree year with the SED information.<sup>12</sup> Because the number of degrees within a small specialty such as musicology is sensitive to significant annual variation, data from several AMS years will generally be combined together to create better comparisons with the SED.

### SED Music Doctorates from 2015

To provide a snapshot of recent graduates, the [SED reports](#) doctorate recipients in music subfields during 2015, its latest year of complete data.

<sup>12</sup>As noted in Section 4.1, the Ph.D. or equivalent is by far the most common terminal degree among AMS members. Other doctorates (D.M.A., Ed.D., etc.) are likely to follow different demographic trends in the fields of music education, performance, or composition, as seen below. For these reasons, the present analysis looked at Ph.D. recipients as the most common comparison group within AMS.

Subfield of study	Total	Degrees		Percentages	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Music education	114	47	67	41.2%	58.8%
Music	54	36	18	66.7%	33.3%
Musicology and ethnomusicology	148	66	82	44.6%	55.4%
Music performance	110	53	57	48.2%	51.8%
Music theory and composition	108	77	31	71.3%	28.7%

For U.S. citizens and permanent residents, information on race and ethnicity was also **reported**. To allow comparison with other tables in this report, degree recipients are grouped here into White, non-Hispanic and all other races/ethnicities.

Subfield of study	Total	Degrees		Percentages	
		White	All other	White	All other
Music education	103	86	71	83.5%	16.5%
Music	23	20	3	87.0%	13.0%
Musicology and ethnomusicology	116	89	27	76.7%	23.3%
Music performance	70	51	19	72.9%	27.1%
Music theory and composition	85	75	10	88.2%	11.8%

SED provides data on these subfields going back to 2007, but these statistics are spread through a number of annual reports. A future statistical report may examine music doctorate statistics over time in more detail.

## Gender

The following table looks at AMS Ph.D. recipients over time by gender. Since annual AMS year data would result in small groups, the AMS responses here are combined together for the 5-year span surrounding the given year from **SED data**. (For example, the AMS “1985” row contains data from years 1983–87, “1990” from 1988–1992, and so forth. The final row for “2015” contains data from 2013–16.)

Even using these 5-year spans, the number of degree recipients is still small enough to observe much more variance than in the broad fields. However, the same general trend of increasing female degree recipients is still apparent.

Year	All fields		Humanities and arts		AMS Ph.D.	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
1985	34.3%	65.7%	40.9%	59.1%	45.1%	54.9%
1990	36.3%	63.7%	43.2%	56.8%	47.8%	52.2%
1995	39.5%	60.5%	46.5%	53.5%	60.8%	39.2%
2000	43.9%	56.1%	49.0%	51.0%	51.1%	48.9%
2005	45.2%	54.8%	49.8%	50.2%	45.6%	54.4%
2010	46.8%	53.2%	50.9%	49.1%	50.4%	49.6%
2015	46.2%	53.8%	50.6%	49.4%	62.8%	37.2%

## Race and Ethnicity

For U.S. citizens and permanent residents, **race and ethnicity data** in the latest SED report is summarized back to 1995. Using the same methodology as the last table, we can compare AMS Ph.D. recipients in 5-year groupings to the overall trends in doctorates.<sup>13</sup> Again, due to small numbers in various subcategories, White, non-Hispanic responses are contrasted with all other responses to race/ethnicity.

Year	All fields		Humanities and arts		AMS Ph.D.	
	White	All other	White	All other	White	All other
1995	78.0%	22.0%	88.1%	11.9%	91.5%	8.5%
2000	81.2%	18.8%	86.7%	13.3%	92.3%	7.7%
2005	78.3%	21.7%	82.8%	17.2%	81.6%	18.4%
2010	76.0%	24.0%	81.4%	18.6%	88.3%	11.7%
2015	74.2%	25.8%	80.9%	19.1%	85.7%	14.3%

<sup>13</sup>Degree recipients where race and ethnicity were not reported are omitted from the SED calculated percentages here to correspond to the AMS data.