Can Mentoring Help Female Assistant Professors in Economics? An Evaluation by Randomized Trial: Corrigendum

By Donna K. Ginther, Janet M. Currie, Francine D. Blau, and Rachel T.A. Croson

In the process of creating the replication files for this paper, two data errors were discovered. These mistakes do not significantly affect the qualitative results or the conclusions of the paper. They do, however, affect the estimates in all of the tables. Almost all of the numerical estimates have changed, but most only trivially. In this corrigendum, we describe the two errors and present corrected tables. The replication data that accompany this article use the corrected data set. We have also updated the NBER Working paper version of this paper (https://www.nber.org/papers/w26864) with the corrected tables and updated exposition.

I. Data Errors

There were three main data sources for the CEMENT evaluation: hand-entered employment data from curriculum vitae (CVs) and other web resources such as departmental web pages or LinkedIn (tenure data set); grant data that were scraped from NSF and NIH databases and matched to CEMENT names (grant data set); and publication data compiled from name matches to Web of Science (publication data). These three databases were compiled at different times and analyzed separately in the paper.

Each time a person applied to the CEMENT workshop, they were assigned an ID. If a person was a control in one cohort and reapplied to another, she was assigned a new ID and the ORIGINALID was retained on the reapplicant's record. In the process of creating the replication data set from the tenure, grant, and publication data, it was noted that there were inconsistencies in the coding of the ORIGINALID across the tenure data set and the grant/publication data sets.

After reviewing research notes and code, it was determined that an older version of the ORIGINALIDs and TREAT variables were incorrectly merged into the publications and grants data. This coding mistake affects the results in columns 1-5 of Table 4 in the article.

While investigating the original problem, the raw data were examined to compare IDs associated with names. At this time additional coding errors that originated when the data were hand-entered from the CVs into the database were discovered. In the data used for the article, three people who applied twice to CEMENT were missing ORIGINALIDs. These three observations appear in both the control group and the treatment group of the sample in the published paper, rather than appearing only in the control group.

II. Revised Results

As a result, we have re-estimated all of the regressions from the original article. The corrected versions of the tables that correspond to the results in the published paper appear below. Although the point estimates change, the qualitative results do not.

Table 3 shows our main results. The probability of having a tenure stream job was increased by 11 percentage points, or 14.9 percent relative to the mean; the probability of having a tenure stream job in a top 100 institution was increased by 15.9 percentage points or 56.4 percent. With respect to tenure itself, the treatment significantly increased the probability of a tenured job in an institution ranked in the top 30 by 6.9 percentage points (78.7 percent), and the probability of tenure in a top 50 ranked institution by 9.3 percentage points (73.8 percent). The treatment was also estimated to have increased the probability of a tenured job at an institution ranked in the top 100 or top 200, but these effects were not significant. At the same time, participants had a significantly lower probability of having a tenured position at a 201+

(unranked) institution; this probability was reduced by 12.0 percentage points (64.5 percent). These offsetting effects help explain why the "Any Tenure" coefficient is small and statistically insignificant. The treatment also significantly lowered the probability of holding a nonacademic job by 9.5 percentage points (40.8 percent).

The notable exceptions to the published article are in Table 4. In the article, the effect of the treatment increased pre-tenure rank 2 publications by .485 ($p<.10$) (Table 4, Column 4). However, pre-tenure rank 3 publications did not increase significantly. In the revised Table 4, we find that treatment significantly increases the number of pre-tenure grants (by 0.150) and publications (by 1.594). Women in the treatment group have 0.216 more top five publications, 0.460 more second-tier publications, 0.918 more third-tier publications. Note that the positive effect on third-tier publications is now statistically significant, and, although the effect of the treatment on the number of second-tier publications is now not statistically significant at the five percent level, it is large relative to its standard error and narrowly misses significance at the 10 percent level. Hence, we conclude that the results are materially the same as the published article.

Table 1: Structure of the Data

Cohort	Year	Treatment	Control	Controls Who Reapplied; #Treated	Missing & Assumed Non-Tenure Track
1	2004	45	34	5; 1T	1T; 2C
2	2006	36	27	10; 6T	
3	2008	41	20	4; 3T	2T; 1C
4	2010	28	19	5; 4T	1T
5	2012	37	50	12; 10T	
6	2014	15	13	6; 4T	

Notes: Column 3 shows those who initially applied and were treated in a given cohort. Column 4 shows those who were initially assigned to the control group. Column 6 shows people who could not be located. They are included in the analysis and assumed to be in non-tenure track positions. One cohort 3 control member died and was removed from the sample. Column 5 shows the number of people assigned to the control group who reapplied in a later cohort. The number after the semi-colon how many were eventually treated. 28 Cohort 6 members with PhD years after 2011 were dropped from the sample.

Table 2: Balance Between Treatment and Control Samples

	Treatment	Control	p-value
Top 10 PhD Institution	0.326	0.304	0.659
Top 20 (11-20) PhD Institution	0.235	0.207	0.546
Top 40 (21-40) PhD Institution	0.196	0.215	0.661
PhD non-US	0.078	0.104	0.408
Academic First Job	0.900	0.859	0.240
First Job Top 10 Rank	0.130	0.111	0.589
First Job Top 11-20 Rank	0.091	0.081	0.75
First Job Top 21-40 Rank	0.083	0.067	0.582
PhD Year	2005.374	2005.689	0.432

Table 3: IV Estimates of Intention to Treat Effects on Outcomes

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Tenure stream	Top 100 Tenure Stream	Any Tenure	Tenured Top 30	Tenured Top 50	Tenured Top 100	Tenured Top 200	Tenured 201+	Last Job Non-Academic
Treated	0.110	0.159	-0.053	0.069	0.093	0.062	0.040	-0.120	-0.095
	[0.056]	[0.057]	[0.059]	[0.035]	[0.041]	[0.048]	[0.056]	[0.049]	[0.053]
Constant	0.649	0.316	-0.099	-0.017	-0.267	-0.120	-0.013	-0.090	0.252
	[0.169]	[0.173]	[0.178]	[0.107]	[0.124]	[0.147]	[0.169]	[0.149]	[0.162]
R-squared	0.035	0.039	0.166	0.066	0.095	0.071	0.065	0.048	0.039
Mean Dep.Var.	0.740	0.282	0.551	0.0877	0.126	0.186	0.277	0.186	0.233

There are 365 observations. Standard errors in brackets. All regressions include dummy variables for each cohort and for years 8 to 16+ since PhD. R-squared for the first stage is 0.744. F-statistic for the first stage regressors is 67.75.

Table 4: IV Estimates Possible Mechanisms for Effects on Tenure

	(1) #Pre-Tenure Grants	(2) #Pre-Tenure Pubs.	(3) #Pre-Tenure Rank 1 Pubs.	(4) #Pre-Tenure Rank 2 Pubs.	(5) #Pre-Tenure Rank 3 Pubs.	(6) Tenure Top 30 Place Given #Pubs. and #Grants	(7) Tenure Top 50 Place Given #Pubs. and #Grants
Treated	0.150	1.594	0.216	0.460	0.918	0.038	0.062
	[0.093]	[0.621]	[0.102]	[0.285]	[0.536]	[0.033]	[0.039]
Constant	-0.379	2.496	0.548	0.202	1.745	-0.074	-0.321
	[0.283]	[1.885]	[0.310]	[0.866]	[1.627]	[0.099]	[0.117]
R-squared	0.048	0.097	0.042	0.067	0.064	0.227	0.209
Mean Dep.Var.	0.274	7.348	0.321	2.356	4.671	0.0877	0.126

Notes: All Table 3 notes apply. In addition, the last two columns include controls for the number of pretenure NSF and NIH grants, and the total number of pretenure publications.