

Here we correct a substantive reporting error in our published manuscript, “Representation and Salary Gaps by Race/Ethnicity and Gender at Selective Public Universities” (*Educational Researcher* 46(7), 343-354). We became aware of the error during external correspondence about the article after publication.

Some of the descriptive statistics reported in the published version of Table 4 (p. 347) are incorrect. The purpose of Table 4 is to compare racial/ethnic and gender shares among assistant professors in our data to racial/ethnic and gender shares among new PhDs from top-50 universities, by field. The latter data are taken from the Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED).

The error is with regard to the reported gender shares among assistant professors in our data (the numbers in brackets in Table 4). All 12 field-specific, gender-share values are incorrect. The published values from the SED data are correct. Figure 1 also reports similar gender-share information about assistant professors based on our data, in aggregate form. The published values in Figure 1 are also correct. The error only applies to the gender-share numbers reported in Table 4 for assistant professors in our data.

The correct numbers are shown in the corrected version of Table 4 below. The substantive importance of the correction is as follows: the inaccurate numbers in the published article imply that the representation of women in STEM fields among assistant professors is similar to the representation of women in STEM fields among recent PhD completers in the SED; however, the corrected numbers make clear that women are underrepresented as assistant professors in STEM fields relative to their representation in PhD production. The gender representation numbers in non-STEM fields are also incorrect in the published article, but the true values are similar to the erroneously reported values and there is no substantive implication of the error.

We offer a brief explanation of what happened for interested readers. The error occurred during our first round of revisions with the paper (i.e., the originally submitted manuscript had the correct numbers in Table 4 throughout). The original version of Table 4 compared the assistant professor shares in our data to analogous shares from the SED, but did not restrict the university sample for the SED. A referee suggested a more elite sample of PhD granting institutions might be more appropriate, given that the universities we sample to obtain our faculty data are selective. This was a good suggestion. Over the course of responding to the referee, and in our own efforts to be thorough, we obtained data on PhDs awarded by field from selective universities using two sources: IPEDS and the SED. Ultimately, the numbers from each source were similar and we elected to continue using the SED in our paper. But when we were comparing the SED and IPEDS data, we used spreadsheets of the same structure as Table 4 for the comparisons. An unfortunate copy-and-paste error led to the problem in the published version of Table 4: the published numbers for the gender shares compare PhD production by field between IPEDS and the SED, rather than PhD production from the SED to assistant professors in our data, which was the obvious intent.

When we became aware of this error, we decided it would be prudent to go back through all of our results and analysis to make sure there are no more errors. We did not find any other substantive errors, but we did find two small errors that we also correct with this document. First,

in that same table (Table 4), there is a typo for the share of white junior faculty in sociology. The published article wrongly indicates that 61.5 percent of junior faculty in sociology are white, but the correct number is 68.5 percent. We cannot attribute this error to anything other than a pure typo. This typo is corrected in the updated version of Table 4 below. The second error is in Table 1, where we did not handle imputed values among individuals with missing experience in the best way, which led us to report a value of average experience in our data of 21.24 when a more accurate number is 21.67. This issue is inconsequential to the regression output that forms the basis for our wage decompositions, but the mishandling of imputed values affects the reported descriptive statistic. We did not find any other errors in our thorough review of the published results (although the imputation error with experience also affects the field-by-field descriptive statistics in Appendix Table B.1, which was not published in *Educational Researcher* but is available on our websites and has been corrected).

We convey our deepest apologies for our errors. They are inexcusable and we take full responsibility.

Table 4 **CORRECTED**. Comparison of Race/Ethnicity and Gender Representation by Field in PhD Production Data from the Survey of Earned Doctorates at Top-50 Universities, and Among Assistant Professors in Our Data (Percentages).

	Biology	Chemistry	Economics	Education (Leadership/Policy)	English	Sociology
Racial/Ethnic Shares						
Asian	13.7 [20.3]	9.8 [19.4]	16.8 [34.2]	10.3 [17.5]	5.3 [12.8]	12.2 [6.9]
Black	3.6 [0.4]	2.5 [0.9]	2.7 [2.4]	15.5 [15.9]	1.8 [8.6]	3.9 [13.7]
Hispanic	6.2 [3.6]	6.8 [6.5]	5.0 [11.0]	7.2 [4.8]	8.5 [4.3]	8.3 [11.0]
White	70.6 [75.8]	74.7 [73.2]	70.0 [52.4]	58.8 [61.9]	78.9 [74.4]	71.7 [68.5]
Other/Unknown	5.9 [0.0]	6.2 [0.0]	5.5 [0.0]	8.2 [0.0]	5.5 [0.0]	3.9 [0.0]
Gender Shares						
Female	53.7 [40.6]	38.3 [26.9]	29.9 [25.0]	63.1 [60.3]	54.3 [58.1]	63.8 [60.3]
Male	46.1 [59.4]	61.6 [73.2]	69.9 [75.0]	36.9 [39.7]	45.7 [41.9]	36.2 [39.7]
Unknown	0.2 [0.0]	0.1 [0.0]	0.2 [0.0]	0.0 [0.0]	0.0 [0.0]	0.0 [0.0]
N	3,506 [281]	1,020 [108]	581 [164]	103 [63]	525 [117]	290 [73]

Notes: The first number in each cell is the SED percentage of degrees produced by field in 2013-14 at top-50 universities; the second number is square brackets the percentage of assistant professors in that field in our data from 2015-16. The SED data are restricted to doctorate recipients who graduated from universities on the U.S. News & World Report "Best Colleges 2016" list of top-50 universities, inclusive of private universities. **Bolded entries indicate cells where the published number reported for our data (in brackets) has been corrected.**