Figure 7. Path coefficients of the best-fit model.

ple is roughly equal to that of the men. The graduate program quality of men and women are also equivalent, thus eliminating it as a possible explanation.

Given the difficulty and cost of collecting data on larger samples, one implication of these findings is that authors of publishing productivity studies need to report correlation matrixes for men and women separately. As additional studies are published, this will eventually enable the quantitative cumulation of results across studies for each sex. Thus, for future use, we report the

Table 7
Correlation Matrix Reproduced by Best-Fit Model (Above the Diagonal) and Difference Matrix (Below the Diagonal)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. ABILITY	—	-.10	.62	.25	.17	.18	.29
2. SEX	.00	—	-.06	-.03	-.02	.38	.14
3. GPQ	.00	.06	—	.15	.28	.17	.23
4. PREPROD	.00	.06	-.06	—	.04	.16	.32
5. QFJ	-.01	.12	.00	.03	—	.36	.35
6. PUBS	.00	.05	-.02	.03	.05	—	.54
7. CITES	.00	-.01	.02	.02	.02	.01	—

Root-mean-squared deviation = .06; LISREL χ^2(47, N = 162) = 54.2, p > .05; goodness-of-fit index = .95.

Note. ABILITY = composite of SELECT, PHIBETA, and HONORS; SEX = 1 for women, 2 for men; GPQ = graduate program quality; PREPROD: quality-weighted publications before Ph.D.; QFJ = quality of first academic job; PUBS = number of publications in first 6 years after Ph.D.; CITES = number of times PUBS cited by others.

separate correlation matrixes for men and women in the Appendix.

Summary and Conclusions

This study contributes to the literature on academic productivity by presenting a unique synthesis of competing theories by sociologists, economists, and psychologists. This review identified both differences and striking similarities in the diverse theoretical perspectives. Across disciplines, there is little disagreement on the primary causal antecedents of publishing productivity, namely, ability, graduate program quality, early productivity, the quality of the first job, and the sex of the researcher. Five of the six models posited a direct path from ability to the quality of the graduate program. Results confirm the existence of this path as well as a direct path from ability to each of these measures of publishing productivity: early publications (during graduate school), the number of publications in the first 6 years as a faculty member, and citations to those publications.

The theoretical models produced less agreement on the specification of other paths. One such area of disagreement concerned the existence of a path from graduate program quality to the quality of the first job. The models based on progressive selectivity (screening, accumulative advantage, and merit) specify this path, the importance of which is supported by the results. Yet, the results also suggest that the accumulative advantage and merit models misspecify the role of early productivity. The two economic models, human capital and screening, omit early productivity and sex of the researcher, both of which contribute significantly to later publishing productivity. Each the-