

## Merton, Robert K (1910–2003)

Christian Fleck, University of Graz, Graz, Austria

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

### Abstract

Over the period of three quarters of a century, Robert K. Merton demonstrated an impressive productivity as a sociologist of different specialties. First and foremost, he contributed to sociological theory and is the founder of the sociology of science. He also contributed to the sociology of knowledge, organization theory, deviant behavior, mass communications; and the professions and less broadly recognized fields of sociological semantics, and the sociology and history of ideas. The broad range of subject matters he studied and his close reading of former contributions to sociology resulted in Merton's identifying and labeling such social phenomena as the self-fulfilling prophecy, unanticipated consequences, focus groups, and role models, among a great many others. Given this wide spectrum of conceptual and empirical contributions and Merton's plea for middle-range ambitions in theory building, he will continue to be a sociologist of consequence.

If social scientists and authors from other branches of scholarship would always name the originators of neologisms and concepts they use, one name would probably surface much more often than any other: Robert K. Merton (following his own style of writing, which exhibited a strong inclination toward acronyms, I will refer to him as RKM hereafter). He coined, borrowed, polished, refined, and reformulated concepts more than any other social scientist. Along that way, he also introduced a new term for this type of work: initially 'conceptual analysis' (Merton, 1968: 168–171) and later on 'reconceptualization' (Merton, 2004: 245–260). Without RKM, not only would the language of the social sciences be more meager, but also the vernacular, the vocabulary of ordinary life. 'Self-fulfilling prophecy,' 'role model,' 'dysfunctional,' 'focussed interview' (see Merton, 1987a for an explanation of the double-s), 'serendipity,' and other Mertonian coinages traveled smoothly into the lexicon of middle-ranged educated people, not only in the Anglophone world but also beyond. Other Mertonian reconceptualizations remained inside the walls of academia: Thomas theorem, Matthew effect, latent versus manifest, opportunity structures, etc.

The *Oxford English Dictionary*, a source RKM regularly consulted both to examine changes of meaning over time and to encounter unknown but telling expressions (Merton, 2004: 233–244), cites his publications four-dozen times to document trajectories of semantics. Going through these quotations, one can see that RKM both codified meaning, so his wording functioned as an exemplar, and invented, sometimes unsuccessfully, new expressions. To give only a few examples: aberrant, avocational, backfence, benchmark, boondoggling neurosis, caste hypogamy, the local and the cosmopolitan, Matthew effect, modal personality, opinionnaires, out-grouper, pilot study, point-to-point correlation, prestige-structure, problematics (the principal problems), quantitativist, retreatism, ritualism, role, role model, subsurface trends in class structure.

On a par with augmenting scholars' and lay people's vocabularies come RKM's publications. Since the rules of the academic game require participants to refer sources, we can say with some certainty that several of his papers and some of his books became what Eugene Garfield called 'citation classics' (one of the many admirers of RKM and his oeuvre). Garfield,

the founder of the citation index business, has been encouraged and tutored by RKM and listed some of his work in the category of highest cited papers (Garfield, 1963).

To better understand RKM and his intellectual distinctiveness beyond citation counts, it is advisable to take a look at the format of RKM's writings and publications. The majority of the books authored by RKM fall in the genre of collections and only a small minority fit the prerequisites of a monograph. In contrast to what happens elsewhere in academia and to other authors, RKM's collected volumes are much wider known than most of his monographs (Merton, 1949, 1957a, 1968, 1973, 1976, 1982, 1996). Paraphrasing one of his well-known phrases, one could identify his writings as middle-range texts. They do not try to cover huge intellectual landscapes but selected regions, which are investigated not from an eagle's perspective but by someone much closer to those investigated. RKM only rarely engaged in the textbook standards of participant observation as his preferred mode of data collection, but his writings show that he always tried to get as close to the field he analyzed as possible. One could call what forbade RKM to write about things strange to him were his need for familiarity coming up against inaccessibility in a researcher's time frame (see his explanations on strategic research event in (Merton, 1987b: 11–15)). To consult another of RKM's favorite lexicographic sources, most of his texts are essays in the strict sense of the definition of this genre by one of the founding fathers of modern lexicography, Samuel Johnson (1709–84): 'First taste of any thing,' 'a loose sally of the mind, an irregular, undigested piece, not a regular and orderly performance.' This circumscription might sound strange in the ears of present-day readers, but it is in accord with one of RKM's lasting convictions regarding the status of sociology as a science. In his early years, he stuck to the conviction that sociology is a young member of the science family and has a long way to go before arriving at the mature level of its siblings (Merton, 1945a). In later years, RKM bid farewell to the idea of sociology's quick maturing and even conceded that sociology might never become a science *more geometrico*. Long before he changed his mind with regard to the maturity of his craft, he had chosen the less scientific format of the essay as the most appropriate for his intellectual ambitions and inclinations. Enterprises less academically mature than neighboring rivals, e.g., sociology

compared to physics, ask for writing styles and publication formats that avoid fixations and stringencies and favor explorations. Here as elsewhere in the social world, the alignment of the causality's arrow is not carved in stone and correlation prevents hasty interpretations. But who wants to rule out that someone with a preference for the literary form gravitates toward subjects that best fit his format of choice?

### Merton's Paradigmatic Vision

Given the probing style of his writing, it is anything but easy to summarize RKM's intellectual contributions or to identify the core of his intellectual ambitions. At least since the first volume of collected papers, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (abbreviated by RKM usually as STSS), appeared in print in 1949, a regular criticism he had encountered was that he did not provide an encompassing theory. While this may be true, ultimately this truth depends on the meaning one assigns to the highly equivocal term 'theory,' as RKM himself outlined in the introduction of the first two editions of STSS, which became two separate chapters in the third edition.

RKM did not provide any general theory such as Darwin's theory of natural selection, or Freud's theory of the role the unconscious, or Weber's theory of occidental rationalism – theories whose core can usually be summarized in one sentence. Instead, he outlined the panorama a theory should try to cover. RKM does not provide simple sets of propositions and call them a theory, but labors on several aspects and elements of theoretical relevance. Therefore, his theories are seldom encompassing but hint toward what one should keep in mind when examining particular aspects of social life. Given the collectively shared mood not only of sociologists but also of neighboring social scientists in the middle of the twentieth century, it is surprising to see that RKM was not in favor of grand theories that are supposed to explain everything out of a handful of concepts and vaguely defined relations between them. Early on, RKM distanced himself from Parsons' endeavor to develop such a general theory (because he did this politely and did not orchestrate it as a parricide like many other unruly disciples, most later generations of sociologists did not notice the depth of differences between these two, Merton, 1980). Parsons' claim, that his general theory will be different from the speculative theories of Spencer and his contemporaries, did not persuade RKM. Looking back to the years following the end of World War II, one needs to highlight that it was not very fashionable to challenge the highfalutin ambitions proposed by Parsons, then widely admired.

Another interpretation of theory could point to the generalization one strives for or hopes to achieve. The more generally applicable a proposition, the more likely we could call it a theory. What others labeled a theory RKM called a 'paradigm,' very early on. He made use of this term first in 1945 when he outlined a paradigm for the sociology of knowledge (Merton, 1945b), in 1949 when he elaborated one for functional analysis, and later one for structural analysis (Merton, 1975). He also used the same strategy in other contexts: e.g., in his reconstruction of the meaning of anomie (Merton,

1938c, 1995), in his attempt to elaborate patterns of intermarriage (Merton, 1941), and elsewhere. RKM must have been surprised, to say the least, when he had to recognize that someone else became designated as the originator of the term paradigm. However, his historical notes on Thomas Kuhn's trajectory do not show any jealousy (Merton, 1979, 2004: 264–269). According to RKM, paradigms are orienting, which means that they are an outline for what a researcher should look for; they direct research by providing basic queries, list variables, and outline possible connections between elements under scrutiny.

Contemplating about the properties of what could be reasonably called a sociological theory, RKM arrived at a level below the generalized ones, which Parsons and nearly all earlier theorists preferred; he gave it the versatile title "theories of the middle range: theories that lie between the minor but necessary working hypotheses that evolve in abundance during day-to-day research and the all-inclusive systematic efforts to develop a unified theory that will explain all the observed uniformities of social behavior, social organization, and social change" (Merton, 1968: 39).

This notion and understanding of the theory work in sociology has been challenged, repudiated, and most of all misunderstood. Its meaning and range is debatable, but RKM devoted more energy and effort to contribute theories of this type rather than defending his concept as such. It is nearly impossible to provide a list of all Mertonian theories of middle range, but some of them will be covered below. An intrinsic problem in identifying these kinds of theories lies in the difficulty distinguishing theories from concepts in RKM's writings. Take as an example one of his most famous expressions, the self-fulfilling prophecy. Is it a middle-range theory, a mechanism, as some later admirers of RKM proposed, or is it anything more than a cleverly labeled concept? The scope of applicability of this 'dynamic social mechanism,' as he himself classified this concept-theory (Merton, 1968: 182), is nearly limitless: one should not be surprised to find proofs of it in ancient time, in far away corners of today's world, in highest developed as in disadvantaged, underdeveloped stages of mankind – in a word: it fits the criteria of universalistic applicability, much more than the definition of middle range would ask for. RKM himself subsumes the self-fulfilling prophecy, its counterpart the suicidal or self-destroying prophecy together with the "unanticipated consequences of action or decision or belief" (Merton, 1968: 182) as one pattern of latent functions. In comparing this concept with another famous reconceptualization of RKM, the interpretation and reformulation of Emile Durkheim's anomie, one wonders whether the range of these 'types of individual adaptation' – conformism, innovation, ritualism, retreatism, and rebellion – is broader than the former mentioned ones or not. Just to mention one aspect of a comparative analysis, one could imagine a human group, which cannot realize its culturally defined goals directly but in which the mechanism of self-fulfillment operates, nonetheless. Or to put it in another way: both self-fulfilling and anomie mechanisms seem to be valid in and for nearly every type of social group but neither help us to make distinctions between these groups, societies, or other larger social structures. The transition from concept to theory has

not been prescribed by RKM. We are, therefore, more or less free to choose arbitrarily between them.

Beneath high-abstraction and low-verifiable validity, to which RKM contributed in his earlier career more heavily than later on, he made a large number of contributions to sociological knowledge, only some of which can be covered in such a condensed tribute to a scholar who authored his first published paper at the age of 24 and who handed over his last manuscript to the publisher at the age of 93. In the seven decades between 1934 and 2004 when *The Travels and Adventures of Serendipity* came out in English posthumously (a translated version had been published in Italy in 2002), RKM published 20 books, more than 150 articles, numerous introductions, prefaces and, book reviews and has been responsible for coediting two huge compilations of reprints: 61 dissertations in sociology and 100 ‘classics, staples, and precursors in sociology.’

### A Selection of RKM's Substantive Contributions

If we distinguish between core convictions and lasting engagement in a scholar's oeuvre, I would like to select five such durable concerns in RKM's case.

His very first book, a revised edition of his 1936 Harvard PhD thesis, came out in 1938, not the best time in contemporary history to draw the attention of academia to the work of an unknown youngster (Merton, 1938a). Contrary to the unpromising environment, this juvenilia impressed experts then and now (Cohen, 1990). *Science, Technology and Society in Seventeenth Century England* had been produced under the tutelage of the eminent historian of science, George Sarton. RKM had conducted research on the formation of modern science in England in the early days of the Royal Society. The history of science context did not keep the trained sociologist from applying contemporary inventions of social research methodology, e.g., he contemplated about how to draw a sample from the *Dictionary of National Biography* and ended up with about 6000 biographical data sets of individual scholars; he conducted a content analysis of the early volumes of the *Proceedings of the Royal Society*; and he paid tribute to the embeddedness of the work of these scientists in larger public affairs of building vessels, improving navigation, and designing weapons. Together with some related articles and strengthened by the fact of a reprint of core chapters of the dissertation in consecutive editions of STSS, RKM became the founding father of sociology of science. During the seven decades of his academic life, RKM remained concerned with this special branch of sociological research (Cole and Zuckerman, 1975). In 1937, while still a graduate student, Sarton made him an associate editor for ‘Social Aspects of Science’ in the editorial team of the journal *Isis*. RKM demonstrated his continued interest by publishing and commissioning trend reports and some of the first bibliographies (Barber and Merton, 1952; Barber, 1952, 1956). Later in life, he devoted his ASA presidential address to his specialty (Merton, 1957b), directed some dissertations and well-funded major research projects, helped to create bodies for international exchange of ideas and research findings within this group of specialists (RKM was the first president

of ISA's research committee sociology of science), and was able to establish good relations to scientists themselves. Evidence of that latter point is that he was the first and is still the only social scientists who received the *National Medal of Science* from the hands of the US president.

A second field of investigations, which occupied RKM for some years, was the result of his close collaboration with Paul F. Lazarsfeld at the Bureau of Applied Social Research (Lazarsfeld, 1975; Merton, 1998). It was then labeled ‘mass communication research’ and would fit today into ‘sociology of culture’ and ‘cultural sociology’ properly. Back in the 1940s, recent societal transformations attracted the attention of social scientists: the role of radio, meaning and workings of propaganda, and political attempts to make use of both technologies. The most visible result of RKM's involvement in this area is the small monograph *Mass Persuasion*, which he wrote with the assistance of Marjorie Fiske and Alberta Curtis (Merton et al., 1946, 2004). The underlying study was the birthplace of the focused interview, which became subsequently adapted and modified into focus group studies, prompting RKM to publish a whole manual of procedures (Merton et al., [1956]1990). In *Mass Persuasion*, the team of investigators interviewed people after they listened to the third all-day war bond drive by a then well-known singer and radio talk show host, Kate Smith. Combining content analysis and focused interviews, the research team, which had been formed on short notice (Lazarsfeld called this firehouse research: Lazarsfeld, 1969: 313), presented both an analysis of the persuasiveness of a mass culture heroine and an insightful exploration of what made this program attractive for listeners. In a paper RKM published around this time together with Lazarsfeld (Lazarsfeld and Merton, 1948), the two authors elaborated what later on became known as the Columbia tradition in mass communication research, a middle-of-the-road position that accredited the critical wing of social analysis with some validity: they called it ‘narcotizing dysfunction of media’ but insisted that media fulfilled social functions too: status conferral, on the one hand, and enforcement of social norms, on the other. The fact that RKM's involvement in empirical social research brought two monographs mainly authored by him to life is in itself telling regarding that his main interests were elsewhere. Two chapters in STSS's part on theoretical sociology, which were also published independently as a book (Merton, 1967), devote to this interrelationship in some detail: “The Bearing of Sociological Theory on Empirical Research” and “The Bearing of Empirical Research on Sociological Theory” (Merton, 1968: 139–171).

Judging by the academic echo it evoked, one of RKM's earliest papers surpass all others: “Social structure and anomie,” first published in 1938 in *American Sociological Review*, not only became a citation classic but also had lasting influence on the sociological study of deviant behavior. For decades, no student of criminology, deviant behavior, and neighboring fields could evade the five types of individual adaptation, or strain theory as an important way to understand deviance. RKM's interpretation of Durkheim's concept of anomie remains influential and controversial at the same time: 40 years after the publication one of his students gave an overview on the reception (Cole, 1975) and

three quarters of a century after its first print RKM's paper got quoted 3797 times in Google Scholar (August 2014). RKM himself contributed to the debate on anomie theory, further elaborated the meaning of opportunity structures (see his retrospective memoir: [Merton, 1995](#)), and used it as an analytical model for composing a reader together with Robert Nisbet on *Contemporary Social Problems* ([Merton and Nisbet, 1961](#)). Between 1961 and 1976, when this reader appeared in its fourth edition, it was formative for thinking about forms of deviance, at least in American colleges and universities.

At any rate, two more lines of thinking can be identified as characteristic of RKM: His devotion to the history of the sciences and social sciences and his elaboration of what he called sociological semantics. The interest in the past of his own discipline started for RKM from his conviction that re-conceptualization and taking a second glance at past contributions to sociology are fruitful endeavors. Later in his career, he took his own life and work as an exemplar to demonstrate the relevance of archived material, like unpublished correspondences, to grasp particular developments in sociology in more detail. He restrained from writing a full-fledged autobiography but penned several shorter memoirs, most famously the Charles Homer Haskins lecture he gave in his hometown Philadelphia in April of 1994 ([Merton, 1994](#)).

One could argue that autobiographical details of a scholar's life do not influence the validity of his pronouncements and argues even more strongly that hobby horses do not belong to an academic balance sheet. But a portrait of RKM would be lacking in color and integrity if OTSOG would not be mentioned. The acronym stands for *On the Shoulders of Giants*, originally a somewhat lengthy letter to his friend, the Harvard historian Bernard Bailyn, typed during some leisure time at the end of 1957. Eight years later, RKM's lengthy letter became a book and has since been translated and gone through at least three editions. At the time when the original manuscript has been produced, and even when the first printed version appeared in 1965, only few readers knew that this 'Shandean Postscript' was nothing like a 'singleton' (cf [Merton, 1961a](#)). Around the time of the letter writing, which resulted in OTSOG, RKM was working with his colleague Elinor Barber on a manuscript that only appeared some 40 years later. The book ([Merton and Barber, 2004](#)) contains a 70-page afterword where RKM elaborates on the evolution of his interest in the serendipity pattern and his plea for what he then called *sociological semantics*. By that he meant the analysis of changes in the meaning of widely used concepts or terms as well as the investigation of sociological characteristics of its creators, providers, users, and those ignoring such inventions.

### An Improbable Life Trajectory

Given this short overview of this scholar's oeuvre, the reader might want to know how all this could have been accomplished by one man. To put it in a slightly different way: Who was the man behind all these publications? The author was not born in 1910 but only some 15 years later, as the interested reader first had a chance to read in a portrait of RKM,

which was published in the widely distributed magazine *New Yorker* by the science journalist Morton Hunt ([Hunt, 1961](#)). About 34 years later, RKM confirmed the story in his Haskins lecture of 1994: The newborn son of Yiddish-speaking immigrants from Russia goes under a very different name in 1910 and changed it to a more American sounding one when he aspired to start a professional career as a magician. Before this, encouraged by his mother and his sister's husband, he adopted both reading and magic as habits. Due to friendly female librarians in the neighboring library, established by a generous gift from Andrew Carnegie, one of the Gilded Age's robber barons, young not-yet-Robert earned a good education in "literature, science, and history, especially in biographies and autobiographies" ([Merton, 1994](#): 343). In Philadelphia, RKM attended high school and continued into college at the then noncredited Temple University. There he met his first sociology teacher, George E. Simpson, who recruited the sophomore, now known as RKM, as a research assistant to help him finish his own dissertation on *The Negro in the Philadelphia Press*. From Simpson, RKM learned sociological techniques of data collection and analysis. His mentor also took the undergraduate student to the Annual Meeting of the then American Sociological Society. Back then, the number of attendants was small enough that an ambitious young no-name could chat with an established older man. Pitirim A. Sorokin (who, just as RKM's parents, was born in Tsarist Russia but was neither Jewish nor Russian, but belonged to the Finno-Ugric minority of Komi) encouraged RKM to apply for a scholarship for graduate study at Harvard University, where Sorokin recently had been hired to found the department of sociology. From 1931 onwards, RKM spent 7 years around Harvard Square where he met some of his future mentors and friends. Together with Sorokin, he authored at least three papers and learned Italian over a summer break after Sorokin's request (visiting professor Corrado Gini's English was insufficient for teaching). Sorokin and RKM drifted apart partly due to the latter's choice of his dissertation topic ([Merton, 1989](#)). As already mentioned, Sarton took over as mentor and role model: from him, RKM learned a new style of writing and judging others' contributions ([Thackray and Merton, 1972](#)). RKM's admiration for the Belgian-born polymath never receded ([Merton, 1985](#)). Then Talcott Parsons entered the circles of the graduate student, which brought RKM back on route to a career in sociology ([Merton, 1980](#)). The fact that he remained an underpaid tutor in Harvard's department could not have to do with the pervasive anti-Semitism held by Harvard's WASPs because RKM's Jewish origins were not known publicly until his disclosure in 1994. Given RKM's productivity before he reached the age of 30 (one book, more than a dozen articles, including some which became classics ([Merton, 1936, 1938b; Merton and Sorokin, 1937](#)), and a bunch of book reviews), it is not a big surprise that other universities were eager to hire the young Harvard man. From 1938 to 1941, RKM took a detour through the Deep South and acted as chairman and professor at Tulane University in New Orleans. Around this time, RKM must have realized that he may once become famous and started to administer his correspondence and files rigorously and easy to navigate for later users of his papers, stored at the

very university where he spent most of his career: Columbia University in the City of New York. There he started as an assistant professor on a post, which has been split in two because the two powerful members of the department could not agree on one candidate. The tacit assumption of the department's rivals and other Columbia people must have been that within a short period of time only one incumbent will survive. Quite the contrary happened – very much to the advantage of sociology. RKM and the nearly 10-years older Paul F. Lazarsfeld did not battle each other but collaborated. The story of how this relationship started has been initially told by the *New Yorker* and then by Lazarsfeld in the festschrift RKM received at his 65th birthday (Lazarsfeld, 1975): Instead of having the intended first dinner at the Lazarsfeld's, the two men went downtown to a radio studio to conduct an urgent radio-audience study, leaving their astonished wives behind. When the job was done, both continued talking at the Russian Tea Room until long after midnight.

Lazarsfeld was able to persuade RKM to join him at the newly renamed Bureau of Applied Social Research where RKM remained, in one or another function, until its end. The relationship between the Viennese-Jewish upper-middle-class mathematician-turned-into-social researcher and the Philadelphian slum dweller and Harvard alumnus became one of the highly unusual success stories in academia. They nurtured several cohorts of first-class students who became fellow sociologists – just to mention some from the earliest days: Peter M. Blau, James Coleman, Lewis Coser, Rose Laub Coser, Alvin Gouldner, Seymour Martin Lipset – and dominated American sociology for a while. The highly improbable collaboration stretched out beyond the Columbia campus. RKM also acted as gatekeeper at several publishing houses and foundations: at Ford, Guggenheim, the Palo Alto Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, MacArthur, Russell Sage. At other spending bodies, RKM acted either as board member or reviewer. It is not inconceivable that such a powerful position generated some jealousy.

There is another trait in RKM's performance, which needs to be mentioned: His refusal to take positions in public. RKM never performed as a public intellectual, never wrote op-eds, appeared at public events or sent letters to the editor (for one exception see Merton, 1961b). He started his days as early as 04.30 in the morning and continued working in his home office until he reached a degree of exhaustion or feeling of completeness. He then walked to his more publicly available office at Columbia or his small cubicle at the Russell Sage Foundation's headquarter where he enjoyed the status of Foundation Scholar. Apparently, he did not need much sleep because one could also meet him later in the day or at night. RKM seemed to enjoy living in New York City and meeting people from several corners of this quintessential professional metropolis. But he always remained a private person and never joined movements, organizations, or any other forms of public engagements. He rejected calls to other places, even if they were Oxford. His political convictions shine through in several of his papers, most explicitly in response to the Nazi movement in Germany and his concern with racial discrimination in his own country (Merton, 1942, 1948).

## Legacies

A decade passed since RKM died on 23 February 2003, but it seems he and his works are more appreciated today than ever. During his lifetime, he received two festschriften (Coser, 1975; Gieryn, 1980), two volumes with critical comments on his work appeared (Mongardini and Tabboni, 1998; Clark et al., 1990) and two books introduced and critically commented on his work (Sztompka, 1986; Crothers, 1987). Criticism has been raised, but never reached the level of the diatribes against his friend-and-teacher Parsons and his collaborator-and-friend Lazarsfeld (cf vicariously for others Mills, 1959; Gouldner, 1970).

The biggest influence of RKM is epitomized by one of his concepts: obliteration by incorporation. But as mentioned above, some of his contributions are still related to him as their originator. Over the last couple of years, at least three more tribute-like collections appeared after conferences in Budapest, New York, and Warsaw (Elkana et al., 2011; Calhoun, 2010; Mica et al., 2011), complemented by short introductions to his work in German and French (Mackert and Steinbicker, 2013; Saint-Martin, 2013).

It might be neither a self-fulfilling nor suicidal prophecy to say that both RKM's published work and the immensely rich collection of manuscripts, correspondences, and other material stored and cataloged at the Rare Book and Manuscript Division of Butler Library, Columbia University, as the Robert K. Merton papers will find further interpreters assessing matters from the viewpoint his shoulders offer.

*See also:* Anomie: History of the Concept; Anomie; Celebrity; Communication Research and Media Studies, History of; Crime, Sociology of; Definition of the situation: History of the Concept; Delinquency, Sociology of; Deprivation: Relative; Ethical Questions in Social and Behavioral Sciences, History of; Focus Groups; Functionalism, History of; Gatekeepers in Social Science; Ignorance, History of Concept; Knowledge, Sociology of; Kuhn, Thomas S. (1922–96); Lazarsfeld, Paul Felix (1901–76); Media Events; Parsons, Talcott (1902–79); Science and Technology Studies, History of; Science, History of; Science, Sociology of; Scientific Misconduct, Plagiarism, and Institutional Control of Misconduct; Social Structure: History of the Concept; Sociological Theory; Sociology, History of; Sorokin, Pitirim Alexandrovich (1889–1968); Strain Theories and Crime; Unintended Consequences: History of the Concept.

## Bibliography

- Barber, B., 1952. *Science and the Social Order*. Free Press, Glencoe, IL.
- Barber, B., 1956. *Sociology of science. A trend report and bibliography*. *Current Sociology* 5 (2), 89–153.
- Barber, B., Merton, R.K., 1952. *Brief bibliography for the sociology of science*. *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 80 (2), 140–154.
- Calhoun, C. (Ed.), 2010. *Robert K. Merton: Sociology of Science and Sociology as Science*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Clark, J., Modgil, C., Modgil, S. (Eds.), 1990. *Robert K. Merton: Consensus and Controversy*. Falmer Press, London.
- Cohen, I.B. (Ed.), 1990. *Puritanism and the Rise of Modern Science: The Merton Thesis*. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick.

- Cole, J.R., Zuckerman, H., 1975. The emergence of a scientific specialty. The self-exemplifying case of the sociology of science. In: Coser, L.A. (Ed.), *The Idea of Social Structure*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, pp. 139–174.
- Cole, S., 1975. The growth of scientific knowledge. Theories of deviance as a case study. In: Coser, L.A. (Ed.), *The Idea of Social Structure*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, pp. 175–220.
- Coser, L.A. (Ed.), 1975. *The Idea of Social Structure: Papers in Honor of Robert K. Merton*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York.
- Crothers, C., 1987. *Robert K. Merton*. Tavistock Publications, London.
- Elkana, Y., Sziget, A., Lissauer, G. (Eds.), 2011. *Concepts and the Social Order: Robert K. Merton and the Future of Sociology*. Central European University Press, Budapest.
- Garfield, E., 1963. Robert K. Merton – Author and Editor Extraordinaire. Part 1 [1983] and Part 2. In: *Essays of an Information Scientist*, pp. 312–318, pp. 319–329. Philadelphia.
- Gieryn, T.F. (Ed.), 1980. *Science and Social Structure: A Festschrift for Robert K. Merton*. Transaction of the New York Academy of Sciences, New York.
- Gouldner, A.W., 1970. *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. Basic Books, New York.
- Hunt, M., 28 January 1961. Profiles: how does it come to be so? *The New Yorker* 39–63.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F., 1969. An episode in the history of social research. In: Fleming, D., Bailyn, B. (Eds.), *The Intellectual Migration. Europe and America, 1930–1960*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, pp. 270–337.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F., 1975. Working with Merton. In: Coser, L.A. (Ed.), pp. 35–66.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F., Merton, R.K., 1948. Mass communication, popular taste, and organized social action. In: Bryson, L. (Ed.), *Communication of Ideas*. Harper, New York, pp. 95–118.
- Mackert, J., Steinbicker, J., 2013. *Zur Aktualität von Robert K. Merton*. vs Verlag, Wiesbaden.
- Merton, R.K., 1936. The unanticipated consequences of purposive social action. *American Sociological Review* 1, 894–904 [Reprinted in 1976].
- Merton, R.K., 1938a. *Science, Technology and Society in Seventeenth Century England*. Saint Catherine Press, Bruges, Belgium.
- Merton, R.K., 1938b. Science and the social order. *Philosophy of Science* 5, 321–337.
- Merton, R.K., 1938c. Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review* 1938, 672–682 [Reprinted in 1968, pp. 185–214].
- Merton, R.K., 1941. Inter marriage and the social structure. *Psychiatry: Journal of the Biology and Pathology of Interpersonal Relations* 361–374 [Reprinted in 1976, pp. 217–250].
- Merton, R.K., 1942. A note on science and democracy. *Journal of Legal and Political Sociology* 1 (1–2), 115–126.
- Merton, R.K., 1945a. Sociological theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 50 (6), 462–473.
- Merton, R.K., 1945b. The sociology of knowledge. In: Gurwitsch, G., Moore, W.E. (Eds.), *Twentieth Century Sociology*. Philosophical Library, New York, pp. 366–405 [Reprinted in 1968, pp. 510–542].
- Merton, R.K., 1948. Discrimination and the American creed. In: MacIver, R.M. (Ed.), *Discrimination and National Welfare*. Harper & Brothers, New York, pp. 99–126 [Reprinted in 1976, pp. 189–216].
- Merton, R.K., 1949. *Social Theory and Social Structure: Toward the Codification of Theory and Research*. Free Press, Glencoe.
- Merton, R.K., 1957a. *Social Theory and Social Structure*, second ed. Free Press, Glencoe.
- Merton, R.K., 1957b. Priorities in scientific discovery. *American Sociological Review* 22 (6), 635–659 [Reprinted in: 1973, pp. 286–324].
- Merton, R.K., October 1961a. Singletons and multiples in scientific discovery. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 105 (5), 470–486 [Reprinted in: 1973, pp. 343–370].
- Merton, R.K., 16 July 1961b. The canons of the anti-sociologist. In: *New York Times* [Reprinted in 1976, pp. 180–185].
- Merton, R.K., 1967. *On Theoretical Sociology: Five Essays, Old and New*. Free Press, New York.
- Merton, R.K., 1968. *Social Theory and Social Structure*, third ed. Free Press, New York.
- Merton, R.K., 1973. In: Storer, N.W. (Ed.), *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Merton, R.K., 1975. Structural analysis in sociology. In: Blau, P.M. (Ed.), *Approaches to the Study of Social Structure*. Free Press, New York, pp. 21–52 [Reprinted in 1976, pp. 109–144.].
- Merton, R.K., 1976. *Sociological Ambivalence and Other Essays*. Free Press, New York.
- Merton, R.K., 1979. *The Sociology of Science: An Episodic Memoir*. Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale.
- Merton, R.K., 1980. Remembering the young Talcott Parsons. *The American Sociologist* 15, 68–77.
- Merton, R.K., 1982. In: Rosenblatt, A., Gieryn, T.F. (Eds.), *Social Research and the Practicing Professions*. Abt Books, Cambridge.
- Merton, R.K., 1985. George Sarton: episodic recollections by an unruly apprentice. *Isis* 76 (4), 470–486.
- Merton, R.K., 1987a. The focussed interview and focus groups: continuities and discontinuities. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51, 550–566.
- Merton, R.K., 1987b. Three fragments from a sociologist's notebooks. Establishing the phenomenon, specified ignorance, and strategic research materials. *Annual Review of Sociology* 13, 1–28.
- Merton, R.K., 1989. The Sorokin-Merton correspondence on Puritanism, Pietism and science, 1933–1934. *Science in Context* 3 (1), 291–298.
- Merton, R.K., 1994. *A Life of Learning*. Charles Homer Haskins Lecture. ACLS Occasional, New York paper no. 25. [Reprinted in 1996, pp. 339–359].
- Merton, R.K., 1995. Opportunity structure. The emergence, diffusion, and differentiation of a sociological concept, 1930s–1950s. In: Adler, F., Laufer, W.S. (Eds.), *The Legacy of Anomie Theory*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, pp. 3–78.
- Merton, R.K., 1996. In: Sztompka, P. (Ed.), *On Social Structure and Science*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Merton, R.K., 1998. Working with Lazarsfeld: notes and contexts. In: Lautman, J., Lécuyer, B.-P. (Eds.), *Paul Lazarsfeld (1901–1976). La sociologie de Vienne à New York*. L'Harmattan, Paris, pp. 163–211.
- Merton, R.K., 2004. In: Merton, R.K., Barber, E.G. (Eds.), *Autobiographical Reflections on the Travels and Adventures of Serendipity*, pp. 230–301.
- Merton, R.K., Barber, E.G., 2004. *The Travels and Adventures of Serendipity: A Study in Historical Semantics and the Sociology of Science*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Merton, R.K., Fiske, M., Kendall, P.L., 1990. *The Focused Interview: A Manual of Problems and Procedures*. Free Press, New York [Originally 1956].
- Merton, R.K., Fiske, M., Curtis, A., 1946. *Mass Persuasion: The Social Psychology of a War Bond Drive*. Harper & Brothers, New York.
- Merton, R.K., Fiske, M., Curtis, A., 2004. *Mass Persuasion: The Social Psychology of a War Bond Drive*. Introduction by P. Simonson. Howard Fertig, New York.
- Merton, R.K., Nisbet, R.A., 1961. *Contemporary Social Problems*. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, New York.
- Merton, R.K., Sorokin, P.A., 1937. Social time. A methodological and functional analysis. *American Journal of Sociology* 42, 615–629.
- Mica, A., Peisert, A., Winczorek, J. (Eds.), 2011. *Sociology and the Unintended: Robert Merton Revisited*. P. Lang, Frankfurt.
- Mills, C.W., 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Mongardini, C., Tabboni, S. (Eds.), 1998. *Robert K. Merton & Contemporary Sociology*. Transaction, New Brunswick.
- Saint-Martin, A., 2013. *La sociologie de Robert K. Merton*. La Découverte, Paris.
- Sztompka, P., 1986. *Robert K. Merton: An Intellectual Profile*. St. Martin's Press, New York.
- Thackray, A., Merton, R.K., 1972. On discipline building. The paradoxes of George Sarton. *Isis* 63 (4), 472–495.