



Lazarsfeld's wives, or: what happened to women sociologists in the twentieth century

Christian Fleck

To cite this article: Christian Fleck (2021): Lazarsfeld's wives, or: what happened to women sociologists in the twentieth century, International Review of Sociology, DOI: [10.1080/03906701.2021.1926672](https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2021.1926672)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2021.1926672>



© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 19 May 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 140



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Lazarsfeld's wives, or: what happened to women sociologists in the twentieth century¹

Christian Fleck 

Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna and Poletayev Institute for Theoretical and Historical Studies, Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russian Federation

ABSTRACT

The paper compares the lives of three female social scientists born in the first two decades of the twentieth century and belonging to the first generations that had the opportunity not only to study at universities, but also to realistically consider a professional career in academia. Marie Jahoda, Herta Herzog and Patricia L. Kendall made their ways separately and interacted only rarely with each other, but shared at least one characteristic which influenced their careers: they were married to Paul F. Lazarsfeld, one of the eminent sociologists of the twentieth century, prominent as someone who encouraged and supported many of his collaborators and students. The comparison of these three women shows that they were professionally successful but did not completely prioritize academic work before other interests, ambitions, and obligations. These priorities found a correspondence in their underperformance in academia with regard to the particular preconditions to enter the pantheon of an academic discipline. Both their oeuvres and their academic records suggest that they were not actively striving to become academic 'immortals.' Here it is shown that women, even if they are to be located below the 'ultra elite,' produced remarkable and memorable intellectual achievements.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 15 June 2020
Accepted 24 April 2021

KEYWORDS

Marie Jahoda – Herta Herzog – Patricia L. Kendall – female academic careers

Prelude

The Austrian vernacular allows one to address a person by their occupation, e.g. 'Herr Doktor' (verbatim Mister Doctor), and the Austrians extended this practice to wives. In most cases, therefore, a 'Frau Professor' was not really a professor but rather a professor's wife. Only after 1956, when Berta Karlik became the first female professor (in physics) at the University of Vienna, the Austrians saw the need to correct their language.

The opportunity to become a (real) 'Frau Professor' has opened up all around the world only quite recently—'recently' if one considers that the academic world is relatively slow in its rhythm of generational change. Academia's average retention period lasts thirty years on average, and due to self-recruitment, fundamental changes have taken

CONTACT Christian Fleck  fleck@ihs.ac.at  Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna, Austria and Poletayev Institute for Theoretical and Historical Studies, Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russian Federation

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

place only within the timespan of three generations (or during periods of rapid staff increase²).

The democratization of several countries has been accompanied by policies purporting gender equality. Whereas during World War I women became employed in munition factories and other places where they had to substitute workers who were turned into soldiers, middle class women seldom left their traditional places inside the bourgeois family. Due to the pressure for suffrage by activists from the first wave of feminism, the inclusion of the other half of the population became a reality around the same time as the opening of the universities to women. However, female parliamentarians appeared earlier on the scene than female professors, very much for the simple reason that an academic career requires a longer period of education and apprenticeship than a political career.

There have been slight national differences. The otherwise conservative Switzerland opened its universities to women earlier than neighboring Germany and Austria. Gender-segregated ‘women colleges’ were founded even earlier in the United States (Harwarth et al., 1997). In most Western countries, the first female professors appeared only during the second half of the twentieth century; earlier cases were complete outliers, such as the legendary scholars Laura Bassi (Bologna 1733), Marie Skłodowska Curie (Sorbonne 1908), and Lise Meitner (Berlin 1926). It should come as no surprise that all these women scholars succeeded in fields far away from the posh and prejudice-driven humanities and social sciences disciplines. A scholar in Central European countries who wanted to climb up the career ladder in academia not only needed more training than a first degree, but she also had to go through a second dissertation examination, the so-called Habilitation. It functioned as the needle through which only those who ‘fit’ into academia were channeled—Jews, socialists, and women did not.

Women born in the first quarter of the twentieth century were the first generation of their sex benefiting from the still reluctant opening of opportunities, initially for getting a university education and subsequently for academic careers. Motivation and courage were not enough to succeed. Yet how should one analyze these hindrances and identify the rare supportive forces that impacted women’s academic careers? Most histories of women in academia tell the life of an individual (Stevens & Gardner, 1982a; Gardner & Stevens, 1992; Deegan, 1991; O’Connell & Russo, 1990; Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1998; Honegger & Wobbe, 1998). However, this approach makes it difficult to identify socio-structural barriers, and patterns of inclusion and exclusion remain uncovered. On the opposite end, to use merely statistical data of gender gaps cannot sufficiently expose mechanisms of encouragement and discrimination that individuals experience in their academic life. An additional disadvantage of studies on gender discrimination is their decision not to differentiate between the sciences and other branches of scholarship (Zuckerman et al., 1991; Sonnert & Holton, 1995). It seems, however, that several academic branches were open in varying degrees to women during the first half of twentieth century. Even more than scientific disciplines, local environments favored or discouraged women.

Alternatively, one could take scholarly micro-environments where early on the presence of women was stronger than elsewhere. There is not much supporting literature; therefore, the following is a prototype of such an approach. The smallest micro-environment which could be considered here is the family, including the marriage of female scholars. Interesting enough, there has been some research done in the 1970s and

1980s on academic couples. Martin et al. (1975) investigated the American Sociological Association's members who were married to a departmental colleague in the years 1969–1974 and could be identified because of identical family names (the authors were aware of the selection bias). These sociologists showed unique pattern with regard to the productivity of the partners: Husbands were more productive than their wives, but the latter published more than the members of a female control group. Bryson et al. (1976) sent out a questionnaire to 605 members of the American Psychological Association who claimed 'husband-wife-credit' with regard to the fees and added a control group. One of the findings reported by Bryson et al. is the higher productivity of psychologists married to a psychologist. Males gained more out of this constellation than females but, again, women married to a psychologist outperformed those of the same sex who were single or married to someone of a different professional background. Goodman et al. (1984) followed up with a questionnaire study of approximately 170 couples of sociologists. Again, they found a higher productivity and several other findings challenging conventional wisdom.

The major substantive finding, we believe, is that professional achievement is not the result of any specific form of either sponsorship or collaboration style but is more a result of a social and professional facilitation of being married to a co-disciplinarian. (Goodman et al., 1984, p. 260)

Cole and Zuckerman (1987) researched the consequences of marriage in academia and found out that within the elite group of 'eminent' scientists, married women published more than single women. These studies did not find continuation in later decades, but they are of interest because they cover members of the earliest generations of female psychologists and sociologists. Following Goodman et al., one could doubt a causal link between being married to an academic colleague and factors favorable to publishing more than other members of the same sex and the same discipline. Most likely, cultural factors rather than methodological considerations were responsible for the discontinuity in researching the topic of academic couples. The supporting role of female partners is covered in most books narrating the life of an eminent male member of any academic tribe, but one could not report the same for the forces supporting female social scientists in the middle of the last century.

A somewhat larger micro-environment than marriage and family are departments, research groups, and so-called schools. In the first half of the twentieth century, some of them encouraged women more than others. Two such women-friendly milieus were the psychology department at the University of Vienna and its offspring, the *Wirtschaftspsychologische Forschungsstelle*. The department did not exist as an independent unit within the university, but Karl Bühler held a full professorship in philosophy there and established psychological research during his tenure from 1922 to 1938. He was married to Charlotte Bühler, who was one of the first women receiving a habilitation, the second degree within the Central European academic system. The *Forschungsstelle* had been established in 1931, thanks to the initiative of Paul Lazarsfeld who acted as the expert for statistics at the university. The only paid assistant there was Egon Brunswik, who married Else Frenkel-Brunswik only after their joint escape following the Anschluss in 1938. Historians of psychology agree that the Bühler Institute was one of the most fertile environments supporting women in their academic efforts early on (Benetka,

1995; Stevens & Gardner, 1982b). After Lazarsfeld left Vienna for New York in 1933, the Forschungsstelle was directed by women until its closure in 1937. In New York, Lazarsfeld founded again an extramural research unit, initially loosely connected to the newly established University of Newark, later affiliated with Columbia University, where it became known as the Bureau of Applied Social Research. During the early period, the Bureau's staff was heavily female (cf. Fleck, 2011, chapter 5). Peter Simonson and Lauren Archer collected short biographical data for 34 women active in the emerging field of communication research who were employed by the Bureau.³ One of them, Alice S. Rossi (1922-2009), became the third female president of the American Sociological Association in 1983.⁴

Vienna's psychology milieu and New York's empirical social research Bureau are connected through several individuals, four of whom are at the core of the following pages.⁵ The man and two of the three women discussed in detail below were active on both sides of the Atlantic. In addition, the three women scholars—Marie Jahoda (1907-2001), Hertha Herzog (1910-2010), and Patricia L. Kendall (1921-1990)—shared one distinguishing mark: Each of them was married to the same man, Paul F. Lazarsfeld (1901-1976).

The present author is aware of the fact that naming the husband before the names of three women social scientists seems to put the man in a more prominent place in front of the women. Criticisms of reifying gender discrimination comes soon.⁶ However, the world in which some remain longer in the collective memory than others cannot be revolutionized by will. In all branches of scholarly work, very few are selected to be canonized and live on in historical memory, and the vast majority are deemed to get lost in history sooner or later. The very process of becoming 'immortal' cannot be analyzed in this paper, but the following pages offer some of the details one need to consider in building a theory of immortality. The widespread tendency to focus on the top of academia invites to ignore the fact that remarkable research has also been produced below the top, still quite distinct from that which can be somewhat disparagingly called research for the footnotes.

An idea that has been developed in Lazarsfeld's lectures and written down by participants could be of help in proceeding with this analysis. 'The Analysis of Deviant Cases in Communication Research' by Patricia L. Kendall and Katherine M. Wolf appeared for the first time in a 1949 collaborative report (Kendall & Wolf, 1949, pp. 152-179) and was reprinted as 'The Two Purposes of Deviant Case Analysis' (Kendall & Wolf, 1955, pp. 167-170) in the highly influential reader *The Language of Social Research* (Lazarsfeld & Rosenberg, 1955). During the first three quarters of the twentieth century, women have been considered the quintessential exceptions in academia. In statistical-based explanations (and not only there), they were sidelined as outliers or deviant cases. Kendall & Wolf name the following 'function' of an analysis of these deviant cases: Uncover additional factors for up-to-now accepted explanations of behavior, by 'correct[ing] the over-simplifications of predictive schemes by demonstrating the relevance of [these] additional variables' (1949; p. 155). Another function would be the refinement of the measurement of variables, but identifying additional factors behind becoming canonized, or immortal, is enough for the present purpose. For lack of space I cannot elaborate a theory of immortality in detail, but point to some of its elements throughout this paper. In short, a person becomes immortal in science and scholarship if their

contributions to further develop the knowledge of a specific discipline are still remembered years after they left the academic stage.⁷

One could argue that Lazarsfeld himself belongs to the immortals of sociology; today he no longer belongs to the top-dogs of this elite, but his reputation is still high enough to be listed in encyclopedias, textbooks, histories, etc. Looking at the top 100 immortals in sociology (Korom, 2020), Lazarsfeld seems to exemplify a ‘deviant case’ in other respects too. He was the only sociologist whose female partner(s) consistently practiced the same trade and became candidates for immortal women in sociology (and neighboring fields) in their own right, as I show below. Of course, there were other male sociologists married to female sociologists (like W.I. and Dorothy Thomas, Robert and Helen Lynd, Everett C. and Helen MacGill Hughes, Peter Rossi and Alice S. Rossi, Robert K. Merton and Harriet Zuckerman), but Lazarsfeld was the only one who practiced serial monogamy in sociology.

Lazarsfeld married Jahoda in 1927 and she divorced him in 1933; he married Herzog in 1936 and this marriage dissolved in 1945; and from 1949 onwards Lazarsfeld was married to Kendall. These data would invite one to speculate about a Lazarsfeldian marriage pattern. Jahoda was twenty when they married (and he was 26), Herzog was twenty-six (when he was 35) and Kendall was twenty-eight (when he was 48). I am, however, not interested in male coupling strategies. Three women were married to Lazarsfeld at an age that usually coincides with the early steps of a professional career. So, one could think about the hindrances and encouragements offered by a partner.

The paper proceeds as follow: First, I will provide short biographical portraits of the main actors, and then I will compare the three women’s career steps and the role of mentors in their paths. I will then dig into the individual motivations and ambitions and wrap up the analysis by looking at the academic output of the three to decide to what degree each of them contributed memorable publications, which would form the basis of becoming immortal, or a classic, in their academic discipline.

Jahoda

Marie Jahoda⁸ was born into a middle-class family of Jewish ancestry in 1907 in Vienna, where she lived for the next 30 years together with three siblings. During her high school years, she started attending, with the encouragement of her older brother Eduard, meetings of the social democratic high school student organization. At one ‘Ferienkolonie,’ or summer camps organized by this organization, she met Paul Lazarsfeld, one of the organizers of the camp, for the first time. Mitzi, as Jahoda was known by her friends and relatives, fell in love with Lazarsfeld around 1925 and married him in 1927, immediately after the premature death of her father Carl, who disapproved of this relationship. At this time Jahoda was in her first year of post-secondary education. She attended courses to become an elementary school teacher and started studying psychology at the university. During her youth and young adulthood, Jahoda’s purpose in life was politics. Early on she became an organizer within the broad spectrum of activities offered by the social democratic party, which became known as Red Vienna. She organized summer camps when she was still in high school, participated in teacher-pupil-conferences, and reached her first high point in politics at the age of 18 when she was one of the speakers at the May Day celebration in Vienna.

Looking back at her early years, Jahoda revealed the motivation behind choosing psychology as her major:

My decision to study psychology was based on my very, very deep conviction that I would one day be Minister of Education in a socialist Austria. Psychology seemed to me to be the best preparation for that job which was the one job in life that I wanted. This great illusion let me into psychology. (Jahoda, as cited in Fryer, 1986, p. 116; comp. Jahoda, 1979, p. 113)

In the remaining years of democratic rule in Austria, Jahoda lived a very intense life. Besides her political engagement she held several jobs, spent almost a year in Paris to overcome troubles in her marriage, and gave birth to her daughter Lotte in 1930. Two years later she graduated in psychology with a dissertation thesis in which she interviewed old Viennese about their lives. The marriage with Lazarsfeld came to an end around the same time, but both continued collaborating professionally which resulted in the pathbreaking study *The Unemployed of Marienthal* (Lazarsfeld-Jahoda & Zeisl, 1933). The book came out in spring 1933 in Leipzig, a highly inappropriate coincidence because the Nazi's anti-Jewish campaign started at the same time. Because of this, the authors decided to hid their authorship behind the veil of the *Wirtschaftspsychologische Forschungsstelle*. The small book was not burned by the Nazis; it was even reviewed in an official journal in Germany. Together with other reviews, it made the authors known to others. For instance, the then exiled Institut für Sozialforschung under Max Horkheimer commissioned their like-minded Viennese social researchers to contribute to the voluminous study *Autorität und Familie*, which came out in Paris in 1936 (Horkheimer, 1936).

Professionally the situation for Lazarsfeld and Jahoda was what later on became known as precarious. Neither of them held a regular position at the university, nor did they earn much money from the market research Lazarsfeld initiated around the same time. The offer of a fellowship engineered by his mentors Karl and Charlotte Bühler ended Lazarsfeld's non-career in Austria in the fall of 1933.⁹ Over the next two years he tried to support the Forschungsstelle across the Atlantic, an effort which brought some surpluses intellectually but not financially. The Forschungsstelle survived, more as a façade than an income provider under the direction of Jahoda.

Besides the obligations as a single mother, Jahoda continued with her political engagement in the underground after the ban of the party in February 1934. She used the research office as a cover address for illegal correspondence, rented a bank safe to store treasonable documents, and played a crucial role helping the leader of the underground organization to maintain his freedom.¹⁰ In November 1936 Jahoda was arrested and spent more than half a year in prison. A judge convicted her for anti-state-activities, and only international interventions and protests helped to free her from a successive administrative incarceration. Eight months after her release and her forced exile to England, the Nazis took power in Austria. If Jahoda were in the hands of the police at that time, her fate would have been very dark.

The living conditions of the 30-year-old political refugee in London were different from what her supporters had claimed when they pressed the Austrian government to set her free: the promised job had only existed on paper. Well-meaning supporters managed to secure a field research assignment for Jahoda. This brought her to South Wales, where she studied an initiative of self-help for unemployed miners. When she handed over the final report to the man who initiated the scheme and helped Jahoda's mother

to escape from Nazified Vienna, he declared that the study would ruin his life work. Jahoda decided to store the manuscript in her drawer. It became published only decades later and therefore could not improve her professional standing during the first years in exile.

From 1937 until 1945, Jahoda lived as a political exile in England, participated in the activities of the London Bureau of Austrian Socialists, accepted an assignment to participate in radio propaganda aired to occupied Austria, and received support via fellowships and small research grants.

In 1945 Jahoda moved via Canada to New York to reunite with her daughter, who lived there with Lazarsfeld and his second wife since the summer of 1937. As a latecomer from Europe, Jahoda profited from two factors that supported her ambition to establish herself in the US. On the one hand, her ex-husband had successfully established himself there after a transition period of living in Manhattan as an illegal immigrant. Since 1940 Lazarsfeld was professor of sociology at Columbia University and directed his second research institute, the Bureau of Applied Social Research. On the other hand, there was a demand for competent social researchers in the war effort's aftermath. Demand for scientific expertise increased afterwards. Jahoda's first assignment in New York was under Max Horkheimer in the American Jewish Committee's big research project 'Studies in Prejudice.' One of the five volumes in this series was co-authored by Jahoda.

Working at the Bureau brought her in close contact with former friends and colleagues from Vienna and initiated new collaborations, such as with Robert K. Merton. Besides the intellectual stimulation she received, working that close to her former husband unsettled her.¹¹ As a solution she accepted an invitation by New York University and secured her first regular tenured job there at the age of 42 as a professor of social psychology and co-director of the Research Center for Human Relations. Finally, the life trajectory seems paved. Jahoda did not fall in love with her new country of residence but accepted its citizenship in 1950 (until this time she remained stateless because the Austrian government revoked her citizenship in exchange for her release from prison). Her research portfolio expanded, and she continued selecting her topics from a political vantage point: Prejudice, education, the role of women, ethnic minorities, political propaganda. No wonder that she had been one of the first social scientists who reacted to the contemporary witch hunt, McCarthyism, by studying the consequences of the political climate for those who were not its declared targets. To round up her academic performance, she became the lead author of a two-volume textbook on methods of social research.

During a sabbatical she spent in England in 1957, she rekindled her relationship with Austen Albu, an MP for the Labour Party whose wife had died the year before. Jahoda decided to 'return' to England, married Albu the next year, and was on the job market again. A first assignment brought her to Brunel College, at the time a school for technology, where she later rose to professor of psychology. In 1965 she was offered the chair in social psychology at the newly erected University of Sussex in Brighton. The rest of her academic career was connected with this university, in whose vicinity she and her husband lived up to their death. The *Chicago Tribune* once included Jahoda in a collective portrait of House of Common Wives, i.e. Americans married to British politicians.¹² Besides being a Frau Professor herself, Jahoda finally became a minister's wife, when Albu entered the Wilson government in 1965 to stay in this capacity until the Labour Party's defeat in the 1967 election.

When asked by the interviewer David Fryer in which community Jahoda felt at home, she replied:

If I want to be high falutin, I can say 'I am a world citizen'. But if I want to be true, oh, I'm just a rootless refugee. (Fryer, 1986, 118)

After her retirement from Sussex, Jahoda continued to publish but was hindered from traveling because Albu suffered from Alzheimer and she cared for him until his death in 1994. In the last decade of her life, she received some honorary degrees and attended international conferences. She died at the age of 94 in her home in Sussex.

It is impossible to summarize Jahoda's life and works in a few words, but looking only at her academic career, it should become clear that winning acclaim from peers and admirers, accumulating academic capital, and taking part in the vanity competition satirized by Bradbury, Koestler, Lodge, Lurie, et al., was not at the center of her ambitions. She saw scholarship always as subordinated to the demands of what she called 'real life.' Role obligations from outside academia were of equal relevance, and more than once in her life she gave priority to them instead of playing the reputation game. Jahoda did not change her intellectual core area: She started as a social psychologist and sometimes moved a bit more to mainstream survey research, but always remained a scholar at the crossroads between psychology and sociology. Her political convictions smoothed over the years a bit, but no sharp breaks happened. More than others from her academic reference groups, she insisted during the seven decades of her active participation in academia that research should serve people instead of perpetuating the unworldliness of the ivory towers.

Herzog

Herta Herzog¹³ was also born in Vienna. Her family was smaller than Jahoda's and their Jewish roots veiled by converting to Catholicism. Her upbringing was less politicized than that of her first husband Paul Lazarsfeld and his comrades. She met him first at the university, when she started studying psychology. Herzog seems to have been focusing exclusively on her academic interests, besides the fact that she, like Lazarsfeld and Jahoda, played a string instrument. She had to stop this passion after a serious illness which resulted in a lifelong impairment of her right hand. Herzog's PhD thesis analyzed data from a psychological experiment executed via the radio in May 1930. Under the patronage of Karl Bühler, Lazarsfeld prepared a replication study of American psychologists by airing an identical text spoken by eight different speakers and inviting the audience to speculate about the personality of the speakers. 'Voice and Personality' came out as an article in the *Zeitschrift für Psychologie* (Herzog, 1933). After graduating in 1932, she worked at the Bühler institute. Her ties to the Forschungsstelle were looser, so she neither participated in the work that resulted in the Marienthal study, nor did she collaborate in the radio audience research project Lazarsfeld undertook for the Austrian broadcasting company RAVAG in 1931 (Mark, 1996).

Late in 1935 Herzog left Vienna for New York to join Lazarsfeld, whom she married the year after. In the summer of 1937 Lazarsfeld brought his daughter Lotte to New York, after he had received a telegram in the Austrian Alps offering him a job he had heard rumors about before: director of a big research project on the cultural consequences of

the radio, financed by the Rockefeller Foundation and funded lavishly enough to recruit his new wife as well. Herzog became one of the earliest collaborators in what became known as the Princeton Radio Project, transformed then to the Office of Radio Research and finally established as the Bureau of Applied Social Research. Over the next six years Herzog contributed heavily to the output of the team: She contributed at least 19 different articles running up to 652 pages, occupying the second rank after Lazarsfeld himself, who wrote 55 papers of 1247 pages in total.¹⁴

Some of Herzog's papers were well received back then. Her style of research was explorative and qualitative, accompanied by some theoretical ambitions. In 'Professor Quiz: A Gratification Study' (1940), the subtitle indicates the interpretive orientation. Based on only eleven 'very detailed interviews' (1940, p. 65), she identified four different 'appeals' of such a format. First, the listener could compete with the contestants. Second, observing the contestants' behavior is similar to attending a sport competition. Third, the listeners could rate themselves, and finally, they might receive some education from the content of the questions. Each 'appeal' contains its own version of gratification. In these thirty-one pages, Herzog avoided any snobbery against the silliness of the audience. She displayed the same attitude in a paper on listeners of daytime serials. This 1940 published paper was reprinted several times and, together with 'On Borrowed Experience: An Analysis of Listening to Daytime Sketches,' (1941) and 'What Do We Really Know About Daytime Serial Listeners?' (1944) formed part of the Herzog legacy in communication research. The interest in her research of the 1940s emerged only when some younger scholars turned to the history of what then was labeled communication research; as a result, Herzog was promoted to notoriety only after her death.¹⁵

Herzog volunteered in a 'firehouse research' project, as Lazarsfeld called research done immediately after a surprising event happened (Lazarsfeld, 1969, p. 313). For Halloween in 1938, CBS Radio aired a one-hour adaptation of H.G. Wells' *War of the Worlds*. Orson Welles' performance had been so impressive that several listeners were not able to recognize the fiction and panicked as the *New York Times* reported the other day on its front page. That very morning, Lazarsfeld phoned his friend and collaborator from the Radio Project, Frank Stanton, who was meanwhile employed at the research division of CBS. Stanton promised to finance a pilot study, which Herzog executed with bravura. Another friend-collaborator of Lazarsfeld, Hadley Cantril, joined the research effort, but this friendship came to an end because Cantril did not grant Herzog the credit she deserved. Despite her priority role in the research and the contribution of a chapter to the book, Cantril decided to list Herzog and another female 'helping hand' only as 'with the assistance of ...' (Cantril, Gaudet, & Herzog, 1940).

It is unknown to what degree this unpleasant experience with the academic pecking order contributed to Herzog's decision to quit her aspirations in this area. In any case, three years after the *Invasion from Mars* appeared in print, she left academic research and started a new career outside academia.¹⁶ In 1943 she joined the advertising firm McCann Erickson Inc. to do qualitative research. An old friend of Lazarsfeld from Viennese days started working there at the same time: Hans Zeisel had been hired for quantitative research. Whereas Zeisel returned to academic life after ten years in market research, Herzog stayed there until retirement. Obviously, she earned much more money there than during her time at the Radio Research Project, where she has been paid the least of all staff members if one relates payment to output. Herzog received

\$1.39 per published page that she wrote, whereas others got up to \$120 per page.¹⁷ Further, at McCann Erickson she became promoted and reached top positions after fifteen years in the business. We do know a little bit about her work in the rapidly growing advertising industry because it attracted the interest of journalists, definitely more than the work of her former husband and his university colleagues. The *New York Times* reported regularly about advertising accounts moving between rivals at Madison Avenue and about strategic alignments in market research.

When Herzog became director of creative research at McCann Erickson, she introduced 'motivation research' there.¹⁸ It could not, as the newspaper article explained, 'supplant experienced creative judgment. But ... it can help considerably, after sound market research has been conducted, to guide creative judgment toward more successful long-range marketing decisions.'¹⁹ Decades later, 'Dr. Grete Guttman,' a character like Herzog, made an appearance in the series 'Mad Man,' differing from Herzog only insofar as the fictitious market researcher from Vienna had to tell her colleagues that she got her inspirations from Dr. Freud.²⁰

In real life 'Dr Herzog,' as the press distinguished her from the rest who appear only as Mr. So-and-so, was one of the few women in the higher ranks of this new branch of applied research; and she was one of the few Jews too (Pope & Toll, 1982). In 1959 she became selected to be one of four partners in a new agency concentrating its efforts on developing new ways of influencing consumers. The reporting journalist comes thick and fast with expressing his admiration: in the 'experimental laboratory for new ideas in communication ... they can ask themselves broad questions such as what will the advent of global television mean to advertising or how can color television be more skillfully utilized to sell products,' and so on forth.²¹ Not only did journalists admire Herzog's insights; politicians also followed in trusting this new kind of research. For his two successful re-elections for Governor of New York in 1966 and 1970, the Republican Party's Nelson Rockefeller decided to choose this think tank-like special agency to run his campaigns. Herzog was responsible for the research connected to it.

Shortly afterwards, Herzog accomplished another milestone in her career when she became 'chairman' [sic!] of Marplan, the market research division of McCann Erickson.²² She retired from this position in 1970 to take care of her ailing second husband, Paul Massing, who suffered from Parkinson's disease. They had met each other in the circles of German émigrés in New York, where Massing worked under Horkheimer for the American Jewish Committee's research project on anti-Semitism. Massing was born in 1902 in the Rhine Province of Germany and received his PhD from the University of Frankfurt in 1928. Together with his first wife, they lived the risky life of Soviet spies, traveling back and forth between Moscow and Berlin. In 1933 the Nazis arrested Massing and deported him to one of the earliest concentration camps. After five months he was released and able to escape Nazi Germany. Immediately afterwards, he wrote under a pseudonym about his experiences a book he labeled a novel.²³ Massing continued working for the Soviets, traveled illegally to Germany and accepted reporting assignment to Moscow during the heyday of the 'great purge.' The couple was able to legally depart to the US, where both continued working for the Soviets by recruiting informants and handing over documents; both Massings later revealed their activities to the FBI, and Hede Massing became one of the famous friendly witnesses in the Alger Hiss trial in 1949.²⁴ Around this time Paul Massing started dating Herzog, whom he married in

1954 when he held a professorship at Rutgers University. In 1976 Massing and Herzog moved to Germany, and after Massing died in 1979, Herzog returned to academia, when she gave lectures at the universities in Tübingen and Vienna. During the last decades of her long life she lived in a small village in Tyrol in the vicinity of her sister's family.

Herzog died at the age of nearly 100. Between her first publication in 1933 and the last, which came out in 1994, she had 61 years of professional experience roughly divided into five different career phases. First, Herzog became an academic psychologist under Karl Bühler. From 1935 to 1943 she lived an intensive life as a social researcher, studying communication in the broadest sense in changing arrangements of collaboration. After this, Herzog worked for two-and-a-half decades in the glamorous world of advertising, market, and consumer behavior research, where she occupied leadership positions from the very start. She left the world of corporations to take care of her ailing husband and returned during retirement to activities most similar to the highly productive period of the late 1930s. Very late in her life she became rediscovered as an early contributor to audience research, focus group interviewing, marketing, and communication research. In the latter field she reached even the status of a classic scholar.²⁵

Kendall

Patricia Louise Kendall²⁶ was born in Colorado on the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains in 1921. She moved to the East Coast to attend Smith College, a private liberal arts college for women located in Northampton, Massachusetts, where she graduated in 1942. She moved to New York's Columbia University for graduate studies in sociology. Early on she joined the staff of the Bureau of Applied Social Research, where she initially worked under Robert K. Merton on methodological questions. She managed to publish two of her early papers together with this mentor: In 1944 they discussed the so-called Boomerang Response (Merton & Kendall, 1944) and in 1946 they published 'The Focused Interview' (Merton & Kendall, 1946), a highly consequential methodological paper that was expanded to a book in 1956. This 'Manual of Problems and Procedures' – so the subtitle – became a kind of founding publication for what is known today as focus group research (Merton, Fiske, & Kendall, 1990).

In 1949 Kendall married Lazarsfeld and four years later their son Robert was born. Before Kendall earned her PhD in 1954, she published numerous other papers, and book chapters. She also contributed to research projects of the Bureau with which she remained connected until 1965, when she became professor at Queens College and later at the Graduate Faculty of the City University of New York. She held this position until her death.

Kendall's publications fall into two categories. On the one hand, she contributed original pieces to ongoing methodological questions; on the other hand, she became an expert in research about physicians and the problems of medical education. Most of the first ones were included in the two influential readers on methodology, *Language of Social Research* (edited by Lazarsfeld in 1955 with Morris Rosenberg) and *Continuities in the Language of Social Research* (edited by Lazarsfeld, Pasanella, & Rosenberg in 1972 with Rosenberg and Ann K. Pasanella). Besides strict mainstream methodological contributions – e.g. on panel design, survey analysis (Kendall & Lazarsfeld, 1950) – she

formalized the Bureau's stance against the use of significance test (1957). She also elaborated on an idea Lazarsfeld had published orally in his lectures on methodology at Columbia University's department of sociology: that deviant case analysis should broaden the perspectives of scholars who analyze empirical outliers (together with Katharine M. Wolf 1949/1955). Kendall's substantive contributions to the sociology of the medical profession are best exemplified in the 1957 volume *The Student-Physician: Introductory Studies in the Sociology of Medical Education*, edited together with Robert K. Merton and George G. Reader (Merton, Reader, & Kendall, 1957).

Looking at her life trajectory, the career of Patricia Kendall was much more regular than the ones of Lazarsfeld's two former wives. Kendall started publishing her work at a very young age. For twenty-two years she belonged to the Bureau of Applied Social Research. The two leading figures at this research and training unit and at the Department of Sociology at Columbia University, Merton and Lazarsfeld, both influenced and collaborated with Kendall. Her PhD was somewhat delayed when she reached this threshold at the age of 32, twelve years after she started her graduate studies at Columbia. In the early 1950s the status of a post-doc was not really established because most of those (men) who were interested in an academic career got tenured very quickly, or at least landed tenure-track positions. Women of Kendall's generation could join in, and several 'alumnae' of the Bureau became professors. Kendall might have relinquished a career outside New York because of her roles as wife and mother, but in the end, she became a professor eleven years after obtaining her PhD, though initially in a teaching intensive college.

In 1957 Kendall received a questionnaire sent by one of her classmates from Smith College, Bettye Naomi Goldstein. The sender asked the members of the Class of 1942 to share about their personal lives fifteen years after graduation. The data collected became the core material for *The Feminine Mystique*, authored by Betty Friedan (née Goldstein), and published in 1963. Whether Kendall returned her questionnaire or even communicated with Friedan is unknown. What is known is that the Columbia sociology professor William J. Goode supported Friedan during the writing of her bestseller. The book expressed harsh criticism against functionalism in sociology and psychoanalysis – and in one footnote Friedan praised Jahoda for a more appropriate presentation of women's roles.²⁷

Six years after her husband's death, Kendall edited a volume with a selection of Lazarsfeld's writings (Lazarsfeld, 1982). As we will see in a moment, in hindsight Kendall was not completely satisfied with her professional career. She died at the age of 68, after being active in the academic world for 45 years. In contrast from Jahoda and Herzog, Kendall combined qualitative and quantitative methodology and published in both fields.

Personal ambitions in comparative perspective

As indicated in the introductory remarks, in order to analyze female careers it is necessary to simultaneously look at the opportunity structures and the formation of individual wishes and goals, combined here under the term of ambitions. In one of his earliest publications, Lazarsfeld analyzed questionnaire answers about what working class children wanted to reach in their lives. Back in the late 1920s, but before the Great Depression and its explosion of unemployment, he classified the open-ended answers of Viennese youth

about their goals in life into an eight-piece typology, which ran from ‘general slogan’ to ‘specific state of society, individual economic goal, individual psychological goal’ towards ‘personal happiness, political work, other work, learning’ (Lazarsfeld, 2011, p. 89). While I do not want to apply this classification to the three women considered here, I want to demonstrate the awareness of the nuanced range of goals in life on the part of researchers educated in the intellectual vicinity of Viennese psychology.

Nearly all studies about academic eminence follow the tacit understanding that it requires complete dedication and work to climb up into the elite of one’s discipline. One could illustrate this assumption paraphrasing Gertrude Stein’s prominent slogan, ‘Scholar is a scholar is a scholar is a scholar,’ or express the same idea in the language of role theory, labeling a scholar as someone in an all-consuming role that does not allow digressions or rivaling obligations. Like monks and nuns, professional revolutionaries, composers, and poets, scholars of all academic branches are proud of their ability to cut out the distractions and demands of real life. Lewis A. Coser called such an ensemble of role obligations ‘greedy institutions,’ but did not mention scholars as illustrations (Coser, 1974). However, Goodman et al.’s 1984 paper on the academic couple made use of this concept and was published in the *Festschrift* for Coser. Often enough, people following these prescriptions are, in the eyes of others, just caricatures of wrongly directed ambitions. Jerry Lewis took up these then widespread stereotypes in his 1963 comedy science fiction movie ‘The Nutty Professor.’

Thanks to Patricia Kendall, we possess a description of the everyday behavior of someone, in this case Paul Lazarsfeld, who fell deep into what was later labeled a ‘flow’:

Paul has spent the last week working day and night practically on a recent development in latent structure analysis. He is in one of those states where he doesn’t get out of pajamas unless he has to because that would take too much time from his computations and musings, and where I have to speak to him three or four times before I am certain that he has heard me. But he’s pleased with himself, and feels that he has accomplished something for the first time since coming out here.²⁸

Interestingly enough, these travesties of the scholar’s role are heavily gendered. The short portraits of three sociologists from the twentieth century provided above illustrate that these women did not perform a totalizing role because of other competing roles. Each of the three women did have family care obligations for a while. Jahoda gave birth to their daughter Lotte in 1930, while Herzog acted as a caring stepmom for Lotte when she arrived in New York in the summer of 1937 because her mother had to go into exile after half a year in prison as a political opponent of the authoritarian Austrian government. Kendall gave birth to her son Robert in 1953 and subordinated her own career ambitions to those of her husband. Jahoda and Herzog married for a second time, which brought changes of place with it, and both served as caregivers to their ailing husbands in older age. We would have to go a long road to find a man of comparable academic records who devoted that many years to others.

An obvious consequence of taking care of others is the shortage of time to perform scholarly work. If we disentangle a scholar’s portfolio, we could identify at least four areas of activities. Each activity needs time, and one could question whether someone could become an academic immortal without having been active in each of the following efforts:

1. Expressing and disseminating your own ideas and insights, either orally or in written form.
2. Finding opportunities to cultivate new ideas, collect impressions, uncovering new information, and proving hypotheses.
3. Playing the reputation game by bringing yourself to the attention of others and placing your name prominently in front of target audiences.
4. Recruiting enough admirers for your publications to increase your ‘Scholarometer’ numbers, and securing a life after your death by reach beyond your own generation through pupils who refer to you (and your work).

Each of these strategies could be performed successfully or sloppily, and not all well-intended attempts will bring the profit one seeks or deserves. However, someone who disregards all of these activities as nonsense has to pay the fee. If we restrict the analysis period to the decades in the middle of the twentieth century, it might be hard to find an immortal social scientist who rejected all of these academic impression management tactics.²⁹

Let us now look at the three women and measure their level of participation in each of the four activities. Unfortunately, the measurement level will not go beyond the ordinal.

Expressing ideas: Only Jahoda shows a continuity in writing over a longer period of time; Herzog might have had more ‘followers’ during her time at the advertising companies and more widely disseminated her ideas in these days, but there is no publication record available to measure this kind of impact.³⁰ Kendall published regularly but in diminishing numbers of output; her record as an academic teacher does not reveal long-term consequences in the form of pupils, protégés and protégées.

To compare the publication output of the three female social researchers, WorldCat offers some numbers. In [Table 1](#) I added three of their male collaborators for further comparisons. Lazarsfeld and Merton definitely fall in the group of immortals, whereas Herzog’s second partner Paul Massing resorts to the group of ordinary scholars. World-Cat, a meta catalogue, does have serious shortcomings and contains many double entries, but there is no indication that the errors discriminated systematically against any group of individuals.³¹ Thus, the numbers themselves cannot be taken seriously, but from a comparative point of view the proportions should be convincing.

If we include the timespan that each of the five used to publish academically, we see the astonishing intensity with which Herzog produced her, in absolute terms, small oeuvre: more than 90 per cent of her publications came out in one decade, whereas Merton’s output extends over seven decades and Lazarsfeld’s over five decades; simple

Table 1. Comparison of library information for five social scientists

Name	# of works	in ... languages	... libraries
Herzog, Herta	35	2	1.917
Jahoda, Marie	195	5	9.573
Kendall, Patricia L.	40	2	1.533
Lazarsfeld, Paul F.	546	6	23.995
Massing, Paul W.	26	5	1.598
Merton, Robert K.	561	8	41.471

Source: Search in WorldCat, 13 October 2020. Data from the search for Details: find more information about.

calculations would reveal that even in a standardized world of equality (of time for publications), the two men would out-publish Herzog, albeit more narrowly.

Becoming an immortal in academia requires something that is called an oeuvre, meaning a set of publications containing enough ideas, insights, claims, etc., to make it possible for followers to refer to them and build a body of secondary literature around their ideas. I will discuss this point later on.

Finding opportunities: Until Jahoda became a NYU professor, she had spare time only under highly impeding circumstances, such as when she spent time in jail or as a refugee without income. She used her first and only sabbatical more privately than academically by reconnecting with a former lover in her first country of exile, England. We see that Jahoda profited academically from unexpected opportunities to gain insights into unfamiliar corners of society. She returned to Marienthal when a Quaker-sponsored community relief project offered an opportunity to glimpse a second view of the community; she accepted an invitation to live with Wales miner families and joined not only research teams, but also political milieus during her years in the US. Back in England she enjoyed campaigning with her second husband among his constituency in Edmonton in the northern part of London, whose MP seat Albu held from 1948 to 1974. However, one should take notice that Jahoda was never selected for one of the fellowship leaves at any of the centers of advanced studies that mushroomed since the 1950s; furthermore, she won only one fellowship that allowed her to pursue research interests of her own.

Herzog's chances to lean back and cultivate new ideas were better; from the moment she was promoted to one of the earliest think tanks in the marketing business, her obligation was to play with ideas. According to her own testimony she was successful with at least some of them.³² Kendall enjoyed the mixed blessings of being a professor's wife when Lazarsfeld got a one-year fellowship at the newly established Center for Advanced Studies in Behavioral Sciences in Palo Alto in California for the period 1954-1955. There was only one woman in the group of approximately 36 fellows, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Lazarsfeld's colleague from Vienna, but there were many wives, some of them also mothers of small children, such as Kendall. During the whole year Kendall wrote more field note-like diary letters addressed to 'Dear Family,' and excerpts of them survived in the correspondence of Robert Merton, a sometime visitor to the Center. Unfortunately, Kendall never published these revealing notes about the inaugural class of the leading center for advanced studies and the anomia that prevailed because the fellows did not know how to handle this new situation. Kendall offered telling stories about the expected roles of the girlfriends, partners, and wives accompanying the fellows. Kendall seems to have been the only Frau Professor who participated in some of the intellectual gatherings, whereas most of the other female residents accepted the role of hosts for parties.

Playing the reputation game: Insiders of the academic life are aware of the fact that if one strives for prominence, he or she should invest effort and take part in the reputation game. Beyond the entertainment and hints provided by campus guides to academic life and similar counseling literature, we do not possess systematic knowledge about the rules governing this game (Coser, 1988; Furstenberg, 2013). The following list of activities should not be controversial: serving in professional associations; directing reputable research projects; delivering prominent lectures; receiving honorary degrees; functioning as editor of leading journals or book series; accepting prizes; being selected for academies;

and so on. Without going into details, it seems appropriate to code Kendall as someone with practically none of these credentials, and Herzog as similar because her reputation reached a perceptible level only in the world of marketing and advertisement research (and very late in life, long after retirement). Jahoda, on the other hand, received at least three honorary degrees from German and Austrian universities, though very late in her career (Bremen 1985, Linz and Vienna 1998). She served in some professional organizations, e.g. as the first female president of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, which awarded her the Kurt Lewin Memorial Prize in 1981 (Rutherford et al., 2011). In 1992 Jahoda was elected as an international honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In England she was named a member of different governmental commissions and became a Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire (CBE) in 1974, the step just below the Sir/Dame level in the British honour system.

It is nevertheless fair to say that all three women were not heavily interested in the reputation game's particularities. Jahoda, when asked about her private archive, told the author of this paper to his astonishment that, unlike 'Paul [Lazarsfeld] and Joe [Buttinger] who kept every piece of paper,' she did not take herself too seriously. When the Archive for the History of Sociology in Austria obtained her papers, it became clear that she meant it this way; the amount of surviving correspondence, for instance, was very tiny. Similarly, Herzog wrote to Perse that she never identified as an 'organisation woman,' so she loved 'discussion with bright people' but remained a loner professionally. She was surprised when in 1986 she became honored in the Market Research Council's Hall of Fame (Herzog 1994/95).

Recruiting admirers: The husband of the three women, Paul Lazarsfeld, did possess the qualities and leanings of a boy scout leader; as an academic teacher he impressed his students less in lectures, but rather in small groups of collaborative work. Did this leadership feature mirror itself in his wives' attitudes and behavior? There's no need to call the mirror neurons to stress the possibility of such family resemblance. Nearer to sociology, Lazarsfeld wrote a paper on friendship together with his long-term friend and collaborator Robert Merton, wherein the two authors developed the distinction that friendship could either be based on similarity or the opposite, or homophily and heterophily (Lazarsfeld & Merton, 1982). Regarding the inclination and passion for organizing and encouraging collaborators, students, and even peers we do not find much similarity in the professional vitae of Jahoda, Herzog, and Kendall. However, Jahoda became a contemporary witness regularly consulted by younger generations interested in politics, unemployment research, the history of psychology, and sociology, and she found admirers even years after she died in 2002 (Jahoda, 2019). To some degree, something similar happened to Herzog, whose publications from the 1940s became rediscovered nearly half a century later when the field of communication research started to write its own history, and the search for the neglected history of women began.³³

Besides lacking strong strides to recruit admirers and pupils of their academic work, the three female sociologists under consideration here left their marks in historical records. The most used indicator to measure the impact of a scholar's work was developed only from the 1960s onwards; today young scholars develop their publication strategies by considering features such as Impact Factors of journals. It is safe to say that the three women discussed in this paper did not care about such things. Nevertheless,

Table 2. Recognition numbers from different databases

Name	Wikipedia	IBSS		SSCI	Scopus
		Author	all		
Herzog, Herta	3	0	28	34	14
Jahoda, Marie	11	10	125	281	90
Kendall, Patricia L.	0	1	37	231	3
Lazarsfeld, Paul F.	23	9	520	2,112	373
Massing, Paul W.	3	2	15	51	10
Merton, Robert K.	43	48	1,532	8,631	1,060

Note: Wikipedia counts the number of pages devoted to the particular individual in different languages. IBSS (International Bibliography of the Social Sciences) is a database that covers the period from 1951 to the present; the search executed there was <'Name, first name' OR 'First name name'; the second search restricted the before-mentioned search to the field Author. Web of Science is the continuation of the Social Science Citation Index, a more selective database from 1988 onwards; the search was restricted to the SSCI database and was for Cited Authors only. Scopus, which started in 2004, is a more comprehensive database that includes book chapters.

databases reveal some figures. Table 2 displays the number of entries in three different databases and summarizes the number of different entries in Wikipedia. The International Bibliography of the Social Sciences is the oldest representative of its type; it started in 1951 and tried initially to comprehensively cover the entire range of social sciences journals. The Social Science Citation Index is somewhat younger (it began in 1988) and claims to be more selective, accepting only high-ranking journals into its database. Even younger is Scopus, from the rivaling publishing giant Elsevier, which started in 2004 and covers many more publications (journals as well as books). Each of these databases allows for different search strategies. I used a general search for all three, but used the cited author option for SSCI; for IBSS I used both the general search and one that counts only the authorship. Since absolute numbers are of no importance in the present context, the different counting strategies are of no interest. Let us call the measures recognition numbers, which are higher with the greater impact or admiration reached by an individual scholar. What Table 2 reveals is that Herzog, Kendall, and Massing are marginally represented as authors of journal articles in IBSS. The differences in the three columns from the right reveal a relative clear ranking of the three women: Jahoda outperforms the two others, and Jahoda is much better placed than Massing, but far from the numbers Lazarsfeld and Merton were reaching.

Each of the three women were married for some time to a sociologist whose standing in the pantheon of his discipline is undisputed; their own academic careers reflect an idiosyncratic profile of activities in the four areas I have identified as core activities for scholars attempting to belong to the group of future immortals. The purpose of this paper was to show that these three women have achieved remarkable and memorable intellectual accomplishments, even if they did not belong to the 'ultra elite' of the highest one per cent of scholars praised and remembered more than the rest below them.

Coda

In the late 1990s I was invited to contribute a chapter on Jahoda in a book preliminarily titled *Klassikerinnen der Soziologie*. This very title referred to a series of books published by a leading German publishing house under the label *Klassiker der Soziologie*. I then sent the draft to Marie Jahoda and asked her for comments on my portrait of her. In the

accompanying letter I indicated the title of the book where this piece should appear. Jahoda's response was clear and came as a big surprise: She would take all possible measures to prevent being classified as a *Klassikerin*. (For readers unfamiliar with German, it is possible to indicate a difference in the German language with regard to genus. A *Klassikerin* is then by definition a woman, whereas a *Klassiker* could either be male or female. The generic genus does not reveal the sex/gender). She even mentioned the service of a lawyer to stop this publication. Jahoda explained that in contrast to Merton, whom she mentioned explicitly, her oeuvre lacks the level of generality that is, in her perspective, a prerequisite to be called a *Klassiker*; hers is not a theory on which others could build their own work. In subsequent letters and e-mails I reassured her and promised to intervene with the editors. They were as astonished as I was when I received Jahoda's letter of protest. Thus, the book's title had been changed to the non-controversial, yet pale in comparison, title *Frauen in der Soziologie* (Fleck, 1998).

Notes

1. I want to thank the following readers of an earlier version of this paper for their very detailed comments and criticisms: Lotte Bailyn, Matthias Duller, Marianne Egger de Campo, Barbara Hönig, Daniela Jauk, Andreas Kranebitter, Andrea Ploder, Karin Scaria-Braunstein, and Katharina Scherke. An anonymous reviewer deserves to be included in the list of supporting readers. They still might not be satisfied with the character of the present version but they are not responsible for any of the faults and imbalances, which are completely mine.
2. The number of women full professors increased during the expansion periods of the higher education system much more rapidly than in any other period, as Carl Neumayr (2018) has shown for the U.S.
3. <http://outofthequestion.org/Women-in-Media-Research/Office-of-Radio-Research-Bureau-of-Applied-Social-Research.aspx>, accessed April 6, 2011.
4. Ten years earlier Mirra Komarovsky (1905-99) was the second woman elected to this position. She worked during her early career together with Lazarsfeld in a research project funded by the exiled Frankfurt Institute for Social Research and made the report her PhD. Thesis in 1940.
5. Others with feet in both milieus were Ernest Dichter, Paul M. Neurath, Katherine Wolf, Hans Zeisel, and Ilse Zeisel.
6. I am not the only one who has acted this way. Nearly all portraits of Jahoda, Herzog, and Kendall mention their marriage to Lazarsfeld.
7. I hope to publish a paper with the title 'A Theory of Immortality' in the near future.
8. There is no book-length biography of Jahoda available. Readers with some German might find a website dedicated to her informative: <http://agso.uni-graz.at/jahoda/1024+/index.htm>. Jahoda, 2017 contains both biographical information and a bibliography. Wikipedia runs biographies both in English and German as well as 9 other languages. Besides an autobiography (Jahoda, 1997), there are several published and unpublished interviews available.
9. On Lazarsfeld, see Fleck, 2015, which lists some of the secondary literature; Wikipedia offers biographies of him in 27 languages.
10. Joseph Buttinger, 1953 gave a very sympathetic portrait of Mitzi in his polemic memoir *In the Twilight of Socialism* where he did not spare with harsh criticisms against other comrades. Comp. Buttinger (1972).
11. Expressed in a long letter to Merton on 24 June 1949, Robert K. Merton Papers, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Box 43: Correspondence to and from Marie Jahoda.
12. March 29, 1964, p. F3.

13. Short biographies on her are by Perse, 1996 and Klaus & Seethaler, 2016. Wikipedia has three sites in English, German and Arabic. The only autobiographical text of Herzog is a letter written to Elizabeth Perse from 1994, which functioned as the main source for Perse, 1996. The letter is available at <http://outofthequestion.org/Additional-Resources/Documents.aspx>. An unpublished interview about her experiences in the advertising world has been conducted by Adam Curtis and is available at: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p009jd1g>
14. Fleck, 2011, Table 5.2, p. 216.
15. Besides the early short biographical sketch by Peres, the remembrances were initiated by the US American communication researcher Liebes (2003), Katz (2003), and Peter Simonson (with his documentary *Out of the Question: Women, Media, and the Art of Inquiry*, 2009), followed by Josef Seethaler and Elisabeth Klaus (2016) and Engel (2019). Before gender mainstreaming became standard in the history of the (social) science(s), Herzog did not receive much attention; see Rogers, 1994, where her name is mentioned only three times in passing.
16. Lazarsfeld included Herzog's initial report on the Invasion from Mars in 1955 in his reader *Language of Social Research: Herzog, 1955*.
17. Interestingly enough, no gender discrimination had been in force there. The two employees with the highest per page remuneration were women, and the three directors got between \$98 (Stanton), \$42 (Cantril) and \$25 (Lazarsfeld). See Fleck, 2011, Table 5.4, p. 219.
18. Fellow Viennese expat Ernest Dichter made this label notoriously known. Dichter became known outside the advertising business when Vance Packard attacked him in his *Hidden Persuaders*; see Dichter, 1977 and Eugster, 2012.
19. New York Times, October 20, 1955, p. 51; see for a later detailed analysis of Manhattan's advertising business Jackall & Hirota, 2000.
20. Instructive background information and telling illustrations can be found at Adam Curtis Blog, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/adamcurtis/entries/855b6a7f-72a3-31c9-a037-43ae1c49293c>
21. Robert Alden, Advertising: Where the Imagination Has Room to Soar, New York Times, June 20, 1960, p. 41.
22. New York Times, July 18, 1961, p. 44.
23. Karl Billinger, Schutzhäftling 880. Aus einem deutschen Konzentrationslager had been published in German both in France by one of the publishing companies organized by Willy Münzenberg and in Moscow (see Billinger, 1935a, 1935b). Translations into several other languages are documented: English, US-American, Danish, Norwegian, and Polish. Most probably they have been financed by the agitprop agency of the Comintern. A preprint was published in the US in *New Masses*, vol. 14. 1935c, number 1, p. 20–27 under the title 'In the Nazi's Torture House.'
24. It is not completely clear at what point in time the Massings stopped acting as spies. Documents revealed after the fall of the Communist rule in Russia indicate that as late as 1942 Paul Massing was involved in recruiting Franz Neumann for the Soviets. See Alexander Vasiliev's Notebooks, Whitre Notebook #1, <https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/112564>
25. Liebes, 2003.
26. The only source with biographical information is an obituary by Sills and Smith (1990).
27. Jahoda & Havel, 1955, quoted by Friedan (2013 [1963]), page 170, note 28.
28. Patricia L. Kendall, 'Excerpts from letters from PLK to 'Dear family'', September, 1954 to June, 1955,' entry February 14, 1955, p. 8. Merton Papers, Correspondence Kendall, Patricia, 1943–1990
29. Even the originator of the concept of impression management, Erving Goffman, a self-styled misanthrope, did not object to presenting himself in everyday academic life.
30. Herzog helped the returned Frankfurt critical theoretician to acquaint their collaborators with new techniques of qualitative analysis; later she spent a year establishing Marplan in Europe.

31. WorldCat does not offer any explanation for its statistical data, which are themselves somewhat hidden on the website. „Works‘ seem to refer to separate entries in one of the catalogues assembled in WorldCat; ‘language‘ refers to translations, and ‘libraries‘ indicates the number of libraries holding at least some publications of the referent persons.
32. See Interview with Herta Herzog by Andrew Curtis, 20 August 2010, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p009jd1g>.
33. It is revealing that one of the earliest publications in the field of the history of communications, Rogers, 1994, nearly ignored Herzog. Her ascent to prominence took place under the search for women banner.

Acknowledgment

The author has worked on this article within the framework of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE) and with the support of a subsidy granted to the HSE by the Government of the Russian Federation for the implementation of the Global Competitiveness Program.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

Christian Fleck was president of the Austrian Sociological Association and ISA’s Research Committee History of Sociology. Research and teaching posts abroad: Schumpeter Fellow at Harvard University, Fellow at the Dorothy and Lewis B. Cullman Center for Scholars and Writers, The New York Public Library; Fulbright Visiting Professor University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Directeur d’études invite at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris; Austrian Marshall Plan Foundation Fellow University of California, Berkeley. Most recent publications: *Meiensteine der Soziologie* (Campus 2020); *Shaping Human Science Disciplines* (Palgrave Macmillan 2018); *Sociology in Austria* (Palgrave Macmillan 2016); and *Etablierung in der Fremde* (Campus 2015).

ORCID

Christian Fleck  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6922-9362>

References

- Benetka, G. (1995). *Psychologie in Wien. Sozial- und Theoriegeschichte des Wiener Psychologischen Instituts, 1922-1938*. WUV-Universitätsverlag.
- Billinger, K. (1935a). *Fatherland*. International Publishers.
- Billinger, K. (1935b). *Schutzhäftling 880: Aus einem deutschen Konzentrationslager; Roman*. Ed. du Carrefour.
- Billinger, K. (1935c). In the Nazi’s torture house. *New Masses* 14 (1), 20–27.
- Bryson, R. A., Bryson, J. B., Licht, M. H., & Licht, B. G. (1976). The professional pair: Husband and wife psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 31 (1), 10–16. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.31.1.10>
- Buttinger, J. (1953). *In the twilight of socialism: A history of the revolutionary socialists of Austria. With the assistance of E. Ashton*. Praeger.
- Buttinger, J. (1972). *Das Ende der Massenpartei. Am Beispiel Österreich. Ein geschichtlicher Beitrag zur Krise der sozialistischen Bewegung*. Neue Kritik.

- Cantril, H., Gaudet, H., & Herzog, H. (1940). *The invasion from Mars: A study in the psychology of panic*. Princeton University Press.
- Cole, J. R., & Zuckerman, H. (1987). Marriage, motherhood and research performance in science. In: *Scientific American*, 256 (2), 119–125. <https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0287-119>
- Coser, L. A. (1974). *Greedy institutions: Patterns of undivided commitment*. Free Press.
- Coser, L. A. (1988). Letter to a young sociologist. In L. A. Coser (Ed.), *A handful of thistles: Collected papers in moral conviction* (pp. 275–284). Transaction.
- Deegan, M. J. (1991). *Women in sociology: A bio-bibliographical sourcebook*. Greenwood.
- Dichter, E. (1977). *Motivforschung – mein Leben. Die Autobiographie eines kreativ Unzufriedenen*. Lorch.
- Engel, D. (2019). Research for the Mad Men – Herta Herzog als Klassikerin der Medienforschung und Werbepaxis. In S. Heinemann (Ed.), *Werbegeschichte(n): Markenkommunikation zwischen Tradition und Innovation* (pp. 15–26). Springer VS.
- Eugster, D. (2012). Heimliche Verführer im Kalten Krieg. Ernest Dichters Motivforschung in der Kritik. In G. Gerber, R. Leucht, & K. Wagner (Eds.), *Transatlantische Verwerfungen - Transatlantische Verdichtungen. Kulturtransfer in Literatur und Wissenschaft 1945-1989* (pp. 156–177). Wallstein.
- Fleck, C. (1998). Marie Jahoda (geb. 1907): Lebensnähe der Forschung und Anwendung in der wirklichen Welt. In C. Honegger, & T. Wobbe (Eds.), *Frauen in der Soziologie: Neun Portraits* (pp. 258–287 and 326–333). C.H. Beck.
- Fleck, C. (2011). *A transatlantic history of the social sciences: Robber barons, the Third Reich and the invention of empirical social research*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Fleck, C. (2015). Lazarsfeld, Paul Felix (1901–76). In J. D. Wright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social & Behavioral Sciences (Second Edition)*. Vol. 13 (pp. 635–640). Elsevier.
- Friedan, B. (2013 [1963]). *The feminine mystique*. W. W. Norton.
- Fryer, D. (1986). The social psychology of the invisible: An interview with Marie Jahoda. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 4 (1), 107–118. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0732-118X\(86\)90063-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0732-118X(86)90063-2)
- Furstenberg, F. F. (2013). *Behind the academic curtain: How to find success and happiness with a PhD*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Gardner, S., & Stevens, G. (1992). *Red Vienna and the golden age of psychology, 1918 - 1938*. Praeger.
- Goodman, N., Royce, E., Selvin, H. C., & Weinstein, E. A. (1984). The academic couple in sociology: Managing greedy institutions. In W. W. Powell, & R. Robbins (Eds.), *Conflict and consensus: A festschrift in honor of Lewis A. Coser* (pp. 240–261). Free Press.
- Harwarth, I., Maline, M. S., & DeBra, E. (1997). *Women's colleges in the United States: History, issues, and challenges*. Washington, DC: National Institute on postsecondary education, libraries, and lifelong learning. *U.S. Dept. of Education*.
- Herzog, H. (1933). Stimme und Persönlichkeit. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, 130 (3-5), 300–369.
- Herzog, H. (1940). Professor Quiz – a gratification study. In P. F. Lazarsfeld (Ed.), *Radio and the printed page: An introduction to the study of radio and its role in the communication of ideas* (pp. 64–93). Duell, Sloan and Pearce.
- Herzog, H. (1941). On borrowed experience: An analysis of listening to daytime sketches. *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung/Studies in Philosophy and Social Science*, 9 (1), 65–95. <https://doi.org/10.5840/zfs1941915> doi:10.5840/zfs1941915
- Herzog, H. (1944). What do we really know about daytime serial listeners? In P. F. Lazarsfeld, & F. N. Stanton (Eds.), *Radio research, 1942-1943* (pp. 3–33). Essential Books, Distributed by Duell, Sloan and Pearce.
- Herzog, H. (1955). Why did people believe in the “Invasion from Mars”? In P. F. Lazarsfeld, & M. Rosenberg (Eds.), *The language of social research: A reader in the methodology of social research* (pp. 420–428). Free Press.
- Herzog, H. (1994/95). *Letters to Elisabeth Perse, 12 Sept 1994, 29 Sept 1994 and 25 April 1995*. <http://outofthequestion.org/Additional-Resources/Documents.aspx>
- Honegger, C., & Wobbe, T. (Eds.). (1998). *Frauen in der Soziologie: Neun Portraits*. C.H. Beck.

- Horkheimer, M. (1936). *Studien über Autorität und Familie. Forschungsberichte aus dem Institut für Sozialforschung*. Librairie Félix Alcan.
- Jackall, R., & Hirota, J. M. (2000). *Image makers: Advertising, public relations, and the ethos of advocacy*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jahoda, M. (1979). 'Ich habe die Welt nicht verändert': Gespräch mit Marie Jahoda. In M. Greffrath (Ed.), *Die Zerstörung einer Zukunft: Gespräche mit emigrierten Sozialwissenschaftlern: Günther Anders, Hans Gerth, Marie Jahoda, Leo Löwenthal, Adolph Lowe, Toni Oelsner, Alfred Sohn-Rethel, Karl August Wittfogel* (pp. 103–44). Rowohlt.
- Jahoda, M. (1997). Rekonstruktionen. In S. Engler, & B. Hasenjürgen (Eds.), *"Ich habe die Welt nicht verändert": Lebenserinnerungen einer Pionierin der Sozialforschung* (pp. 9–100). Campus.
- Jahoda, M. (2017). *Lebensgeschichtliche Protokolle der arbeitenden Klassen 1850-1930. Dissertation 1932: Mit einem Porträt über die Autorin von Christian Fleck*. Ed. by Johann Bacher, Waltraud Kannonier-Finster, and Meinrad Ziegler. Innsbruck: StudienVerlag.
- Jahoda, M. (2019). J. Bacher, W. Kannonier-Finster, & M. Ziegler (Eds.), *Marie Jahoda: Arbeitslose bei der Arbeit & Aufsätze und Essays: Zwei Bände im Schubert*. StudienVerlag.
- Jahoda, M., & Havel, J. (1955). Psychological problems of women in different social roles – A case history of problem formulation in research. *Educational Record*, 36, 325–333.
- Katz, E. (2003). *Canonic texts in media research: Are there any? Should there be? How about these?* Polity Press.
- Kendall, P. L., & Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1950). Problems of survey analysis. In R. K. Merton, & P. F. Lazarsfeld (Eds.), *Continuities in social research: Studies in the scope and method of "The American soldier"* (pp. 133–196). The Free Press.
- Kendall, P. L., & Wolf, K. M. (1949). The analysis of deviant cases in communication research. In P. F. Lazarsfeld, & F. N. Stanton (Eds.), *Communications research, 1948-1949* (pp. 152–179). Harper.
- Kendall, P. L., & Wolf, K. M. (1955). The two purposes of deviant case analysis. In P. F. Lazarsfeld, & M. Rosenberg (Eds.), *The language of social research: A reader in the methodology of social research* (pp. 167–170). Free Press.
- Klaus, E., & Seethaler, J. (2016). *What do we really know about Herta Herzog? Exploring the life and work of a pioneer of communication research*. Peter Lang Academic Research.
- Korom, P. (2020). The prestige elite in sociology: Toward a collective biography of the most cited scholars (1970-2010). *The Sociological Quarterly*, 61 (1), 128–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380253.2019.1581037> doi:10.1080/00380253.2019.1581037
- Lazarsfeld-Jahoda, M., & H. Zeisl. (1933). *Die Arbeitslosen von Marienthal. Ein soziographischer Versuch über die Wirkungen langdauernder Arbeitslosigkeit, mit einem Anhang zur Geschichte der Soziographie, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von der Österreichischen Wirtschaftspsychologischen Forschungsstelle*. Hirzel.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1969). An episode in the history of social research. In D. Fleming, & B. Bailyn (Eds.), *The intellectual migration: Europe and America, 1930-1960* (pp. 270–337). Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1982). *The varied sociology of Paul F. Lazarsfeld: Writings*. Ed. by Patricia L. Kendall. Columbia University Press.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F. (2011). *An empirical theory of social action: Collected writings*. Ed. by Christian Fleck and nico stehr. Bardwell Press.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., & Merton, R. K. (1982). Friendship as social process: A substantive and methodological analysis. In P. L. Kendall (Ed.), *The varied sociology of Paul F. Lazarsfeld: Writings* (pp. 298–348). Columbia University Press.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., Pasanella, A. K., & Rosenberg, M. (1972). *Continuities in the language of social research*. Free Press.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., & Rosenberg, M. (1955). *The language of social research: A reader in the methodology of social research*. Free Press.
- Lengermann, P. M., & Niebrugge-Brantley, J. (1998). *The women founders: Sociology and social theory, 1830-1930, a text/reader*. McGraw-Hill.

- Liebes, T. (2003). Herzog's 'On borrowed experience': Its place in the debate over the active audience. In E. Katz (Ed.), *Canonic texts in media research: Are there any? Should there be? How about these?* (pp. 39–53). Polity Press.
- Mark, D. (1996). *Paul Lazarsfelds Wiener RAVAG-Studie 1932. Der Beginn der modernen Rundfunkforschung*. Wien.
- Martin, T. W., Berry, K. J., & Jacobsen, R. B. (1975). „The impact of dual-career marriages on female professional careers: An empirical test of a Parsonian hypothesis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 37(4), 734–742. <https://doi.org/10.2307/350824> doi:10.2307/350824
- Merton, R. K., Fiske, M., & Kendall, P. L. (1990). *The focused interview: A manual of problems and procedures*. Free Press.
- Merton, R. K., & Kendall, P. L. (1944). The boomerang response: The audience acts as co-author – Whether you like it or not. In: *Channels*, 21(7), 1–4. 15–18.
- Merton, R. K., & Kendall, P. L. (1946). The focused interview. *American Journal of Sociology*, 51(6), 541–557. <https://doi.org/10.1086/219886> doi:10.1086/219886
- Merton, R. K., Reader, G. G., & Kendall, P. L. (1957). *The student-physician: Introductory studies in the sociology of medical education*. Harvard University Press.
- Neumayr, C. (2018). *Changes in the social composition of the professorate: After the social and cognitive academic revolutions around 68*. Paper presented at the SSHA conference in Phoenix, AZ.
- O'Connell, A. N., & Russo, N. F. (1990). *Women in psychology: A bio-bibliographic sourcebook*. Greenwood Pr.
- Perse, E. M. (1996). Herta Herzog (1910–). In N. Signorielli (Ed.), *Women in communication: A biographical sourcebook* (pp. 202–211). Greenwood Press.
- Pope, D., & Toll, W. (1982). We tried harder: Jews in American advertising. *American Jewish History*, 72(1), 35–51. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23882651>
- Rogers, E. M. (1994). *A history of communication study: A biographical approach*. Free Press.
- Rutherford, A., Unger, R., & Cherry, F. (2011). Reclaiming SPSSI's sociological past: Marie Jahoda and the immersion tradition in social psychology. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67(1), 42–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01682.x>
- Seethaler, J., & Klaus, E. (2016). Introduction: Herta Herzog: A pioneer of communication and marketing research. In E. Klaus & J. Seethaler (Eds.), *What do we really know about Herta Herzog? Exploring the life and work of a pioneer of communication research* (pp. 15–23). Peter Lang.
- Sills, D., & Smith, C. W. (1990). Obituary Patricia L. Kendall. In *Footnotes of the ASA*, vol. 18, no 5, May (pp. 12–13).
- Sonnert, G., & Holton, G. J. (1995). *Gender differences in science careers: The project access study*. Rutgers University Press.
- Stevens, G., & Gardner, S. (1982a). *The women of psychology: Volume 1: Pioneers and innovators*. Schenkman.
- Stevens, G., & Gardner, S. (1982b). *The women of psychology: Volume 2: Expansion and refinement*. Schenkman.
- Zuckerman, H., Cole, J. R., & Bruer, J. T. (1991). *The outer circle: Women in the scientific community*. W.W. Norton.