
Eminence Rankings of Personality Psychologists as a Reflection of the Field

John D. Mayer

University of New Hampshire

Kevin M. Carlsmith

Princeton University

The eminence of scholars within a given field can reveal which conceptual work and scientific methods in the field are most prized and valued. The authors follow procedures employed in other disciplines to calculate the eminence of personality psychologists for the first time. The top 60 individuals are classified according to rank, years of productivity, and type of research. The authors found two distinct rankings of eminent individuals depending on the type of textbook surveyed and found that the ranking of eminence overlaps clinical psychology more than social psychology. These and other results are used to discuss the nature of personality psychology today.

The eminence of particular scholars within a given field can reveal which conceptual work in the field is most prized and which scientific methods are most valued (Myers, 1970). Knowing which individuals are eminent within a field can also enhance one's understanding of a field's definition and its coverage. Personality psychology is often portrayed as a divided field with some individuals interested in theorizing and others interested in research. If this is the case, then perhaps different constituencies within the field will employ different rankings of the eminent individuals within it. Yet another reason to examine such eminent individuals is to explore the relationship between personality psychology and its neighboring fields. The degree to which eminent individuals in one field are also eminent in another says something concerning the similarity among fields. For example, personality and clinical psychologists have been viewed as similar in the past, but Hogan (1993) has remarked that "many clinicians seem to have lost interest in personality and personality assessment as traditionally understood" (p. 295). Similarly, personality is today often viewed as a subdiscipline of social psychol-

ogy (Hogan, 1993; Kenrick & Dantchik, 1983), although Allport argued personality should be distinct (Kihlstrom, 1987).

A person's eminence within a given area of psychology has often been assessed by examining the individual's citation counts. Rankings of psychologists have been performed for psychology as a whole (Nissim-Sabat, Farr, Horton, Owens, & Shelton, 1989; Perlman, 1980) and for the subdisciplines of clinical psychology (Cox, 1978), counseling psychology (White & Hernandez, 1991), and social psychology (Gordon & Vicari, 1992). Three articles defining eminence of individuals and departments in social psychology have been published in *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* (Gordon & Smith, 1989; Perlman, 1984; Perlman & Lipsey, 1978), but we know of none that has been published for personality psychology.^{1,2} The establishment of a baseline coverage for personality at this point could help define the field as well as assist in understanding future changes within it (cf. Over, 1982, p. 53).

Background

A fairly fixed method has been employed and validated in the past for charting eminence within a given field (Gordon & Vicari, 1992; Perlman, 1979, 1980, 1984; Perlman & Lipsey, 1978; Zusne & Dailey, 1982); we will

Authors' Note: We wish to thank Dr. Bill Peterson, who assisted in classifying eminent personologists according to their research approaches, and Dennis Mitchell, who read and commented on an earlier draft of this article. Address correspondence either to John D. Mayer, Department of Psychology, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 05824, E-mail jack.mayer@unh.edu, or to Kevin M. Carlsmith, Department of Psychology, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, E-mail kevinc@princeton.edu.

PSPB, Vol. 23 No. 7, July 1997 707-716
© 1997 by the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc.

follow these general procedures so as to create a picture of eminence within personality psychology. These past ranking procedures employ textbook index listings. Textbook indexes are considered superior to counts of citation databases because general citation index counts (e.g., Social Sciences Citation Index) may overemphasize individuals who have contributed to fields other than the one targeted. For example, Gordon Allport may have an inflated overall citation count relative to his contribution to personality psychology because of his contribution to social psychology (Perlman & Lipsey, 1978). Textbook indexes may also better represent past but enduring influences on a field than do contemporary citation counts. The textbooks surveyed are often chosen from those that have reached at least the third edition and that have been published in recent years (Gordon & Vicari, 1992; Perlman & Lipsey, 1978). Approximately eight are used in typical counts because this provides adequate reliability. In the present article, we will follow the general procedure described above but modify it both to fit the specifics of the field of personality psychology and to increase the validity of the general procedure.

A distinction is often made between two types of personality psychology textbooks: a *specific-theories* book that proceeds individually through specific theorists (e.g., Freud, Jung, Sullivan, Maslow, etc.) and a more general *big-paradigms* textbook (Emmons, 1989) that integrates broader theoretical perspectives (e.g., psychodynamic, biological, trait, humanistic, etc.) with more contemporary research topics. These two types of books reflect the possibly divergent interests of two constituencies within personality psychology—one oriented toward personality theories and the other more oriented toward personality paradigms and their related research. (There also exist advocates of a more purely research-oriented approach, but textbooks representing that approach "have not often run to multiple editions" [Mendelsohn, 1993, p. 107].) To compare and contrast these specific-theory and big-paradigm constituencies, we will survey eight textbooks here, four representing each type.

Our aims are several. First, we want to identify the most important figures in personality psychology, the decades in which they published, and the methods they used. Second, we will inquire as to whether the specific-theory and big-paradigm constituencies employ different conceptions (i.e., different citation rankings) of individuals in the field. Third, we will inquire as to the nature of personality textbook coverage of eminent individuals and how this coverage of eminent individuals is similar or different from that in related disciplines such as social psychology. And lastly, we will examine how

similar or different eminent individuals in personality psychology are from those in social or clinical psychology by comparing our list with similar lists from clinical and social psychology.

METHOD

Textbooks

Approximately 33 personality textbooks have been published in recent years; a recent review counted 28 (Mayer, 1995b), to which can be added 5 more that we have found since that time (Engler, 1994; Feist, 1990; Hergenbahn, 1994; Ryckman, 1993; Wallace, 1993). From these, 8 textbooks were selected employing the criterion that they had reached at least a third edition since 1990 and that their table of contents clearly identified them as a specific-theory or big-paradigm book, as described by Emmons (1989). Four specific-theory and four big-paradigm volumes were chosen (see above). The four specific-theories books were Engler (1994), Hergenbahn (1994), Monte (1991), and Ryckman (1993). The four big-paradigm textbooks were Burger (1993), Liebert and Spiegel (1994), Mischel (1993), and Pervin (1993).

Once the books were selected, the index of each book was optically scanned into a computer database. After this initial scanning, we manually examined the data and corrected it as necessary for usage variations regarding a psychologist's initials and any other scanning errors.³ At this point, most prior researchers selected all individuals who obtained five or more citations in any one of the eight textbooks. Because an individual could conceivably have four citations in all eight books and be overlooked by the five-or-more criterion, we decided to use the more aggressive criterion of four or more citations in any one of the eight textbooks. Of course, we might still pass over one or two individuals who obtained three citations in each book. We instituted additional procedures, described in the next section, to reduce this remaining concern. From our data, we produced an initial ranking, in which we summed each individual's citations across all books (of the eight) for which they received four or more citations. This yielded an initial group of 382 individuals. As is customary, corrections were then made so that any textbook authors' self-citations (and citations of regular coauthors) were adjusted to the average of the remaining textbooks. We then selected the top-ranked 50 individuals.

Reliability of Ranking Procedure

Prior research has accepted the ranking procedure described above as the final one. But we searched for any individuals who were at all likely to have been overlooked

due to limitations of the standard procedure outlined above. Among the 50 most cited individuals, 84% were cited in three books or more, and those cited in only one book appeared to us to be from other fields and/or less known (e.g., D. P. Barash, R. D. Laing). Beyond the 50th individual, only 10 more individuals (of 332 remaining) were cited in three or more books. Given this pattern, a more meaningful index of eminence beyond the 50th individual appeared to be citations across at least three books. For this reason, the 10 individuals who had been cited in three or more textbooks four or more times were placed in the ranks from 51 to 60. Also note that these individuals seemed more likely to move into the top 50 once their citations below four were filled in because they had achieved recognition over a greater number of textbooks. After having selected these individuals, we filled in all the citation numbers under four for all 60 individuals (the first 50 and the next 10). The Spearman rho between the original rankings and those after citations under four had been filled in was $r(60) = .99$, indicating there were no meaningful changes in the rankings and that citations below four can be safely ignored as has been done in the past. Just as impressively, of the 10 individuals added because they were cited in three or more books, not one entered the top 50 when their citations under four were added. Both of these procedures provided very strong indications that our ranking procedures for the top 50 are accurate.

Further Description of Eminent Personality Psychologists

First decade of research productivity. For each of the above 60 psychologists, we assigned decades of research productivity by examining the text in which the individual was most heavily cited and then referring to the reference section of that volume to find the earliest and latest decade of that psychologist's cited work. We adjusted any dates for accuracy when they appeared to be misleading.⁴ One substantial exception to this was that all individuals who, to the best of our knowledge, were alive at the time of writing this article were listed as continuing their research into the 1990s.

Research favored. Each of the above 60 psychologists was categorized with respect to primary (and sometimes secondary) research method employed. There is no accepted source for such classification. We, therefore, employed four very coarse categories of research, including (a) observational, (b) psychometric, (c) experimental, and (d) other, which included purely theoretical psychologists, mixtures, and unknowns. The first category includes personologists who employed repeated, intense observation of multiple case studies (Mayer & Bower, 1986, p. 474); the second and third categories are

fairly straightforward and are described, along with the *other* category, below. The first three categories were defined as follows:

Observational. Personality psychologists who use this approach often share the belief that the richness of human nature is best studied through intense observation of the individual. These psychologists have typically been trained in personality itself, psychiatry, or clinical psychology. The central features of this approach are the repeated observation of multiple, often clinical, case studies. Techniques found in clinical settings such as interviews, free association, or hypnosis are often used. Common outlets for this research include case studies, journal articles, and the publication of books.

Psychometric. Personality psychologists who use this approach are concerned with describing personality through the use of measurement scales. This includes creating and validating scales to measure individual differences. These psychologists are typically trained in individual differences, social, personality, or industrial psychology. Research emphasis often focuses on the measurement of and correlations between various psychological criteria and tests. Journal articles, textbooks, test manuals, and applications are typical outlets for this research.

Experimental. Personality psychologists who use this approach are concerned with describing personality through the experimental manipulation of its parts or the actual situation surrounding the person. The training of these psychologists tends to be predominantly academic in personality, social, experimental, or clinical programs. Empirical field or laboratory research and academic investigation are the hallmarks of this category. Publications are most often made within scholarly journals and textbooks.

The remaining *other* category was a post hoc combination of three other instruction sets, (a) mixed, denoting a mix of the above three categories; (b) other, including purely theoretical work; and (c) unknown, to the raters.

The first author and a colleague trained in a personality program classified the 60 individuals into one of the above categories. Agreement between raters on the full 60 individuals as to the four categories was assessed via Cohen's (1960) kappa coefficient, which varies from -1 (disagreement) to 0 (no agreement) to 1 (perfect agreement) for nominal categorization and adjusts for number of categories employed. Agreement between raters on the 60 individuals across four categories yielded a $\kappa(60) = .53$, $p < .001$; agreement between raters on a subset of 42 individuals classified by both raters as either observationist, psychometrician, or experimentalist was $\kappa(42) = .71$, $p < .001$. The first kappa is low to moderate; the second is considered quite satisfactory (the latter kappa is higher than the reliability of many psychiatric diagnoses in DSM-III; Spitzer, Forman, & Nee, 1979). These levels of agreement were sufficient for the present purposes.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Recall we had divided textbooks within the field into two groups: specific-theory books and big-paradigm books. The influence of each of the top 60 individuals was measured independently by each textbook's citation. Thus, each textbook can be viewed as analogous to a test item. Proceeding on this basis, the four specific-theory books were in high agreement as to eminence, producing a coefficient alpha reliability for the top individuals of $r(60) = .90$; the big-paradigm books were similarly high at $r(60) = .82$. Despite their differences, the overall alpha for the combined books was $r(60) = .89$. Note that although the reliability of the eight books combined is somewhat lower than that of the specific-theory books alone, the combination's content validity is higher because it represents a more balanced representation of what is important in the field of personality psychology as a whole.

Rank Order, Years of Scholarly Activity, and Type of Scholarly Activity

Table 1 shows the overall ranking of 60 psychologists important to personality psychology. The list starts off with Freud, Rogers, Bandura, and Skinner (ranked 1 to 4, respectively) and concludes with Kazdin, Epstein, Kagan, and Thorndike (ranked 57 to 60, respectively). The decades in which the psychologists' most cited work originated are immediately to the right. As can be seen, there is considerable variability in years of work. The group begins with Sigmund Freud, who began publishing in the 1890s along with Josef Breuer. A large number of individuals worked during the midcentury period (1940-1960). Finally, those who have been active into the 1990s are so designated and include 33 of the 60 individuals (55%).

Recall that predominate scholarly activity was categorized as observational, psychometric, experimental, and other (see Methods section, above). Using this system, 55 out of 60 (92%) of the personality psychologists were classified as observationists, experimentalists, or psychometricians by one or both raters (55 by at least one rater; 42 by both). The remaining 5 personologists (8%) were rated within the *other* category by both raters. Of these, we reclassified 3 who had been unknown by examining their respective works; 2 of these were readily reclassified. The third unknown was 1 of 3 individuals (5%) who were left within the *other* category; this included 2 sociobiologists and 1 editor.

The major research orientation of the individual is listed in Table 1 in the column labeled *Predominant Methods of Study*. A single research orientation reflects the consensual categorization of the two raters; when there

was disagreement between raters or when the authors knew of an important secondary involvement, a secondary approach was also listed. It is worth noting that all major individuals on the list regularly employed some empirical means of data gathering—that is, none was a pure theorist, although many evolved in that direction later in their careers.

Comparison of Specific-Theory and Big-Paradigm Books

Preliminaries. One of our questions was whether specific-theory textbooks emphasize personality psychologists differently than do big-paradigm textbooks. To assist interpretation of that question, we first compared the overall citation rates across the two types of books. For each book, we selected two starting pages at random, with the constraints that (a) no introductory chapters would be used and (b) the random starting pages should be drawn from different chapters. From a given starting point, we then counted forward 10 citations to obtain a citation-to-word ratio. The citation-to-word ratio was equivalent across books, with theory books citing every 175 words and paradigm books citing every 172 words, $t(14) = .06$, *ns*. Because the theory books in our sample were a bit lengthier in pages, they would be expected to have a modestly higher number of absolute citations ($M_{\text{pages}} = 681$ vs. 592).

Rank ordering of eminence across books. One of our questions was whether specific-theory textbooks emphasize different personality psychologists than do big-paradigm textbooks. We calculated rankings of psychologists for the theory and paradigm books separately. The intercorrelation of the summed rankings of the specific-theory books versus those of the big-paradigm books was $r(60) = .73$; this correlation can be corrected for attenuation due to unreliability to see the degree of agreement between the two sets of books if they were perfectly reliable. If the two sets of books employed the same underlying approach to rankings, their intercorrelations corrected for attenuation would be $r_{\text{attenuation}} = 1.0$. Instead, $r_{\text{attenuation}}(60) = .85$, which indicated that the agreement between the two sets of books is high but substantially less than perfect even after ruling out the influence of measurement error. This supports our original distinction between the two sorts of books and indicates that the two constituencies within the field rank order the same psychologists differently.

An inspection of the data indicates that the theory and paradigm books cited psychometricians and experimentalists about equally, although the theory books cited both types of personologists at a higher level (perhaps because of those books' greater length or because of a citation style focusing on fewer individuals). Means for the theory books were 38.4 for the average eminent

TABLE 1: The 60 Most Highly Cited Personality Psychologists Across Eight Personality Textbooks

Personologist	Earliest and Latest Decade of Commonly Cited Work ^a	Predominant Method(s) of Study	Number of Pages Indexed		
			In the Four Theory Texts	In the Four Paradigm Texts	In the Eight Texts
Mentioned an average of 100 or more pages/book					
Freud, Sigmund	1890-1939	Observational	634	222	856
Mentioned an average of 25 or more pages/book					
Rogers, Carl	1940-1979	Observational	176	135	311
Bandura, Albert	1960-1990s	Experimental	135	142	277
Skinner, B. F.	1930-1989	Experimental	222	52	274
Kelly, George	1950-1969	Observational/psychometric	166	61	227
Allport, Gordon	1930-1959	Observational/psychometric	184	42	226
Adler, Alfred	1900-1969	Observational	204	16	220
Maslow, Abraham	1940-1979	Observational	169	38	207
Mentioned an average of 10 or more pages/book					
Jung, Carl	1920-1959	Observational	170	29	199
Eysenck, Hans	1940-1990s	Psychometric/experimental	147	47	194
Horney, Karen	1930-1969	Observational	160	15	175
Cattell, Raymond	1940-1979	Psychometric	118	43	161
May, Rollo	1940-1979	Observational	152	4	156
Erikson, Erik	1950-1979	Observational	128	25	153
Mischel, Walter	1960-1990s	Experimental	58	95	153
Miller, Neal E.	1940-1990s	Experimental	96	50	146
Fromm, Erich	1940-1969	Observational	104	18	122
Dollard, John	1930-1949	Experimental	89	27	116
Rotter, Julian	1950-1969	Psychometric/experimental	59	31	90
Mentioned an average of 3 or more pages/book					
Laing, R. D.	1950-1979	Observational	75	2	77
Watson, John	1910-1959	Experimental	54	20	74
Pavlov, Ivan	1920-1929	Experimental	47	24	71
Jones, Edward	1950-1969	Experimental/observational	44	7	51
White, Robert	1950-1969	Observational	41	10	51
Buss, Arnold	1970-1990s	Psychometric/experimental	23	27	50
Murray, Henry	1930-1959	Psychometric/observational	25	25	50
Freud, Anna	1920-1969	Observational	43	5	48
Hull, Clark	1940-1949	Experimental	28	20	48
Cantor, Nancy	1970-1990s	Experimental	7	37	44
Breuer, Josef	1890-1899	Observational	40	2	42
Ellis, Albert	1950-1990s	Observational	25	17	42
Barash, David	1970-1979	Other	41	0	41
Seligman, Martin	1970-1990s	Experimental	3	33	36
Plomin, Robert	1980-1990s	Psychometric	8	27	35
Wilson, Edmund O.	1970-1990s	Other	94	1	35
Evans, Richard	1970-1990s	Experimental	33	1	34
Sullivan, Harry	1950-1969	Observational	21	12	33
Buss, David	1980-1990s	Psychometric	11	21	32
McCrae, Robert	1980-1990s	Psychometric	3	29	32
Eysenck, Michael	1980-1990s	Experimental/psychometric	30	1	31
Beck, Aaron	1960-1990s	Observational/psychometric	11	19	30
Block, Jack	1960-1990s	Psychometric/observational	2	28	30
Kihlstrom, John	1980-1990s	Experimental	4	26	30
Kohut, Heinz	1970-1990s	Observational	18	12	30
Costa, Paul	1980-1990s	Psychometric	3	26	29
Hartmann, Heinz	1930-1959	Observational	27	2	29
McClelland, David	1950-1990s	Psychometric/experimental	0	26	26
Markus, Hazel	1970-1990s	Experimental	2	23	25
Funder, David	1980-1990s	Experimental	4	19	23
Wolpe, Joseph	1950-1990s	Experimental	5	18	23
Ansbacher, Heinz	1950-1990s	Other	21	1	22
John, Oliver	1980-1990s	Psychometric	4	18	22
Rachman, S.	1960-1990s	Psychometric	10	12	22
Wilson, Glenn D.	1970-1990s	Psychometric	10	12	22

(continued)

TABLE 1: Continued

Personologist	Earliest and Latest Decade of Commonly Cited Work ^a	Predominant Method(s) of Study	Number of Pages Indexed		
			In the Four Theory Texts	In the Four Paradigm Texts	In the Eight Texts
Mentioned an average of 3 or more pages/book					
Wilson, G. Terence	1980-1990s	Experimental	9	13	22
Goldberg, Lewis	1960-1990s	Psychometric/experimental	7	14	21
Kazdin, Alan	1970-1990s	Experimental	11	9	20
Epstein, Seymour	1970-1990s	Psychometric	4	14	18
Kagan, Jerome	1960-1990s	Psychometric/experimental	3	14	17
Thorndike, Edward	1910-1939	Psychometric/experimental	16	0	16

a. All still-active psychologists are considered to be cited through the 1990s.

psychometrician versus 43.7 for the average experimentalist, $t(46) = .33$, *ns*. The means for the paradigm books were 24.4 versus 29.8, respectively, $t(46) = .77$, *ns*. The two book types cited observationists quite differently, however; theory book citations of observationists were far higher than those found in paradigm books ($M_s = 113.9$ and 32.4 , respectively), $t(22) = 4.14$, $p < .001$. The statistical significance of the difference in citations for observationists across the two book types was also tested by an ANOVA. The interaction between book type (theory, paradigm) and personologist type (observationist, psychometrician, experimentalist) was significant, $F(2, 68) = 8.18$, $p < .001$. The theory books' higher overall citation rate of eminent individuals was also significant, as indicated by a main effect, $F(1, 68) = 21.6$, $p < .001$, and although this was due in large part to the difference in observationists, a post hoc comparison found that the difference remained when examining psychometricians and experimentalists exclusively, $t(47) = 2.09$, $p < .05$.

Further support for the difference comes from an examination of individuals who were favored in one type of text or the other. An individual was designated as favored by one constituency or another when he or she had 10 times as many references in one book type or the other. A few personologists favored by the theory texts were Adler, Horney, May, Laing, and Breuer (there were seven others). Personologists favored by the big-paradigm books were Seligman, Block, McClelland, and Markus. Those favored by the specific-theory books were almost all observationists, whereas those favored by the big-paradigm books were almost all psychometricians or experimentalists. This further suggests a meaningful difference between the two constituencies.

Average year of citations. Theory books may cite older material because they provide more historical coverage than paradigm books. When we calculated our citation-to-word ratio, we also kept track of each book's average citation date (checking the reference list to substitute original publication dates as necessary). The theory

books did indeed cite references averaging 12 years older than those cited in paradigm books ($M_s = 1961$ vs. 1973), $t(158) = 4.19$, $p < .001$.

Comparisons of Influential Personality Psychologists With Influential Social and Clinical Psychologists

Comparison with eminent social psychologists. Finally, we compared our list with the 60 most cited social psychologists as ranked by Gordon and Vicari (1992), who used a procedure essentially identical to our own. We found an overlap of 5 names (8%)—Edward Jones, Albert Bandura, Sigmund Freud, Gordon Allport, and Neal Miller (ordered as in the social list). Incidentally, using methods described above on a set of four new social psychology textbooks, we calculated that the social books in general cited research averaging in the year 1985, 12 years again more recent than either type of personality book, $t(20) = 2.02$, $p < .06$. (The four books used were Baron & Byrne, 1991; Deaux, Dane, & Wrightsman, 1993; Myers, 1996; Taylor, Peplau, & Sears, 1994.)

Comparison with eminent clinical psychologists. We also compared our list of influential figures with a list of highly cited individuals in clinical psychology journals. The fact that this list of clinicians came from journal rather than textbook citations means that the procedures are noncomparable, but no alternative ranking was available. Even given this limitation, it is still probably meaningful to note that the 12 most cited individuals (the complete list) in the *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* included 4 individuals who were also among the top 60 on the personality list (Julian Rotter, Albert Bandura, Carl Rogers, and Joseph Wolpe), for a 33% overlap, compared with an 8% overlap for the top 12 social psychologists (the same percentage overlap as for the top 60 social psychologists). It is provocative that even though the citation collection procedures were so different, there is apparently more overlap with clinical than with social psychological lists. No lists from other fields were available for comparison (see Note 2).

1993; Maddi, 1993). The extensive coverage of today's theories books could still be enlarged, to judge from the arguments that one or another important theorist is overlooked (Cheek, 1983; Smith, 1995; Lester, 1995). Other alternatives for organizing the field are also possible and are noted in the next section.

Issues underlying the theory-research controversy and a possible remedy. To some extent, the specific-theory versus big-paradigm controversy pits the eminent personologists of the past against the active researchers of today (and theoreticians of tomorrow). Today's personality textbooks of both types assign the vast majority of their citations to a few eminent individuals in the field. How can this practice be evaluated according to standards of accuracy both in representing the field and in teaching what is important? We would advocate that, in the ideal case, citations reflect those works that have most substantially contributed to the field, with adjustments necessary for teaching undergraduates who may need to be taught certain materials before others and who may find certain materials more accessible than others.

As Mendelsohn (1993) has inquired,

The question then becomes what, if anything, have the Theorists of Personality identified . . . that distinguishes them from the many, many others who have observed and written about human behavior? What is special about their work? Why in our teaching of personality should we pay particular attention to them as sources of ideas in preference to artists, philosophers, and theologians? (pp. 108-109).

Perhaps the answer to Mendelsohn's question is that the more eminent personality psychologists working from the beginning of the 20th century in fact collected many of the more relevant insights of artists, philosophers, and theologians and translated these ideas into a beginning language of science. Ellenberger (1970) noted "that many of [the neurologist] Pinel's case histories seem to be borrowed from Balzac's novels" (pp. 283-284). Freud drew insights from artists such as Shakespeare and Sophocles and from such philosophers as Shopenhauer (Ellenberger, 1970). The result was a collection of insights from past historical eras that was translated into an early-stage language of personality but not yet into a fully modern science.

If this is the case, then these founders of psychology may forever hold the position of revered pioneers within our field. The evidence from the present survey is also, however, that other fields employ different citation patterns that may be fairer to those who number themselves among the productive contemporary contributors to a field. One possible direction in which to resolve this disagreement is to integrate the past and the present better than we have done to date. Nearly 50 years ago,

Allport (1960, p. 301) reflected on how journal articles rarely cited older theorists. He believed that the same concepts were being invented again and again with different names, and he attributed the problem to a faddism in which "Old wine, we find, tastes better from new bottles." Hogan (1994) has noted the same state of affairs today. To integrate past and present would mean, first, making a greater effort at recognizing similarities of concepts from one era to another and, because different eras often employ different theories, recognizing similarities of concepts from one theory to another. Next, it would mean linking historical and contemporary topics that have been treated most often as independent. Works that explicitly make such links could be used for that purpose (e.g., Dollard & Miller, 1950; Erdelyi, 1985; Mayer, 1995a, 1995b; Westen, 1992). The result would be reviews (in textbooks and elsewhere) that more frequently integrate across historical and theoretical boundaries. Examples of such integratory approaches can already be found in certain textbook chapters, including those by McAdams on the self (1994, Chapter 10), and by Pervin on cognitive units of personality (1996, Chapter 3). Such chapters radically integrate concepts that belong together but have been segregated by a sometimes counterproductive adherence to theoretical distinctions of the past (Mayer, 1995b).

Relation of Personality to Other Disciplines and Future Changes in Personality Psychology

We turn now from comments on personality psychology itself to its relations with other fields. Judging from measures of personality's most influential individuals, the field seems dramatically different from social or clinical psychology. Nonetheless, it is common to consider personality closely related to social psychology given the large number of psychology departments that treat social and personality psychology as one area and given the well-known journals that include both disciplines in their titles. Such considerations notwithstanding, personality psychology appears largely distinct from social psychology given the 8% overlap of influential individuals across the two fields. The field seems closer to clinical psychology with which it possesses a 33% overlap in emphasis (even though the methods of ranking were different!).

What makes personality psychology different from social or clinical psychology has not yet been fully agreed upon. Part of the issue involves better defining what personality psychology studies and what the aims of the discipline are. The debate over what the field of personality is has been growing in recent years (Maddi, 1993; Mayer, 1993-1994, 1995a; Mendelsohn, 1993; Pervin, 1990). Some have called for a return to specific theories (e.g., Hogan, 1993; Maddi, 1993), whereas others have noted the advent of big-paradigm approaches as impor-

Differing emphases on eminence. One other characteristic of citations in personality textbooks relative to those in social psychology is worth noting. The distribution of citations for the top 60 individuals is remarkably different in personality textbooks than in the neighboring field of social psychology (as reported by Perlman & Lipsey, 1978). Within personality textbooks, the top 10 individuals had an average of roughly 300 citations each, and the bottom 10 had an average of 20 citations each, a ratio of 15:1. In the social psychology texts, the top 10 cited individuals had an average of roughly 115 citations each, and the bottom 10 had 40 citations each, a ratio of only 3:1.⁵ Depending on one's perspective, one could say (a) that the structure of the personality field is best communicated with a focus on a small number of eminent contributors, (b) that personality psychology is actually more focused and coherent in its structure, (c) that social psychology is more evenhanded and balanced in its coverage, or (d) some combination of these. (Note that the social texts are not simply disagreeing given that their reliability—that is, intertext agreement—is reported as high; Perlman & Lipsey, 1978.)

DISCUSSION

The present rank ordering has led to a number of findings. First, we have (a) identified and described the top-cited 60 personality psychologists, (b) found empirical manifestations of the specific-theory and big-paradigm constituencies within personality psychology, (c) found that personality textbooks tend to be focused on a smaller set of individuals than textbooks in social psychology, and (d) found that eminence in personality psychology appears more closely related to eminence in clinical than in social psychology. We obtained these findings to answer questions about the structure of the field of personality psychology at this point in time. The remainder of the discussion will examine what this pattern might say about the field of personality psychology today.

A Description of Eminent Psychologists in Personality

An examination of Table 1 indicates that the field of personality psychology as a whole remains dominated by the great personality psychologists of the early and middle portions of the century and has begun to include some more recent theorists as well. Sigmund Freud, Carl Rogers, and Albert Bandura lead off the list. Some people have criticized the field of personality as a hagiography of dead theorists. But personality is not simply a "walk through the graveyard"; the criticism seems exaggerated, as roughly half of our personality psychologists are still active. Our list also indicates that the eminent individuals employed a broad range of research ap-

proaches—from observational to psychometric to experimental. It is also worth noting that these individuals—including Freud, Skinner, Mischel, E. O. Wilson, and Cattell—represent widely divergent viewpoints on human nature.

Eminence within the field was often built on multiple accomplishments. Carl Jung was known as an innovative researcher long before he was recognized for his theories; Sigmund Freud devoted himself to empirical case studies. Most of our 60 psychologists generated theories after engaging in substantial empirical research of one type or another; furthermore, the majority of these personologists continue their research today. Perhaps a common characteristic shared by these highly successful individuals is that each has an interesting or novel approach to describing human nature. Personality psychology has, in fact, sometimes been described as the study of human nature (Ross, 1987). Whether or not one agrees with this definition, a number of textbooks incorporate such considerations. As psychologists mature in their careers, they increasingly concern themselves with such issues, thereby appearing more philosophical. At this level, as Skinner (1971, chap. 1) has ruefully noted, their commentaries on human nature would have been fairly recognizable to the ancient Greeks more than 2,000 years ago.

Finally, there exist specific personality determinants that lead to eminence. This article did not examine such characteristics, but others have and have concluded that such characteristics as intrinsic motivation, creativity, and even arrogance may contribute to a high citation rate (e.g., Feist, 1993; Simonton, 1988; Wispe, 1981).

Specific-Theory Versus Big-Paradigm/Research Coverage

The debate concerning which approach is better. The two styles of textbooks that exist in the area reflect a controversy concerning coverage of the field. This controversy is often stated as whether one should emphasize specific theories or emphasize larger paradigms and their associated research. Some have argued that the vast majority of journal articles today make relatively little contact with the work of the small set of individuals who constitute the most eminent personologists (e.g., Heatherton, 1993). They have gone even further, writing that "the continued emphasis on theories of personality is . . . both anachronistic and a misleading representation of what, in fact, personality psychologists think about and do" (Mendelsohn, 1993, p. 104). On the other side, some have defended theory volumes, stating that the research literature seems a "Tower of Babel" (Maddi, 1993, p. 86), and even defenders of the research literature find it "empty and trivial" (Mendelsohn, 1993, p. 113). Theories seem like the best route to integration (Hogan,

1993; Maddi, 1993). The extensive coverage of today's theories books could still be enlarged, to judge from the arguments that one or another important theorist is overlooked (Cheek, 1983; Smith, 1995; Lester, 1995). Other alternatives for organizing the field are also possible and are noted in the next section.

Issues underlying the theory-research controversy and a possible remedy. To some extent, the specific-theory versus big-paradigm controversy pits the eminent personologists of the past against the active researchers of today (and theoreticians of tomorrow). Today's personality textbooks of both types assign the vast majority of their citations to a few eminent individuals in the field. How can this practice be evaluated according to standards of accuracy both in representing the field and in teaching what is important? We would advocate that, in the ideal case, citations reflect those works that have most substantially contributed to the field, with adjustments necessary for teaching undergraduates who may need to be taught certain materials before others and who may find certain materials more accessible than others.

As Mendelsohn (1993) has inquired,

The question then becomes what, if anything, have the Theorists of Personality identified . . . that distinguishes them from the many, many others who have observed and written about human behavior? What is special about their work? Why in our teaching of personality should we pay particular attention to them as sources of ideas in preference to artists, philosophers, and theologians? (pp. 108-109).

Perhaps the answer to Mendelsohn's question is that the more eminent personality psychologists working from the beginning of the 20th century in fact collected many of the more relevant insights of artists, philosophers, and theologians and translated these ideas into a beginning language of science. Ellenberger (1970) noted "that many of [the neurologist] Pinel's case histories seem to be borrowed from Balzac's novels" (pp. 283-284). Freud drew insights from artists such as Shakespeare and Sophocles and from such philosophers as Shopenhauer (Ellenberger, 1970). The result was a collection of insights from past historical eras that was translated into an early-stage language of personality but not yet into a fully modern science.

If this is the case, then these founders of psychology may forever hold the position of revered pioneers within our field. The evidence from the present survey is also, however, that other fields employ different citation patterns that may be fairer to those who number themselves among the productive contemporary contributors to a field. One possible direction in which to resolve this disagreement is to integrate the past and the present better than we have done to date. Nearly 50 years ago,

Allport (1960, p. 301) reflected on how journal articles rarely cited older theorists. He believed that the same concepts were being invented again and again with different names, and he attributed the problem to a faddism in which "Old wine, we find, tastes better from new bottles." Hogan (1994) has noted the same state of affairs today. To integrate past and present would mean, first, making a greater effort at recognizing similarities of concepts from one era to another and, because different eras often employ different theories, recognizing similarities of concepts from one theory to another. Next, it would mean linking historical and contemporary topics that have been treated most often as independent. Works that explicitly make such links could be used for that purpose (e.g., Dollard & Miller, 1950; Erdelyi, 1985; Mayer, 1995a, 1995b; Westen, 1992). The result would be reviews (in textbooks and elsewhere) that more frequently integrate across historical and theoretical boundaries. Examples of such integratory approaches can already be found in certain textbook chapters, including those by McAdams on the self (1994, Chapter 10), and by Pervin on cognitive units of personality (1996, Chapter 3). Such chapters radically integrate concepts that belong together but have been segregated by a sometimes counterproductive adherence to theoretical distinctions of the past (Mayer, 1995b).

Relation of Personality to Other Disciplines and Future Changes in Personality Psychology

We turn now from comments on personality psychology itself to its relations with other fields. Judging from measures of personality's most influential individuals, the field seems dramatically different from social or clinical psychology. Nonetheless, it is common to consider personality closely related to social psychology given the large number of psychology departments that treat social and personality psychology as one area and given the well-known journals that include both disciplines in their titles. Such considerations notwithstanding, personality psychology appears largely distinct from social psychology given the 8% overlap of influential individuals across the two fields. The field seems closer to clinical psychology with which it possesses a 33% overlap in emphasis (even though the methods of ranking were different!).

What makes personality psychology different from social or clinical psychology has not yet been fully agreed upon. Part of the issue involves better defining what personality psychology studies and what the aims of the discipline are. The debate over what the field of personality is has been growing in recent years (Maddi, 1993; Mayer, 1993-1994, 1995a; Mendelsohn, 1993; Pervin, 1990). Some have called for a return to specific theories (e.g., Hogan, 1993; Maddi, 1993), whereas others have noted the advent of big-paradigm approaches as impor-

tant (Heatherston, 1993; Emmons, 1989). Still others have called for a reorganization of the field according to a series of research topics (Mendelsohn, 1993), according to evolutionary biology (Buss, 1984), according to the study of lives (McAdams, 1995), or according to the nature of the personality system itself (Mayer, 1993-1994, 1995a, 1995b; Pervin, 1990). As this discussion continues, it is sure to contribute in part to the changing nature of the discipline. It is partly to this debate that we have directed our comments concerning the most eminent individuals in personality psychology. It is this debate that provides both commentary on and guidance to the field of personality.

NOTES

1. Although Perlman's (1984) article refers to personality psychology, textbooks relevant to social psychology were used exclusively.

2. To rule out prior surveys in the area of personality psychology, we searched Psych Lit for titles including key terms such as *eminence*, *research productivity*, *ranking*, and *citations* from 1974 forward. In addition, we examined the references sections of all pertinent articles we did collect from our successful searches. The only textbook eminence rankings we found were for (a) all of psychology, (b) social psychology, (c) clinical psychology, and (d) counseling psychology.

3. Once the book indexes were scanned, they were imported into a standard spreadsheet. Page ranges were converted to individual pages (e.g., 104-106 was converted to 104, 105, and 106). This resulted in eight spreadsheets, one for each book. A line from any given spreadsheet at this stage listed an author name and the pages on which he or she was cited (e.g., Cantor, N./477/479/480/482/489). Next, author names were examined for scanning or typographical differences. The eight spreadsheets were then combined into a larger one through cutting and pasting; error checking continued through this stage. A program was then written that calculated a final citation count for each author for each book. At this stage, the spreadsheet consisted of lines specifying author, book, and citation count (e.g., Cantor, N./Burger/5). The final working spreadsheet was a 382 x 8 spreadsheet that had the authors listed down the left side in alphabetical order, the eight textbooks across the top, and the correspondent citation counts for each author-book combination arranged in the appropriate cells.

4. For example, Henry Murray was cited most frequently in Engler's book at 10 times; however, only his *Explorations in Personality* (1938) was referenced. We extended the decades of his productivity to include the 1950s because a few of his later works were cited in other texts.

5. The ratio for citations of the top 10 personologists to the 10 who fell between 41 and 50 was also high, at 11:1, which indicates that the higher ratio we find in personality (relative to social) psychology is not a matter of the method we used for selecting the final 10 individuals.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1960). The open system in personality theory. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 61*, 301-310.
- Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (1991). *Social psychology: Understanding human interaction* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Burger, J. M. (1993). *Personality* (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Buss, D. M. (1984). Evolutionary biology and personality psychology: Toward a conception of human nature and individual differences. *American Psychologist, 39*, 1135-1147.
- Cheek, J. (1983). William James and the fourth force in personality psychology. *Personality Forum, 1*, 21-24.
- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20*, 37-46.
- Cox, W. M. (1978). Frequent citations in the *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* during the 1970s. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46*, 204-205.
- Deaux, K., Danc, F. C., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1993). *Social psychology in the '90's* (6th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Dollard, J., & Miller, N. (1950). *Personality and psychotherapy*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ellenberger, H. (1970). *The discovery of the unconscious*. New York: Basic Books.
- Emmons, R. A. (1989). The big three, the big four, or the big five? *Contemporary Psychology, 34*, 644-646.
- Engler, B. (1994). *Personality theories* (4th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Erdelyi, J. H. (1985). *Psychoanalysis: Freud's cognitive psychology*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Feist, G. J. (1993). A structural model of scientific eminence. *Psychological Science, 4*, 366-371.
- Feist, J. (1990). *Theories of personality* (2nd ed.). Ft. Worth: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Gordon, R. A., & Smith, C. J. (1989). Research productivity in social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15*, 463-472.
- Gordon, R. A., & Vicari, P. J. (1992). Eminence in social psychology: A comparison of textbook citation, social sciences citation index, and research productivity rankings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 26-38.
- Heatherston, T. F. (1993). Personality psychology: The way we were and the way we are. *Contemporary Psychology, 38*, 504-505.
- Hergenhahn, B. R. (1994). *An introduction to theories of personality*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hogan, R. (1993). An optimistic forecast. In K. H. Craik, R. Hogan, & R. N. Wolfe (Eds.), *Fifty years of personality psychology* (pp. 293-297). New York: Plenum.
- Hogan, R. (1994). Heritage has value. *Dialogue: Newsletter of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, 9*, 8.
- Kenrick, D. T., & Dantchik, A. (1983). Interactionism, idiographics, and the social psychological invasion of personality. *Journal of Personality, 51*, 286-307.
- Kihlstrom, J. F. (1987). Introduction to the special issue: Integrating personality and social psychology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 989-992.
- Lester, D. (1995). *Theories of personality: A systems approach*. Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Liebert, R. M., & Spiegler, M. D. (1994). *Personality: Strategies and issues* (7th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Maddi, S. R. (1993). The continuing relevance of personality theory. In K. H. Craik, R. Hogan, & R. N. Wolfe (Eds.), *Fifty years of personality psychology* (pp. 85-101). New York: Plenum.
- Mayer, J. D. (1993-1994). A system-topics framework for the study of personality. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 13*, 99-123.
- Mayer, J. D. (1995a). The system-topics framework and the structural arrangement of systems within and around personality. *Journal of Personality, 63*, 99-123.
- Mayer, J. D. (1995b). A framework for the classification of personality components. *Journal of Personality, 63*, 819-877.
- Mayer, J. D., & Bower, G. H. (1986). Learning and memory for personality prototypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 473-492.
- McAdams, D. P. (1994). *The person* (2nd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- McAdams, D. P. (1995). What do we know when we know a person? *Journal of Personality, 63*, 365-396.
- Mendelsohn, G. A. (1993). It's time to put theories of personality in their place, or, Allport and Stagner got it right, why can't we? In K. H. Craik, R. Hogan, & R. N. Wolfe (Eds.), *Fifty years of personality psychology* (pp. 103-115). New York: Plenum.
- Mischel, W. (1993). *Introduction to personality* (5th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Monte, C. F. (1991). *Beneath the mask*. Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations in personality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Myers, C. R. (1970). Journal citations and scientific eminence in contemporary psychology. *American Psychologist, 25*, 1041-1048.
- Myers, D. G. (1996). *Social psychology* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Nissim-Sabat, D., Farr, W. H., Horton, P. F., Owens, M. C., & Shelton, T. (1989). Citations of distinguished scientists in introductory psychology textbooks. *Teaching of Psychology, 16*, 74-75.
- Over, R. (1982). The durability of scientific reputation. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 18*, 53-61.
- Perlman, D. (1979). Rear end analysis: The uses of social psychology textbook citation data. *Teaching of Psychology, 6*, 101-104.
- Perlman, D. (1980). Who's who in psychology: Endler et al.'s SSCI scores versus a textbook definition. *American Psychologist, 35*, 104-105.
- Perlman, D. (1984). Recent developments in personality and social psychology: A citation analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 10*, 493-501.
- Perlman, D., & Lipsey, M. W. (1978). Who's who in social psychology: A textbook definition. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 4*, 212-216.
- Pervin, L. A. (1990). A brief history of modern personality theory. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*. New York: Guilford.
- Pervin, L. A. (1993). *Personality: Theory and research* (6th ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Pervin, L. A. (1996). *The science of personality*. New York: John Wiley.
- Ross, A. O. (1987). *Personality: The scientific study of complex human behavior*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Ryckman, R. M. (1993). *Theories of personality* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Simonton, D. K. (1988). *Scientific genius: A psychology of science*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Skinner, B. F. (1971). *Beyond freedom and dignity*. New York: Knopf.
- Smith, M. B. (1995). A forgotten classic: Murphy's integrative view of personality. *Contemporary Psychology, 40*, 631-633.
- Spitzer, R. L., Forman, J.B.W., & Nee, J. (1979). DSM-III field trials: I. Initial interrater diagnostic reliability. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 136*, 815-817.
- Taylor, S. E., Peplau, L. A., & Sears, D. O. (1994). *Social psychology* (8th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wallace, W. A. (1993). *Theories of personality: A basic issues approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Westen, D. (1992). The cognitive self and the psychoanalytic self: Can we put our selves together? *Psychological Inquiry, 3*, 1-13.
- White, A., & Hernandez, N. R. (1991). Trends in article citations in three counseling journals, 1952-1988. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 419-422.
- Wispe, L. G. (1981). Research on positive and negative social behavior. *Social Behavior and Personality, 9*, 203-209.
- Zusne, L., & Dailey, D. P. (1982). History of psychology texts as measuring instruments of eminence in psychology. *Revista de Historia de la Psicologia, 3*, 7-42.

Received June 8, 1995

Revision accepted August 22, 1996