

tion that the issues arising from disagreements among personality theories are grist for the mill of comparative analytic research (Maddi, 1968, 1993, 1996), which will identify the best theorizing rather than discard content disagreements in advance. There are, of course, many personality theories, but their diversity can be reduced to a more manageable level by inducing from them the basic models of personality theorizing. When I engage in this process, what emerges is the conflict, fulfillment, and consistency models, each with two subtypes.

Psychologists need to collaborate with each other in formulating comparative analytic research that can resolve the fundamental issues arising from the differences between these three models. For example, the conflict model conceptualizes all functioning as defensive (owing to the inevitable incompatibility between the individual's selfish instincts and society's need to preserve the common good), whereas the other two types see some functioning as defensive and other functioning as nondefensive (depending on whether socialization has been punishing or supportive). When the kinds of data considered relevant in the two models are taken into account, it should be possible to carry out research that shows whether only some or all functioning is defensive. The results of such studies will favor one or another of the personality models.

The other approach in comparative analysis involves comparing the relative power of peripheral statements of personality theories. All the concrete characteristics used by each theory in formulating its personality types need to be measured in appropriate ways, and deductive factor analytic techniques should be used to determine whether there is evidence supporting the predicted characteristics and their organization into types. The theories that emerge from this approach with empirical support need then to be compared in their ability to explain the behavioral data considered relevant to psychologists. Once again, the result of such an approach will be to favor some personality theories over others.

This comparative analytic research approach will quickly identify the empirically best personality concepts and theories. I suggest that it is these results that should guide attempts to identify and advocate an overall approach to personality on which all can agree and that can help in unifying the various fields of psychology.

REFERENCES

- Maddi, S. R. (1968). *Personality theories: A comparative analysis* (1st ed.). Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- 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. 85–102). New York: Plenum Press.
- Maddi, S. R. (1996). *Personality theories: A comparative analysis* (6th ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Mayer, J. D. (2005). A tale of two visions: Can a new view of personality help integrate psychology? *American Psychologist*, 60, 294–307.

Correspondence concerning this comment should be addressed to Salvatore R. Maddi, Department of Psychology and Social Behavior, School of Social Ecology, University of California, 3340 Social Ecology II, Irvine, CA 92697-7085. E-mail: srmaddi@uci.edu

DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.61.4.331

A New Vision of Personality ... and of Personality Theory

John D. Mayer
University of New Hampshire

Today, personality psychologists are engaging in ground-breaking, innovative research. Reviews of the field, however, often fail to reflect these advances, because they focus instead on a historical set of *grand personality theories*: the psychodynamic, trait, humanistic, and other viewpoints of the early-to-mid-20th century that are not fully relevant to contemporary work. In my article "A Tale of Two Visions: Can a New View of Personality Help Integrate Psychology?" (Mayer, May–June 2005), I proposed a new fieldwide framework for the discipline of personality psychology; in essence, it is a new outline to organize contemporary theory and research in the field.

Maddi (2006, this issue) raised two interrelated objections to that proposed framework. First, he believes that there is a better way to organize the discipline of personality psychology than the one I proposed. His method involves comparing and analyzing the grand theories of personality and using the results of his analyses to guide research in the discipline. Second, he was concerned that I want to de-emphasize the grand theories of the field.

To understand our respective positions, it helps to revisit briefly the origins of the focus on grand theory. In the 1950s, personality psychologists were actively en-

gaged in a search for a fieldwide framework to organize the study of personality. Hall and Lindzey (1957) developed the dominant framework for the time: an impartial review of the field's grand theories—psychodynamic, behavioral, humanistic, trait, and so on—and the research to which those theories gave rise. Hall and Lindzey organized the discipline by covering one theoretical perspective after another, but with little or no prescription for bridging the differences among them.

A decade later, Maddi (1968) proposed a potential solution to the problem. He believed that the grand theories of Freud, Jung, Rogers, and others could be compared with each other, and the differences among them could then be resolved through research. To compare the theories, Maddi proposed a meta-theory which stated that all grand theories address three aspects of personality. Each theory, from this perspective, makes statements about personality's *core*, *development*, and *peripheral expression*. Core statements concern the biological, fixed bases of personality. Developmental statements describe the processes that draw out the individual's core so that the person is effective in meeting environmental demands. Finally, through development, an individual's peripheral aspects grow into visible traits or personality types. In Maddi's (2006) terms, Carl Rogers's theory would be summarized as follows: A person is born with an innate tendency for healthy growth (core). That growth tendency can be promoted through support and love from the environment (development), and if so promoted, will result in a fully functional person (peripheral expression).

The New Vision Compared With Maddi's Meta-Theory

Maddi's (1968) meta-theory usefully organizes the statements of the grand theories of the early-to-mid-20th century, yet I am not sure it is sufficient to organize the field. Maddi's focus on the grand theories highlights the important and interesting qualities of those theories but is weighed down by the nonempirical, diffuse, and often internally inconsistent nature of those same theories (Hall & Lindzey, 1957). In his analysis, Maddi concluded that the grand theories can be divided into those that view the individual as (a) in conflict and full of defense mechanisms, or (b) seeking fulfillment, or (c) functioning in a kind of steady state (Maddi, 1968, 2006, p. 331). He recommended research to find out which viewpoint is correct. Such conclusions, however, appear to reflect the broad generalities of the grand theories themselves. The issue of whether personality is in con-

flict or is seeking fulfillment, for example, seems to make little contact with such contemporary issues as identifying personality's most important traits and how the self functions.

The new vision I have proposed begins with a fundamental assumption that, I believe, unites most personality psychologists: that personality is a psychological system made up of interrelated parts. Based on that idea, the blueprint for the new vision, called the *systems framework for personality*, organizes the field according to four topics: (a) What is personality? (b) What are its parts? (c) How is it organized? and (d) How does it develop? This framework focuses on the personality system itself (as opposed to grand theories), yet it also makes use of theory.

How Does the New Vision View Personality Theory—and Personality?

Maddi (2006) believes that disagreements among the grand theories are a fruitful source of research ideas. Although that may be true, there is more to personality psychology than the grand theories alone. Contemporary *standard* theories, in contrast to grand theories, have as their aim explaining one or more key parts of personality or key aspects of its organization and development. These standard theories are more modest in scope than were the grand theories and are distinguished, in part, by better accounting for the empirical complexity of the personality system.

Some standard theories provide a link to the grand theories by reformulating and updating them for use in research today. For example, standard theories of defense mechanisms, such as of repression and denial, update Freud's (1917/1966) original ideas and do so without any necessary adherence to the rest of Freud's theory (e.g., Pyszczynski, Greenberg, & Solomon, 2004). Other standard theories have arisen independent of any single grand theory to guide specific research programs. For example, the lexical hypothesis states that important personality traits can be identified in the words of a given language such as English. That hypothesis led to the Big Five trait approach and to the identification of such traits as openness–closedness (e.g., Goldberg, 1993).

Today, these standard theories form the backbone of the field, defining its issues and motivating its research. Yet it also true that standard theories, by themselves, cannot organize the field. Such theories are often focused on a specific feature of personality and frequently make little contact with potentially related theories. For that

reason, standard theories require integration into an overall picture of personality.

One way to deal with personality theories—both grand and standard—as well as to integrate the field's research involves a shift from a grand theory framework to the systems framework. This shift would change how personality is depicted in, for example, the personality chapter in the *Annual Review of Psychology* and in introductory psychology textbooks, in encyclopedia entries on personality, and in personality's textbooks and handbooks. In this new approach, the discipline's theory and research would be organized in a new integrated sequence. Consider, for example, a hypothetical set of lectures reviewing the field.

The first lectures would introduce an initial picture of personality as a system situated amid biological systems, such as the brain and body, and social systems, such as the psychological situation and significant social groups. The grand theories can be described as initiating psychologists' contemporary perspectives on the system: some emphasizing biological causes of personality (psychoevolutionary); others, social explanations (social–cognitive); and still others, intrapsychic approaches (e.g., trait theory).

The second set of lectures would provide a close-up of the more important parts of personality, including its motives, stylistic traits such as openness–closedness (drawing on the lexical hypothesis), and mental models, such as models of the self, of the world, and of relationships. Theoretical discussions (and disagreements) among relevant theories can be drawn on as needed to define and describe the parts.

Personality comes further into focus in the third set of lectures on personality organization. There, individual traits are organized into hierarchies such as the Big Five, and the major functional areas of personality are described more broadly: energy management (motives and emotion), mental models, social action, and the executive self (including mental defense).

The fourth set of lectures, on development, takes the picture of personality and brings to it a sense of movement and change over time. Here, the growth of personality's parts and organization is examined: Traits exert their influence on personal outcomes over time; the individual's dynamic organization and goals may stay the same or shift unexpectedly. The image of personality is one of both stability and change.

Maddi (2006) was correct in suggesting that this approach shifts the focus away from the grand theories of the 20th century to something new. Many of us who, like

Maddi, have studied and appreciated the grand theories will experience the loss involved in such a change. I believe that at the same time, working with this unitary new vision of personality represents a step toward a more integrated, up-to-date discipline—and one better able to communicate to our students and our colleagues.

REFERENCES

- Freud, S. (1966). *Introductory lectures on psychoanalysis* (J. Strachey, Ed. & Trans.). New York: Norton. [Original work published 1917]
- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26–34.
- Hall, C. S., & Lindzey, G. L. (1957). *Theories of personality*. New York: Wiley.
- Maddi, S. R. (1968). *Personality theories: A comparative analysis* (1st ed.). Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Maddi, S. R. (2006). Taking the theorizing in personality theories seriously. *American Psychologist*, 61, 330–331.
- Mayer, J. D. (2005). A tale of two visions: Can a new view of personality help integrate psychology? *American Psychologist*, 60, 294–307.
- Pyszczynski, T., Greenberg, J., & Solomon, S. (2004). Why do people need self-esteem? A theoretical and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 435–468.

Correspondence concerning this comment should be addressed to John D. Mayer, Department of Psychology, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824. E-mail: jack.mayer@unh.edu

DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.60.4.332

Positive Psychology Versus the Medical Model?

Stephen Joseph
University of Warwick

P. Alex Linley
University of Leicester

Seligman, Steen, Park, and Peterson (July–August 2005) provided a progress report on positive psychology, reviewing the impressive developments over the past five years. We wholeheartedly support the positive psychology movement and believe its success is a testimony to Seligman's vision and leadership. However, in looking back over the past five years, we are mindful of what the next five years may hold and are concerned over the future direction and development of the positive psychology movement.

Seligman and colleagues (2005) began by acknowledging that positive psy-