

REVIEW ARTICLE

Digital History of Psychology in Modern Russia

Konstantin B. Zuev*

Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

Abstract. *Relevance.* The digitalization of science has heightened the relevance of applying quantitative methods in historical disciplines. In the history of psychology, this trend, termed "digital history of psychology," is in an active formative stage, requiring systematization and analysis of existing practices, particularly within the Russian scientific context. *Problem.* Despite the growing number of studies employing scientometric approaches, there is a lack of a comprehensive analysis of the main directions, objects, and prospects for applying these methods in Russian historical-psychological science. *Objective.* To identify the main trends and systematize the objects of application of scientometric methods within the framework of digital history of psychology in contemporary Russia. *Methods.* An analytical (non-systematic) review was conducted of publications, primarily by researchers from the Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences and published in leading Russian psychological journals – *Psikhologicheskii Zhurnal* (Psychological Journal) and *Voprosy Psichologii* (Questions of Psychology). *Results.* 1. An authorial classification of objects of historical-psychological research, convenient for applying scientometric methods, is proposed: specific events, individual scholars, institutions and collectives, research trends, national science, and science as a whole. 2. It is demonstrated that scientometric methods are applied to all object types but to varying degrees: most actively in the study of individual scholars and research trends, and least in the analysis of singular events. 3. The review identified key "application points" for scientometrics and prospects for its development, including the use of altmetrics, webometrics, and the analysis of archival data on personnel and funding. *Conclusion.* The integration of scientometrics into the history of psychology is a dynamic process that contributes to greater evidence-based research and enriches scientometrics itself with historical context. The findings underscore the need for theoretical conceptualization of a specific subject matter for digital history of psychology, which could be the "dominants of scientific development" – systemic structures operationalized through quantitative indicators.

Keywords: *History of Psychology, Digital History of Psychology, Dominant Principle*

1. Introduction

For a long time, the history of psychology was considered the most humanities-oriented among all psychological disciplines. However, the general digitalization of science has also impacted this field. In his article, C. Green (2016) introduces the term "digital history of psychology" and relates this direction to cliometrics, which originated in economic science. In our view, it is more accurate to draw an analogy between digital history of psychology

and scientometrics – a branch of science studies whose origins trace back to the works of A. de Candolle and which emerged as an independent discipline in the second half of the 20th century. A key feature of scientometrics is the use of quantitative indicators to describe scientific activity. Primarily, these are bibliometric characteristics of publications (year of publication, journal, volume, etc.) and their derivatives, which are largely based on citation data. In turn, digital history of psychology

* Corresponding author: e-mail address: zuevkb@ipran.ru

DOI: 10.38098/nsom_2025_05_03_05

implies the mandatory creation of complex databases designed to systematize large volumes of historical information (mostly textual). The question of including other quantitative characteristics in scientometric analysis remains debatable. The author of this article adheres to the broadest possible interpretation of scientometrics as a set of quantitative methods for analyzing scientific activity, including both specific and non-specific indicators. One thing remains undeniable: beyond publication characteristics, the sphere of scientometric interest includes personnel issues within the scientific community. It was to these issues that the early works of de Candolle (Springer Handbook..., 2019), the classic studies of Cattell (1910), and a number of contemporary research works (see, for example: Lovakov & Agadullina, 2019) were devoted.

The objective of this work is to identify the main research trends in the field of digital history of psychology in contemporary Russia.

2. Method

This study is not a systematic review. The analysis primarily included works by researchers from the Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, as well as publications from two leading Russian psychological journals: *Psikhologicheskii Zhurnal* (*Psychological Journal*) and *Voprosy Psichologii* (*Questions of Psychology*).

Tasks:

1. To systematize the objects of study within the history of psychology.
2. To describe scientometric research applied to each of these objects.
3. To identify prospects for the application of scientometric methods in Russian historical-psychological research.

Main objects of historical-psychological research through the lens of scientometrics examines historical-psychological publications that utilized scientometric indicators and outlines prospects for their further application.

For the convenience of analysis, the studies are grouped by object as follows:

1. Study of a specific event (e.g., publication of an article or book, holding of a conference, presentation).
2. Study of individual scholars and their scientific legacy.

3. Study of institutions and research collectives.
4. Study of trends (schools, fields) within psychology.
5. Study of national science (e.g., domestic/Russian psychology).
6. Study of the development of science as a whole.

This classification was developed based on the specific nature of the research object, taking into account the practicality of applying scientometric indicators. The proposed framework is not the only possible one. In their analysis of the bibliometric landscape of the history of psychology, A. N. Morgun, Yu. N. Oleinik, and A. L. Zhuravlev identified the following groups: methodology of the history of psychology, formation of scientific trends and branches, history of psychology in the educational space, scientific legacy of authors, psychological thought across time (periods, epochs), individual scholars (biographies), institutionalized community (institutes, departments, societies), and scientific communication (conferences) (Morgun, Oleinik, & Zhuravlev, 2021). As can be seen, the presented classifications partially overlap and differ in certain aspects. Without delving into a detailed discussion of the merits and limitations of each, it is important to emphasize that they were created for different purposes. The first (author's) classification aims to systematize the practice of applying scientometric methods within the history of psychology, while the second (proposed by Morgun, Zhuravlev, and Oleinik) is designed for a scientometric analysis of this research field as a whole.

3. Results

However, it is appropriate to begin the review with works that first substantiated the very possibility of applying scientometric methods within Russian-language historical-psychological scholarship. The first article featuring the phrase "scientometric analysis" in its title was published in 1990 (Livshits & Krylova, 1990). It presents statistical data on the thematic focus of publications in *Psikhologicheskii Zhurnal* (*Psychological Journal*) and the structure of its authorship, including the authors' qualifications and institutional affiliations. The authors identified the most productive researchers (those who published the maximum number of articles in the journal during the period under review), as

well as the works and authors that received the highest number of citations. Furthermore, the level of citation of Psychological Journal authors in another authoritative publication, *Voprosy Psichologii* (Questions of Psychology), was analyzed. The article is primarily of a reference nature and is not grounded in any theoretical framework.

The next significant milestone was the article by A. V. Kolyushkina and Yu. N. Oleinik, "Possibilities of Using Citation Index in Historical-Psychological Research" (Kolyushkina & Oleinik, 2002). It attempts not merely a statistical description of psychology's branches, research problems, authors, and citations, but also a scientific interpretation of the obtained data. In essence, this work marks a transition from applied accounting to full-fledged scientific inquiry.

3.1. Study of a specific event

Now, let us turn to the analysis of the objects outlined earlier.

We were unable to identify works specifically dedicated to analyzing a singular scientific event (e.g., a book, conference, article) using scientometric methods. Formal conference reports could be considered an exception, but they themselves may serve as an object of study rather than an example of such analysis. A notable exception is the study by Yu. V. Kovaleva dedicated to a long-term scientific seminar held at the Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The author treats the seminar as an integral event. Through bibliometric (or "reportometric") and scientometric analysis of the presentation texts, the most frequent terms were identified across years and laboratories. A key finding was the dominance of generalized, interdisciplinary concepts (primarily "human" [chelovek]), reflecting the comprehensive, holistic approach to studying the psyche characteristic of the Institute of Psychology during the period under study. The work emphasizes the uniqueness of the seminar as a stable, regular, and evolving institute-wide event that played an important role in the context of state-led science reforms (Kovaleva, 2023). Nevertheless, strictly speaking, a seminar is not a singular scientific event. Therefore, this section will focus not so much on reviewing existing works, but rather on the prospects for research in this area.

When examining an individual publication, a detailed analysis of its citation metrics is highly relevant. Using this indicator can help study the

publication's reception across different historical periods and identify factors influencing its impact. It also allows for an analysis of how the work is perceived by the contemporary scientific community and for pinpointing key ideas that have been developed in modern science. This largely applies to author analysis as well, which will be discussed later.

It is worth noting separately that the issue of measuring the influence (impact) of an individual publication is quite contentious in scientometrics. Beyond citation data and a range of altmetrics, researchers have virtually no other tools for such assessment. This represents another point of intersection between the history of psychology and scientometrics, where the former discipline could contribute to the development of the latter by adding substantive historical context to the interpretation of quantitative indicators.

The potential for analyzing scientific conferences as singular events that reflect the state of science at a specific historical juncture remains largely untapped. Potential avenues for such analysis include: the principles behind session organization, the distribution of presentations across sessions, the themes of plenary lectures, the status of session chairs, and other formal parameters. Quantitative analysis of this data can contribute to a deeper understanding of the developmental trajectories of psychological science in a given era. Furthermore, if conferences are examined within the broader context of scientific communication, it becomes possible to identify predominant forms of knowledge exchange in different historical periods and, crucially, to build forecasts for the future. In today's infometrics-driven world, such retrospective and prospective analysis appears extremely relevant.

3.2. Study of individual scholars and their scientific legacy

Let us proceed to the next object of analysis.

One of the most common types of historical-psychological research is the study of individual scholars—that is, the analysis of their biography, scholarly legacy, and scientific contribution. The potential for applying scientometric methods in this area is considerable.

As an example, we can cite a bibliometric study of the scientific legacy of B.F. Lomov, the founder of the Institute of Psychology of the USSR Academy of Sciences, conducted by the author of this review (Zuev, 2020). The entire

range of scientometric indicators used was grouped into three clusters: the demand for the scholar's works within the professional community, the relevance of their legacy across different periods, and the prospective value of their ideas. The study employed standard tools of the Russian Scientific Electronic Library eLibrary.ru, the Scopus database, and the Yandex platform's internet query analysis system. The results demonstrated that Lomov's works consistently hold high positions in rankings of Russian psychologists. His most cited work is the book *Methodological and Theoretical Problems of Psychology*, leading to the conclusion that the scientific community primarily perceives Lomov as a methodologist. An analysis of citing journals, keywords, and the subject areas of citing publications confirmed the continued relevance of his legacy. At the same time, it was noted that the representation of Lomov's works in the international Scopus database is extremely limited, with a low citation count. Similarly, search queries for his full name, "Boris Fedorovich Lomov," are infrequent in the leading Russian search engine.

Research by A.A. Kostrigin and T.M. Khusyainov focused on the legacy of V.M. Bekhterev, based on an analysis of a text corpus from the Google Books service (Kostrigin & Khusyainov, 2018). According to the authors, the highest number of mentions of Bekhterev in Russian-language publications pertains to the topics of "Psychiatry," "Psychoneurology," and "Psychology." It is important to emphasize that the analysis covered publications from the late 19th century onward, not just recent decades. The authors also compared the frequency of mentions of V.M. Bekhterev and L.S. Vygotsky, linking this dynamic to ideological processes in science. It was shown that during their lifetimes, Bekhterev's works were cited more frequently than Vygotsky's. After the deaths of both scholars, the frequency of mentions of their names declined, particularly sharply for Vygotsky, which is associated with the state prohibition of pedology. In the 1960s, Vygotsky's name re-entered scientific discourse, while Bekhterev's mention frequency remained at its previous level. Based on the analysis of mentions in both Russian- and English-language literature, the authors conclude that Bekhterev's ideas have had a significant and enduring influence. This work was carried out within the framework of digital history of psychology.

Recent years have seen a significant increase

in the number of scientometric studies of individual scholars, largely due to the work of V.I. Belopolsky and A.A. Kostrigin. These authors have conducted comprehensive scientometric analyses of the work of a number of scholars (e.g., L.I. Antsyferova, A.V. Brushlinsky), utilizing both classical methods (analysis of publication and citation counts) and relatively novel approaches, including periodization of scholarly output, calculation of original coefficients, and detailed analysis of the relationship between scientometric indicators and a scholar's formal status and position (Belopolsky & Kostrigin, 2024a, 2024b).

A promising direction in the study of individual scholars is the analysis of the contemporary scientific community's assessment of a scholar's contribution, analogous to studying the citation patterns of a single work. Analyzing recent citations makes it possible to identify which ideas are most in demand at present and to hypothesize about the reasons for this demand.

The most innovative direction appears to be the use of scientometric data to study scholars' personal characteristics, such as adaptability, work style (individual or collaborative), organizational skills, reflexivity, and scientific leadership. This approach significantly expands the possibilities for the psychological analysis of scientific activity using quantitative methods (Zuev, in press).

Another important quantitative indicator of a scholar's organizational and mentoring activity is the number of dissertations (highest qualification works) completed under their supervision or with their consultation. O.A. Artemyeva, for instance, identifies several clusters of abilities essential for a research team leader (Artemyeva, 2020). The thesis regarding a particular scholar's high organizational and pedagogical abilities can find empirical support through a count of the dissertations successfully defended under their supervision.

3.3. Study of institutions and research collectives

Moving on to the analysis of research on institutions and scientific collectives, two works warrant particular attention. The first is dedicated to the formation of the social psychology sector at the Institute of Psychology of the USSR Academy of Sciences (Belopolsky, Zhuravlev, & Kostrigin, 2020). This study is especially valuable as such analytical works are

exceedingly rare in the history of psychology. Its high scholarly standard should also be noted. However, scientometric methods are used minimally within it. Without in any way diminishing the significance of this work, we will use it as an example to consider how the application of quantitative indicators could have deepened the analysis.

The authors rightly devote considerable attention to the personnel composition of the sector in its formative stage, listing all staff members by name. Nevertheless, the academic degrees of these employees are not specified. Including this information could have strengthened the authors' thesis regarding the high importance of this research area. Recall that J. M. Cattell once used a similar approach to substantiate psychology's status as a scientific discipline in the United States.

In analyzing the sector's publication output, the focus is on monographs and edited volumes, while other types of publications remain outside the scope of the study. Yet, an analysis of the full range of publications could have demonstrated the extent to which the sector's work was known and sought after beyond the Institute of Psychology of the USSR Academy of Sciences. A detailed analysis of the citation metrics for the works discussed, including their temporal dynamics, also appears promising. Such an analysis could shed light on several important aspects: the ongoing relevance of the sector's classical works in contemporary psychology, and the geographical and thematic scope of their citation.

The issue of training early-career researchers within the sector is not addressed at all, despite the fact that a postgraduate program (aspirantura) was operational at the Institute from its earliest years.

A separate section of the article is dedicated to scientific-organizational activities, specifically the seminar "Methodological Problems of Social Psychology." The authors list all presenters from 1973–1975 along with their presentation topics. However, the presenters' academic degrees and institutional affiliations are not provided. Such a straightforward analysis could have visually demonstrated the seminar's significance for the scientific community of that period.

The second article, strictly speaking, does not belong to the history of psychology, although it was conducted by psychologists (Aleksandrov & Maksimova, 2017). Its inclusion in this review is justified for two reasons. First, it represents a

rare example of a theoretically grounded scientometric study. Second, its object of analysis is not a formal structure (e.g., a laboratory, department, or institute) but an informal association of scholars (a paradigm community), which nonetheless cannot be classified as an entire scientific field. The authors analyzed the citation patterns of 500 articles published by representatives of one such community. It was shown that for a significant period after publication, articles are cited predominantly within that paradigmatic community. The hypothesis of a subsequent increase in citations due to the dissemination of ideas beyond the community was confirmed, while assumptions linking citations to publications in popular science media and to a shift from theoretical to applied research were not supported. The most important finding of the study was "the discovery of the S-shape of publication citation curves and the heterogeneity of citation dynamics within the scientific community. The proposed explanation for the shape of these curves (a flat initial segment, a stepwise pattern, and a possible saturation point) suggests that published results are utilized by discrete paradigm groups" (Aleksandrov & Maksimova, 2017, p. 43).

In conclusion, we would like to highlight another promising indicator for the scientometric analysis of a department, organization, or even informal research communities: the number of postgraduate students (or candidates in other forms of degree pursuit) and their distribution among research supervisors. Such an analysis could reveal which research directions within a collective were considered most promising.

3.4. Study of trends

The analysis of the development of specific topics, trends, and concepts is one of the most common types of research in the history of psychology (Morgun, Oleinik, & Zhuravlev, 2021a). Therefore, it is unsurprising that scientometric methods are already actively used in this area.

I.N. Eliseeva and Yu.N. Oleinik analyzed studies of the category "individuality" [individual'nost'] based on dissertation research (Eliseeva & Oleinik, 2019). The authors defined the following objectives:

1. To delineate the thematic scope of dissertation works whose titles contain direct references to the study of various aspects of individuality.

2. To identify quantitative characteristics of Russian dissertations to establish the dynamics of this thematic scope over the selected period.

To address these objectives, alongside general scientific methods, traditional methods of historical-psychological analysis were used: the statistical method, thematic classification, publication count method, and the slang method. In total, the authors analyzed 239 dissertations in psychology and related sciences defended between 1992 and 2018.

Thus, the first stage of the analysis focused on the institutional affiliation of research on human individuality.

Next, the authors analyzed the dynamics of the number of defended dissertations. Peak research activity was identified from 1998 to 2006. A decline in interest in individuality research, suggested by the data, was partially confirmed by the authors through an analysis of publications indexed in the Russian Science Citation Index (RSCI).

The authors also analyzed: research samples, thematic areas of individuality studies (17 in total), research centers with the most intensive dissertation output, and leading scholars in the training of highly qualified personnel. The obtained data made it possible to identify research schools primarily engaged in developing problems of individuality.

It is noteworthy that the history of psychology itself has become an object of scientometric analysis. A.N. Morgun studied the following parameters: publication activity in the field of history of psychology, the distribution of publication counts across organizations, and the main journals featuring specialized sections on this topic (Morgun, 2019). All indicators were examined using data from the Russian bibliometric database RSCI. The earliest indexed publication dates back to 1967. It was shown that eight Russian journals are classified under the rubric "History of Psychology. Biographies" in the State Rubricator of Scientific and Technical Information (GRNTI). Analysis of 783 publications (excluding dissertations and works by classic authors) demonstrated a steady increase in the number of works on the history of psychology, with grounds to expect this trend to continue. It was also revealed that representatives from 204 scientific and educational organizations contribute to historical-psychological research, with clear leaders among them. The list of the most

productive organizations is headed by the Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, where 20 staff members are engaged in topics related to the history of psychology. This result deserves special attention as it represents not a bibliometric but a personnel analysis. Furthermore, it was shown that historians of psychology pay roughly equal attention to domestic and foreign research. The analysis revealed that, in some cases, historical-psychological publications significantly (more than threefold) enhance a journal's impact factor. The author concludes: "The history of psychology, with its specific nature as a reflexive science and a small number of pure representatives, occupies a notable position in enriching scientific knowledge, particularly psychological knowledge" (Morgun, 2019, p. 144).

As a final example of a scientometric study of a research trend, we cite the article by A.A. Fedorov dedicated to a bibliometric analysis of publications on post-nonclassical psychology in the RSCI (Fedorov, 2019). The article analyzes a contemporary corpus of publications (the earliest dating to 2000). It is shown that the number of publications on post-nonclassical psychology is steadily growing, although most authors have published only one article. Three thematic clusters were identified: the cultural-analytical approach, the theory of psychological systems, and the subject-system approach. Representatives of the latter cluster less frequently identify themselves with post-nonclassical psychology.

Furthermore, bibliometric analysis of the current state of a particular research problem or scientific field over a 10–15 year period is gaining popularity among researchers. Examples of such work in psychological research include publications by the author of this article (Zuev & Nestik, 2018), G.V. Ozhiganova (Ozhiganova, 2019), and several others. It appears that while such studies may not possess immediate historical value, they can serve as a foundation for future historical-psychological analysis.

As research on trends appears to be the most developed area in terms of scientometric method application, this section will not separately outline prospects for its future development.

3.5. Study of national science

Research on national science is conducted along several lines. Within this review, it is pertinent to focus on the work by A.Ya.

Antsupov, S.L. Kandybovich, V.M. Kruk, G.N. Timchenko, and A.N. Kharitonov (Antsupov et al., 2014). The authors do not use the terms "scientometrics" or "digital history of psychology" in their article, opting instead for "statistical analysis." However, in essence, this study is scientometric in nature as it is based on quantitative data analysis. The choice of the research object is notable: the development of psychological science is investigated through an analysis of doctoral dissertations defended since the degree's establishment in 1935. The authors deliberately forgo a content analysis of the works, focusing solely on their formal characteristics. Specifically, they identify regional patterns (53% of all dissertations were defended in Moscow, 17.2% in Leningrad/St. Petersburg, and 29.8% in other cities), the distribution of dissertations by specialty (the overwhelming majority were defended in four specialties: 19.00.01, 19.00.07, 19.00.05, 19.00.13), and other parameters.

Of particular importance is the authors' analysis of defense rates during periods of socio-political upheaval that the country experienced in the late 20th century. "Perestroika dealt the main blow to the process of preparing and defending doctoral dissertations in the regions, without causing noticeable damage to this process in Moscow and St. Petersburg. In the last seven years, a certain decentralization in the preparation of doctoral dissertations has been observed" (Antsupov et al., 2014, p. 65). The authors measure the impact of social upheaval (an external factor) using scientific metrics. It would be important to complement this approach with a content analysis of dissertation topics.

The prospects for applying scientometric methods in the study of national science can be outlined in the following directions. From a bibliometric perspective, this includes the analysis of journal publications. We have previously written about the potential of this approach in a joint publication with P.V. Morozov (Zuev & Morozov, 2016). Publications in leading psychological journals can be considered a relevant reflection of the state of national science (Zhdan, 2015). A separate line of inquiry could be the study of the most prominent publishing series at the Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Zuev, 2022).

The second promising direction pertains to the analysis of personnel and financial resources

allocated to science development in different periods. Such data are available for the relatively short post-war period and are held in the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences in the form of staffing schedules and other documents awaiting scholarly examination. The level of funding and personnel allocation can indicate the development priorities of various scientific fields, both at the level of individual organizations and the country as a whole. Documents from earlier periods are fragmented. Their search and systematization constitute a separate research task.

3.6. Study of the development of science as a whole

In conclusion, let us examine the prospects for studying psychology as a whole. Research on trends in the development of psychological science at a global level is less common and can be biased, aimed at demonstrating the superiority of a particular country in the field. At the same time, research transcending national borders and encompassing significant regions is being conducted with increasing frequency. A significant work of this kind in psychology is an article published in 2019 in the leading scientometric journal *Scientometrics*, dedicated to the analysis of psychological research in the post-Soviet space (Lovakov & Agadullina, 2019). The article analyzes publications by authors from post-Soviet countries in psychological journals from 1992 to 2017, i.e., over the 26 years following the collapse of the USSR. During this period, 4,986 psychology articles were published in 15 post-Soviet countries, accounting for less than one percent of the global volume of publications in psychological journals. Nevertheless, this period saw an increase in the number of publications, especially in Russia and Estonia. The article is also notable for its use of a classic personnel metric — the ratio of population size to the number of scientists.

As another example of research on the development of science as a whole, one can cite the works of A.V. Sukharev (Sukharev, 2020a, 2020b). Similar to the article by I.O. Aleksandrov and N.E. Maksimova (Aleksandrov & Maksimova, 2017), they do not analyze psychology per se, but the methodological approach they employ could be applied in historical-psychological research. The author studies the development of science (primarily natural science) in England, Germany, France, and the USA from the 19th century onward. The works are framed within a transdisciplinary

ethno-functional approach; however, as one piece of evidence, they utilize a classic scientometric indicator – the number of Nobel laureates per 100,000 of a country's population. A.V. Sukharev identified statistically significant differences in this indicator between countries, which "reflect, to a certain extent, the comparative level of scientific understanding of nature in these countries; the highest level of achievement was identified in Germany" (Sukharev, 2020a).

The prospects for researching global psychological science are extensive. They include, for instance, analyzing the dynamics of scientific centers (based on the number of publications in different eras) and studying the citation of works. However, it appears that precisely in this area of historical-psychological analysis, altmetrics and webometrics methods will be in greatest demand.

Undoubtedly, the proposed framework does not exhaust the full spectrum of historical-psychological research. Nevertheless, it helps identify key "application points" for scientometric methods in historical-psychological analysis.

4. Conclusion

The conducted review demonstrates that the integration of scientometric methods into Russian history of psychology is an actively evolving process. The analysis has revealed a spectrum of research practices and key "application points" for quantitative methods applied to traditional objects of historical-psychological knowledge: from the study of individual events and scholars to the analysis of institutions, research trends, national science, and science as a whole.

The overwhelming majority of the reviewed works address specific research tasks without focusing on formulating a specific subject matter for scientometrics within the history of psychology. However, as the review has shown, the application of scientometric methods stimulates discussions of a fundamental nature, for example, concerning the classification of objects in historical-psychological research. These discussions extend beyond pure scientometrics, touching upon issues of the theory and methodology of the history of psychology.

In this context, a discussion on developing a specific subject matter for scientometric research within the history of psychology

appears particularly promising. This subject could be the **dominants in the development of psychological science** – structures characterized by systematicity, development, and agency, which can be operationalized through specific numerical indicators. Dominants can be understood as the totality of ideals, rules, norms, values, and managerial practices in conducting research and presenting results, accepted within a particular scientific community (from local research groups to national scientific schools) during a specific historical epoch. Identifying and analyzing such dominants through the lens of scientometric data paves the way for a deeper, more structured, and evidence-based understanding of the logic and driving forces behind the evolution of psychological knowledge.

CRedit author statement: K.B. Zuev - Conceptualization, literature selection, systematization, description, and conclusions

Competing interests: The author declares that have no conflicts of interest regarding this manuscript. There are no financial or personal relationships that could have influenced the work.

Acknowledgments: The author thanks the staff of the Laboratory of the History of Psychology and Historical Psychology at the Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences for their thoughtful analysis and constructive discussion of the article's concept.

Funding: This work was supported by the state assignment of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation (Project No. 0138-2025-0010, "The Dynamics of Scientific Psychological Knowledge in the Context of Russia's Historical Development in the 20th Century").

Highlights

- The use of scientometric indicators contributes to greater evidence-based historical and psychological research, and at the same time, enriches scientometry.
- Scientometric indicators are used in almost all types of historical and psychological research.
- Scientometrics is most widespread in psychological research and least widespread in the research of individual events.
- The prospects for using scientometric indicators in historical and psychological

research lie both in the field of classical scientometry and in the field of alternative metrics and infometry in general.

- The development of digital history and scientometric methods in historical and psychological research has the potential to contribute to the creation of a new field of study in the history of psychology - the dominant trajectory of scientific development.

References

1. Aleksandrov, I. O., & Maksimova, N. E. (2017). Patterns in the dynamics of citation of scientific publications. In A. L. Zhuravlev & V. A. Koltsova (Eds.), *Fundamental and applied research in modern psychology: Results and development prospects* (pp. 36–45). Institute of Psychology, Russian Academy of Sciences.
2. Antsupov, A. Ya., Kandybovich, S. L., Kruk, V. M., Timchenko, G. N., & Kharitonov, A. N. (2014). Statistical analysis of doctoral dissertations in psychology (1935–2013). *Psychological Journal*, 35(5), 62–76.
3. Artemyeva, O. A. (2020). Abilities of a scientific team leader: A historical-psychological study. In A. L. Zhuravlev, M. A. Kholodnaya, & P. A. Sabadosh (Eds.), *Abilities and mental resources of a person in a world of global changes* (pp. 160–165). Institute of Psychology, Russian Academy of Sciences.
4. Belopolsky, V. I., & Kostrigin, A. A. (2024a). Andrey Vladimirovich Brushlinsky: An experience of scientometric analysis of scientific work. *Psychological Journal*, 45(5), 101–112.
5. Belopolsky, V. I., & Kostrigin, A. A. (2024b). Lyudmila Ivanovna Antsyferova: Scientometric analysis of scientific work (on the 100th anniversary of her birth). *Psychological Journal*, 45(6), 5–17.
6. Belopolsky, V. I., Zhuravlev, A. L., & Kostrigin, A. A. (2020). The first years of scientific activity of the social psychology sector at the Institute of Psychology of the USSR Academy of Sciences. *Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Social and Economic Psychology*, 5(3), 197–226. <https://doi.org/10.38098/ipran.sep.2020.19.3.008>
7. Cattell, J. M. (1910). The origin and distribution of scientific men. *Science*, 32(827), 633–648. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.32.827.633>
8. Eliseeva, I. N., & Oleinik, Yu. N. (2019). Scientometric analysis as a method for studying the state and dynamics of a scientific field (using the example of the use of the category "individuality" in the titles of dissertation research from 1992–2018). In A. L. Zhuravlev, E. A. Nikitina, & N. E. Kharlamenkova (Eds.), *Methodology, theory, history of personality psychology* (pp. 218–233). Institute of Psychology, Russian Academy of Sciences.
9. Fedorov, A. A. (2019). Bibliometric analysis of publications on post-nonclassical psychology in the Russian Science Citation Index. *Voprosy Psichologii*, 4, 135–145.
10. Glänzel, W., Moed, H. F., Schmoch, U., & Thelwall, M. (Eds.). (2019). *Springer handbook of science and technology indicators*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02511-3>
11. Green, C. D. (2016). A digital future for the history of psychology? *History of Psychology*, 19(3), 209–219. <https://doi.org/10.1037/hop0000012>
12. Kovaleva, Yu. V. (2023). The seminar "Current Directions in Psychological Research" as an event in the scientific history of the Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences: Qualitative and quantitative historical-psychological analysis. *Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Social and Economic Psychology*, 8(4), 232–274.
13. Kolyushkina, A. V., & Oleinik, Yu. N. (2002). Possibilities of using citation index in historical-psychological research. In A. L. Zhuravlev & V. A. Koltsova (Eds.), *Modern psychology: State and prospects of research. Part 4. Methodological problems of historical-psychological research* (pp. 288–298). Institute of Psychology, Russian Academy of Sciences.
14. Kostrigin, A. A., & Khusyainov, T. M. (2018). Digital Humanities in the history of psychology (using the example of the surname V.M. Bekhterev). *Digital Scholar: Philosopher's Lab*, 1(1), 160–179. <https://doi.org/10.5840/dspl20181110>
15. Kostrigin, A. A., & Mazina, K. N. (2018). The origins and relevance of the emergence of cognitive psychology (Digital Humanities in the history of psychology). *History of Russian Psychology in Persons: Digest*, 3, 19–30.
16. Livshits, V. M., & Krylova, N. V. (1990). Scientometric analysis of materials from the "Psychological Journal" over ten years. *Psychological Journal*, 11(6), 118–123.
17. Lovakov, A., & Agadullina, E. (2019). Bibliometric analysis of publications from post-

Soviet countries in psychological journals in 1992–2017. *Scientometrics*, 119(2), 1157–1171.

18. Markusova, V. A. (2014). History and development of scientometrics. In *Guide to scientometrics: Indicators of the development of science and technology* (pp. 14–48). Ural University Press.

19. Mazov, N. A., & Gureev, V. N. (2015). Alternative approaches to evaluating scientific results. *Herald of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, 85(2), 115–122.

20. Morgun, A. N. (2019). The scientometric space of research in the history of psychology: Gains and costs. *Znanie. Ponimanie. Umenie*, 2, 136–146. <https://doi.org/10.17805/zpu.2019.2.12>

21. Morgun, A. N. (2020). Russian history of psychology in the Russian and international information space. In A. L. Zhuravlev & D. A. Kitova (Eds.), *Psychological research in Internet space: Search engines, social networks, electronic databases* (pp. 295–327). Institute of Psychology, Russian Academy of Sciences.

22. Morgun, A. N., Oleinik, Yu. N., & Zhuravlev, A. L. (2021). Institutional factors in the development of Russian history of psychology (based on the Russian Science Citation Index). *Psychological Journal*, 42(1), 111–121.

23. Morgun, A. N., Oleinik, Yu. N., & Zhuravlev, A. L. (2021). Thematic directions of Russian history of psychology as internal factors in the development of the field: A scientometric analysis based on the Russian Science Citation Index. *Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Social and Economic Psychology*, 6(1), 220–251.

24. Nalimov, V. V., & Mulchenko, Z. M. (1969). *Scientometrics. The study of science as an information process*. Nauka.

25. Ozhiganova, G. V. (2019). Adaptation of the "Spiritual Personality" questionnaire on a Russian-speaking sample. *Experimental Psychology*, 12(4), 160–176.

<https://doi.org/10.17759/exppsy.2019120413>

26. Osipov, G. V., & Klimovitsky, S. V. (2019). *Scientometrics. Indicators of science and technology: A textbook for universities* (2nd ed.). Yurayt Publishing House.

27. Sukharev, A. V. (2020a). Comparative analysis of the development of the natural science component of the German mentality in the late 19th – early 20th centuries in the context of leading

Western European countries. Part I. *Electronic Scientific Journal "GosReg"*, 3 (33) pp.212-218

28. Sukharev, A. V. (2020b). Comparative analysis of the development of the natural science component of the German mentality in the late 19th – early 20th centuries in the context of leading Western European countries. Part II. *Electronic Scientific Journal "GosReg"*, 3 (33) pp. 219-224

29. Zhdan, A. N. (2015). Publishing activity as a direction of work of the Moscow Psychological Society (1885–1922). In D. B. Bogoyavlenskaya (Ed.), *From the origins to the present: 130 years of the organization of the psychological society at Moscow University: Collection of materials of the anniversary conference: In 5 volumes: Volume 1* (pp. 151–153). Cogito-Center.

30. Zuev, K. B. (2020). Scientometric analysis of the creative heritage of B.F. Lomov. In A. L. Zhuravlev & D. A. Kitova (Eds.), *Psychological research in Internet space: Search engines, social networks, electronic databases* (pp. 340–362). Institute of Psychology, Russian Academy of Sciences.

31. Zuev, K. B. (2022). The publishing series "Proceedings of Young Scientists of the Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences": A sociocultural and scientometric analysis. *Scientific Notes of the Institute of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, 2(4), 63–82. https://doi.org/10.38098/proceedings_2022_02_04_07

32. Zuev, K. B. (in press). Prospects for scientometric analysis of a scientist's personality and work. *Social Sciences and Humanities in the Far East*.

33. Zuev, K. B., & Morozov, P. V. (2016). Full-text electronic library "Psychological Journal. Archive 1980–1990": Opportunities for historical-psychological research. In A. L. Zhuravlev, V. A. Koltsova, & Yu. N. Oleinik (Eds.), *History of Russian and world psychological thought: Fates of scientists, dynamics of ideas, content of concepts* (pp. 73–79). Institute of Psychology, Russian Academy of Sciences.

34. Zuev, K. B., & Nestik, T. A. (2018). Bibliometric analysis of the development of main directions in psychological research (based on Web of Science data and Google search query statistics). In A. L. Zhuravlev & A. V. Yurevich (Eds.), *Psychological knowledge: Current state and prospects for development* (pp. 671–697). Institute of Psychology, Russian Academy of Sciences.

Цифровая история психологии в современной России

К.Б. Зуев

Институт психологии Российской академии наук, Москва, Россия

Резюме. *Актуальность.* Цифровизация науки актуализирует применение количественных методов в исторических дисциплинах. В истории психологии это направление, обозначаемое как «цифровая история психологии», находится в стадии активного формирования, требуя систематизации и анализа существующих практик, особенно в российском научном контексте. *Проблема.* Несмотря на растущее число исследований, использующих наукометрические подходы, отсутствует целостный анализ основных направлений, объектов и перспектив применения этих методов в российской историко-психологической науке. *Цель.* Выявить основные тенденции и систематизировать объекты применения наукометрических методов в рамках цифровой истории психологии в современной России. *Методы.* Проведён аналитический обзор (не систематический) публикаций, преимущественно выполненных сотрудниками Института психологии РАН и опубликованных в ведущих российских психологических журналах – «Психологический журнал» и «Вопросы психологии». *Результаты.* 1. Предложена авторская классификация объектов историко-психологического исследования, удобная для применения наукометрических методов: отдельное событие, персоналии, институции и коллективы, направления, национальная наука, наука в целом. 2. Продемонстрировано, что наукометрические методы применяются ко всем типам объектов, но в разной степени: наиболее активно – в исследованиях персоналий и направлений, наименее – в анализе единичных событий. 3. Обзор выявил ключевые «точки приложения» наукометрии и перспективы её развития, включая использование альтметрик, вебметрики, анализ архивных данных о кадрах и финансировании. *Заключение.* Интеграция наукометрии в историю психологии является динамичным процессом, способствующим большей доказательности исследований и обогащению самой наукометрии историческим контекстом. Полученные результаты подчёркивают необходимость теоретического осмысления специфического предмета цифровой истории психологии, в качестве которого могут выступить «доминанты развития науки» – системные структуры, операционализируемые через количественные показатели.

Ключевые слова: история психологии, цифровая история психологии, принцип доминанты

Information about the author

Konstantin B. Zuev, Researcher, Laboratory of the History of Psychology and Historical Psychology of Psychology of the Russian Academy of Sciences; 13/1 Yaroslavskaya St., 129366, Moscow, Russian Federation; ORCID: 0000-0003-1237-8169, e-mail: zuevkb@ipran.ru

Информация об авторе

Константин Борисович Зуев, научный сотрудник лаборатории истории психологии и исторической психологии, Институт психологии Российской академии наук; Российская Федерация, 129366, Москва, ул. Ярославская 13/1; ORCID: 0000-0003-1237-8169, e-mail: zuevkb@ipran.ru

Citation: Zuev, K.B. (2025). Digital History of Psychology in Modern Russia. *Natural Systems of Mind*, 5(3), 48-58. doi: 10.38098/nsom_2025_05_03_05