

Supplementary Information

Supplementary Table S1

Ponterotto's (2025) Handbook Considerations and Questions Opening Toward Autoethnography

Ponterotto's (2025) handbook consideration in the author's interpretation	Question opening toward AE
Psychobiographer–subject relationship	Why did this subject become significant?
Bias	What assumptions and emotional or interpretive biases shape the interpretation?
Countertransference	What resonances and “resistances” emerge?
Positionality	From what demographic, cultural, and personal position does the author speak? What similarities and differences exist between the author and the subject?
Ethical transparency	What needs to be made visible?
Methodological control	How can subjective involvement be examined?

Note. AE = autoethnography.

Supplementary Table S2

Reconstruction of Authorial Experiences and Their Subsequent Relevance to the HPM

Experience	Transformations	Subsequent HPM relevance
Beginning secondary school in the year of Hungary's political transition	Sensitivity to the historical change of positions	Life-course and historical position
Relationships with senior psychobiographers	Entry into the international PB space	Knowledge-production space; center–semi-periphery; legitimation
Reading Burnell	The transformation of implicit authorial presence into an explicit methodological factor	Author–subject relation; reflexivity; bias control
A colleague's retrospective comment	Recognition of the differing historical positions of the same author	Historical author; research-reflexive time

Note. HPM = Historical Positionality Matrix; PB = psychobiography. The colleague's comment is cited as a personal communication (Á. Bálint, personal communication, June 10, 2026). Used with permission.

Supplementary Table S3

Overview of the Historicity of Psychobiographical Interpretation

Element/status	Basis in the literature	Focal-case problem/trigger	Emergent claim	Consequence for the HPM
PB as a historically changing form of knowledge	• Changing subject range, theory, and methodology • Increasing context sensitivity and authorial visibility • Changing norms of legitimation and publication	• Journals, reviews, and rereading: changing questions and meanings • Not only a problem of theory application but also a problem of knowledge production	• Historical subject, historical author, and historical theory change over time • The system of relationships among the elements also changes over time • The knowledge-production space also changes over time	• A time axis in every dimension • Current PB norms • Temporal change in the relationships
Historical subject: changing position within their own life course	• Sociocultural, political, and historical context • Temporocentrism/anachronism • Source criticism and triangulation	• High life-course agency versus low narrative agency • Repeated historical disruption • Limited material and recognition-related convertibility of action outcomes	• Actually accessible alternatives • The form, degree, and cost of agency • The outcomes of actions resulting from agency and their structural convertibility • Historicization of autonomy and development • Sources as historically situated interpretations	• Historical period/life stage • Norms and institutional conditions • Structural room for maneuver and alternatives • Narrative agency, life-course agency, and the structural convertibility of action outcomes • The historical position of sources
Historical author: same person—different interpretive position	• Positionality, bias, and countertransference • Horizon of understanding • Journals, memos, controlled empathy, and reflexivity	• Earlier and later research phases: different readings of the same data • Review as a mediator and indicator of a different	• Biographical identity does not equal epistemic identity • Through metareflection, a new authorial position may become reconstructable	• Date/research phase • Life-course, professional, and disciplinary situation • Theoretical knowledge and question formulation

Element/status	Basis in the literature	Focal-case problem/trigger	Emergent claim	Consequence for the HPM
		readerly and interpretive norm • An anomaly that became recognizable only later	• Change as knowledge-production and history-of-knowledge data	• Relationship to the subject • Comparison of journals, memos, manuscript versions, and reviews • Linguistic, institutional, and publication position
Historical theory: a historical-cultural product of knowledge production	• Theory application • Multi-theoretical framework and theory triangulation • Critique of WEIRD universalism	• The applied theory in the focal case required analysis at multiple levels • The implicit and explicit conceptions of autonomy, development, and agency within the theory required reflection • Even after complementary cultural and historical-structural perspectives were included, a conceptual gap remained that required the TSS	• Descriptive fit does not equal contextual adequacy • The theory's own conception of the human being, development, autonomy, and agency • Application as translation and calibration • Partial insufficiency does not equal rejection	• Time, place, and discipline of origin • Empirical and cultural reference • WEIRD/non-WEIRD position • Implicit conception of the human being and agency • Explicitly stated cultural references and limits of validity, and their consideration by the person applying the theory • Levels of application • Calibration/supplementation
Historically changing knowledge-production space: the context and active structurer of the triad	• Internationalization of PB and WEIRD predominance • Changing institutional legitimation and publication space • Center–semi-periphery relations, academic dependency, and linguistic hierarchy	• The review process of an English-language journal in a central publication space • Emphasis on agency as an interpretive norm • Translation of local historical experience into the language of theories produced at the center	• Not a neutral background and not a fourth element of equal status • Structures which subjects become researchable and legitimate, as well as the questions, language, and forms of legitimation through which they are interpreted • The position of the reader/reviewer is part of knowledge production • A changing space produces new questions and new anomalies	• Center–semi-periphery relation • Institutions, resources, and networks • Language and conceptual translation • Legitimate subjects, theories, and questions • Journal, reviewer, and audience norms • Changes in the author's room for maneuver

Note. TSS = tragic semi-peripheral self. The literature basis summarized in the table draws primarily on research concerning the historical development and methodological norms of psychobiography, sociocultural and historical contextualization, authorial positionality and reflexivity, the cultural situatedness of theories, and the structural conditions of knowledge production. Principal sources include Alatas (2003), Burnell (2013), Demeter (2019), Henrich et al. (2010), Mayer et al. (2023), Ponterotto (2025), Runyan (2005), and Wallerstein (1997, 2010).

Supplementary Table S4**The Main Theoretical and Methodological Contributions of the HPM**

Area	Contribution of the HPM
PB	It treats the subject, the author, and the theory as historical within a single relational model and offers an analytical framework for documenting and reconstructing changes in their configuration.
PB–AE	It does not simply connect two methods but constructs a metalevel model of knowledge production.
Positionality	It does not list static authorial attributes but examines documentable position change.
Historicity	It connects historical time and research-reflexive time.
Theory application	It distinguishes and operationalizes descriptive fit, contextual adequacy, and application outcomes, and incorporates these into the examination of historical theory and the analysis of the subject–theory relation.
Agency	It distinguishes and relates to one another narrative agency, life-course agency, the historically available repertoire of choice, and the structural convertibility of action outcomes.
Knowledge production	It analyzes the review, language, the publication space, and center–semi-periphery dynamics as factors structuring the subject–author–theory triad in PB.