

CONSTRUCTIVIST TEACHING: BEYOND THE TOOLBOX, THE ICP EXPERIENCE

Massimo Giliberto, Chiara Lui, Elena Sagliocco

Institute of Constructivist Psychology, Padua, Italy

“Role” is a construct that emerges from Sociality (Kelly, 1955). What can we say about the role of the constructivist teacher? This article aims to present the Institute of Constructivist Psychology’s teaching experience, starting from the assumption that being a constructivist teacher is not just about applying a toolbox, but implies a role relationship with students that changes in real time. Students are invited to abandon passive roles and to embody the role of psychotherapists-in-training from the first session. The class is considered as a learning community where the psychotherapists-in-training are invited to creatively co-construct the boundaries within which their own learning possibilities take life.

Keywords: *sociality, role, teaching corollary, learning context.*

TO HAVE A ROLE OR TO BE A ROLE?

Sociality is a very significant, foundational topic, which is not merely a central notion in Personal Construct Theory (PCT), but also, and above all, a crucial issue in human affairs. Particularly now, in this period of global emigration, new nationalism, separateness and discrimination, and of a renewed privileging of mechanism in science and in psychology, we feel a lack of Sociality; an absence that highlights its importance. In fact, if we look at Sociality – as Kelly intended and in simple terms – as the attempt to understand the others’ viewing of the world through their eyes, this is not only the basis and the *focus of any relationship*, both personal and professional, but also the necessary *ethical foundation* to acknowledge the other as similar to us, a legitimate interlocutor, another human being, a person like us (Giliberto 2017; Stojnov 1996). So, *playing a role* means immersing ourselves in this attempt, starting from this fundamental *similarity* in order to understand other worlds, exploring *diversities*. In this respect, we believe, playing a role cannot be simply to play a part, *to have a role*, but – more precisely – it means *to be* a role, to embody a role through the sociality process.

As Kellian psychologists our constant and consistent attempt is to understand the others’

personal vision of the world and themselves, working with ourselves reflexively in this process of knowledge. This is the humanistic principle that distinguishes us, we think, from other ‘dehumanized’ psychologies that are seeking to put people into different boxes¹. In our opinion, this approach applies – thinking solely in professional terms – in our reciprocal relationships both in the therapy room and in teaching.

Sociality, understanding the other’s personal vision, putting ourselves in their shoes, is fundamental from the PCT perspective. Nevertheless, apparently, it is not what always happens. For instance, every time we avoid (consciously or not) the effort to understand the other’s point of view in order to maintain our personal vision of things, we fail in the attempt to extend our sociality. This seems a common experience in our daily life, even between us as colleagues who are supposed to be ‘expert’ in this. Sometimes, it might be easier – we guess – *to have* a role instead of *to be* a role.

¹ As ‘humanistic psychology’ we intend a perspective that looks at the whole person, not only from the psychologist’s view, but also from the point of view of people observing their own behaviour, rather than categorizing groups of people with similar features or problems.

The teaching corollary

Concerning our field of interest, ‘teacher’ can be just a label given to a construct. So, the same label could have many meanings, expressing many possibilities and directions for our actions. For instance, it is self-evident that *having a role of teacher* is different from *being a teacher*, at least in the light of the sociality process: rather than thinking about their own role – consciously or not – as the one who is just interested in transmitting content, a teacher – from our perspective – is intrinsically involved in the attempt to understand the personal outlook of their student in order to co-construct the knowledge, sharing the constructive enterprise. In other words, and paraphrasing Kelly, we can imagine a possible Teaching Corollary:

To the extent that a ‘teacher’ construes the learning processes of a student, s/he may be able to play a role as a teacher in a social process involving the student.

So, if being a teacher seems to be a challenge, being a constructivist teacher seems to be a further, stronger step. We can teach, from a position of sociality, many subjects without ever relating to them. I can study the seabed and the ocean floor without the experience of diving. In the same way I can study constructivism and PCT without ever meeting them. It is certainly possible. It happens. But, above all, for practitioners, does it make sense? Is there a difference between simply studying this theory, and learning PCP by living it? If we accept the idea that constructing means, at the same time, *acting, knowing* and *being* – an embodied knowledge – we have to consider that to teach the practice of constructivism without practicing constructivism, seems at the very least paradoxical.

But, what does it mean *to be a constructivist teacher*? Moreover, what kind of learning context is consistent with this attempt? What are its presumptions and implications?

TEACHING CONSTRUCTIVISM VS. BEING A CONSTRUCTIVIST TEACHER

As Massimo Giliberto and Mary Frances discussed in the European Personal Constructivist Association conference in 2014,

The ‘true constructivist teacher’ doesn’t exist. Nevertheless, maybe it is possible to think about teaching constructivism in terms of coherence, where coherence means accordance, consistency between the constructivist presuppositions and actions (Giliberto & Frances, 2014).

And, different implications and methods arise from the two main ways to teach: an established educational practice and a constructivist-oriented practice. Is it possible to teach constructivism as we do any other subject? Of course, as we already said, yes, it is:

In this case, constructivism seems to be handed out like a ‘reality data’, something that has to be taught to students as information. Teacher and constructivism are two separate entities, but the first is full of knowledge about the second. There is nothing right or wrong in this; the teacher may not be working within this approach but may simply be describing and illustrating it, with no other professional goal (ibidem).

On the other hand, in a constructivist-oriented practice, the constructivist teacher has to renounce the presumption of an objective collection of facts and data to teach, and be aware that the ‘reality of teaching and learning’ is a co-constructed experience shared with students.

This means that in no case constructivism can be transferred as a fact, or worse, as a truth. Consequently, the teacher cannot consider themselves as a true constructivist teacher, but as an imperfect attempt – as teacher – to be coherent with their assumptions. Why imperfect? Because imperfection, or the awareness of the imperfection, renews the idea that ‘the teacher’ is also a construct, a changing anticipation, within a lived relationship. Being a constructivist teacher is a process, not a state or a statement. As a dancer, this teacher will not simply explain the dance to students, but will dance with them, embodying

the theory and searching for coherence between teaching – as relational and experimental process – and contents (ibidem).

Here we are, in the middle of the topic: sociality, as a way to play a role, or better, to be a role in a social relationship.

THE NOTION OF “ROLE”: BEYOND THE TOOLBOX

The Sociality Corollary is the ‘cornerstone’ of PCT in which Kelly shows the process that makes relationships with other people possible. Nevertheless Kelly doesn’t indicate in any way which kind of role we must play, nor does he make distinctions between one role and another. The content of a role is given by the point of view we choose in relation to other people. Role and relationship become inseparable and they can’t be defined outside the experience of shared construction within the relationship. In this way, when we talk about role constructs we do not mean a set of tools we use in order to orient ourselves in relationships. We are instead describing the construction of a process, which takes form in that time and in that relationship and is jointly elaborated. PCT is a theory strictly focused on processes: in every single moment, our experience is channelized by anticipations construed through the replications of events. In every single moment our experience is an elaboration of the way we construe events and, at the same time, a process of channelizing new anticipations. In other words, we continuously elaborate both what we have been and what we will be. Therefore, talking about roles without considering what happens in every single moment within the relationship is nonsense. Being a friend, a parent, a lover, a sister acquires its meaning only through the lived experience we have in a relationship.

In order to make it possible to define ourselves through these roles, we need, in our opinion, three tightly linked things:

- a. The choice (and the responsibility) of our point of view;
- b. Someone else who chooses to play a role compatible with ours;
- c. A relationship that allows us that experience.

In this way, when we choose to be a constructivist teacher we can’t overlook some questions: who is a student for us? Is it possible to see teaching and learning as two faces of the same coin, two different ways to read the same process? Which kind of experiences can we facilitate with students and between them? As Balzani, Del Rizzo and Sandi wrote:

Learning, that is the change in students’ constructions, takes place through experience. So the classroom becomes a laboratory in which continuous experimentations take place. Adapting Kelly’s scientist metaphor (Kelly, 1991a/1955, p. 4) to this context, we can say that teachers and students co-construe a series of shared experiments. Teachers, as supervisors of students’ experiments, have the responsibility of facilitating the students’ path to both personal and professional growth by proposing specifically designed experiments, construing an environment that can promote different kinds of interactions between students, by valuing students’ proposals and initiatives (Balzani, Del Rizzo & Sandi, 2011, p. 173).

In the light of this, our focus and responsibility is on the possibility of playing a role, and also the responsibility of the point of view we choose in order to act within our relationships. If we want to embody sociality we have to consider our point of view as just one of many possibilities, but, at the same time, we have to identify it as the one we prefer. The link between these two positions sometimes makes role relationships difficult. If we overlook one or both of these aspects we can risk embodying a relativistic point of view that doesn’t allow us to act within the relationship, or we may attempt to structure other people without understanding them.

As teachers we always have to be careful of this kind of risk. In this way our theory is not just a theory to teach and assist others to learn, but it becomes the point of view from which we choose to look at our students, to understand teaching and learning, and to act as teachers. Everything we do within the relationship with our students has to be consistent with it. Everything we do as teachers, the way we look at our students, the way we answer their questions, the way we choose to organize lessons or the school

itself becomes the way we embody theory, the way we *are* a role. Starting from this assumption we can talk about the Institute of Constructivist Psychology (ICP) experience as the way we choose to live as teachers, the way we try to be teachers.

LEARNING CONTEXTS AND PROFESSIONAL IDENTITIES: VOICES FROM WITHIN

If a ‘role’ is constitutive of every relationship, then any relationship is possible only in a ‘context’. We can think of the context merely as a backdrop, the scenery within which we act, or we can construe it as something more like the many possible directions we can travel in a city, as a variety and choice of borders and possibilities in which we could play a role.

What we have just affirmed about the notion of ‘role’ can be referred also to the notion of context, that is: is it possible to think about a didactic context (a school) as a constructivist context in terms of consistency between the constructivist presuppositions and the way in which the same context is understood and organized? It is usual to think of a context as ‘out there’, as an objective datum or a place to go, that determines and at least influences our actions but cannot be influenced by us. However, in PCP terms, the ‘context’ is seen as something that cannot exist outside the experience of those who live and generate it. It is not a collection of data, a reality that objectively exists ‘out there’ as *a place* to go. Instead, it can be thought of as a way, *a path*, an experience we go through while we live (in) it. Context is the set of constructions we use to give meaning to particular circumstances in a particular moment. Following this perspective, it is a hermeneutical frame to move from and within. It becomes the possible narrative where everyone can choose a position, giving sense to him/herself. Our social identities can emerge in social exchanges and be channelized by the meaningful contexts we move in.

Every training enterprise – like a school or even a family – is grounded on certain assumptions upon which the context is built, giving form to actions that channelize identities. Considering the learning context where students are

trained to become psychotherapists, could a specific context channelize a particular kind of professional identity?

A short survey

We have shared and discussed this question with the Institute of Constructivist Psychology (ICP) psychotherapists-in-training² from three classes (I, II, III year), elaborating it through works in little groups, ‘fish boxes’,³ and open discussions that everyone has contributed to, teacher included⁴. During this short survey our psychotherapists-in-training have based their arguments on their direct experiences both of a ‘traditional school’ (from the Primary School to the University) and ICP learning context. As a result of this comparison, two types of ‘school context’ have been described.

The school as services provider

Participants have described at first the context of a traditional school, a model considered the most common in our culture and that even pervades academic circles, in their opinion. This context has been described as a ‘service provider’ and is based on the idea that knowledge is a collection of notions that teachers have to pass to their students.

Our three groups of participants elicited and shared mainly four criteria:⁵

- a. Dependency relationships – “I pay, you have to give me services and skills”, but also “I completely depend on your judgment”.

² Being active ‘psychotherapists-in-training’ is the way in which we invite people to think themselves instead of ‘passive students’.

³ The ‘fish box’ is a technique used in order to facilitate the discussion in a group. Two people start to discuss about an issue at the centre of a bigger group. Everyone has something to say comes into the group of contributors.

⁴ The survey sample was made up of about fifty male and female students.

⁵ A classroom defined the criteria of this learning context, in a nutshell, as ‘marketing-oriented’.

- b. Performance in the learning process – “The more exactly I reproduce professor’s contents, the more I am a good student”.
- c. Competition between colleagues.
- d. Power as domination and mastership.

This learning context is described as well and is strictly hierarchically organized. Space and time, like activities, are severely controlled. Therefore, sharing with our students the idea that these pre-suppositions are constructs, actions, paths along which we anticipate and move, we asked them what kind of professional identity, particularly as psychotherapist, they think could be channelized through a learning context like this?

Summarizing the answers of the three groups, a professional identity profile emerges which is essentially self-referential if not unfulfilled. Students – coherently with criteria they found – describe a practitioner who will be (or try to be) a performer, using a pedagogical approach in therapy, pursuing hierarchical positions of power, who is competitive instead of collaborative, engaged in defending him/herself from failure and invalidation while, vice versa, he/she will be particularly focused on a professional successful career where earning money can be a direct pointer of success and self-realization.

The school as possibilities provider (or ideas incubator)

Starting from their experience of ICP learning context – that is the way in which it is organized, the role students experience in the relationship with teacher, and the way of teaching – participants have identified in this an alternative to previous model of the school as ‘services provider’. Participants have named this kind of learning context ‘possibilities provider’ or also ‘ideas incubator’. The ICP model is perceived and described as a global learning event so that not just the lessons, but every action and activity have to be thought as a formative opportunity. Across all three groups of participants the idea is shared that – from a constructivist point of view – looking at students and teachers as ‘scientists’ actively construing the meaning of their world. The focus of the learning process is not only on the theory and notions but also on the network of

relationships, activities, experiences and meanings we can construe within a system. Students, describing this context as ‘narrative’ and ‘participatory’ – instead of merely ‘instructive’ – have named these criteria:

- a. Role playing.
- b. Agency.
- c. Collaboration and participation.
- d. Power as responsibility.
- e. Self-reflexivity.

The psychotherapists-in-training have described this kind of model as process orientated and focused on experience, where the school becomes, from their point of view, a possibility to act, to create, to be determinative. From a school as ‘services provider’ we deal, in this alternative context, with a school as ‘possibilities provider’.

According to participants, the professional identity profile that could be channelized by this kind of learning context should be focused on: being participative and collaborative, being a ‘creative explorer’, a ‘transformer’ instead of performer, aware of connections between systems, self-reflexive and responsible. Moreover, far from being taken for granted just because of a role position, power is linked to the responsibility of being a teacher or a psychotherapist, of creating something that can be useful to share in the same context which everyone contributes to generating. To say this with the psychotherapists-in-training words:

“We directly manage projects and services in order to develop our skills and our own professional identity. In doing things we produce knowledge. Culture is produced, not re-produced”.

And again:

“I have a power to the extent that I have responsibilities and competences within a context. It means that, if I change the context where I don’t have the same responsibility and competence, I am like everyone else”.

Finally, we think that as teachers we have the responsibility not only for our skills, for our baggage of notions, but also in order to promote actions, experiences, and practices consistent

both with our presuppositions and related criteria, and with the kind of professional identity we would favour. According to Mary Frances:

We cannot easily slip into constructivist practice in a traditional teaching environment and assume that students understand what is happening or can make good sense (and good learning) from (Giliberto & Frances, 2014).

In other words, we are responsible also for the learning context we co-create with our students.

THE ICP EXPERIENCE

At this juncture, it seems necessary to better clarify the way in which the ICP School is organized and works. It is a graduate school of psychotherapy recognized by the Italian Minister of Education, Research and University, which lasts for four years. Students are organized in classes of a maximum of 20 members. The school runs four classes per year and is now in its 15th year. Each group meets together once a month, for three days of training on the weekend. Between these meetings, students have to do a practical training in a clinical setting, at least for one hundred and forty hours per year.

Each class is led by three teachers of psychotherapy – that is considered the theory-oriented part – and many professors from other subjects. There is also one learner-teacher, who is a psychotherapist already graduated who begins his/her training to become a constructivist trainer in psychotherapy and follows a group through its four years journey⁶. This is the structure of the

⁶ It is important to understand the presence and role of learner-teachers: they are generally construed by the group as closer to the students than the teachers, but at the same time, they are psychotherapists already trained. Also, they are present during all weekends, collaborating with each teacher, so they represent a sort of ‘link’ between the training sessions led by different teachers. Of course, how learner-teachers are construed – as well as the teachers and the group itself – is something that develops and changes during the four year journey of each training group.

school in brief. But, in which concrete ways does this school try to be a living laboratory of PCT?

The school as a global learning event

We can start by saying that the didactic experience is not exiled to the classroom and to the moment of the lesson: the whole school, the way in which it is organized and open to the students’ initiatives is considered as a didactic space. The physical core of the school is a little library in which students and teachers have the possibility to meet each other and organize activities every day. Many activities are managed directly by students themselves. They are invited to be active and creative, following the lines of research they feel more personally involved in. They are also invited to share and to verify their ideas and their clinical experience as therapists, not only in the classroom, but also between one lesson and another. They are helped in all these challenges by people that work in the Research and Documentation Centre and in the Clinical Centre of the School, Centres that they themselves inhabit and mainly manage. ‘Participation’ and ‘experience’ are two keywords. Sharing a constructive enterprise is the lighthouse.

From passive students to psychotherapists-in-training

From the very first day of their training, as we already underlined, students are invited to leave the clothes of ‘passive students’ and to wear those of ‘psychotherapists-in-training’, considering themselves as active constructors of their own learning experience⁷.

With their long-term background of traditional education, it is not easy nor quick for ICP students to abandon their usual constructions of themselves, and of a teacher as someone distant, an expert, a person full of knowledge, to listen to

⁷ In a metaphor, the learning process of a ‘traditional’ student is like a ‘jukebox’ experience. Pre-order the contents, insert coins, and give the teachers what they want to hear. The more accurate the reproduction of the contents, the more adequate the student is considered.

as a sort of ‘guru’. Instead, we invite them to treat teachers as colleagues, with more experience in psychotherapy, but still colleagues. We invite them to assume as quickly as possible a new view, embodying the role of psychotherapist (in training, of course) and working from the very first time as if they have to practice immediately. This implies embodying self-reflexivity and responsibility for their own professional identity without delegating to the teachers the task of giving answers to their questions, but construing them together.

As in psychotherapy practice with clients, also in training we consider questions to be the main tools to elicit trainees’ personal construct systems. It means challenging what appears obvious, inquiring what’s implicit and making it explicit, eliciting premises and dimensions of constructs related to the main topics which the role of psychotherapist is grounded in – such as the idea of ‘person’, ‘disease’, ‘diagnosis’, ‘help’, ‘therapy’, ‘change’... It means increasing consciousness and self-reflexivity on how everyone construes their world as practitioners of a helping relationship, in order to elicit the starting point of each trainee and of the class as a group.

Kelly, in a passionate lecture given at the University of Puerto Rico in 1958, referring to the role of the university professor, punctuates some topics that in our opinion can be particularly relevant to our topic, and that perfectly fit with the role of the teacher in psychotherapy training. He says:

While in high school there were declarative sentences ending with full stops and often with exclamation marks, in the university, nearly all of the sentences are implicitly sentences which start with a question mark, so there is the implied inflexion of the question mark in everything that is said...I suppose another way of saying the same thing is that you teach students in the university how to ask questions whereas the high school has often tried to teach them how to give answers or to regurgitate answers, to throw them back out of their mouths. Now the task is to teach them how to ask questions...There’s another shift, and this is a hard one for many a professor to make. It is a shift from controlling students, from managing them, to challenging them. It is the shift in the role of the profes-

sor...Basically, this is a problem of taking people who come as students, and changing them into colleagues (Kelly, 2003)

The group as a learning community and laboratory of relationship

Then, Kelly goes on underlining the importance of inviting students to establish new relationships with their own colleagues:

I think one of the great tasks of the university is to create a kind of community in which a great deal of education goes on between students, to create a climate of interactive scholarship, so students know which other students to go to in order to get help on something. For if you depend upon education to take place in the classroom or in the library, or at home at the desk, you are missing one of the great resources of education (Kelly, 2003).

In ICP, the group is construed as a learning community, a concrete laboratory of relationships, where the psychotherapists-in-training are invited to consider themselves, their colleagues and the teachers as human beings personally and reciprocally engaged in co-construing their shared experience. Before working with clients and in order to train in the psychotherapist role, the colleagues in the group and their mutual interactions are the best opportunity to experience and act in relationship as the matrix of experiments of change they want to learn to design with their future clients. Moreover, it is the best opportunity to learn and practice reading human interactions as processes, applying constructivist assumptions and PCP professional constructs.

Thus, the assumption of personal and mutual responsibility for the training journey is an invitation that begins from the very first weekend and goes on through the whole experience of the four years. And, it emerges together with creativity and alternative construing: for example, instead of imposing rules on the training group focusing on the boundaries more than on the possibilities, we ask them to imagine what kind of experience is the best to share in order to reach their common goal. Alternative thinking means asking the group questions like: What are

the best conditions of experience we can share to design this training journey and keep on? What are the possibilities that you want to experience together here? And only after having focused on opportunities and possibilities, we ask: So, what rules and boundaries do we need to share to reach our goals?

Above all experience

An ongoing effort of proposing all the contents through an experiential methodology characterizes all the training, theoretical contents included. Basically, because we believe that PCP is a theory for and about people and their ways of living, so content becomes easy to understand when it reveals its inner experiential code. Experience and practice is the main way to make PCP contents meaningful. If this is meaningful for the trainees, and if PCP becomes a useful lens to understand first of all their own experiences, and they find in a PCP perspective that fertile view of themselves and people they're with, we can guess that during the training, PCP will become a useful theory for their clinical and professional practice too.

So, the journey begins...

From the teachers' point of view, the macro-cycle of experience of the four years of training deals with the kind of experience they want to promote in each group, taking into particular account the typical system of constructs in movement that every group has in its self-organization.

The first year is dedicated 'to dismantle without destroying' the students' epistemological assumptions whilst, at the same time, opening them up to constructivist assumptions. The second year focuses on orienting the students in formulating a constructivist diagnosis. In the third year, teachers are engaged in being 'a benchmark, without bottling up' the students' aggressiveness. The fourth year is dedicated 'to define and release' the students in their career (Balzani, Del Rizzo & Sandi, 2011).

The experience cycle goes on during the course of each year. Since action is knowledge,

anticipations become conditions of experience designed to invite students to give shape to their own venture of learning. Investment, encounter and revision represent an ongoing process, lived moment by moment in the relationship within the group training.

The revision phase can occur in every moment the group is meeting together, since it depends on each person's anticipations and runs along the boundaries and possibilities of the network of relationships between students and teachers. Nevertheless, there are some particular moments dedicated to revision, in the middle of the year and at its end. To increase self-reflexivity, the psychotherapists-in-training are invited to give their self-evaluation, followed by the teachers' one. We ask them to focus on their movement related to those aspects of themselves particularly involved in the construction of the therapist role. They focus on their own improvement points and are invited also to take care of the movement of their colleagues, sharing the responsibility to grow as future psychotherapists.

CONCLUSIONS

The theory of constructivism states that learning is non-linear, recursive, continuous, complex and relational. We can say more: the process of learning is always a mix between teaching and learning in which we are continuously immersed, even if with different responsibilities. This seems to be our concrete experience whether we think *we have the role* of teacher or *we try to be* a teacher; whether we believe ourselves disconnected from the context or we feel ourselves as active part of that. Through our actions we, at same time, learn and teach; we are teacher and learner, maybe just for ourselves. This awareness – from our point of view – obliges us to self-reflexively practice sociality, in the terms used by George Kelly, and this not like a toolbox, but as an existential effort to live and stay in relation with others. Holding this in mind, we have tried to illustrate how we are attempting to be both a teacher and part of a context, consistent with constructivist and Kellian presuppositions.

Of course, what we have shown so far is just our interpretation about what a constructivist school could be, it's just one of the possible ways to be constructivist teachers, not better or worse than others but the one we have chosen, the one we have to be responsible for.

The aspects we presented so far are just examples of how we chose to answer, from our very first experience to today, the questions we asked ourselves: how should a constructivist psychotherapy school be, consistent with its premises? What kind of experience should it facilitate? And again, how could a constructivist teacher embody these premises?

To embody Sociality, both in our professional and personal life, we have to pay attention to what happens in our relationships; we have to consider our interpretation of the others not as a way to read an ontological reality but as construction of meanings that take form within the relationship. Saying this with Kelly:

If I fail to invest in a role, and relate myself to you only mechanically, then the only thing that disconfirmation can teach me is that the organism I presume you to be is not wired up to produce the behaviours I thought it would, just as my typewriter does not always behave in the way I expect it to...And if I insist on construing you as I do my typewriter, I shall probably take my predictive failures as an indication only that I should look to see if there isn't 'a screw loose somewhere' in you. Or perhaps I shall wonder if I haven't 'struck the wrong key', or if something hasn't 'gotten into your works', like a 'motive' or a 'need', for example. I may even conclude that you are a brand of 'typewriter' that has been badly put together. Certainly if this is the way I go about concluding my experiential cycle, I can scarcely claim that I have engaged myself in a social process. Mine might be the kind of experience that gets the commonwealth's work done, but it would not be the sort that builds viable societies (Kelly, 2003).

In conclusion, if it may be possible to teach and to learn PCP and constructivism without ever meeting them, we are involved in a very different journey in which Constructivism and Sociality are both the way and the destination.

REFERENCES

- Balzani, L., Del Rizzo, F. & Sandi, F. (2011). The journey as constructivist learner-teachers: how to become teachers of constructivist psychotherapy. In Stojnov, D., Džinović, V., Pavlović, J. & Frances, M. (Eds). *Personal Construct Psychology in an accelerating world*. (pp. 169 - 180). Belgrade: Serbian Constructivist Association, EPCA Publications.
- Giliberto, M. (2017). Per un'etica esperienziale e non normativa. *Rivista Italiana di Costruttivismo*, 5(2), 9-27.
- Giliberto, M. & Frances, M. (2014). Constructivist teaching or being a constructivist teacher? Paper presented at the XIIth biennial conference of the European Personal Construct Association, Brno, Praha - Czech Republic.
- Kelly, G. A. (1955/1991). *The psychology of personal constructs* (vol. 1-2). New York, NY: Norton. 2nd Edition, London: Routledge, 1991.
- Kelly, G. A. (1958/2003). Teacher-Student relations at University level. In Fransella, F. (Ed.), *International Handbook of Personal Construct Psychology*, (pp. 295-302). Chichester: Wiley & Sons.
- Stojnov, D. (1996). Kelly's theory of ethics: Hidden, mislaid, or misleading. *Journal of Construct Psychology*, 9(3), 185-199.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Massimo Giliberto is Director of the graduate School of Constructivist Psychotherapy of the Institute of Constructivist Psychology (ICP) in Padua (Italy). He is a practicing psychotherapist and acts as consultant and coach for private companies and organizations. The focus of interest in his work concerns psychotherapy, epistemology, ethics, didactic method and cross-cultural psychology.

He is a co-founder of the European Constructivist Training Network, member of the editorial boards of the *Journal of Personal Construct Theory and Practice* and of the *Journal of Constructivist Psychology* and editor of the *Rivista Italiana di Costruttivismo*.

Contact: giliberto@icp-italia.it

Chiara Lui is a constructivist psychologist and psychotherapist, teacher at the Institute of Constructivist Psychology in Padua, Executive Director of the *Rivista Italiana di Costruttivismo*,

Beyond the toolbox: The ICP experience

Programme Manager of *ICP International Lab*, and member of the council of *Società Italiana di Costruttivismo*. She works with people and their relationships, constantly trying to translate constructivist premises into experiences and opportunities for change. As a psychotherapist she meets every day with adults, adolescents and families. She works also as consultant, trainer and supervisor of other professionals and associations in the context of helping relationships.

Contact: chiaralui@gmail.com

Elena Sagliocco is a constructivist psychologist and free-lance psychotherapist, and a teacher at the Institute of Constructivist Psychology of Padua. As a psychotherapist she works with adults in individual and couple psychotherapy. She is also a trainer and supervisor in helping relationship contexts, and in particular she has had a long professional experience in the field of psycho-oncology and end-of-life care.

Contact: e.sagliocco@gmail.com

REFERENCE

Giliberto, M., Lui, C., Sagliocco, E. (2019). Constructivist teaching: Beyond the toolbox, the ICP experience. *Personal Construct Theory & Practice*, 16, 32-41

Received: 9 January 2019 – Accepted: 25 June 2019 – Published: 10 November 2019