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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Chapter I provides an overview of this study and its setting, rationale, and analytical framework. The chapter concludes with a brief description of the research methodology employed in this study and the limitations of this study.

Overview of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the process of construct change and development during a cross-cultural experience. The people involved in this experience were five Polish social scientists-teacher educators.

The Polish educators' cross-cultural experience took place during a 14 week project at the Mershon Center of The Ohio State University. The goal of the project was to design a preservice teacher education course dealing with schools in a democratic society.

---

1 The Mershon Center is a privately endowed multi-disciplinary organization at The Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. The Center is concerned with education and research on foreign policy, international security, and civic education. This project was carried out through the Citizenship Development for a Global Age Program.
An assumed responsibility of schools in a democratic society is educating students for democratic citizenship. Changes in the five Polish educators' constructions of this responsibility during their cross-cultural experience was at the heart of this study.

While describing their cross-cultural experience, I sought to interpret the process of "how" and the reasons "why" any possible changes occurred in the Polish educators' constructions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. These changes may have occurred during the mutual shaping process that takes place through social interaction. Assuming change to be the case, the following question emerged: What changes took place in the Polish educators' constructs, and what were the contributing factors during this cross-cultural phenomenon? This question guided my study.

A theoretical framework based in constructivist cognitive psychology (Kelly, 1955) supported my inquiry, as I attempted to develop grounded assertions based upon the educators' interpretation of their experiences. I searched

---

2 According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the term "mutual shaping" or "mutual simultaneous shaping" is one of naturalistic inquiry's basic axioms. This axiom is noted later in this chapter and is explicated further in Chapter III. However, it is necessary to define briefly this term due to its use throughout this chapter: "The interaction has no directionality, no need to produce that particular outcome . . . ; it simply "happened" as a product of the interaction—the mutual shaping" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 151-152).
for these interpretations through a naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Rationale for the Study

The rationale for this study was twofold. First, Eastern and Central European Ministries of Education are seeking collaborative efforts with American institutions as they redefine their educational systems. This study may provide information to Ministries interested in cross-cultural projects designed specifically for reconsidering citizenship education since the fall of communism. Second, the study may contain valuable lessons for American institutions and policy-makers as they contemplate developing similar collaborative projects with the former communist nations of Eastern and Central Europe.

Setting of the Study

The setting of this study was the cross-cultural portion of a collaborative effort between the Mershon Center and the Polish Ministry of National Education. This ongoing effort is in response to the need for democratic citizenship education in post-communist Poland.

In September, 1990, a chance meeting in Washington, D.C., between the Associate Director of the Mershon Center and an official from the Polish Ministry of National Education, signaled the beginning of a joint effort to
enhance and accelerate education for democratic citizenship in Poland. A proclamation signed in August, 1991, by The Ohio State University's President, the Mershon Center's Director, and the Director of the Center's Citizenship Development for a Global Age Program committed the University to a collaborative project between the Center and the Polish Ministry of National Education.

The primary, long-range goal of the ongoing "Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland" project is to "help Polish educators promote the development of democracy in Poland through the education of succeeding generations of Polish youth to be active, competent citizens committed to democratic values" (Proclamation, August 6, 1991). The Ministry and the Center designated immediate objectives in support of the primary, long-range goal. The objectives included the development of a civic education curriculum and supportive instructional materials for primary and secondary schools, the preparation of civic education teachers and teacher educators, and the establishment of Centers for Civic and Economic Education across Poland.

Specifically, this study focused on project efforts related to teacher education in a developing democratic society. From September 14, 1992, to December 22, 1992, five Polish educators were in residence at the Mershon Center at The Ohio State University. Their charge was to
develop the curriculum for a preservice teacher education course entitled "Schools and Democratic Society."³

The Polish educators were to prepare the rationale, objectives, bibliography, and student readings for a two-semester course on the principles of democracy as they apply to the organization and operation of schools in Poland. The Polish Ministry of National Education hopes that the course will be required of all preservice teacher education students in Poland.

At the start of my second year of doctoral studies at The Ohio State University, I was assigned to the teacher education segment of the project as a Graduate Research Associate. This appointment began in the summer of 1992. It was my job to oversee the administration of the program. Although not involved directly in the development or teaching of the seminars for the Polish educators, I was responsible for facilitating their work during their stay in the United States. In this capacity, my responsibility was to help them meet their needs from the time of their arrival to the time of their departure. This responsibility included, but was not restricted to, arranging transportation, scheduling scholarly and recreational activities, disbursing stipends, chaperoning, and attending

³ In May, 1994, the course title was changed. Now, the course is entitled "The School in Democratic Society." However, during the cross-cultural aspect of the project the title remained "Schools and Democratic Society", and, therefore, is kept as such throughout this report.
to all emergency needs of the educators. In this capacity, I was in continuous contact with the educators as they lived and worked in the United States for 14 weeks.

The Research Questions

In line with the intentions of the Polish Ministry of National Education and the Mershon Center, the goal expressed by the *Curriculum Seminar: "Schools and Democratic Society"* (1992) held at The Ohio State University was to provide a team of five Polish educators with the training, instructional materials, background readings, field experiences, and assistance from expert consultants they need to develop a complete first draft of a Course Syllabus for a two-semester college course on "Schools and Democratic Society." (p. 1)

My investigation centered on the experiences of the five Polish educators as they sought to carry out their charge.

During the course of the study, the following questions emerged:

- Assuming the Polish educator's constructions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship changed during their intensive cross-cultural experience, what were these changes?

- Which cross-cultural experiences of the Polish educators delimited their constructs of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship?

- How did the Polish educators' previous constructs blend with their cross-cultural environment and shape their construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship?
Theoretical Framework for Analysis

Rationale

The theoretical framework I chose for this study is based on constructivist cognitive psychology. There were three reasons for this decision.

The fundamental reason for this choice is that this approach to psychology undergirds naturalistic inquiry—the research paradigm of this study. Both constructivist cognitive psychologists and naturalistic inquirers try to "do justice to the internal world of the person" (Pope, 1982). The open question for constructivist psychology and naturalistic inquiry is not whether reality exists, but what people make of it. The ontological assumption of an unknown reality does not preclude its existence. This assumption "contends that all we know of the world are human interpretations of our experience of the world" (Bednar, Cunningham, Duffy, & Perry, 1991). In turn, the naturalistic paradigm adapts more readily than traditional approaches to the cross-cultural phenomena under investigation, with particular respect to the number of respondents and the development of individual case studies.

Second, constructivist cognitive psychology afforded a wide range of possibilities for understanding and portraying the mutual shaping of the construct under investigation—the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Unlike the causal relationships and generalizations sought
by other forms of psychological and sociological analysis, constructivist cognitive psychology explores the idiosyncrasy of our personal constructs in order to find working assertions within particular contexts.

Third, in addition to linear causality and generalization, determinist theoretical frameworks from cross-cultural psychology and social psychology draw predominantly from the notion of unobtrusive observation and methods (Berry, 1980). As a participant observer, my approach to this study begged a constructivist framework.

**Overview**

In the main currents of Western thought, the notion of constructivist cognitive psychology is rooted in the epistemological discourse over the determinant of cognition—nature versus nurture. Immanuel Kant believed that the basis of human knowledge is to be found in innate ideas or axioms that exist a priori to any environmental experience. Ruch and Zimbardo (1971) summarized the notions of Thomas Hobbes, who, a century before Kant, eschewed this nativist position with the argument that "sensations and experience are the source of all knowledge, and that memory and imagination are decaying sense impressions held together by association" (p. 112). Locke (1690/1894) was a proponent of Hobbes' theory. He concluded that humankind was born with a *tabula rasa*, a sort of blank tape on which experience makes its mark.
In this century, neo-pragmatists have echoed the nurturing aspect of perceptual and intellectual growth by noting the historicist position—a position steeped in Dewey's (1925, 1934, 1938) notion that experience is at the base of all human knowledge. Rorty (1989) captured the neo-pragmatist's position:

[Historicist thinkers] have denied that there is such a thing as "human nature" or the "deepest level of self." Their strategy has been to insist that socialization, and thus historical circumstance, goes all the way down—that there is nothing "beneath" socialization or prior to history which is definatory of the human. (p. xii)

Consequently, idiosyncratic constructions of our previous experiences form the basis of how we perceive and order the phenomena around us. According to constructivist cognitive psychology, changes in our constructions occur when we are confronted by experiences that do not fit our construct systems (Piaget, 1952, 1957; Kelly, 1955).

Constructivist cognitive psychologists consider our conceptualization of the world as a process of mutual simultaneous shaping between the individual and his or her environment and not necessarily a behavioral response of the human mind to extant reality. This process precludes the existence of a static universe. In his *magnum opus* entitled *The Psychology of Personal Constructs*, Kelly (1955) linked this notion to the idiosyncratic interpretation or construction of experience. He based his personal construct theory on the following epistemological assumption: "We
assume that all of our present interpretations of the universe are subject to revision or replacement" (Kelly, 1955, p. 15). He called this view "constructive alternativism." This assumption, its basic theoretical postulate, and pertinent accompanying corollaries operated as the theoretical framework for this study.¹

The five Polish educators engaged in a directed cross-cultural experience. This sort of directed experience is what Dewey (1916) meant by education in general, and Martorella (1991) dichotomized into formal and informal experience. Since constructivist cognitive psychology, particularly personal construct theory, leans heavily on the nurturing of constructs through personal experience, its application to the directed cross-cultural experiences examined in this study was an appropriate approach to viewing data gathered through qualitative means.

Methodology

This study was a naturalistic inquiry, not only because naturalistic inquiry fit with epistemological beliefs indicated by the theoretical framework of constructivist

¹ The implications of Kelly's (1955) psychology of personal constructs for this study are elaborated in the review of the literature. For the moment, however, it is useful to note his "Fundamental Postulate: A person's processes are psychologically channelized by the way in which he [sic] anticipates events" (p. 46) and his "Individuality Corollary: Persons differ from each other in their construction of events" (p. 55).
cognitive psychology, but also because my inquiry process was obtrusively interactive. I sought context bound hypotheses, and I searched for understanding through the process of mutual shaping. In addition, this study emanated from my belief that there are multiple realities of the same phenomenon, and these realities are constructed socially (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

**Hermeneutic Approach**

"Hermeneutics characterizes a general approach to the interpretation of meaning reflected in any human product, expression, or action, often referred to as a text or 'text analog'" (Moss, 1994, p. 7). In this study, I approached the cross-cultural experience and setting hermeneutically in an attempt to describe and interpret the meaning of the conditions under which the Polish educators involved in the project acted in developing the course plan. The Polish educators' interpretations of their cross-cultural context and how these interpretations entered into their constructions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship supported a hermeneutic approach on my part. I interpreted their constructions (interpretations) over the course of a particular experience.

**Assumptions**

Five epistemological assumptions drawn from Lincoln and Guba's (1985) axioms of the naturalistic paradigm
underpinned the research methodology of this study. They are:

1. The nature of reality: Realities are multiple, constructed, and holistic.

2. The relationship of knower to the known: Knower and known are interactive, inseparable.

3. The possibility of generalization: Only time- and context-bound working hypotheses (idiographic statements) are possible.

4. The possibility of causal linkages: All entities are in a state of mutual simultaneous shaping, so that it is impossible to distinguish causes from effects.

5. The role of values: Inquiry is value-bound. (p. 37)

The third chapter describes fully these assumptions and their related, operational characteristics as employed in this study.

**The Inquiry Process**

Based upon a hermeneutic approach and the assumptions of naturalistic inquiry, this study proceeded with the gathering and constant analysis and comparison of qualitative data. The data gathered for this study included reflections of the Polish educators and myself, interviews with the project participants, observations, and project documents.

**Reflections**

At the start of the cross-cultural experience, I asked the five Polish educators to record their thoughts on any experiences that brought new information or perspectives to their construction of the role of schools in educating for
democratic citizenship. In doing so, I requested that the first and last reflections address their definition of that role, so they could act as gauges of possible change. The Polish educators gave me their reflections periodically and at their discretion. My reflections took the form of a reflexive journal that noted methodological considerations and choices, acted as a cathartic release, and described events throughout my personal contact with the teacher educators.

**Interviews**

I interviewed the Polish teacher educators five times during the project. Since their stay in the United States was 14 weeks, I chose to conduct the interviews at regularly spaced intervals. At each interval, I tried to cluster the interviews as tightly as possible so that each respondent's impressions reflected the same time interval of the project. In every case, the interviews were semi-structured.

**Observations**

As a participant observer, my observations took on two forms. My reflexive journal included general observations of each day's activities. Also, I recorded observation notes of the seminar sessions.

**Project Documents**

The most relevant project documents were the draft versions of the course plan developed by the Poles before their departure. In addition, the many revisions of the
educators' seminar-agenda acted as a sort of time line of activities. Two papers presented by the Poles, one at an Ohio Wesleyan University conference and the other at the National Council for the Social Studies Annual Convention in Detroit, Michigan, were included as documents for analysis. The project file, kept in the form of a project chronology, acted as a reference throughout my data analysis and report writing.

The working assertions, or hypotheses, induced from the data are the result of what Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Strauss (1987) termed "constant comparison of cases." In this study, the working assertions germinated from the constant comparison of the five Polish teacher educators--a purposeful sample that can be considered the population.

Limitations of the Study

This study represents the cross-cultural portion of one project designed to reconsider citizenship education in a post-communist democratic society. Consequently, it is recommended that the reader eschew generalization from this study's findings to all similar projects. Concomitantly, the uniqueness of this project makes the transference of the study's findings totally optional to those readers engaged in educational projects in Central and Eastern Europe.

In a related sense, the selection of the five Polish educators chosen for this project represented the decisions
of the Project Co-Directors. The group was not necessarily a representative sample of all Polish educators to which the reader can generalize the findings. The replacement of even one Polish educator in this study with another may have altered considerably the results of this study.

My status as a participant observer in this study had its limitations. Patton (1990) defined the role of the participant observer as someone "who shares as intimately as possible in the life and activities of the setting under study. The purpose of such participation is to develop an insider's view of what is happening" (p. 207). Although this was a major goal during my research, the reader should keep two considerations in mind.

First, the data gathered for this study was in English --the second language of my Polish colleagues and the language of the project. Unfortunately, I do not speak Polish. Therefore, I was prevented from understanding and noting any conversations held in Polish between the five Polish educators.

Second, I did not live with the Polish educators during their stay in the United States. In lieu of this situation, I was not able to follow their cross-cultural experiences with complete depth of observation. As per their admission, the group held private meetings and conversations when I was not in their presence.
Additionally, my cultural biases and preconceived notions undoubtedly influenced the data gathering and analysis. Aside from the fact that I am a second generation Polish-American, I am still an American. Although "the human instrument has certain special properties--chief among them being virtually infinite adaptability . . . " (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 250), we still make meaning of the world through implicit mental templates (Kelly, 1955). I can state safely that my template changed during the course of this study, and that reliance on my judgment in interpreting and analyzing the data was as much the result of implicit knowledge as explicit understanding. For instance, my Polish heritage may have weighed heavily in my decision-making process during data gathering on and interpretation of the five Polish educators' cross-cultural experiences.

Finally, this study contains a limited sense of anonymity. This limitation stems from the international prominence gained by the overall project and, thus, the teacher education component of the project. An international conference held in Jachrancka, Poland, in December, 1993, unveiled this project to more than two-hundred teachers, administrators, teacher educators, and social scientists from not only Poland, but also from the United States, the Council of Europe, and other Central and Eastern European nations. During the course of this conference, each of the Polish educators presented aspects
of the project and its product—the course plan. Since this
conference, the course plan’s "Rationale" has been published
by the ERIC Clearing House for Social Studies/Social Science
Education, and copies of the final version have been
requested by and sent to American and European scholars and
policy makers.

Throughout this report, I sought anonymity for the
project participants. However, all of the Polish educators
involved in the "Schools and Democratic Society" project
consented to the study and appear in this report. Also,
American project participants, through their roles in the
cross-cultural shaping of the Polish educators constructs,
were part of this study. The same limitation applies to
their anonymity. In spite of my efforts to secure
anonymity, someone bent on uncovering the identity of the
respondents and other project participants could do so with
little difficulty.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The recent fall of Eastern and Central European socialist republics made democratic institution building in this region a prime concern. In searching for solace from self-proclaimed dissatisfaction with the past, these nations seek lessons about democratic theory and institutions from established democracies such as the United States (Hamot, 1992).

Given this situation, projects such as "Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland" offer an opportunity to understand the needs of post-communist educators as they perceive them. In this project's cross-cultural environment, the five Polish educators constructed a meaning of what schooling in a developing democratic society can offer its students.

Kelly's (1955) theory of personal constructs presents a lens through which we can interpret meaning from human behavior. Although intended initially as a clinical approach to personal construct analysis, his postulate and corollaries proffer insights into the individual's point of
view during a cross-cultural experience. Kelly’s psychology of personal constructs paralleled cultural anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski’s (1922) belief that the purpose of cross-cultural research is to "grasp the native’s point of view . . . to realize his [sic] vision of his [sic] world" (p. 25).

This emic\(^1\) notion of understanding was the approach I took in this study. Consequently, Chapter II concerns the literature that places Kelly’s psychological theory in the larger body of constructivist thought. In addition, this chapter explicates Kelly’s theory of personal constructs and notes the application of this theory in cross-cultural psychological research.

A Brief Survey of Constructivist Thought

Basic Assumption

Defined generally as a theoretical epistemological position, constructivist thought regards knowledge as socially constructed. Constructivists believe that the individual construes reality based upon his or her perception of the world on a "one-to-one" (person-to-reality) basis. The nature of a singular, free-standing reality "out there" is not a point of discussion for the constructivist. What people make of their world is at the

\(^1\) Patton (1990) noted "what anthropologists call the 'emic perspective'-- the insider's perspective on reality" (p. 241).
center of the constructivist standpoint: "The constructivist assumes that all mental images are creations of people, and thus speak [sic] of an invented reality" (Howard, 1991, p. 187).

Constructivists strive to develop a useful model rather than a reliable theory (Howard, 1991). In carrying out this function, "... constructivists acknowledge the active role they play in creating a view of the world and interpreting observations in terms of it" (Efran, Lukens, & Lukens, 1988, p. 28). Instead of searching for the "truth," constructivists try to grasp the emic perspective in the hope of achieving a notion of meaning or significance. Constructivists look upon the results of their inquiries as transferable from one setting to another, rather than generalizable to a population of situations or people (Lincoln & Guba, 1989).

The Constructivist Alternative to the Objectivist Model

Constructivist views of cognition depart irreconcilably from those of objectivism. Table 1, developed from the work of Soffer (1993) and the work of Neimeyer and Peixas (1990), displays the most basic differences.
Table 1

**Constructivist and Objectivist Principles of Cognition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructivist Principles of Cognition</th>
<th>Objectivist Principles of Cognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge is constructed.</td>
<td>Knowledge is a copy of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge is proactive, goal-directed, and purposive.</td>
<td>Knowledge is reactive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a diversity of possible meanings and alternative interpretations.</td>
<td>There is one correct truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge is judged through viability.</td>
<td>Knowledge is measured by its correspondence with facts of an objective reality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These differences highlight the constructivist position as one that envisions the human being searching for reality through an active, subjective construction. Constructivists believe that thinking depends on our organizational capacity and not the reactive behavior brought about by the impact of a singular reality on our minds. In this sense, constructivism deviates from Locke's (1690/1894) *tabula rasa* formulation of cognition.

**Constructivism in Cognitive Psychology**

The distinction between constructivist and objectivist cognition does not explain fully the different aspects of constructivism in cognitive psychology. Soffer (1993) delineated two categories of constructivist cognitive psychology as "weak" versus "strong" constructivism. His distinction is based on how different constructivist approaches deal with the following question: "[C]an one locate a property intrinsic to a construed entity that
exists independently of the construing subject and forces its meaning on the subject?" (p. 60).

Soffer (1993) viewed the answers to this question as a sort of continuum in constructivist cognitive psychology. The notions of Fisher (1990) and Katz (1984) concerning the existence of innate emotional frameworks and Chomsky's (1957) nativist position on the human understanding of language represent the weak end of the continuum. On the strong side are Piaget's (1972) genetic epistemology and Rychlak's (1988) logical learning theory.

The strong constructivist's distinguishing marks are an extension of the basic assumption that knowledge is socially constructed. The strong constructivists view perceptual experience as indirect, abstracted, and idiosyncratic estimations of reality that form our ability to predict and control various phenomena around us. Reber (1985), in defining the constructivist position, highlighted the basic elements of the strong side of the continuum as

a general theoretical position that characterizes perceptual experience as being constructed from, in Gregory's words, "fleeting fragmentary scraps of data signalled by the senses and drawn from the brain's memory banks--themselves constructions and snippets from the past." The essence of all constructivist theories is that perceptual experience is viewed as more than a direct response to stimulation. It is instead viewed as an elaboration or "construction" based on hypothesized cognitive and affective operations. (p. 151)

George Kelly's (1955) theory of personal constructs emanated from the strong constructivist position and rests
at that end of the continuum (Soffer, 1993). He championed the notion that our perception of the world is indirect and that our perceptions represent only abstracted portions of reality. Kelly fit the description of the strong constructivist because his theory of personal constructs "asserted that people erect successive structures of understanding of the world out of information that is represented to the individual and not directly perceived" (Stewart & Barry, 1991, pp. 122-123). Although Kelly believed that there must be a single reality out there, it does not matter. What is important is what we make of it.

Kelly’s Place in Cognitive Psychology

Kelly (1955) wrote The Psychology of Personal Constructs at a time when behaviorism controlled the field of psychology. Beginning with Watson’s (1913) belief that psychology was the study of stimulus, response, and habit formation, a stream of behaviorist thinking dominated the field. According to Mancuso (1970), "Thorndike’s (1917) connectionalism, elaborated into Hull’s (1943) drive reduction theory, and Skinner's (1938) operant conditioning, became the height of scientific respectability in psychology" (p. 7). Behaviorists dismissed "vestigial cognitive theories" (Skinner, 1968, p. 707) that considered introspection as a part of cognition. For example, many American scholars considered Piaget’s theory of cognition a
part of this vestigial landscape of psychology (Mancuso, 1970).

A return to internal structures as a focus of psychology began in the 1950s. The research of Bruner, Goodnow, and Austin (1956) on the nature of concept development; Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) on meaning; Festinger (1957) on cognitive dissonance; and Miller, Galanter, and Pribram (1960) on problem solving marked this return. Amidst this trend to investigate the basis of behavior as the internal psychological functioning of organisms was the work of George Kelly (1955).

Kelly's (1955) theory of personal constructs resembled a meta-theory of psychological processes:

Kelly's contribution was to work at a meta-theory which borrowed useful constructs from most of the major psychological theories available to him at the time—namely existentialism, phenomenology, humanism, Gestalt theory, Freudian theory, Rogerian non-directive counselling, behaviourism and so forth. (Delmonte, 1990, p. 82)

According to class notes accumulated by Barry (1948)—a student of Kelly's at The Ohio State University—Korzybski’s (1933; 1943) general semantics theory influenced Kelly’s thinking on abstraction as a cognitive process. Korzybski viewed abstraction as a selective activity by which we make meaning of certain material in our total field of perception. Barry also noted the practical therapeutic methods of Moreno’s (1937) psychodramatic techniques as a
major influence on Kelly’s use of role playing in personal construct psychotherapy.

In addition to these ideas from which he borrowed, the philosophy of pragmatism developed by John Dewey influenced Kelly’s thinking:

One individual who was particularly influential but was mentioned only three times [in The Psychology of Personal Constructs (1955)] was John Dewey. . . . Dewey’s pragmatism helped shape the substance and form of Kelly’s thought. The more specific relationship between Kelly and Dewey involves their interest in the active perceptual processes of the individual as well as their criticism of stimulus-response psychology that was gaining momentum in the early years of this century. (Stewart & Barry, 1991, p. 122)

In one of his three references to Dewey, Kelly (1955) made clear his reliance on Deweyan philosophy:

Dewey, whose philosophy and psychology can be read between many of the lines of the psychology of personal constructs, envisioned the universe as an ongoing affair which had to be anticipated to be understood. Such thinking stands in sharp contrast to the kind of realism which insists that if a thing is a spade, it is nothing but a spade; if a person is a schizophrenic, he [sic] is nothing but a schizophrenic; if the heart is a physiological organ, it is nothing but a physiological organ, and it cannot be construed as a psychological organ; if an event is a catastrophe, it is nothing but a catastrophe; if a man [sic] is an enemy, he [sic] is nothing but an enemy. (p. 154)

The belief in a better existence based on our ability to anticipate an ever-changing world through the development and testing of our personal hypotheses lay at the philosophical core of Dewey and Kelly.

As a comprehensive model of internally based cognitive behavior, Bruner (1956) highlighted the significance of Kelly’s (1955) theory as
an effort to construct a theory of personality from a theory of knowledge: how people came to know the world by binding its diverse appearances into organized construct systems which vary not only in organization but in their goodness of fit to the bricks and mortar of reality. (p. 355)

In designing this meta-theory, Kelly (1955) followed a basic notion: "Since man [sic] is always faced with constructive alternatives, which he [sic] may explore if he [sic] wishes, he [sic] need not continue indefinitely to be the absolute victim either of his [sic] past history or his [sic] present circumstances" (p. 43). With this belief as his guide, Kelly laid forth the philosophical position on which his theory of personal constructs stands. This position, known as "constructive alternativism", began with a simple metaphor--"man-the-scientist" (Kelly, 1955, p. 4).

Kelly’s "Constructive Alternativism"

"Man-the-Scientist" Metaphor

In many ways, Kelly’s theory of personal constructs reflected the tradition of liberal humanism (Delmonte, 1990). Throughout the development of his theory, the centrality of the individual never eluded his concern. Kelly’s concern was never more evident than his belief in the metaphor of "man-the-scientist" (Kelly, 1955, p. 4).

To Kelly, the failure of trained social scientists, especially psychologists, was their neglect of the individual’s beliefs, behaviors, and processes:
Psychologists rarely credit the human subjects in their experiments with having similar aspirations. It is as though the psychologist were saying to himself, "I, being a psychologist, and therefore a scientist, am performing this experiment in order to improve the prediction and control of certain human phenomena; but my subject, being merely a human organism, is obviously propelled by inexorable drives welling up within him [sic], or else he [sic] is in gluttonous pursuit of sustenance and shelter." (Kelly, 1955, p. 4)

By citing every person as a scientist, Kelly, like Dewey (1933) in How We Think, democratized the status of the individual in relation to science.

In addition, Kelly, along with most strong constructivists, believed that there were two centrally defining features of cognition: "[1] the dominant role of the subject in meaning creation and [2] the integral nature of knowledge organization" (Soffer, 1990, p. 60). To this end, Kelly (1955) amplified his "man-the-scientist" metaphor:

Now what would happen if we were to reopen the question of human motivation and use our long-range view of man [sic] to infer just what it is that sets the course of his [sic] endeavor? ... Might not the individual man [sic], each in his [sic] own personal way, assume more of the stature of a scientist, ever seeking to predict and control the course of events with which he [sic] is involved? Would he [sic] not have his [sic] theories, test his [sic] hypotheses, and weigh his [sic] experimental evidence? (Kelly, 1955, p. 4)

In response to these questions, Oliver (1970) posited an answer: "He [sic] can 'take in' only what his [sic] construct system is capable of handling. That is to say, what it can not handle is, so far as man [sic] is concerned, mere confusion, chaos" (p. 187). Given this possibility,
Kelly, drawing on the philosophical roots of the "man-the-scientist" metaphor, based his theory of personal constructs on one assumption—constructive alternativism.

**Constructive Alternativism Defined**

"We assume that all of our present interpretations of the universe are subject to revision or replacement. . . . We call this philosophical position constructive alternativism" (Kelly, 1955, p. 15). With this assumption, Kelly embarked on his theory of personal constructs. As noted by Kelly's contemporary, Carl Rogers (1956), constructive alternativism was the foundation on which Kelly built a theoretical position that "looks forward, not backward—which sees behavior as anticipatory not reactive. He is attempting to hold persons as processes, not objects" (p. 357).

Kelly (1955; 1970) viewed people as striving to make meaning of the world by forming personal constructions of reality (Delmonte, 1990). Since Kelly believed that individuals and reality are in a state of constant flux, making sense of the world was a difficult task. In the process of living in this state of constant flux, the notion of constructive alternativism "asserts that people erect successive structures of understanding the world out of information that is represented to the individual and not directly perceived" (Stewart & Barry, 1991, p. 123).
What remains at issue is how we perceive what we perceive. If the individual and reality are in a state of constant flux, how is it that we are able to understand anything? Kelly (1955) believed that individuals abstract aspects of reality on an idiosyncratic basis: "... they must abstract the elements in some degree, else their lives would be hopelessly kaleidoscopic and there would be no possibility of internal organization" (p. 110). In restating Kelly's position on how we perceive the fluctuation of reality, Adams-Webber (1989) noted that "human action lies in the 'mind' and not external events" (p. 192). Thus, what is abstracted by each person is a matter of individual choice—a constructive alternative based on a person's internal organization.

Our personal constructs comprise our internal organization. Our abstractions form our personal constructs. "In the wider perceptual sense the cognitive, linguistic mental representations of objects and events are nonidentical to the external world as a result of this abstracting process" (Stewart & Barry, 1991, p. 126). These constructs, based on our abstractions, create the template through which each individual makes sense of the world and anticipates events.

However, Kelly (1955) noted that the construct is the basis upon which elements are understood. It is a matter of how the person construes the elements in order to deal with them, not where they happen to appear or where he [sic] decides to set them.
down. The construct is an interpretation of a situation and is not itself the situation which it interprets [italics added]. (p. 110)

Our personal constructs form from the choices we make when abstracting reality. Given the assumption that reality and the individual are in a state of constant flux, our interpretation of the world also must fluctuate.

In illustrating this "chameleonlike" quality of reality, Lincoln and Guba (1985) quoted Jocko Conlan, one of the few umpires in Major League Baseball’s Hall of Fame. When asked how he determined the difference between a ball and a strike, he responded: "They ain’t nothin’ til I calls 'em" (p. 70). Apparently, Jocko’s interpretations of the "strike zone" were subject to revision or even replacement.

The Postulate and Its Corollaries

Having stated the philosophical position that all of our interpretations are prone to revision or replacement, Kelly (1955) proceeded to build a Euclidian-like framework for his theory of personal constructs. Based upon a fundamental postulate, he enumerated eleven corollaries. The postulate and its corollaries form the theoretical basis of how we go about the interpretive process—"the thinking behavior of people" (p. 15).
The Fundamental Postulate

Explanation

In the fundamental postulate, Kelly (1955) posited that "a person's processes are psychologically channelized by the way in which he [sic] anticipates events" (p. 46). Basically, everything we do that appears spontaneous or is the outcome of reflective activity is a matter of the way we predict our environment. Our interpretations of our experiences lead us to develop myriad constructs that allow us to decipher the way in which some things are alike and yet different from others. This process is channelized, or directed through constructs developed from past experiences, by the way in which we anticipate our existence.

We choose to do what we do (or think) only so far as our constructs allow us. Since our constructs are liable to revision and replacement in this ever-fluctuating situation, we do not remain static in our interpretations, but build and revise as needed. In accord with constructive alternativism, Kelly (1955) emphasized "the way in which the individual man [sic] chooses to operate, rather than upon the way in which the operation might be ideally carried out" (p. 49). So, our constructs are personal, not necessarily universal, interpretations of reality.

Analysis

In commenting on his postulate some years later, Kelly (1970) reiterated his break with the scholarly traditions of
his day: "In specifying the ways of anticipating events as the directive referent for human processes we cut ourselves free of the stimulus-response version of nineteenth century scientific determinism" (p. 10). Locke, Hume, and Mills laid the ground-work for the logical empiricists of this century with the notion that "knowledge copies (or should copy) the contours of the world" (Gergen, 1985, p. 269). This belief returns us to the idea that, even though humans develop through experience, we are reacting to a singular reality that determines experience. Gergen (1982) termed this tradition the exogenic perspective.

The fundamental postulate of personal construct theory belies the traditional notions of knowledge. With this postulate, Kelly (1955) accentuated the idiosyncratic process of channelizing our actions based upon the way we view the world through personal experience. Cognitive processes are uniquely endemic to each human being. Gergen (1982) labelled this position the endogenic perspective. Extrapolated to cross-cultural investigation, this postulate resembles the emic rather than etic position of the researcher.

Representative of the endogenic perspective in social psychology was the work of Kelly’s contemporary, Kurt Lewin. Undoubtedly aware of Lewin’s work, Kelly was able to draw on a wellspring of related research conducted by two of Lewin’s students—Festinger’s (1954, 1957) work in social reality,
the social comparison process, and cognitive dissonance and Pepitone's (1949) motivated perception theory.

These cognitive theories echo a position similar to Kelly's fundamental postulate. Gergen (1985) noted the major point of comparison between the theories of Festinger, Pepitone, and Kelly: "Human action is critically dependent on the cognitive processing of information, that is, on the world as cognized rather than the world as it is" (p. 269). In order to enhance this dependence, Kelly's fundamental postulate leads us to believe that our predictive ability, as based on our experiences, is vital to our existence.

The process of psychological channelizing is similar to schema theory. Kelly extended the thinking of Bartlett (1932) and Piaget (1952) in psychological organization. The particulars of Kelly's enhancement run throughout the corollaries. Nonetheless, in schema theory and personal construct theory, the endogenic assumption is the same.

In order to have an overall pattern of our experiences that will bind more coherently, we must continue to develop our ability to anticipate events through our construction of reality. Confidence, then, grows from our willingness, based on our experiences, to take risks. The "man-the-scientist" metaphor continues to hold forth in the fundamental postulate.
The Construction Corollary

Explanations

The amplification of personal construct theory begins with the Construction Corollary: "A person anticipates events by construing their replication" (Kelly, 1955, p. 50). Two basic assumptions underpin this corollary.

First, "[e]very man [sic] is assumed to have the capacity to represent the external environment. It is this representation that guides the person's interaction with the environment" (Nystedt & Magnuson, 1982, p. 33). This representation is the method by which we psychologically channelize our processes. Heisenberg (1958), a physicist, put this notion in a strong constructivist light by stating that "[w]hat we observe is not nature itself, but nature exposed to our method of questioning" (p. 58). What we know dictates our interpretation of what goes on around us.

Second, Kelly (1970) believed that no two events are identical. Consequently, we hypothesize about our approximations of events based on their similarity to past experiences: "Since events never repeat themselves, else they would lose their identity, one can look forward to them only by devising some construction which permits him [sic] to perceive two of them in a similar manner" (p. 11). The process of construction involves finding similarities between events that stand in opposition to another event. When this occurs, the psychological channel begins to form.
Given these assumptions, a person "... must modestly concede that the appearance of replication is a reflection of his [sic] own fallible construction of what is going on" (Kelly, 1970, p. 11). Life gains its meaning through our interpretations of what came before and how our interpretations of our past allow us to envision our future.

Analysis

Stewart and Barry (1991) considered this corollary to be the most evident aspect of Kelly’s constructivist approach. This corollary expresses the indirectness of one’s perception. Our uniquely individual abstractions of reality that form our constructs allow us to anticipate events. Delmonte (1990) likened this corollary to Piaget’s twin processes of assimilation and accommodation: "Here we envisage the schemata (or constructs) of adaptive individuals constantly being revised in the light of newly assimilated evidence" (p. 75).

Bruner viewed our anticipation of events in a similar fashion. He believed that through "generic coding," humans go "beyond the information given" (Bruner, 1957/1973, p. 218). When viewed in comparison to the psychology of personal constructs, Bruner’s description of generic coding paralleled the Construction Corollary and its relationship to "man-the-scientist": "the activity of constructing formal models and theoretical constructs is a prototype of what we mean by the creation of generic coding systems that permit
one to go beyond the data to new and possibly fruitful

Kelly (1955), Piaget (1957), and Bruner (1957) posited
that humans anticipate events through abstracted
constructions of reality. In all three cases, the processes
of abstracting and construing occur on an individual basis.

The Individuality Corollary

Explanation

Driven by the notion that no two events are the same,
Kelly (1955) believed that people, as events to each other,
were completely different from each other. He developed
this thought into the Individuality Corollary: "Persons
differ from each other in their construction of events" (p.
55). Just as no two events repeat themselves, no two
individuals interpret events in identical fashion:

No two people can play precisely the same role in the
same event, no matter how closely they are associated.
For one thing, in such an event, each experiences the
other as an external figure. For another, each
experiences a different person as the central figure
(namely, himself [sic]). Finally, chances are that, in
the course of events, each will get caught up in a
different stream and hence be confronted with different
navigational problems. (Kelly, 1955, p. 55)

Essentially, this corollary embodies the idiosyncracy of
thought that forms the basis of constructivist thinking.

For Kelly, however, cognitive individuality did not
preclude the sharing of experience. Even though there are
individual differences in people's constructions of events,
there remains the possibility that we can construe another
person's experiences along with our experiences of the same event and come up with a great many similarities.

Analysis

Kelly's (1955) Individuality Corollary harkens back to the ancient Roman aphorism *si duo idem faciunt, non est idem* (if two people do the same thing, it is not the same thing). To modern constructivists, "focus on the individual's own organization of experience is . . . the major thrust of personal construct theory and the essence of the Individuality Corollary" (Gara, 1982, p. 45).

This corollary refuted the objectivist position prevalent in Kelly's day and accepted in many areas related to cognitive psychology. For instance, the work of Tyler (1950) reflected behavioral response theories as they applied to education. In an extrapolation of Kelly's Individuality Corollary to adult education, Candy (1982) noted the implications of this corollary for objectivist instructional design: "If adult educators aim simply to transmit, intact, a body of knowledge--or indeed a practical skill--the individuality corollary assures that learners will interpret the learning idiosyncratically and will go away with different learning outcomes" (p. 65).

Piaget (1971) echoed Kelly's (1955) belief in the individualized construction of events. Through his explanation of the ontological basis for the assimilation process, Piaget (1971) noted that "no form of knowledge, not
even perceptual knowledge, constitutes a simple copy of reality, because it always includes a process of assimilation to previous structures" (p. 4). Since a person's previous structures do not allow him or her to converge completely with others on a single reality, no two people construe events in a precisely identical way.

The Organization Corollary

Explanation

As we differ in our construction of events, we differ in how we organize our constructions. To Kelly (1955), this difference represented the personal aspect of trying to overcome the incompatible predictions that result from our constructs. In our lives, we experience this predicament during personal conflicts. How we approach these conflicts helps to mold, and is molded by, our construct organization system:

One man [sic] may resolve the conflicts between his [sic] anticipations by means of an ethical system. Another may resolve them in terms of self-preservation. The same man [sic] may resolve in one way at one time and in the other way at another. It all depends upon how he [sic] backs off to get perspective. (p. 56)

To capture this process of personal conflict resolution, Kelly (1955) devised his Organization Corollary: "Each person characteristically evolves, for his [sic] convenience in anticipating events, a construction system embracing ordinal relationships between constructs" (p. 56).

The Organization Corollary represents how we systematize our constructs by arranging them in hierarchies
and further abstracting their meaning. By constructing this sort of system, we minimize contradiction in our predictive abilities. The individual elements of our construction system fit together, more or less, as we seek to predict the unknown aspects of future events:

More and more he [sic] seeks to anticipate all impending events of whatsoever nature. This means that he [sic] must develop a system in which the most unusual future can be anticipated in terms of a replicated aspect of the familiar past. (Kelly, 1955, p. 58)

Since a person's construct system is developed and organized hierarchically, some constructs subsume others.

As an evolving system, we develop and organize our constructs so as to minimize incompatibilities and inconsistencies. This process assists in the anticipation of events. When we fail to anticipate an event, we attempt to rearrange automatically our system of constructs. Our organization fluctuates with a fluctuating world.

Analysis

This corollary is consonant with constructivist views on the holistic character of cognition. The Organization Corollary matches with Piaget's (1971) "differentiation of a total system into subsystems result[ing] in assimilations adapted to particular conditions" (p. 5). Similar to the "holographic metaphor" of reality developed by Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979), Piaget's model is one in which the "total system is always defined and transformed in such a way that, in spite of it's being differentiated into subsystems, each
part of the whole expresses the meaning of the total organization" (Soffer, 1993, p. 61). Soffer went on to note that Piaget's part-to-whole relationship corresponds directly with Kelly’s Organization Corollary: "The nature of the organization, then, is a single hierarchy of change in which each new specialization has meaning only in reference to the entire previous system, and furthermore, each new differentiation redefines the entire system" (Soffer, 1993, p. 62).

The Organization Corollary implies a dialectical nature to construct development. Developmental theorists such as Werner (1957), Piaget (1960), and Riegel (1979) noted the dialectical process by which people confront new and different events. If events can fit our existing constructs without much difficulty, there is little change in our system. The ordinal relationship remains the same. On the other hand, if the person confronts new aspects of his or her environment that cannot be handled readily by the existing system, then change must occur if growth into a new, more complex system is to take place. As a consequence of the dialectical evolution of our personal constructs, we increase our ability to anticipate events. This Hegelian conceptualization of cognition is at the base of the Organization Corollary.
The Dichotomy Corollary

Explanation

"A person's construction system is composed of a finite number of dichotomous constructs" (Kelly, 1955, p. 59). Stated as the Dichotomy Corollary, Kelly had two things in mind.

First, "man's [sic] thinking is not completely fluid; it is channelized" (Kelly, 1955, p. 61). Since thinking is channelized through idiosyncratic constructions, it cannot extend completely into the ideas of others. Thus, the constructs of an individual are finite in number.

Second, constructs represent guidelines by which we view the world around us. The mind draws these constructs out of available events:

A construct is a basic contrast between two groups. When it is imposed [on events or objects] it serves both to distinguish between its elements and to group them. Thus, the construct refers to the nature of the distinction one attempts to make between events, not to the array in which his [sic] events appear to stand when he [sic] gets through applying the distinction between each of them and all the others. . . . The construct, of itself, is the kind of contrast one perceives and not in any way a representation of objects. . . . But, while constructs do not represent or symbolize events, they do enable us to cope with events. (Kelly, 1970, p. 13-14)

Yet, what constitutes the formation of a construct? Essentially, a construct is our cognitive development of similarity between two or more events as they stand in contrast to at least one other event. Bruner (1956) noted that dichotomous constructs occur through "triadic judgment":

That is to say, given events A, B, and C, A and B are judged similar to each other in the same respect in which C is in contrast to both of them. A construct is not understood unless one grasps the two construct poles that form it, one of which may often be unrecognized by the construing person. (Bruner, 1956, p. 356)

Again, the construct is not the thing or event itself, but a channel through which we manage things and events.

An example of the construct "good" versus "bad" may be of some use. Given three schools (A, B, and C), two of them (e.g., A and B) will be better at educating for democratic citizenship than the third (C). By making this distinction, a person can abstract further the qualities of schools A and B and decide which one of these two is "better" than the other at educating for democratic citizenship, making the other school part of the "bad" end of the construct. If we knew only two schools that were educating for democratic citizenship, we could not distinguish between good and bad schools on this basis. However, taking the original three schools into account, C may have the best music program when compared to A and B. Using this different criterion (music education), we may construe the three schools in a different light.

Analysis

This corollary can be difficult to understand due to our propensity to note one thing as different from another without the obvious need of a third object or event for purposes of differentiation. As Bruner (1956) noted, we may
not be cognizant of the contrasting pole that allows us to compare two objects or events. Yet, the ability to contrast two things stems from a third thing that is distinct from, but related to, the other two.

Piaget (1971), through his assimilation-accommodation theory, offered a similar approach to how we construe events: "There can be no assimilation of anything into the organism without a corresponding accommodation" (p. 173). By allowing for similarity and difference for every event as viewed by our construing system, there is an inevitable dichotomy taking place. Soffer (1993) recognized that Piaget's "assimilation is compatible with Kelly's Dichotomy Corollary, which defines a construct as a unique way in which two things are alike and differ from a third" (p. 61).

In addition to its correspondence with Piaget's assimilation process, this corollary links to the Construction Corollary because "people develop bipolar constructs in order to make sense of the world by looking for repetitive patterns of similarity and difference among a series of events occurring through time" (Delmonte, 1990, p. 75). If we anticipate events by construing their replication, then the construction system must develop in some logical fashion. This thought builds on the assumption that we channelize our processes through dichotomous constructs.
The Choice Corollary

Explanation

With the Choice Corollary, Kelly (1955) stated that "a person chooses for himself [sic] that alternative in a dichotomized construct through which he [sic] anticipates the greater possibility for extension and definition of his [sic] system" (p. 64). During the decision-making that runs through the course of our lives, we proportion the field of objects or events to our constructs and act through these constructs. Since our constructs are dichotomous, we choose between the bipolar alternatives of our constructs based upon our anticipations of objects or events. We may choose to reinforce our certainties, or take the risk of broadening our understanding. Either way, we make a decision based upon this "elaborative choice" (Kelly, 1955, p. 65).

Our constructs govern our actions and not the actions of objects. When we make a choice, we do so by aligning ourselves with our constructs and deciding whether to define them, extend them, or both: "One defines his [sic] system, by extension at least, by making it clear how its construct components are applied to objects or are linked with each other" (Kelly, 1970, p. 15).

Analysis

This corollary emphasized our ability to choose, not necessarily change, through our decision-making processes. At the heart of the Choice Corollary, Kelly saw "individuals
as creating their own destinies through their constructions and choices" (Delmonte, 1990, p. 74). In so doing, we may not choose to change a particular construct, but to extend its use and expand it through experience. Choice refines our constructs.

Occasionally, we see people making choices that appear inappropriate for the situation at hand. Or, we see people abstracting aspects of experience that reinforce their previous beliefs. On the other hand, many people take risks and expand their horizons. They approach their fellow human beings with different attitudes or beliefs to test the viability of these new attitudes or beliefs in working through a social situation. Each possibility exemplifies the "man-the-scientist" metaphor.

In each of the above noted situations, a person makes an elaborative choice. Based on this constancy of choosing, Bannister and Fransella (1971) noted this corollary as Kelly’s most obvious attempt at defining our lives as a continuous state of learning, whether it be for enhanced certainty or for progressive understanding: "A personal construct system is not a collection of treasured and guarded hallucinations, it is the person’s guide to living. It is the repository of what he [sic] has learned" (p. 72). Nichol (1980) added that our personal construct system is the basis for continued learning: "A person’s consciousness is a competition of paradigms, some more elaborated than
others, and one probably ascendant. A person has a tendency toward developing better explanations of his [sic] world, a process we call learning" (p. 2).

The Range Corollary

Explanation

By applying finiteness to a single construct, this corollary is a logical extension of the Dichotomy Corollary. In the Range Corollary, Kelly (1955) stated that "a construct is convenient for the anticipation of a finite range of events only" (p. 132).

Few, if any, constructs are relevant to everything. For instance, the construct "large" versus "small" can be applied to a great many objects and events. On the other hand, we do not consider color as being part of the "large" versus "small" construct. Thus, in spite of the rather encompassing size of this construct, it is limited to a range of events and objects.

To Kelly (1970), a "construct was a basis of making a distinction and, by some act, creating an association . . . [A] construct is not a class of objects, or an abstraction of a class [as in the case of a concept], but a dichotomous reference axis" (p. 17). In order to understand a person, we need to find both ends of meaning. The range of a construct is defined by what a person means with regard to a certain object or event and continues to what that person defines as its contrast. Beyond this range, the construct
becomes irrelevant. So, in the example of color and the use of the construct "large" versus "small", one could move to the use of a different construct--perhaps "appealing" versus "revolting."

Recalling the Fundamental Postulate, a person anticipates events. The Range Corollary posits the process by which we anticipate events or objects successfully by locating them at a certain point in a construct (Mancuso & Eimer, 1982). The extensiveness of a construct is determined by its range of convenience for what an event or object is and is not within the same sense of meaning. Kelly (1955) urged psychologists to explore this range with their clients and not to rely solely on similarities within the construct when seeking to understand how a person anticipates events: "Until he [sic] understands how extensively the contrast is construed, he [sic] cannot realize the full import of the client’s thinking" (p. 72).

Analysis

This corollary deals directly with a person’s level of awareness. By seeking the range of a person’s personal constructs, we can come to grips with how a person feels or thinks. Do they show deep understanding or a low level of cognitive awareness? The importance of a construct is determined by the range of convenience a person establishes for that construct.
Adams-Webber’s (1989) analysis of this corollary led him to conclude that "any construct, or system of interrelated constructs, has a limited 'range of convenience' which comprises all those events to which an individual would find its application predictively useful" (p. 191). The range, therefore, determines the level of relevance a person attaches to an object, event, and the subsequent anticipation of the object or event.

As a person extrapolates beyond the range of a construct, there is another point for comparative analysis between Piaget and Kelly. When confronted with something new, Piaget (1972) believed that we assimilate the event or object into an existing schematic structure. In turn, the structure accommodates the new experience through change. This synergetic relationship between accommodation and assimilation leads to equilibrium. When an experience is not assimilated through schematic accommodation, we have disequilibrium.

In Kelly’s terms, people reach their range of convenience when something similar to Piaget’s disequilibrium occurs. The result is the uselessness of that construct for that experience. Going beyond the endpoint(s) of a construct’s dichotomous axis creates a sense of irrelevancy or felt difficulty that gives us an opportunity to move to another construct or open a new channel through which to anticipate events. This attempt to
resolve what Festinger (1957) termed cognitive dissonance is at the heart of the next two corollaries: the Experience Corollary and the Modulation Corollary.

The Experience Corollary

Explanation

In the preceding corollaries, Kelly (1955) posited that a person anticipates events through his or her construction of their replication. In doing so, each person develops a unique construction of reality through an ordinally related and finite set of dichotomous constructs. We choose the best fit of an alternative pole in a dichotomous construct whose range encompasses the event or object under construction.

With the Experience Corollary, Kelly (1955) brought strands of the previous corollaries into a clear focus by stating that "a person’s construction system varies as he [sic] successively construes the replications of events" (p. 72). This focus centered upon the ability of people to adapt, or vary, their construct systems through the means established in the previous corollaries.

Since events do not repeat, Kelly believed that our anticipation of reality is never exact. Our constant state of experience changes our construct system and, thus, our anticipation of reality. Since the structure is idiosyncratic, experiencing is something done by the individual and not done to the individual: "It is not what
happened around him [sic] that makes a man [sic] experienced; it is the successive construing and reconstruing of what happens, as it happens, that enriches the experience of his [sic] life" (Kelly, 1955, p. 72).

Based on this corollary, Kelly (1955) believed that each individual defined experience through revision of his or her anticipations and hypotheses about the world. As we abstract aspects of events and objects around us, "the construction system undergoes a progressive evolution. The person reconstrues. This is experience. The reconstruction of one's life is based upon just this kind of experience" (Kelly, 1955, p. 73).

Analysis

This corollary represents Kelly's (1955) assumption that learning is a constant state of human existence. It is inextricable from the act of living:

The burden of our assumption is that learning is not a special class of psychological processes; it is synonymous with any and all psychological processes. It is not something that happens to a person on occasion; it is what makes him [sic] a person in the first place. (Kelly, 1955, p. 75).

This educative role a person assumes in experiencing events and objects is a point of connection between Dewey and Kelly.

Although Dewey expressed a more mature philosophy of experience than Kelly (Novak, 1983), the influence of Dewey's thoughts on Kelly's interpretation of experience were evident. For instance, Kelly (1955) believed "that our
lives are wholly oriented toward the anticipation of events" (p. 157). This anticipatory nature of experience, a pillar of constructivist thinking, was emphasized by Dewey (1960):

Since we live forward; since we live in a world where changes are going on whose issue means our weal or woe; since every act of ours modifies these changes and hence is fraught with promise, or charged with hostile energies—what should experience be but a future implicated in a present. (p. 27)

The similarity between Dewey and Kelly on this point can be found in the striking resemblance of Dewey’s thinking to Kelly’s (1955) explanation of the Experience Corollary: "Man [sic] eventually learned that he [sic] could lay a sight on the future through the experience of the past" (p. 75).

An implication of Kelly and Dewey’s thinking on experience is a person’s ability to handle variation in his or her construction system. Piaget (1932) foreshadowed personal construct variation in his theory of pre-operational and operational thought. This theory highlighted the movement of children from an egocentrism that prevents them from experiencing events from the perspective of others to an expanding view of the world similar to Hanvey’s (1987) perspective consciousness. To children in the pre-operational stage, cognitive dissonance does not appear to be a factor in their development. Yet, in adulthood, the variation of a person’s constructs can lead to a great deal of difficulty. Research with adults done by Rogers (1969) and More (1974) supported the "common sense hypothesis that an adult is likely to experience more
distress in the abandonment of some aspect of his or her personal construct system than if less drastic revision is called for" (Candy, 1982, pp. 57-68).

Given this conclusion, and the psychotherapeutic intention of Kelly's theory, how do adults deal with cognitive dissonance? What happens, for instance, when an adult experiences a cross-cultural event that puts his or her construction system to a severe test? The Modulation Corollary indicated Kelly's response.

The Modulation Corollary

Explanation

Revision or replacement of our constructs as we experience events and objects can be a perplexing and painful task. Kelly's (1955) Modulation Corollary offered insight into our ability to resolve cognitive dissonance and why we sometimes fail in this attempt at resolution: "The variation in a person's construction system is limited by the permeability of the constructs within whose range of convenience the variants lie" (p. 77).

The permeability of our constructs is our key to understanding. The rigidity of our constructs determines our ability to successively construe the replication of objects or events. Kelly (1955) based this belief on the impression that people develop superordinate and subordinate constructs. As long as they are maintained within the superordinate constructs, subordinate constructs vary with
little difficulty; the superordinate construct remains intact.

When experience challenges our superordinate constructs, the ability of these constructs to absorb our new constructions determines their permeability. If the experience does not permeate one superordinate construct, a person may construe it elsewhere in his or her overall construct system: "... permeability is not a construct's plasticity, or its amenability to change within itself, but its capacity to be used as a referent for novel events and to accept new subordinate constructions within its range of convenience" (Kelly, 1970, p. 19).

To Kelly (1955), steadfast, conscious rigidity of a superordinate construct is an obstruction to learning, and, therefore, can lead to extreme, unresolvable cognitive dissonance:

Indeed, he [sic] cannot even attain the new outlook in the first place unless there is some comprehensive overview within which it can be construed. Another way of expressing the same thing is to say that one does not learn certain things merely from the nature of the stimuli which play upon him [sic]; he [sic] learns only what his [sic] framework is designed to permit him [sic] to see in the stimuli. (p. 79)

If this is the case, how does one learn through the expansion of existing constructs or the development of new ones?

Kelly's (1955) approach to this question brought him to a variation on the "man-the-scientist" metaphor:
The type of construct which is permeable has more of the qualities of a theoretical formulation, as contrasted with a hypothetical formulation, in science. A hypothesis is deliberately constructed so as to be relatively impermeable and brittle, so that there can be no question about what it embraces and no doubt about its being wholly shattered or left intact at the end of an experiment. A theory is not so inflexibly constructed. It is stated in relatively permeable terms so that it may, in the future, embrace many things which we have not yet thought of. It is stated in an open-ended form. A theory, then, both provokes and accepts a wide variety of experimental ventures, some of which may even be antithetical to each other. (p. 81)

This cycle of testing and re-testing through experience leads to emergent or revised constructs that may or may not exhibit qualities of permeability.

If left to stand alone outside the total construct system, these emergent or revised constructs become useless to the person. For example, that which a person construes as the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship will include myriad aspects of democratic content and process. When something new and "undemocratic" with regard to education for democratic citizenship turns up, it is likely to be left out of the construct’s range of concern. If this novel aspect of education does not fit elsewhere in the overall construct system, then it is very likely to be ignored.

Analysis

In his comparative analysis of Piaget and Kelly, Soffer (1993) noted the relationship between assimilation and the Modulation Corollary:
Assimilation should be thought of as a differentiation of the total knowledge system in a manner that maintains the overall integrity or self-consistency of that system. This is similar to Kelly’s Modulation Corollary which states that the construct system can embrace only those events that are compatible with its superordinate structure. (p. 61)

In both cases, we incorporate experiences into a pre-existing structure. These experiences define and transform our system only to the extent to which we give them meaning. To Piaget and Kelly, experience was relative to the role we designate to objects or events in our total functioning. The centrality of an individual’s decision-making in this process accentuates the "strong" constructivism of Kelly and Piaget.

Bruner’s (1957/1973) research in generic coding serves also as a basis for comparison with Kelly’s Modulation Corollary. Bruner’s investigation into the process individuals enact in order to go beyond the information given concurred with Kelly’s (1955) notion of the mind’s "comprehensive overview" (p. 79). Bruner (1957/1973) posited that

[t]he process of finding out what is generic about a given situation so that one can then deal with similar situations later—know their solution without having to go through the tedious business of learning all over again—consists essentially of being able to isolate the defining properties of the class of events to which the present situation belongs. (p. 232).

To Kelly and Bruner, we can see only that which our framework allows us to see.
In addition, Bruner’s research pointed to the viability of permeability: "It seems to me that the principal creative activity over and beyond the construction of abstracted coding systems is the combination of different systems into new and more general systems that permit additional prediction" (Bruner, 1957/1973, p. 235). Reminiscent of Kelly’s terminology, the development of more general coding systems is like a theoretical formulation; it may be able to embrace many things that have yet to be conceived.

The Fragmentation Corollary

Explanation

Kelly (1955) noted that what we think today may not be assumed directly from what we thought yesterday. This distinct possibility lies at the base of the Fragmentation Corollary: "A person may successively employ a variety of construction subsystems which are inferentially incompatible with each other" (p. 83).

Since we exist in a state of constant flux, our successive interpretations of the world may not be derived logically from one to another. This seemingly illogical state of affairs is a matter of inconsistency, or fragmentation, that lies within a person’s construct system. The idiosyncratic interpretation of the world taken by each of us may not seem overtly logical to another person. The tacit psychological channelizing that each of us goes
through may result in processes that other people interpret as illogical.

At this point, it is important to keep in mind that the theory of personal constructs was intended originally as a theory for improving psychotherapy. Thus, it becomes more evident that Kelly (1955) was noting what happens to the individual when the permeability of his or her constructs does not allow for a sense of consistency in abstracting experience:

Since the variation in a person's construction system is subordinate to certain more permeable aspects of his [sic] system, each time his [sic] behaviors or his [sic] ideas undergo a change he [sic] must invoke, in some way or other, the permeable construct which provides the thread of consistency in his [sic] behaviors. If that permeable construct is not too clearly patterned, or if it is not too permeable, he [sic] may have to abandon its use and seek frantically for new ways of making sense out of life. These frantic attempts at new large concept formation may yield some weirdly new constructs, as he [sic] attempts to find the respects in which the events of life have definite likenesses and differences. (p. 88-89)

Analysis

Landfield (1982) defined fragmentation as "inferential incompatibility" (p. 199). Based upon this definition, he proceeded to note the logic of the Fragmentation Corollary when viewed in light of the entire theory of personal constructs:

After all, how could one deeply sense unity without some reference base in fragmentation? Conversely, how could one profoundly experience fragmentation in the absence of a contrasting feeling for and understanding of unity? To comprehend fragmentation or unity, without even an implicit contrast, seems about as
logical as contending that one can know night without
day or life without death. (p. 199)

So, Kelly drew the Fragmentation Corollary directly from the
Dichotomy Corollary in the sense that unity (or
fragmentation) is not distinguishable without the
dichotomous construct of fragmentation (or unity).

Also, the Fragmentation Corollary buttressed the
implied notions of the Modulation Corollary. In the
Modulation Corollary, Kelly (1955) did not specify that
change in our construct system is dependent on all
antecedent aspects of our construct system. The
Fragmentation Corollary makes explicit the inconsistency of
human actions implied by the Modulation Corollary. Kelly
(1955) addressed the difficulty in grasping the seeming lack
of logic in this connection between fragmentation and
modulation:

One of the difficulties . . . is that the reader is
likely to expect any true construct system to be logic-
tight and wholly internally consistent. Yet a candid
inspection of our own behavior and our own thinking
makes it difficult to see how such an ideal system
could exist in reality. (p. 85)

Thus, how else could we love, be jealous of, and then hate
someone almost simultaneously? The Fragmentation Corollary
addresses this seemingly inconsistent human behavior.

The Fragmentation Corollary also addresses how people
gain a grip on the struggle to manage change in their lives.
In an effort to suppress change in our constructs, we may
choose to constrict our field of perception (Kelly, 1955;
Landfield, 1982). To illustrate this point, Landfield (1982) used the example of the bigot who strives to "simplify events by ignoring much relevant information" (p. 217). In so doing, the bigot attempts to limit fragmentation in order to maintain his or her simplistic construct framework. Yet, Landfield went on to note that constriction is not all bad. When confronted with a need to integrate complex material (e.g., the act of curriculum development), "certain withdrawals from activities and people might provide a person with fresh perspectives" (Landfield, 1982, p. 217).

The contrasting approach to interpreting social reality is dilation (Kelly, 1955; Landfield, 1982). Dilation is the enlargement of our perceptual field, and it can be a positive or negative approach to experience. For instance, when a person is involved in a cross-cultural experience, he or she may try to view the event with such a sweeping and widened perception as to develop intense confusion. Yet, the attempt to broaden one's perceptual field may enhance human understanding by expanding, varying, or developing constructs.

Descriptive cases of dilation and constriction noted by Landfield and Leitner (1980) indicated that an alternating process of constriction and dilation contribute to effective learning, or what Kelly (1955) termed the "Creativity Cycle" (p. 528). To Landfield (1982), "effective learning could be
seen as the alternative opening of the system to new possibilities, then a partial closing of the system to the restructuring process" (p. 217-218). The Creativity Cycle, based on seemingly incompatible construct subsystems, is an example of how the Fragmentation Corollary can be viewed as a positive aspect in our process of constructing reality.

The Commonality Corollary

Explanation

Generally, Kelly’s (1955) personal construct theory emphasized the individual’s internal structure as the basis of a person’s thinking behavior. Within the realm of psychotherapy, this emphasis begs an emic approach by the therapist and toward the client or patient. This approach, however, would appear virtually impossible given the preceding corollaries. Only in the Individuality Corollary did Kelly express the notion of understanding between people when he addressed the conceivablebility of people construing the same objects or events in a similar fashion.

With the Commonality Corollary, Kelly (1970) brought the question of similarity of psychological construction to a resolution: "To the extent that one person employs a construction of experience which is similar to that employed by another, his [sic] processes are psychologically similar to those of the other person" (p. 20).² However, Kelly was

² Some years after the original publication of The Psychology of Personal Constructs (1955), Kelly (1970) corrected a previously undetected error in the original
not referring to two or more people experiencing the same or similar events or having the same or similar cycles of experience. Kelly was referring to the terminal phase of experiencing, when the construction of an event is, for the moment, completed: "What has to be similar, in order for their experience to be similar in the same degree, is their construction of experience" (Kelly, 1970, p. 21). So, two or more persons psychologically construing different experiences and drawing conclusions about different events in a similar fashion is the idea of commonality.

This corollary avoids the possibility of personal construct theory portraying humans as completely autonomous islands in a stream of events. Instead, Kelly (1970) believed that the possibility of commonality in our construing of and drawing conclusions from the world around us "leaves us free to envision man [sic] coping with 'familiar' events in new ways and co-operating with other men [sic] to produce novelties which make their world a different place to live in" (p. 22). "Man-the-scientist" became "people-the-cooperative scientists."

---

Version of the Commonality Corollary: "I have only now realized that the word 'psychological' was misplaced in my original phrasing of this corollary. Instead of modifying 'processes', as I originally had it, the term should modify 'similar', as constructive alternativism would suggest" (p. 20). This change explains the deviation of this corollary's date from the date of the other ten corollaries and the postulate as cited in this report.
Analysis

It is in the Commonality Corollary that Kelly addresses the notion of culture—not as a matter of stimulus-response resulting from upbringing and environment, but as what members of a group expect of each other:

When one does understand culture in terms of similarity of expectations, he [sic] can proceed from that point in one of two directions. He [sic] can consider the expectations of others as stimuli to which each person is subjected; or he [sic] can understand cultural similarity between persons as essentially a similarity in what they perceive is expected of them. The latter approach throws the emphasis back upon the outlook of the individual person. This is, of course, the kind of approach one would be expected to make if he [sic] employed the psychology of personal constructs. (Kelly, 1955, p. 93)

This approach to the process of intra-cultural understanding resembles closely that sought by the ethnographic anthropologist (Malinowski, 1922) and defined by LeVine (1984) as "a shared organization of ideas that includes the intellectual, moral, and aesthetic standards prevalent in a community and the meaning of communicative action" (p. 67).

With regard to the basis of culture as seen through the theory of personal constructs, Howard (1991) concluded that "a culture can be thought of as a community of individuals who see their world in a particular manner—who share particular interpretations as central to the meanings of their lives and actions" (p. 190). Without the notion of commonality, cultures would not exist. For that matter, it would be difficult to imagine mutual human understanding on
any level, not to mention the roles of the psychotherapist and the client.

The Sociality Corollary

Explanation

Kelly (1955) brought his basic theory of personal construct psychology to a close with the Sociality Corollary: "To the extent that one person construes the construction processes of another, he [sic] may play a role in a social process involving the other person" (p. 95). With this corollary, Kelly completed his theory by expanding the individual act of thinking to include the social act of construing other people's constructions. He termed the position of a construing individual in this social process a person's "role" (Kelly, 1970, p. 24).

Construing the constructions of another person, as popularly phrased, is the act of putting oneself "in the other person's shoes." At this point, the individual becomes social in his or her thinking behavior. In order for people to play a constructive role with each other, "one must not only, in some measure, see eye to eye with him [sic] but must, in some measure, have an acceptance of him [sic] and of his [sic] way of seeing things" (Kelly, 1955, p. 95).

The concept of role is critically important in the theory of psychological constructs. Even Kelly, whose prolix, two-volume explication of the psychology of personal
constructs synthesized a great deal of the psychological
theory of his day, was a bit awed by what "role" inferred in
the Sociality Corollary: "The implications of this corollary
are probably the most far reaching of any I have yet
attempted to propound" (Kelly, 1970, p. 22).

What, then, did Kelly (1955) mean by one’s role in
society?

To the extent that people understand each other or,
comprehend in the language of our theory, to the extent
that their construction systems subsume each other,
their activities in relation to each other may be
called roles, a role being a course of activity which
is played out in the light of one’s understanding of
the behavior of one or more other people. (p. 100)

With this definition, Kelly went beyond the notion of
similarity as posited in the Commonality Corollary.

For the sake of explanation, the following illustration
may help. This illustration is a variation of an example
used by Kelly (1970) in his attempt to explain the notion of
a person assuming a social role by trying to understand
another person. This example has two levels--the first one
steeped in the notion of objectivism (particularly stimulus-
response) and the second based on constructivism
(particularly the psychology of personal constructs).

Imagine a deaf and enfeebled Ludwig van Beethoven as he
began to compose the final lines of his monumental Ninth
Symphony. While writing the final presto section, he could
have envisioned the orchestra at the premiere performance as
a group of musically inclined organisms reading the music
with eyes moving in a zig-zag motion down the manuscript pages and anticipating the next page turn. This hypothesis could have been rejected or accepted by another person’s objective observation of the premiere performance. Whether or not the musically inclined behaving organisms agreed with his hypothesis would have been unimportant to the "objectivist" Beethoven.

The "constructivist" Beethoven would have viewed his role in understanding the musicians quite differently. As he scrawled the final notes of the symphony on the page, he may have wondered about the awe-inspired attitude of the musicians as they play such a beautiful symphony from the pen of a deaf composer. There they will be on opening night--the members of the orchestra--completely enthralled by the exciting climax of an altogether masterful work. After the performance, he may have gone on to ask the musicians if this is the way they really felt during the performance. No? Well, the hypothesis did not hold forth. What, then, were they thinking? In this case, Beethoven would have been attempting to construe the construction processes of other people as opposed to construing their behavior.

In the first example, Beethoven assumed the etic posture, construing only the behavior of the orchestra members. In the second example, he went a bit further by placing a construction on the way in which he imagined the
members of the orchestra might have thought. This emic posture is what Kelly (1970) meant by a person playing a role in the social process of another person: "But if I am to anticipate you, I must take some chances and try to sense what you are up to" (p. 24).

**Analysis**

Kelly’s (1955) Sociality Corollary pins social processes squarely on the testing out of other people’s outlooks. To construe someone as nothing more than a behaving organism precludes enactment of a role in relation to other people. The etic or exogenic posture leaves little opportunity for meaningful experience. Kelly (1970) believed that taking the etic posture did not involve the individual in a social process based in experience. When assuming this etic role, "the only hypotheses to which I have made an experiential commitment are hypotheses about your overt behavior" (p. 25).

In summarizing the work of Beutler (1981) and Beutler, Clarkin, Crego, and Bergen (1990), Howard (1991) noted their observation of the "convergence of values phenomenon" in applying construct theory to psychotherapy. This phenomenon bears a striking resemblance to the Sociality Corollary: "Treatment is experienced as effective when the participants begin with somewhat different perspectives, but close the gap between them as therapy progresses" (p. 196).
In taking social construction a step further, Howard (1991) drew a comparison between constructivist therapy and a cross-cultural experience: "Therapy might be seen as a cross-cultural experience wherein two life stories come together and each life trajectory is altered by the meeting" (p. 196).

Hanvey (1987) posited "cross-cultural awareness" as a dimension of his educationally attainable global perspective. In defining cross-cultural awareness, he appeared to have a sense of emic social processes similar to that of Kelly and other personal construct theorists. Hanvey defined cross-cultural awareness as

awareness of diversity of ideas and practices to be found in human societies around the world, of how such ideas and practices compare, and including some limited recognition of how the ideas and ways of one's own society might be viewed from other vantage points. (p. 89)

Construing of another's construction process opens the possibility for people to play a role in the social process of others. Employed in a cross-cultural context, Kelly's personal construct theory, particularly the Sociality Corollary, offers a basis for the emic analysis of cross-cultural experiences.

The Application of Personal Construct Theory in Cross-cultural Psychological Research

As a meta-theory of cognition, Kelly's psychology of personal constructs is adaptable to the exploration of a
person’s constructs during a cross-cultural experience. Throughout the explication of his theory, I noted points of adaptability most pertinent to this study. However, the body of literature in cross-cultural psychology reveals little use of Kelly’s ideas as a basis for cross-cultural research. In addition, most of these studies employ personal construct theory within cultures in an effort to derive cross-cultural psychological universals between cultures.

For the most part, Kelly’s theory of personal constructs appears in cross-cultural psychological research through the use of multidimensional scaling techniques in quantifying individual differences within cultures. Lonner (1980) noted Kelly’s influence in the multidimensional scaling techniques developed for cross-cultural research by Wish, Kaplan, and Deutsch (Wish, 1974; Wish, Kaplan, & Deutsch 1973; Wish, Deutsch, & Kaplan, 1976):

Using a multidimensional scaling technique known as INDSCAL (for Individual Differences Scaling), they consistently found four dimensions of inter-personal behavior. They were interpreted as 1) cooperative and friendly (e.g., husband and wife) versus competitive and hostile (e.g., a divorced couple); 2) equal (e.g., close friends) versus unequal (e.g., master and servant); 3) intense (e.g., psychotherapist and patient) versus superficial (e.g., second cousins); and 4) socioemotional and informal (e.g., siblings) versus task oriented and formal (e.g., business rivals). (p. 187-188)

Lonner (1980) related these findings to the Sociality Corollary: "That is, when comparing interpersonal structure across cultures, variance within any culture should be less
than any pattern of variation found across cultures" (p. 188).

Another study of intra-cultural construct validity conducted by DuPreez and Ward (1970) employed a variation of Kelly's role construct repertory technique with the Xhosa of Africa. By using the role repertory construct test, DuPreez and Ward were able to explore concept development among the Xhosa without the normal barriers of literacy associated with psychometric personality tests. The rep test, as an object sorting technique, is carried out with interview techniques that require no written test instruments.

In a rare study employing Kelly's theory to inter-cultural experiences, Kramsch (1981) adapted the postulate and its corollaries to an analysis of teaching culture in language classes. Based on the assumption that our psychological channels "structure a person's thinking and limit his/her access to the ideas and culture of others" (p. 3), Kramsch proceeded to develop a variation of Kelly's (1955) repertory grid test. This test asks people to construe a concept by contrasting it with other concepts in an effort to determine the range of a person's construct.

---

3 Role construct repertory technique was developed by Kelly (1955) in The Psychology of Personal Constructs. It is a psychotherapeutic technique for quantifying a patient's construct validity. This technique was developed from the basic theory and is known commonly as the Rep Test.
In her study, Kramsch (1981) employed the repertory grid test with American students studying French and German, as well as French and German students studying English. Kramsch found that the Dichotomy Corollary, Organization Corollary, Commonality Corollary, and Sociality Corollary were useful approaches to understanding the development of cross-cultural awareness in foreign language students.

Kramsch (1981) concluded that "in a foreign culture, we construe events by contrast and analogy with our own culture as well as by contrast and analogy with other events in that culture" (p. 5). This finding illustrates the Dichotomy Corollary (contrast and analogy), the Commonality Corollary (contrast and analogy with events in that culture), and the Sociality Corollary (contrast and analogy with our own culture).

In addition, Kramsch (1981) found that seeking higher level abstractions between cultures raised her students' level of cross-cultural understanding. In her study, the cross-cultural abstraction process began with "teacher" and broadened to a higher level of abstraction with the construct "role of education." She found that it was easier for the American student to understand and even espouse a French or a German view on teachers because the higher abstraction arrived at, role of education, included both the American and the French/German construct, thus serving as a natural bridge from one culture to the other. (p. 10)

Kramsch likened this cross-cultural bridging process to Kelly's Sociality Corollary. She saw Kelly's cognitive
theory as a way for her to help students "step into another persons shoes" and "as Kelly calls it, 'rotate the axes of one's thinking' without losing ones own cultural identity" (p. 13).

Curiously, the application of Kelly’s theory of personal constructs in cross-cultural psychological research is sparse. This curiosity diminishes, however, when one considers that "a major purpose of cross-cultural psychology is to test the generality of psychological laws" (Triandis, 1980, p. 3).

As a meta-theory, Kelly’s psychology of personal constructs subsumes many psychological laws, but is not concerned with generalization. The theory concerns the individual’s attempt to construe the world around him or her and the therapist’s (or, in this case, the researcher’s) attempt to put himself or herself in the other person’s shoes. Consequently, the application of Kelly’s theory to the data gathered from the cross-cultural experiences of the five Polish educators fit the interpretive, or hermeneutic, approach to naturalistic inquiry taken in this study and noted in the following chapter on research methodology.
CHAPTER III

NATURALISTIC INQUIRY AS A BASIS FOR STUDYING
PERSONAL CONSTRUCT CHANGE AND DEVELOPMENT DURING
A CROSS-CULTURAL EXPERIENCE

Introduction

Five Polish educators visited the Mershon Center in the fall of 1992 with the goal of developing a two-semester preservice teacher education course concerning schools and democratic society. During their 14 week appointment in the United States, formal and informal cross-cultural events filled their lives.

My role as coordinator of the preservice teacher education portion of the "Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland" project allowed me to pursue a unique research opportunity. This opportunity involved an inquiry into the interplay between the Polish educators' cross-cultural experiences and their thoughts on an aspect of schooling critical to emerging democracies such as Poland: the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

From my initial interest in this opportunity, through the 14 week visit of the Poles, to the writing of this report, I made many decisions concerning research
methodology. Chapter III integrates my methodological decisions with the supportive reasons for those decisions. This chapter contains four sections.

The first section presents my rationale for implementing naturalistic inquiry in this study. This section begins with reasons for my interest in carrying out this study and the link of that interest to my choice of naturalistic inquiry as the research paradigm. The first section continues with an explication of the hermeneutic tradition as the research approach within the naturalistic paradigm that I took during this study. This section concludes with the relationship of hermeneutics to the theory of personal constructs.

The second section contains a description of the research design as it emerged during the study. In addition, this section explains the evolution of data analysis procedures.

In the third section, I address the purpose of using a case study to present the findings. This section concludes with my procedures for constructing and criteria for evaluating a case study.

The fourth section describes my strategies to secure trustworthiness in this study.
Rationale for Implementing Naturalistic Inquiry in the Study

As noted in Chapter I, the rationale for this study indicates the study’s potential value to developing and established democracies undertaking collaborative projects in education for democratic citizenship. In naturalistic inquiry, case studies with sufficiently thick description are valued for their transferability between similar situations, settings, or projects (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Geertz, 1973). In order to begin this description, it may assist the reader if my personal rationale for conducting this study came first. In so doing, I anticipate clarification of the reasons for my choice of research paradigm.

Personal Interests and Naturalistic Inquiry

Near the end of my first year of doctoral studies, my adviser approached me with the possibility of moving from the position of Graduate Teaching Assistant in The Ohio State University’s College of Education to the position of Graduate Research Associate at the Mershon Center. My adviser proposed this switch in late April, 1992—approximately five months before the Polish educators’ visit to the United States. The project staff’s anticipated need for assistance in organizing and coordinating the cross-cultural portion of the "Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland" project generated this possibility.
During the following week, I met with the Director of the Mershon Center's Citizenship Development for a Global Age Program. At the end of this meeting, the Director offered me a position as Project Coordinator for the "Schools and Democratic Society" component of the project. Working with five Polish social scientists on the development of a college-level course plan intrigued me, and I accepted the offer.

Between the initial proposal and the ensuing offer, many questions ran through my mind. How would this move relate to my degree in Global and Secondary Social Studies Education? To what degree would this move encumber time in an already full doctoral program? Did I have the skills to work in an intense project with such an important goal?

These questions faded in pertinence when I considered the value of my experiences in relation to the "School and Democratic Society" project goals. Having taught secondary social studies for 16 years, I considered myself to have a fairly sound understanding of citizenship education in a democracy. I had taught an array of content (world history, American history and government, sociology, and current events) through a variety of teaching styles described generally as citizenship transmission, social science, and reflective inquiry (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1978). In addition, I had experiences with schooling in a democracy that ranged beyond the classroom, such as extracurricular
duties, public service in local government, and volunteer community service.

Yet, a question remained: So what? My experience might bring considerable insight to pre- or inservice American teachers. However, what value did it possess for the educational context of a fledgling democracy such as Poland?

Even though all of my grandparents were born in Poland, they immigrated to the United States before World War I. Culturally, I learned much from them. However, their knowledge of Polish society was limited to life, as they saw it, during the tripartition of Poland between Prussia, Russia, and Austria-Hungary. My only other experience with Poland was during a 1976 Ohio State University study-tour. Our stop in Warsaw was brief and took place when the communist end of the bi-polar world enveloped the daily life of Polish society. Other than this fleeting encounter with Poland under communism and a sense of affiliation with Poland as home to my ethnic heritage, little else from my experiences seemed transferable to the project.

In spite of these initial concerns, questions began to form in my mind during May and June, 1992. What would be the value of the project’s cross-cultural aspect for Polish educators developing a two-semester course on schools and democratic society? For that matter, what would be valueless in such a setting? In addition, what could I learn from this experience that would induce me to reflect
upon my accepted and unquestioned understanding of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship? With regard to the previous question, what would make the familiar appear strange?

In late June, 1992, I made my first trip to Poland as a member of the project. I accompanied the Citizenship Development for a Global Age Director, faculty associates, and staff of the "Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland" project. Although most of the group travelled to Poland in January, the latter portion of this trip was the first encounter with candidates for the five positions available in the preservice teacher education portion of the project.

On July 1, 1992, the "Schools and Democratic Society" Project Co-Directors, Senior Consultants, and I attended a meeting in Warsaw with seven Polish social scientists and teacher educators interested in the project. The Co-Directors of the larger project—"Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland"—were also the Co-Directors of the "Schools and Democratic Society" component. The American Co-Director was the Mershon Center’s Citizenship Development for a Global Age Program Director, and the Polish Co-Director was the Director for Teacher Training in the Polish Ministry of National Education. At this stage of the project, "Schools and Democratic Society" had two Senior Consultants. They were Americans. One Senior Consultant
was the Director of the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University, and the other was the Chairperson of the Educational Policy and Leadership Department in The Ohio State University’s College of Education. When development of the "Schools and Democratic Society" course plan began in the United States, the American Project Co-Director and a professor emeritus from The Ohio State University College of Education shared responsibilities for conducting the seminars.

Our meeting at the Ministry of National Education in Warsaw, and the ensuing luncheon, helped to clarify my personal concerns. It became apparent that a 45 year lull in building democratic institutions left the post-communist teacher education community at a loss in their attempt to develop a new model for preservice teacher education.

The relationship between school and community in a democracy and the substantive aspect of schools in a democratic society—including the methodological implementation of democratic theory and practice in schools—were topics of discussion throughout the day. Although not clear on the overall value of my professional experience to the project, our conversations seemed to indicate that my experiences held some significance for the Poles. I felt a growing sense of merit in my question concerning the value, or lack thereof, in the cross-cultural aspect of the project.
Upon our return to the United States, I considered a variety of research questions related to the cross-cultural aspect of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project. After consultation with the Director of the Citizenship Development for a Global Age Program and my adviser, the following question emerged: How would the Polish educators' conceptualizations of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship change during a cross-cultural experience in the United States? I decided to pursue this question during the cross-cultural aspect of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project.

The form of this question evolved throughout the study, and its evolution generated other questions. The final forms of these questions appeared in Chapter I (pp. 2, 6). However, my initial task was to conceptualize a method by which to carry out this study. A desire to hear the Polish educators "reveal their own judgments in their own vocabulary regarding some important set of elements in their own experience" (McCoy, 1983, p. 175) biased my conceptualization of this study.

The choice of an investigative method depends on many factors, prominent among them being the question or problem under consideration and one's perspective or worldview. During the remainder of the summer, 1992, I began work on a research design based on a paradigm that appeared to fit
most sensibly the question at hand and my personal beliefs. My paradigm of choice was naturalistic inquiry.

**Naturalistic Inquiry**

The term naturalistic inquiry embodies, but does not distinguish, the many traditions one can follow in enacting a study based on this research paradigm. For instance, in synthesizing the terms Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Patton (1990) ascribed to naturalistic inquiry's various approaches, one would encounter the following list of qualifiers:

- postpositivistic
- ethnographic
- phenomenological
- subjective
- case study
- qualitative
- hermeneutic
- humanistic
- heuristics
- symbolic interactionism
- ecological psychology
- systems theory
- chaos theory: non-linear dynamics
- orientational

Attendant to this list is the proclivity for overlap between these various modes of naturalistic inquiry (Patton, 1990).

Nonetheless, all of these approaches share commonalities under the umbrella of naturalistic inquiry. Chief among them is investigation in the natural setting of the phenomenon of interest "because the researcher frequents places where the events he or she is interested in naturally occur" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992, p. 3). Lincoln and Guba (1982) noted five axioms that link these various approaches
to each other, even though choice of an approach is
determined by its "fit to the phenomena into which one
proposes to inquire" (p. 237).

The Axioms of the Naturalistic Paradigm

Noted briefly in Chapter I, the following is an
expanded explanation of naturalistic inquiry’s axioms
accompanied by examples from this study.

Axiom 1. The nature of reality: There are multiple,
intangible realities which can be studied only
holistically (to dissociate the wholes is to alter them
radically); inquiry into these multiple realities will
inevitably diverge (each inquiry raises more questions
than it answers) so that prediction and control are
unlikely outcomes, although some level of understanding
(verstehen) can be achieved. (Lincoln & Guba, 1982, pp.
237-238)

The open question for naturalistic inquirers and
personal construct theorists is not whether reality exists,
but what people make of it. The following example comes
from two people watching the same event at the same time and
their interpretation of that event. The event took place on
November 3, 1992, at the home of the American Project Co-
Director. In attendance were the Polish project
participants and several American project staff members.
The occasion for this gathering was to watch the returns of
the election from which Bill Clinton became forty-second
president of the United States.

In their reflective journals, two of the Polish
educators offered their interpretations of that evening’s
event. One Polish educator wrote:
We are very often asked if the election impressed us. Of course, the answer is "yes," but I think that the American election shows also all the weaknesses of American democracy. The people who really do not understand the programs of the candidates choose their candidate because he is more handsome, or younger, or tells jokes. It's a contradiction of democracy. The democracy on election day appears to me as an enormous illusion.

The other wrote:

It was exciting by itself, but also we had an opportunity to watch different TV stations reporting the election results. [The American Project Co-Director] told me that my preferable American TV network, CNN, is perceived in the States as "left" biased. I feel rather hostile toward Western "leftists," but I still do like CNN. I wonder what are the differences in criteria we and you apply to estimate something as "left" or "right" oriented. It can be responsible for some misunderstandings when we are talking about democracy.

To the first respondent, the election results invoked a sense of disdain over the "contradiction of democracy" embodied in the way candidates sell themselves to and are perceived by the American public. The respondent recognized this event as a problem that defined, in part, the negative pole of the construct "democracy." The second respondent, viewing the same television channels in the same setting, noted the differences in defining criteria for labelling the media in a democracy and how those differences could influence discussions throughout the project. Although both respondents noted the event as problematic, neither respondent construed the event in the same way.

**Axiom 2.** The inquirer-object relationship: The inquirer and the object interact to influence one another; especially is this mutual interaction present when the
object of inquiry is another human being (respondent). (Lincoln & Guba, 1982, p. 238)

Once the inquirer and the respondent begin a correspondence, this interaction becomes mutually effectual. This relationship becomes apparent on many different levels during a naturalistic inquiry, but the following example comes from two interviews conducted during the study. More explanation of my interview process is forthcoming in the next section, but for the moment, suffice it to note that the interviews conducted in this study followed the general interview guide approach (Patton, 1990). This sort of interview begins with a set of general, predetermined questions that allow for conversational divergence within each question.

During the third round of interviews, one of the questions was: "Do you still believe that democratic citizenship education holds much potential for Polish society as you may have thought it did when you arrived in the United States? Why or why not?" The following columns represent the questions that emerged from the responses of two Polish educators. "OC" is an acronym for "Observer's Comment."

\[\text{OC's act as explanatory footnotes within the data. At times, meaning of certain nouns and pronouns refer to objects and events explained in the data before or after the segment of data displayed in a case study's narrative.}\]
Respondent A

(a) How do you see the possibility of doing this [OC: reorganizing education] in Poland?

(b) Why do you think that Poland will be receptive to all of this?

(c) In what ways does this process hold potential for Poland?

Respondent B

(a) In what ways did it [OC: the cross-cultural experience] make you believe?

(b) What do you see as the difference [OC: between education and indoctrination]?

(c) Why can you now make this differentiation?

(d) What was that ideology [OC: of a professor this respondent had met during the project]?

(e) What specific values did he discuss?

(f) What do you think of these values?

Although Respondent B’s interview extended beyond the questions noted above, the point remains that in each case, given the same general interview guide question, the opening response led to a conversational interaction. This interaction between me and the respondents led to different trains of thought in each interview. This example illustrates not only the obtrusive nature of the inquirer, but also that of the respondent. The respondents fed back their thoughts, and, by interpreting those thoughts, I fed forward to the next question.

Axiom 3. The nature of truth statements: The aim of inquiry is to develop an idiographic body of knowledge. This knowledge is best encapsulated in a series of "working hypotheses" that describe the individual case. Generalizations are impossible since phenomena are
neither time- nor context-free. (Lincoln & Guba, 1982, p. 238)

Case study reporting of a specific setting, context, and group of individuals leaves little room for conventional generalization. Instead, a case study may supply a natural basis for generalization by the person reading it (Stake, 1978). This goal is achieved through working hypotheses that may or may not be transferred to the reader’s context. That decision lies in the mind of the consumer. The researcher attempts to describe the situation at a level of detail that relates directly to the question or problem at hand. This description allows consumers to decide if the tentative, working hypotheses of the study apply to their situations, thoughts, and/or values. Chapter V of this report serves as an example of this axiom, but only if the consumer sees it as such.

Axiom 4. Attribution/explanation of action: An action may be explainable in terms of multiple interacting factors, events, and processes that shape it and are part of it; inquirers can, at best, establish plausible inferences about the patterns and webs of such shaping in any given case [i.e., "mutual simultaneous shaping" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 37)]. (Lincoln & Guba, 1982, p. 238)

Kelly (1955) noted that our processes are psychologically channelized by the way in which we anticipate events. Since no two people live exactly the same lives, their interpretations of reality are idiosyncratic. Linear causality would hold little credence under this assumption since each individual interprets an
inestimable number and variety of events during his or her lifetime. To extract "one-way" influences would be impossible. Each event shapes and is shaped by the individual.

For example, one respondent pointed to recognition of "democracy as a process" as a major change in his assumptions concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Pressed for an explanation, he said:

One of my troubles before was that I was upset because of the state of policy and the political landscape of my country. I was becoming a loser. An example would be that if somebody proposed a solution for Parliament, and it was not good, I was upset because I felt myself as a loser. Now, I know that you can fight the next day in the same direction. I now know that democracy is a process that never ends.

An interpretation of his response based on this axiom would indicate that his personal construct system modulated and molded, simultaneously, his interpretation based on a web of experiences that came before. The interaction of these previous experiences with an interpretation of his cross-cultural experience mutually and concurrently shaped his construct and his interpretation of his experiences in the United States. To extract one, or even several, causal linkages may be impossible and possibly incorrect.

**Axiom 5.** The role of values in inquiry: Inquiry is always value-bound. It is value-bound in at least four ways: (1) inquiries are influenced by inquirer values; (2) inquiry is value-influenced by the choice of paradigm selected; (3) inquiry is value-influenced by the choice of substantive theory and methods used to guide the collection and analysis of data; and (4)
inquiry is influenced by the values inherent in the context. (Lincoln & Guba, 1982, p. 238)

Point 1: This inquiry was value-bound by what I chose to study—the construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship during a cross-cultural experience. Point 2: This inquiry was value-influenced by choice of the naturalistic paradigm and this paradigm's reliance on participant observation instead of unobtrusive measurement. Point 3: This inquiry was value-influenced by Kelly's personal construct psychology as a choice for the theoretical framework. With regard to Point 4, my continuing involvement in the project obviates the "value resonance" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 178) between myself and the goals of the project and the project participants (both American and Polish).

Given these five assumptions, Lincoln and Guba (1985) enumerated 14 aspects of naturalistic inquiry that characterize this research methodology. Where possible, examples from this study highlight the characteristics.

The Characteristics of Operational Naturalistic Inquiry

Characteristic 1: Natural setting. Pursuing a question in its natural setting is paramount to the naturalistic inquirer. Abstracting the event or object under investigation from its context damages the event or object's meaning within the whole picture because "naturalistic ontology suggests that realities are wholes that cannot be
understood in isolation from their context" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 39).

This characteristic highlights the need to capture meaning in context. My position as Project Coordinator allowed me to pursue this sort of meaning as a participant observer. During the cross-cultural portion of the project, I followed, with few exceptions, the syllabus schedule and itinerary of the educators. Organizationally, the formal part of their experiences was my responsibility.

Frequently, my responsibility extended beyond their formal schedule. For example, a review panel of experts arrived in Columbus near the end of the 14 weeks. Their charge was to critique the course plan's first draft. The Polish educators and I worked collaboratively from Friday to Sunday (December 4, 5, 6, 1992) to edit this first draft of the course plan for Monday's review. Opportunities of this sort made me as much a participant as an observer during the cross-cultural aspect of the project.

Socially, I accompanied the educators on most group outings. Occasionally, individual educators asked me to accompany them on errands, to social gatherings, and at meals. Frequent discussions at their living quarters, sometimes after interviews, led to an understanding of their experiences outside the formal setting. These informal discussions helped me build a holistic picture of their cross-cultural experiences.
Characteristic 2: Human instrument. Reality fluctuates, and humans adapt idiosyncratically to the varieties of situations they encounter every day (Kelly, 1955). Thus, the human as a data-gathering instrument is more capable of adjusting to fluctuations in a social setting than pencil and paper data-gathering instruments developed a priori. Multiple perspectives, unexpected occurrences, and diverse values and morals are but a few examples of a fluctuating social reality to which the human data gathering instrument adapts with resilience.

In cross-cultural research, one is bound to encounter problems concerning language because there are "words and ideas that simply can’t be translated" (Patton, 1990, p. 338). Early in my data gathering, the value of the human instrument became apparent because of language problems. The Polish educators spoke English as a second language, and I spoke no Polish. The need to negotiate literal meaning was constant.

Each of us understood this problem at the onset of the research process. The Polish educators agreed that one of the positive offshoots of this study was the chance to improve their English. One of the respondents raised this possibility in a short preface to her reflective journal: "Sorry my English. Sorry my spelling. Sorry my handwriting! Could we make a deal? I’ll write, but you’ll show me my most important faults!"
As per the Polish educators' requests, I edited all transcriptions of interviews and journals throughout the study. In many cases, my editing led to slightly different meaning or factual misrepresentations that we corrected jointly after each Polish educator checked their transcript for accuracy.

By allowing me to conduct in-depth interviews and by writing personal reflections, the Polish educators offered me opportunities to improve my understanding of their changing constructs over time. During many interviews, a Polish educator and I would discuss the meaning of an English word or phrase that would lead to a series of questions that could not be part of a pencil and paper instrument developed in advance. Our daily, face-to-face contact gave me privileged access to the ideas of the Polish educators. Adapting to their concerns during their stay in Columbus gained me this sort of access and enabled in-depth exchange of ideas leading to the data generated during this study.

During the project, I noted the inadequacy of a paper and pencil survey instrument under these circumstances. This observation came from an experience related indirectly to the project. For two weeks in October, 1992, a group of 16 Central and Eastern European university educators and national education government officials visited the Mershon Center. They came from eight countries. Their visit
coincided with the middle third of the Polish educators' work at the Center. The 16 visitors traveled from the Center for Civic Education in California, through the Mershon Center, and to the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University. Their final destination was the Atlantic Council in Washington, D.C.

Their stay was comparatively short, and I had an interest in their interpretations of what their American experience meant to democratic citizenship education in their respective countries. Since the "Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland" project engaged much of the Mershon staff's time, I decided to use a small, short answer set of predetermined questions to gather the data. Although I used the results for an article, the surveys fell far short of offering any sort of in-depth interpretation of their experiences or indications of their construct change and development. This phenomenon indicated the value of the human instrument to go beyond the superficial and to focus on the idiosyncracy of individual construct systems in order to interpret these systems.

**Characteristic 3: Utilization of tacit knowledge.** Tacit knowledge, or a person's intuitive grasp of reality, rests at the base of propositional knowledge. To the naturalistic inquirer, "tacit knowledge becomes the base on which the human instrument builds many of the insights and hypotheses that will eventually develop (and that will be cast in
propositional form)" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 198). Tacit knowledge is synonymous with the psychological channels through which we anticipate events (Kelly, 1955).

Tacit knowledge played an important role throughout this study. After 16 years of teaching secondary social studies, my construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship contained intuitive knowledge that applied throughout the study and the project. During project seminars, data gathering, and data analysis, certain events and objects triggered my tacit knowledge. For example, category development from the data, especially early in the study, frequently included data, but no categorical title. The "fit" of a datum to the other data in the category seemed appropriate. As more data entered the category, a more explicit pattern led to naming and defining the category.

**Characteristic 4: Qualitative methods.** The naturalistic researcher's bent for the human instrument leads to his or her reliance on qualitative data. "We mean that the human-as-instrument is inclined toward methods that are extensions of normal human activity: looking, listening, speaking, reading, and the like" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 199).

Patton (1990) noted that qualitative methods "consist of three kinds of data collection: (1) in-depth, open-ended interviews; (2) direct observation; and (3) written documents" (p. 10). The number of sub-headings under each
of these categories expands with the needs of the researcher in relation to the question or problem. For instance, Glesne and Peshkin (1992) noted that music, paintings, drawings, and films may add to the body of "documents" ascribed as qualitative data in a particular study.

In this study, I operationalized this characteristic through four qualitative data gathering methods: reflections, interviews, observations, and documents. In the upcoming section on research design and process, I address my use of these methods.

**Characteristic 5: Purposive sampling.** Regardless of paradigm, researchers choose samples with a purpose in mind. For the naturalistic inquirer, samples that contain in-depth cases rich in information on the central issue, question, or problem confronted in the study form the logic of purposive sampling. The sample may change as the focus of the study narrows and different respondents offer information relevant to the focus.

This study involved a population, not a sample, of participants. Fortunately, all of the Polish educators consented to participate in the study. In addition, none of them exercised their right to drop out of the study at any time.

**Characteristic 6: Inductive data analysis.** Patterns emerge from the data through inductive logic. As the naturalistic study evolves, "data must be analyzed
inductively (that is, from specific, raw units of information to subsuming categories of information) in order to define local working hypotheses or questions that can be followed up" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 203). Inductive analysis precludes the development of a priori theory for verification or negation through the observation of predefined variables.

I analyzed all of the data gathered during this study. This analysis process occurred as I gathered data. From the broad scope of inclusion emerged categories that contained patterns and anomalies that defined the constructs of the Polish educators. As these categories emerged, ensuing data gathering focused on further depth into these categories.

For example, one of the subsuming categories that emerged from the data was "attitudes." This category included a sub-category, "barriers." This sub-category included such things as educational conservatism, resistance to change, and the role of the Catholic Church in Poland. The range of convenience for barriers to education for democratic citizenship education in Poland helped to define the larger construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Barriers became objects and events that buttressed the negative pole of the construct under investigation.

Characteristic 7: Grounded theory. Building on inductive logic as the basis for theory development, Glaser
and Strauss (1967) proposed the notion of grounded theory. The theory, when grounded in data, is emergent. Emergence of "local theory" (Elden, 1981, p. 261) from the data is a consequence of the naturalist’s quest to understand multiple realities and to report cases suitable for transference of findings and assertions from local, contextually driven data to similar situations.

Grounded theory is the theory of the local setting and not the affirmation or negation of generalized models. In this sense, contextual values are paramount because "all behavior, without exception, is completely determined by and pertinent to the phenomenal field of the behaving organism" (Kelly, 1955, p. 40).

Emergent patterns in the data grounded and warranted my assertions. The following is an example of an assertion grounded in the data of this study: The role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship is constructed through the school’s level of student engagement in democratic skills and student development of democratic attitudes. Chapter V displays the data that ground this assertion.

**Characteristic 8: Emergent design.** Since the naturalistic inquirer is not aware of what he or she does not know a priori, the design of a naturalistic inquiry is emergent:

The investigator may possess a great deal of tacit knowledge that is germane to the phenomena to be studied. As the inquiry proceeds, it becomes more and more focused; salient elements begin to emerge,
insights grow, and theory begins to be grounded in the data obtained. Hypotheses can be formed and questions posed. (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 209)

The researcher determines avenues worthy of pursuit as he or she becomes immersed in the phenomena of the setting. The design and the process of the inquiry are not linear, but synergetic. The emergent design and process of this study is the sole concern of the next section of this chapter.

Characteristic 9: Negotiated outcomes. Grounded theory, the researcher's interpretations, and accurate reporting are but a few of the aspects of naturalistic inquiry that must be negotiated between the researcher and the respondents. In construing the constructions of others, one has an obligation to check factual accuracy and grounded assertions with the people who offered thoughts, actions, or products. Accepting this responsibility is not only common sense fairness, but also brings credibility to the study.

Negotiated outcomes—a bedrock of trustworthiness in a naturalistic study—relate to the researcher's persistence in checking his or her data and findings with the respondents. My process of member checking is part of the next section of this chapter. Briefly, though, I returned all interview transcripts and reflections to the Polish educators after I edited these data. In cases of misunderstanding or misrepresentation, the respondent and I negotiated an appropriate meaning.
**Characteristic 10: Case study reporting mode.**

Considered generally as an "insightful description of complex events" (King, Keohane, & Verba, 1994, p. 44), the case study report assumes many forms. Nonetheless, the case study plays an important role in creating a picture rich enough to allow transferability of the findings. In addition, the case study as a vehicle of communication bears attributes necessary for the reporting of intricate, multiple realities; mutual shaping; and values held by the researcher and embedded in the context. In this study, I developed five case studies. The third section of this chapter describes how I constructed the cases and criteria for evaluating naturalistic case studies.

**Characteristic 11: Idiographic interpretation.** Based upon the naturalist's belief that social knowledge is time- and context-bound, construction of meaning takes place only within the borders of the particular situation at hand. A study's range of convenience, not unlike a construct's range of convenience (Kelly, 1955), loses its value when it exceeds its boundaries of similarity to an anticipated event or object. This depletion in value does not exclude the construct's or the study's use under different, more transferable circumstances.

Two points highlight the characteristic of idiographic interpretation in this study. First, when a researcher poses a question like the one on which I based this study,
the objective is to gain understanding in a particular situation, and not generalization. Depth of understanding at one site builds a case that has potential for transferability to another site.

Second, the uniqueness of this project at the time of this study precluded any attempt to sample similar projects for generalization. This uniqueness was intact as of May, 1994. At that time, I finished editing the final English version of the course plan. On the inside cover, a note to readers of English states:

This document is the English translation of a two-volume course plan developed for use in Poland. It represents new ground in Polish teacher education—a course designed to highlight the role of school in a democratic society. To our knowledge, it is the first of its kind in post-communist Central and Eastern Europe [italics added]. (Hamot, 1994)

Even if my interest was generalization with regard to cross-cultural experiences across similar programs, it was not possible.

**Characteristic 12: Tentative application.** Since no two events are exactly the same, the idiographic interpretation of an object, event, or situation is an assumption of the naturalistic inquirer. The viability of an idiographic interpretation for other situations is the decision of those seeking to make the transfer of the interpretation to their situation. Transference, or tentative applicability, of idiographic interpretations is similar to Kelly’s (1970) Commonality Corollary: "To the extent that one person
employs a construction of experience which is similar to that employed by another, his [sic] processes are psychologically similar to those of the other person" (p. 20). Only tentative application of a naturalistic study to the same site at a different time, or another, similar site, determines its transferability.

This study is a dissertation. As such, my Dissertation Committee stands in judgment of my efforts. The Committee includes the American Project Co-Director, the Senior Consultant of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project, and a faculty member whose social studies methods course was attended by the Polish educators. The fourth member of the Committee is a faculty member who had several meetings with the Polish educators.

Judgment of this report's tentative applicability is left to each Committee member and his or her knowledge of and experience in the project. Their collective and individual knowledge of the project represents a standard by which this report is subject to evaluation for tentative applicability.

Characteristic 13: Focus-determined boundaries. Although the naturalistic inquirer may enter a context with an urge to grasp the participants' views in a holistic manner, decisions concerning focus remain constant throughout his or her time in the field. The inquiry is bound by that which emerges as relevant to the multiple
realities and values present in the study's context and within the larger framework of the researcher's problem or question. Indeed, this larger framework may change during the course of the research, but the twin guides of inductive analysis and emergent theory assist the researcher in focusing the breadth, depth, and intention of the study.

This characteristic exemplifies the need to begin a naturalistic inquiry with a broad spectrum of concerns and to narrow the focus as the study progresses. An example from this study stems from the evolution of interview questions during the study.

In developing the first general interview guide, I read the first reflections of the Polish educators. I looked for patterns among their concerns about and definitions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship in Poland. The following is the general interview guide I used during the first of five interview sessions:

Question #1: Tell me why you are interested in being a part of this project. What in your life has prompted you to take part in developing a course for the role of schools in a democratic society?

Question #2: What is the difference between schools for a democratic society and a democratic society for schools?

Question #3: What was the role of schools in the previous "authoritarian" society?

Question #4: What knowledge, skills, and attitudes are necessary for developing democratic citizenship?

Question #5: What could and what should be done to promote the idea of the democratic school?
Question #6: What are the barriers to democratic citizenship education in Poland today?

Question #7: Is it possible to educate for democratic citizenship at all?

Question #8: What is "learned" and "acquired" helplessness in terms of a society?

Question #9: What is the role of parents in the Polish educational system?

This list of questions reflects the scope of concerns raised by the Polish educators at the beginning of their cross-cultural experience.

I used the following general interview guide for the last set of interviews prior to the Polish educators' departure:

Question #1: Even though you are still within the experiential context of this project, we are very near the end. Personally, what do you see as the greatest positive aspects of your stay in the United States? Negative aspects?

Question #2: What do you see as the greatest positive aspects concerning your definition of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship? Negative aspects?

Question #3: What is the "ideal citizen?" What are the aspects of this experience that have contributed to your definition?

The evolution of focus evidenced by these two sets of interview questions is an example of the boundary determined by the Polish educators and me. The first set of questions sought information ranging from personal motivation to the definition of terms. The last set of interview questions reflects the transmutation and narrowing of the study's focus to an exploration of construct change and development...
during a cross-cultural experience. In both cases, though, the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship was the construct under investigation.

**Characteristic 14: Trustworthiness.** Ontological underpinnings notwithstanding, that which separates "fact" from "fiction," or warranted assertions from gut-level speculation, is the status of trust established by the researcher and granted by the consumer. Procedures for developing trustworthiness in naturalistic inquiry germinate from the need to establish the credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of the study as a process and a product (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In the last section of this chapter, I address the procedures for meeting these four criteria of trustworthiness.

Regardless of the approach undertaken by the naturalistic researcher, these 14 characteristics are inseparably interdependent so that "each may be taken as a raison d'être for the others; and that the exclusion of any one of them would seriously damage all" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 43).

Aspects of each characteristic may change as a study’s design emerges from the natural context under investigation. Before describing the transmutation of this study’s design, though, an explanation of the relationship between naturalistic inquiry through a hermeneutic approach and the theory of personal constructs may serve as a bridge between
the investigative theory and practice employed in this study.

Hermeneutics as a Means for Understanding

Personal Construct Change and Development

Inquiry is influenced by values, and these values come to the forefront of a study through one's choices of the substantive theory and the methodology employed in collecting and analyzing data. To this point, this report represents, in a general sense, a nexus between naturalistic inquiry and personal construct theory. For example, it was noted in Chapter II, and also by Lincoln and Guba (1985), that the substantive theory of personal construct psychology supports the methodology and ontological underpinnings of naturalistic inquiry.

However, there are many theoretical traditions in naturalistic inquiry. In this study, the approach taken was, for the most part, hermeneutics. The reason for this choice stemmed from my desire to interpret the Polish educators' constructions of reality during a cross-cultural experience and with specific regard to their constructions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. This act of interpretation is the basis of hermeneutics.

Hermeneutics Defined

Originally, ancient Greeks applied hermeneutics as a "technique for interpreting legends, stories, and other
texts" (Patton, 1990, p. 84). Defined today,

[hermeneutics is the art of uncovering that which is hidden. It is the process by which we come to understand the other, whether this other is person, text, or data. The hermeneutic process necessarily involves both an interpreter and a collection of elements to be interpreted. The interpreter may be a researcher, clinician, reader, listener, viewer, or other. The minimal requirement for interpretation is a sympathetic intention to understand the collection of elements available for interpretation. This sympathetic intention implies that the meaning to be extracted from the elements is somehow integral with these elements and not solely a construction in the mind of the interpreter. (Taylor, 1990, p. 107)

Cherryholmes (1991) noted that "their [hermeneutic inquirers'] usage of text goes far beyond words on a page to include the practices by which meanings are constructed, maintained, and conveyed" (p. 48).

Phenomenological Inquiry and the Hermeneutic Circle

In defining hermeneutics, Patton (1990) noted the early roots of today's hermeneutic approach: "Hermeneutic philosophy, developed by Wilhelm Dilthey and other German philosophers, is the study of interpretive understanding, or meaning, with special attention to context and original purpose" (p. 84). This similarity to meaning in context developed in Lincoln and Guba's (1982, 1985) first axiom and first characteristic of naturalistic inquiry raises the question, What is the difference between a phenomenological approach² and a hermeneutic approach? Apparently, the two

² According to Patton (1990), phenomenological inquirers "focus on how we put together the phenomena we experience in such a way as to make sense of the world and, in so doing, develop a worldview. There is no separate or
approaches overlap: "Interpretive inquiry embraces the view that . . . phenomena cannot be understood independent from human interests and activities . . ." (Packer & Addison, 1989, p. 19).

Basically, though, the major overlap involves the act of description (phenomenology) and the further act of interpretation: "[Hermeneutists] are much clearer about the fact that they are construing 'reality' on the basis of their interpretation of data with the help of the participants who provided the data in the study" (Eichelberger, 1989, p. 9). This notion reflects Lincoln and Guba's (1985) characteristic concerning negotiated outcomes between the researcher and the respondents. Hermeneutists term this act "entering the circle": "Establishing a point of view, a perspective, is the forward arc [of the circle], and evaluation forms the reverse arc [of the circle]" (Packer and Addison, 1989, p. 33). The hermeneutic circle moves in its forward arc from the understanding of the researcher to an interpretation of the phenomenon under investigation and back to the researcher in a way that widens his or her constructs' ranges of convenience.

___________________

(objective) reality for people. There is only what they know their experience is and means. The subjective experience incorporates the objective thing and a person's reality" (p. 69).
Typically, the hermeneutic process begins when the interpretive inquirer solicits the first respondent’s construction of reality. Based on that construction, the inquirer explores guidance offered by the first respondent. This guidance leads often to the identification of other respondents, who, in turn, offer constructions that begin to build patterns and anomalies. This process focuses the study. The interpretive inquirer continues the process until the data reach a point of redundancy. If time allows, the inquirer returns to the first respondent with new requests for information developed during the data gathering and continues the circular process as before. In a visual sense, the process resembles a spiral that stops when the inquirer feels that the data cover the patterns that emerged during the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1989).

For this study, I made a slight adjustment in the hermeneutic approach. As per the request of the Polish educators, I developed interview questions in advance and gave the questions to the respondents before each round of interviews. I did not change the questions to reflect constructions developed earlier in the round.

However, I carried the thoughts of each respondent to the next respondent during each round of interviews and within the context of the interview guide approach (Patton, 1990). I cycled constructions offered in one interview forward to the next interview in each round. I accomplished
this aspect of the hermeneutic process by continuously adding notes to my interview guide sheet throughout each interview round. These notes stemmed from analysis of the previous interview(s) within that round of interviews. Constructions leading to new questions helped form the basis of the next round of interviews. In addition, reflections and project documents, as data, added to the development of questions for each interview round. These data offered concerns and constructions that I incorporated into succeeding interview guides. Figure 1 (p. 108) illustrates this process.

**Hermeneutics and Grounded Theory**

The hermeneutic approach to naturalistic inquiry demands interpretation from a specific perspective. In this case, the perspective stems from the theoretical framework of personal construct psychology. What remains, though, is the salient question of grounded theory in relation to interpretation from a specific perspective. How can the two co-exist? Addison (1989) noted two major interpretive strengths of grounded theory:

Both grounded theory and interpretive research are constantly comparative; that is, they adopt the stance of always questioning gaps, omissions, inconsistencies, misunderstandings, and not-yet understandings. This practice is a central feature of both grounded theory and hermeneutic research.

Grounded theorists recognize the importance of context and social structure. Glaser (1978) talks about context and conditions that contribute to social situations, and their effect on social structure . . . (p. 41)
Figure 1: Hermeneutic Research Process
In addition, Addison (1989) clarified two major differences between grounded theory and interpretive research:

Grounded theory is an inductive process: theory must grow out of the data and be grounded in that data; theory must not become just the construction of the researcher. In contrast, in interpretive research, theory building is a co-constitutive process: the researcher begins with preunderstandings that affect how he or she perceives the world and selects "data." Theory must be built not just from the bottom up, but hermeneutically co-constituted in a dialogical manner that involves much self-reflection by the researcher.

Although grounded theorists admit the perspective of the researcher changes while doing research, they seem to limit the change in the researcher to learning about the world of the participants rather than examining his or her own preunderstandings. This is an important hermeneutic principle: that as the researcher learns about the social interaction he or she is researching, he or she also learns about him or herself. (pp. 41-42)

The interpretive inquirer seeks to develop a case that brings the respondent's intuitive knowledge to the fore. In completing the hermeneutic circle, the researcher makes his or her intuitive knowledge explicit through reflection on and interpretation of the knowledge gained. Hermeneutics, not unlike mutual shaping or the act of learning, is a circular process. Addison termed his analysis of grounded theory through hermeneutic standards "a grounded interpretive method" (p. 42).

Hermeneutics and Personal Construct Psychology

The reflective aspect of the hermeneutic approach lends much to the rationale for personal construct psychology as this study's theoretical framework. Gaining a grasp of a
respondent's thoughts is a dual construction: the respondent offers an interpretation of reality, and the inquirer construes that interpretation through his or her construct system--a reflective act.

Kelly (1955) offered personal construct psychology as a basis for psychotherapy. He approached psychotherapy as something that could bring out the intuitive knowledge and beliefs of the patient so that the therapist could gain an emic perspective as possible and begin to understand the world of the patient. By making that world explicit, and thus gaining a point from which to embark on understanding the worldview of the patient, the process of mutual shaping takes place.

In making her case that hermeneutics and personal construct psychology are one-in-the-same idea, Taylor (1990) noted that

both research and psychotherapy begin with the optimistic assumption that meaning can be discovered from data. . . . Meaning can be uncovered by exploration, insight, and learning. This is what is meant by hermeneutics, the discipline concerned with interpretation of human behavior as essentially intentional. Kelly's fundamental postulate that "a person's processes are psychologically channelized by the ways in which he anticipates events" (1955, p. 46) is therefore a hermeneutic position and personal construct psychology is a hermeneutic exercise. (p. 106)

This logic led me to apply Kelly's ideas not as a theory to be verified or negated, but as a meta-theory that embodied my beliefs and lent a constructive hand to data gathering
and analysis during the cross-cultural aspect of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project.

**Hermeneutic Inquiry, Personal Construct Psychology, and Cross-cultural Experiences**

As noted earlier, my objective in carrying out this study was to bring forth the Polish educators' interpretations of their cross-cultural experiences. Specifically, what changes took place in the Polish educator's constructions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship during this experience, and what were the contributing factors?

As Project Coordinator, I held the position of a participant observer. Our close association precluded an etic stance on observing and interpreting the Polish educators' changing constructs. In addition, I could not exclude my beliefs and values from the inquiry. This impossibility gave me the chance to examine my beliefs concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

Given my position, my proximity to the Polish educators' experiences, and our daily interactions, I concluded that pursuit of my question would take the path of a naturalistic inquiry. Due to the fact that my interpretations of their reality would feed back into my constructs, the hermeneutic tradition of naturalistic inquiry seemed to make the most sense. In light of the data
gathered, Kelly's theory of personal constructs gave me a handle for analysis because of its close relationship to the axioms and characteristics of naturalistic inquiry and its resemblance to the philosophical underpinnings of hermeneutics.

Understanding construct change during a cross-cultural experience would be difficult without assuming the position of participant observer. Addison (1989) noted that the participant observer's presence will influence the actions of the respondents. Nonetheless, even if the Polish educators adjusted their actions in my presence, carrying on indefinitely in this manner was doubtful due to our proximity during the project. As noted by Addison (1989), "this is why it is important, when trying to understand a culture, to immerse oneself in that culture for a significant period of time" (p. 43). This notion of proximity is also why participant observation of a cross-cultural experience, even if the inquirer is from the culture being experienced, begs the development of an emic perspective similar to that sought in personal construct psychology and brought to bear through a hermeneutic approach to naturalistic inquiry. The following section explains how this process was carried out.
Unfolding the Inquiry Design and Process

The eighth characteristic of operational naturalistic inquiry highlights the emergent nature of this sort of research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This characteristic is an essential commonality among naturalistic studies because "a qualitative design unfolds as fieldwork unfolds. The design is partially emergent as the study occurs" (Patton, 1990, p. 61). Fundamentally, the inquiry process drives the design of the study.

This study reflects generally the emergent nature of a naturalistic inquiry. In order to disabuse those unfamiliar with naturalistic inquiry of the feeling that it is amorphous and mysterious, qualitative research literature offers elements for constant consideration during a study. During this study, Lincoln and Guba's (1985) major elements of a research design guided my considerations. They include:

- Determining focus of the inquiry
- Determining the fit of the paradigm to the focus
- Determining fit of the paradigm to the substantive theory selected to guide the inquiry
- Planning logistics
- Determining where and from whom data will be collected
- Using human instrumentation
- Collecting and recording data
- Data analysis
- Establishing trustworthiness

In addition, not all elements develop during the study: "It does not follow, however, that because not all of the elements of the design can be prespecified in a naturalistic
inquiry, none of them can" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 226). For example, much of my logistical planning depended on the project schedule and the time limit of the project, both of which existed before the research process started.

Thus far, this report, particularly this chapter, contains my considerations for determining three of the design elements:

(a) the focus of the inquiry (the broad question concerning construct change and development during a cross-cultural experience with regard to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship);

(b) fit of the paradigm to the focus (a hermeneutic approach to studying construct change during a cross-cultural experience); and

(c) the fit of the paradigm to the substantive theory selected to guide the inquiry (constructivist cognitive psychology as embodied in the theory of personal constructs).

This section highlights five of the remaining elements and my decisions for developing those elements during and after the actual field work. I reserved the element of trustworthiness in the study for the last section of this chapter.

This section contains two parts. The first part integrates my reflections and field notes with how I approached pertinent design elements during field work. The second part recounts my data analysis procedures.
Research Activities and Decisions

During the Fieldwork

Planning Logistics

In a naturalistic inquiry, milestone events are unpredictable. However, when a researcher assumes the role of participant observer, the context of the project, program, or event affords a framework for planning.

The cross-cultural aspect of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project took place between September 14 and December 22, 1992. The Mershon project secretary maintained a schedule for seminar meetings and related activities, as well as some recreational activities. This schedule acted as my planning framework (see Appendix A). As a guide, this schedule helped my logistical planning in three ways: (a) in making decisions on when to schedule interviews with the Polish educators; (b) in clearing my personal schedule for observations; and (c) in keeping my mind on the fact that this project would not last forever, and my data gathering needed to take place within the time frame of the schedule.

I made other logistical planning decisions, and many of them appear throughout the other design elements. However, the following entry from my reflexive journal is an example of how the best laid plans can fall prey to the unexpected:

Dec. 15, 1992 (Tues.)

At 7:15 a.m., Thersa called me to tell me that Rosza’s father died. We arranged for a flight to Poland this
evening. Her emotions were steady, but I don’t know how she reacted when she heard the news. I am going to be very selfish in my following comments. This is a blow to the research, because I need to get her mem-
ber check from interview #4; her journal; and somehow conduct interview #5 and get that member checked.

Fortunately, unforeseen circumstances like this example were infrequent throughout my data gathering. In this case, Rosza was conscientious in spite of her grief. After she returned to Poland, she mailed her journal and her member check of the fourth interview. Logistically, and as a matter of decency, I decided not to conduct the final interview until I saw Rosza during my next trip to Warsaw in March, 1993.

Determining Where and From Whom the Data Will Be Collected

This element concerns decisions on selecting a site to conduct one’s research and selecting the sample of respondents. Site selection includes permission to access the location, project, or event targeted for research.

Sample determination involves seeking out those people most capable of informing the research problem or question as it evolves. Thus, the sample may change as the purpose of the research changes. In any case, the researcher must procure the respondents’ consents and plan openly for ethical considerations with regard to the respondents’ well being.

Site and sample selection. My decisions concerning site selection were not difficult. Since I envisioned the study as an inquiry into construct change during a cross-cultural
experience, the most logical place to undertake data
gathering was in the cross-cultural setting of the project--
Columbus, Ohio.

Yet, I needed to gain consent from three gatekeepers in
order to conduct the study. The project gatekeepers were
the American Project Co-Director, the Polish Project Co-
Director, and the Senior Consultant to the project. During
our trip to Warsaw in June, 1992, the Polish Project Co-
Director granted me permission to conduct this study even
though my conceptualization of the study was in its early
stages. In July, 1992, the American Project Co-Director
gave his consent to the study, and he agreed to double-check
the permission granted by the Polish Project Co-Director.
In September, 1992, the Senior Consultant to the project
gave his consent to my study.

With regard to the Polish educators, I asked for and
received their informed consent to participate in this
study. My journal entries from the first days of the
project noted the events that led to their signing of the
informed consent sheets:

Sunday, September 20, 1992

Just prior to going into Morrill [OC: the student
dormitory where the Poles received their meals], I
approached the Pew 5 about helping with the research.
They were very open to it! [OC: "Pew 5" was a term used
by the Mershon project staff. This term was reserved
for the Polish educators because of the name of the
funding body that supported the project--the Pew
Charitable Trusts of Philadelphia.]
Monday, September 21, 1992

At 1:30, the Poles returned to Mershon for a "product" discussion. Afterward, I gave them copies of the design proposal. They were still enthusiastic. I asked them to read the proposal and sign the informed consent sheets if they still wished to participate.

The next day, the five Polish educators returned the informed consent sheets (see Appendix B).

All of them remained part of the study throughout the cross-cultural aspect of the project. Their continued participation in the study gave me the rare opportunity to conduct the study with a population and not a sample.

Ethical considerations. Since this design element deals with sample selection, it raises issues of ethical responsibility on the part of the researcher. Patton (1990) developed guidelines for ethical considerations in a naturalistic study. I used several of these ethical guidelines throughout the data gathering process and the writing of this report.

The first ethical issue concerned promises and reciprocity. With regard to promises, the informed consent agreement stated that each participant had access to all data pertinent to his or her participation in the study. In addition, the informed consent agreement gave the Polish educators the right to require amendments to or deletions from the draft report that they found inappropriate with regard to their role in the study. I sent the draft report to each of the participants for their final approval.
Initially, reciprocity, or "What's in it for the participant?", was less concrete. My initial design proposal--read by the Polish educators--indicated the possibility that they would be able to maintain focus on the project goal by participating in this study. I hoped that the research question and the continuously narrowing focus of the study would persist in raising the following question in their minds: "What am I experiencing that is really transferable to the context of the educational transitions taking place back home?" At the end of the study, and without my solicitation, the Polish educators highlighted this reciprocity as a valuable aspect of the research process for them and the project goals.

Second, Patton (1990) urged researchers to consider the ethical issue of risk assessment when interviewing respondents and asking them to write personal reflections on their experiences. Recognizing these risks was critical since the Polish educators were active in a project of undetermined importance to their changing educational system. In addition, and after I gathered the data, the elections of September, 1993, changed Poland's government from a majority of anti-communists to a majority of former communists. This situation made the Polish educators' approval of the draft report imperative. If the data implicated them in any way, they had the opportunity to omit it from the draft.
Patton (1990) posed two other concerns when assessing the risks of a study—psychological stress and peer ostracism. Keeping the integrity and intent of the project in mind, I feared the possibility that this study could promote psychological stress for the Polish educators and/or submit participants to ostracism by their peers for having divulged certain information. To prepare for these possibilities, I informed the Polish Project Co-Director that I would call on his judgment if the need arose. In addition, I planned to relate any concerns to the American Project Co-Director, Senior Consultant, and two other members of my Dissertation Committee if either of these possibilities took shape. The Project Co-Directors and my Dissertation Committee members served as my confidants and counselors throughout the study. Due to what I can only describe as a mutual trust that developed between me and the Polish educators, issues of psychological stress or ostracism never surfaced during this study.

Finally, there is the ethical issue of confidentiality. I noted this issue in Chapter I: Limitations of the Study. However, in spite of my efforts to insure anonymity of the project participants through changed names, the growing recognition of this project on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean diminishes what I thought was a reasonable promise of confidentiality. Again, I relied on the decisions of the Polish educators as they reviewed the draft of this report.
Their recommendations for the final draft became my most reasonable stance on the issue of confidentiality.

Determining Successive Phases of the Inquiry

Lincoln and Guba (1985) cited three general phases a study passes through to completion. These phases are orientation and overview, focused exploration, and member check. Due to the emergent nature of a naturalistic research design, the researcher is unable to predict these phases before the study begins. Narrowing the focus of the problem or question determines each phase.

Orientation and overview. Orientation and overview is the phase during which the researcher gets "some handle on what is important enough to follow up in detail" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 235). This phase lasted two weeks. Orientation and overview ended when I analyzed the Polish educators’ first journal entries. We decided collectively that the first journal entry would focus on their definition of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. The salient points that emerged from the first journal entries became the general guide for the first interview. The journal’s pushed the study into the next phase.

Focused exploration. Focused exploration began with the first interviews and continued until the end of the fourteen weeks. The general focus was construct change over time during a cross-cultural experience. Objects and events
experienced by the Polish educators continued to sharpen this focus throughout this phase. The following excerpt from my reflexive journal typifies the mutual shaping that became apparent during this phase:

Nov. 11, 1992 (Wed.)

Today, I interviewed Maria and Witek. Maria is becoming more relaxed and reflective in interviews. During her interview, there was a great emotional discussion about reciprocity. The mutual cross-cultural experience of what we have done for the Poles and what the Poles have done for me was the focus of our discussion on reciprocity. I am beginning to see some of the things in our society that we take for granted in a different light.

This excerpt indicated the depth of the cross-cultural experience for the respondent. Also, this entry demonstrates the backward arc of the hermeneutic circle as I began to question my views in light of the data offered by the Polish educators.

Member check. The final phase, member check, took place when I sent the draft report to the Polish educators for their review of its accuracy and their judgments concerning the report's confidentiality level. This version of the report contains their recommended changes.

Using Human Instrumentation

Much of the literature on the design and process of a naturalistic inquiry recommends the use of teams for gathering and analyzing data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, 1989; Patton, 1990; Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). I gathered and analyzed the data used in this study by myself. Of course,
the Polish educators helped me to refine their constructions through their member checks. In addition, the Polish educators kept reflective journals. Ultimately, though, I maintained the research schedule, analyzed the data for patterns and gaps, and conducted all of the interviews.

The researcher seeks to improve his or her data gathering and analysis abilities during a naturalistic study. For 10 of the 14 weeks that the Polish educators were in the United States, I participated in a graduate-level course on qualitative research in global education. I used this opportunity to discuss my data gathering and analysis with my classmates and my professor. The course project was the collaborative development of a report based on qualitative interviews the students conducted throughout the course. The interviewees were experts in global education and teachers with a global perspective. The contrast between working with a team and working alone was clear. For instance, gathering data as a team quickened the process. However, negotiating mutual understanding during data analysis and report writing was time consuming and occasionally difficult. Nonetheless, lessons learned from the dissertation research and the class project worked together to improve my abilities as a human instrument.

Collecting and Recording Data

I used four qualitative forms of data collection during this study. They were interviews, reflective journals
(including my reflexive journal), project documents, and observations. My reasons for choosing these four methods of data gathering related to my desire to capture the thoughts of the Polish educators and to fill gaps that appeared in any one method with information gathered from another method.

**Reflective journals.** I asked the Polish educators to write down any cross-cultural experiences that applied to their construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Writing reflective journals gave the Polish educators a chance to note and comment on cross-cultural experiences of which I was unaware through direct observation or interviews. I asked the educators to write the first and last journal entries as definitions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

After they gave me the first entries in their reflective journals, which I needed early in the study in order to start the data analysis process, the Polish educators gave me their reflections whenever they deemed appropriate. Four of the five Polish educators wrote their final reflections after they returned to Poland. They believed that time would be needed to reflect on the cross-cultural experience and the relationship of that experience to their definitions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.
As a part of their reflective journals, I asked the Polish educators to write an autobiography. These data appear as the introduction to the cases.

**Interviews.** The interviews helped me to fill gaps in my observations and gaps brought to light in the Polish educators' journals. At the Polish educators' requests, I developed the first three of five sets of interview questions in the interview guide approach described by Patton (1990), and I gave them the questions in advance. This approach gives the researcher a chance to develop general interview questions before the actual interview takes place. The Polish educators believed that receiving the questions in advance would help them in preparing their thoughts in English.

This approach motivated me to turn the interview notes into transcripts in a timely fashion. In order to develop questions based on previous data, I had to ask for member checks within one day of each interview. Securing member checks of transcribed interviews as quickly as possible lends accuracy to the respondents' constructions at the time of the interviews (Lincoln & Guba, 1989). In addition, this approach kept me focused on constant and comparative data analysis essential to a naturalistic study.

The Polish educators and I developed the last two sets of general interview questions collaboratively. This approach emerged from my growing association with the Polish
educators. I wanted to involve them in the study as much as possible. The following excerpt from my reflexive journal describes the first attempt at this collaborative effort:

**Wednesday, November 25, 1992**

At 4:00 pm, I asked the Pew 5 to reconvene at Mershon. I had made overheads of four possible questions for the fourth round of interviews. We collaboratively discussed the merit of these questions, and they suggested questions of their own. I like this method. The reciprocity and ownership issues involved in the process make me feel better about the next round. One real issue for them concerns their exposure to multicultural and global education while they've been here.

Another example of the emergent nature of the interview process stems from my decision to use a computer to conduct an interview. For the first four interviews, I recorded responses in my handwriting, took them home for transcription, and returned them the next day for member checking. During a Saturday interview session at the Mershon Center, one of the Polish educators and I decided to try conducting an interview with both of us at the computer keyboard. This method of interviewing made a great deal of sense:

**Saturday, December 19, 1992**

I interviewed Maria today. This was the first time that we did an interview directly on the computer. I should have been doing this all quarter. It saves a lot of time, and since this is a collaborative process, the member check is a lot quicker.

This sort of interview process was possible for two reasons. First, the rapport established over time between the Polish educators and me allowed for non-problematic and
simultaneous co-editing and interviewing. Second, the language issue discussed earlier lessened in importance as we searched collaboratively for the words most appropriate for expressing their thoughts. The Polish educators were able to see their thoughts on the monitor and, when necessary, they were able to stop me from continuing the interview so that they could express their thoughts more precisely. In addition, I asked for member checks of these last interviews, but these member checks were virtually unnecessary.

**Project documents.** The goal of the cross-cultural phase of the project was to develop the draft of a two semester course plan for preservice teacher education on schools and democratic society. The Polish educators decided that the course plan should contain seven modules and a rationale. Each Polish educator wrote one or more of the modules. These modules and the rationale were subject to critique during seminar meetings held with the Polish educators, the American Project Co-Director, the project’s Senior Consultant, and me. As the base of seminar discussions throughout the second half of the seminar schedule, these modules and the rationale became part of the data. The draft course plan gave an indication of the Polish educators’ thoughts on the role of school in educating for democratic citizenship as these thoughts emerged from the project task.
In addition, the Poles wrote and presented two papers for professional conferences. These papers concerned the Polish educational system's state of affairs after the fall of communism and what was perceived by the group as urgent needs in this system. These documents added contextual data to the study.

Typically, projects funded by outside sources keep a paper trail. I kept the project files for the "Schools and Democratic Society" project. I developed the files chronologically. This cataloging process kept the files in line with the seminar schedule. Articles, book chapters, and handouts used in reference to the seminars acted as contextual data. Iterations of the course plan and announcements of events formed a set of documents that indicated the flow of the formal aspect of the seminars.

Observations. My reflexive journal acted as a trail of methodological decisions. Also, this journal included notes on each day's events. As such, my journal became home to observations I made each day. At the beginning of the research process, these observations were broad in scope. As the focus of the study narrowed, my observations became more selective.

Data Analysis Procedures

Using the Constant Comparative Method

Frequently, qualitative research literature highlights the strengths of the constant comparative data analysis

This process is inductive, and data gathering becomes part of the analysis process:

This strategy combines inductive category coding with a simultaneous comparison of all social incidents observed. As social phenomena are recorded and classified, they also are compared across categories. Thus, the discovery of relationships, that is, hypothesis generation, begins with the analysis of initial observations, undergoes continuous refinement throughout the data collection and analysis process, and continuously feeds back into the process of category coding. (Goetz & LeCompte, 1981, p. 58)

Feeding back to previous codes and categories gives the researcher the opportunity to "digest" the data and refine the categories. Through this emerging typology, the researcher returns to the setting to gather more data based upon the emerging focus of the study. Lincoln and Guba (1989) likened this process to the hermeneutic circle.

The constant comparison of data goes across cases to note similarities and differences that emerge throughout the process. During this study, constant comparison of data took place within each case and between the five cases.

Categories emerged as the "fit" between bits of data developed. Data within a category remained together until that category took the shape of an emerging, definable theme
or until a larger category indicating a broader relationship subsumed the category.

Throughout this study, my concern was construct change over time within the boundaries of a particular construct—the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. The constant comparative data analysis method enabled me to focus on the subconstructs of the Polish educators as they emerged early in the study. Pursuit of those subconstructs constituted the focused exploration stage of the research process. These subconstructs, or major categories, comprised the Polish educators’ construct system with regard to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. These categories were knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

Coding the data. My data gathering procedures included interviews and reflective journals. After transcription and member checks of each series of interviews or journal entries, I coded sentences, strings of sentences, and fragments of sentences that stood alone in relation to text that came before and after these data. Keeping wide margins and triple spacing on the transcripts, I used a red pen in separating these data. I separated the data with arrow heads (< >).

Regarding interview data, the respondent’s name, interview number, and question number would have been lost without some sort of coding system. I developed a code for
marking each datum in the margin next to the datum. The following is an example: GrInt2#3(d)V1. This code indicates that the datum was Greg's (Gr) second interview (Int2), third question (#3), and fourth divergent question (d). Once categories received definitions, a code for concepts, events, or objects accompanied the coding. In this example, "V1" represents the category of "Values." For journal entries--both mine and the educators'--the same system applied without recognition of question numbers and letters.

I cut each datum from the transcript, and I mounted each datum on an index card. Prior to the cutting and mounting process, I bound photostatic copies of each analyzed sheet of text in individual binders by respondent and in chronological order. In so doing, I returned to the full transcript, if necessary, to find quickly the quote in its original, textual setting. The Appendix C contains an example of a coded interview page from this study.

Categorizing the data. After coding the first raw data, the naturalistic researcher takes the stack of cards and begins to group the cards by their "fit" to each other. New stacks form as themes emerge. As more data are analyzed and certain themes become clarified, categorical definitions form. Eventually, each stack takes on a name and a definition. Lincoln and Guba (1985) referred to this data categorizing process as the "3x5 shuffle."
The first data analyzed in this study were the Polish educators' first journal entries in which they defined the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. After coding the data, I formed thirty-six categories, some defined, from which I generated the first set of interview questions. I received the first journal entries on October 2, 1992, and began the first round of interviews on October 4, 1992. After analysis of the first round of interviews, the following categories formed:

Codes
10/7/92

- Attitude - AIU
- Barriers - BRR: conservatism/rejection of new ideas/role of the Church/resistance to change
- Change agents - CA: empowerment
- Changing school system - CSS
- Conflict resolution - CNR: mediation of conflicts
- Context - CON
- Cross-cultural awareness - CCA
- Definition - DF
- Democratic society for schools - DS
- Global and multicultural education - GBL
- Indoctrination - IDT
- Knowledge - KN
- Learned helplessness - LH
- Parent/teacher activity and relations - PTA
- Parents - PRT
• Political pressures on society - PPS

• Role of school in authoritarian society - RSA: old structure of schools/authoritarian schools/direct role of school/indirect role of schools

• Role of School in a democracy - RSD: direct role of schools/indirect role of schools

• School reflects society (political system) - SRS

• Skills - SKL: social skills

• Social pressures on schools - SPS

• Teaching Methods - TM

• Theory versus practice - TVP

• Thinking Skills - TSK

• Transition to democracy - TD

• Unpreparedness of teachers - UOT: teacher training; teacher competence

• Values - VL: teachers' partiality to certain values

During the remainder of the study, interview and journal data began to coalesce around three of the initial categories--knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Increasingly, the Polish educators referred to these three major sub-con structs during interviews and in their journals. As these data categories grew larger, they subsumed some of the earlier categories. In addition, I returned to data analyzed previously and looked for relationships between these data and knowledge, skills, and attitudes. In many cases, these earlier categories did not fit completely into one of the three major categories. Yet, each of these
earlier categories shared properties with either knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes.

For purposes of analysis and case study construction, I began to cross-reference the minor categories within the three larger sub-constructs. Table 2 illustrates the second phase of data analysis. This phase represents the status of my data analysis before the writing of the cases. Categories that could not be subsumed by any one of the major categories have x’s in more than one cell.
Table 2
Data Analysis Cross References: Second Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Agents</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing School System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural Awareness</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Society for Schools</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global and Multicultural Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoctrination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-Teacher Activities and Relations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Schools in a Democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Schools in an Authoritarian Society</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Pressures on Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory versus Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I constructed the cases, data analysis continued.

In some cases, categories from the second phase of data analysis folded into other categories and reduced the number of categories within the sub-constructs of knowledge,
skills, and attitudes. Table 3 illustrates the final data analysis cross-referencing.

Table 3

Data Analysis Cross References: Final Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Agents</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing School System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global and Multicultural</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Schools in a Democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Pressures on Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory versus Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table offers an overview of the final data analysis phase. As such, this table represents a composite of the data gathered during the study. However, the table does not delineate among the five cases. No two cases exhibited the same categorical emphasis. In addition, this chart does not indicate construct change over time. These aspects of data analysis formed the basis for the cases displayed in Chapter V.
The Case Study Reporting Mode

The Purpose of Case Studies

In naturalistic inquiry, case studies act as thick descriptions of the program, project, group, and/or institution under investigation (Geertz, 1973). The case study approach to naturalistic analysis takes on many forms (Clesne & Peshkin, 1992), but, overall, "the purpose is to gather comprehensive, systematic, and in-depth information about each case" (Patton, 1990, p. 384). The most common vehicle for case study reporting is a narrative description.

Specifically, naturalistic case studies serve to: (a) reconstruct the respondent's constructions (the emic posture); (b) build on the reader's tacit knowledge to develop a sense of vicarious experience; (c) demonstrate the interplay between the researcher and respondents to allow for judgment of the researcher's biases; (d) expose the inquiry's internal consistency; and (e) offer a description thick enough for readers to grasp and evaluate the context of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Taken together, these elements of purpose function as guidelines during the construction of a case study.

Ultimately, the question or problem defines the purpose of a particular case study report (Spence, 1989). In this study, I inquired into construct change over time. In pursuit of this objective, I chose the narrative format for writing the cases. With Lincoln and Guba's (1985) elements
of purpose in mind, I chose to construct the narrative chronologically and by themes and topics.

**Construction of the Case Studies**

Chronological case studies follow a pattern of some "'developmental cycle,' 'moral career,' or 'timetable' characteristic of the setting or actors under investigation" (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983, p. 217). In order to accomplish this goal, I introduce the five case studies with a description of the cross-cultural aspect of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project. This description of the project is Chapter IV. This introduction includes the pseudonyms, positions, and related details of the people mentioned in the cases. In addition, Chapter IV describes the common events of the Polish educators' cross-cultural experiences during the "Schools and Democratic Society" project. This introduction serves as a base of information that crossed the five cases.

Chapter V contains the five cases. I introduce each case with the Polish educator's autobiography, edited with contextual data offered during interviews and noted in journals. I begin the individual cases with edited autobiographies to frame each case in an emic light and add to the description of each case.

Following each Polish educator's autobiography, I present a comparison of his or her first and last definitions of the role of schools in educating for
democratic citizenship. This comparison sets the stage for a more detailed description of construct change over time and within the three sub-constructs of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Additionally, this comparison of first and last superordinate constructions offers the reader a general sense of the sort of change and development within each case.

Stylistically, the body of each case is in first person narrative (my voice). The body of each case describes change over time within the broad categories of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that emerged during the constant comparison of data. Within these descriptions, I interpret the changes through the psychology of personal constructs. This hermeneutic aspect of the cases runs throughout.

Moreover, the interpretive process generated a sixth case study based on my changing constructs and spanning the five cases. Throughout the cases, I note points of mutual shaping between myself and the Polish educators that brought my intuitive knowledge to the foreground. During the course of our mutual, cross-cultural experiences, aspects of their changing and developing constructions interacted with my assumptions on many aspects of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

Each case concludes with a summary section. In this section, I address, within each case, the three questions
raised during the focused exploration phase of the study:

- Assuming the Polish educator's constructions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship changed during their intensive cross-cultural experience, what were these changes?

- Which cross-cultural experiences of the Polish educators delimited their constructs of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship?

- How did the Polish educators' previous constructs blend with their cross-cultural environment and shape their construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship?

Chapter V concludes with a cross-case comparison of the Polish educators' construct changes and developments over time. This section serves the purpose of synthesizing findings regarding similarities and differences across the cases.

A Rubric for Evaluation

To reiterate, my goal was to describe and interpret construct change over time. The setting of this quest was the cross-cultural aspect of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project. The participants in this project were five Polish educators involved in teacher education. The construct under investigation was the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

In assessing the merit of the case studies displayed in Chapter V, the following standards, based on case study criteria developed by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Spence (1989), form a rubric by which to judge whether or not I
accomplished my goal through these cases. The case studies should:

- offer the emic perspective of the participants;
- render a holistic, lifelike, and identifiable picture to readers with similar experiences;
- describe the interaction between the participant observer and the participants to a degree that allows for recognition of researcher bias;
- exhibit consistent data gathering and interpretation to insure fairness within and between cases;
- offer the reader access to significant portions of emic formulations so that evaluation of the researcher’s abstractions is possible.

Finally, when the reader finishes reading the cases, he or she must evaluate the level at which I answered the three questions that emerged during this study.

**Trustworthiness**

"Is this what happened?" "Does this study apply to another, similar situation?" "How stable are the data over time?" "Did the researcher’s biases focus and limit the study, or did they undermine the thoughts of the respondents?" Together, these questions form the basis for judging the overall trustworthiness of a naturalistic inquiry. Respectively, Lincoln and Guba (1985; 1989) termed the essence of these questions as credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

Throughout this chapter, I have described and exemplified my methods in carrying out this study. Among
these descriptions and examples lie many of the aspects of the study intended to insure trustworthiness. This concluding section of Chapter III brings together the various aspects of the research process that answer the above noted questions. I used the guidelines for establishing trustworthiness as noted by Lincoln and Guba (1989).

**Credibility**

In order to insure a credible and faithful rendering of the events, objects, and thoughts described in this study, I implemented several measures. These measures centered on my participant observer status, my reflexive journal, the opinions of a colleague, and the member checking process.

First, my role as Project Coordinator enabled me to achieve prolonged engagement in the field and persistent observation of the cross-cultural portion of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project. Prolonged engagement accounts for the amount of time needed to build rapport and trust with the respondents. Rapport and trust between researcher and respondents facilitates the uncovering of constructions and the sorting out of misinformation. In my case, I spent as much time as the project required to fulfill its goal. In addition, my experience with the Polish educators developed into relationships that extended beyond the scope of the project and into social areas
ranging from informal dinner conversations to a Sunday afternoon trip to the hospital emergency room.

Second, persistent observation focuses the breadth of prolonged engagement. To achieve this aspect of credibility, I recorded each day’s events in my reflexive journal. This journal acted also as a place to record methodological decisions, working hypotheses, and personal reflections. In addition, my reflexive journal contained two-hundred pages of seminar observation notes. Five sets of five interviews supplemented my depth and persistence of observation.

Third, a fellow graduate student acted as my peer debriefer. Throughout the research process, he offered critiques of my methodology, working hypotheses, and personal biases. In addition, he listened willingly to hours of cathartic release designed to ease the psychological stress associated with qualitative fieldwork.

Fourth, I relied on the member checks of the Polish educators for accuracy of interview and reflection data and verification of my construction of their cases. I solicited member checks throughout the data gathering stage. Additions to and emendations of the transcripts centered mainly on misunderstandings stemming from the language problem noted earlier.
Transferability

Assurance of transferability is critical to naturalistic inquiry. Transferability is the level of a study’s ability to inform similar situations or the same situation at a different time. Determination of this criterion’s level is left to the reader.

In this case, my Dissertation Committee included three members of the project and an interested party. Their individual and collective knowledge of the project formed a base for determining transferability of this study. The level at which the case studies offered a thick description of construct change over time determined much of this study’s transferability.

Dependability and Confirmability

I placed these criteria together because of the similarity of methods by which I sought to achieve them. I solicited opinions on the study’s dependability during formal and informal meetings with members of my Dissertation Committee, fellow project staff, and interested classmates. Their detached positions allowed them to offer perspectives on data stability that I did not see. For instance, once the focus of the study sharpened, a member of my Dissertation Committee questioned my still extensive observations. This person noted that the study had sharpened enough to include only those observations necessary to corroborate the focus.
Confirmability is a criterion that determines whether the inquiry is rooted in the contextual aspects of setting and people, or if the inquiry is rooted in the researcher’s imagination. Again, I relied on the Polish educators and my Dissertation Committee for confirmability. The Polish educators’ member checks of the draft report helped me to meet this criteria. The close association of the Dissertation Committee to the project gave them insight into whether my personal biases overwhelmed the context, or if the study reflected a position grounded in that context.
CHAPTER IV

THE CONTEXT OF THE CASES

Introduction

This chapter begins with a brief description of Poland’s educational situation prior to and immediately after the fall of communism. This first section acts as a basis for the need of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project and describes the proposal developed to meet this need.

The next section builds a description of the setting, the people, and the events that comprised the cross-cultural aspect of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project. This section begins with a description of the Mershon Center and its larger setting--The Ohio State University. A brief description of the people involved in the project follows the setting of the project. The third component of this section highlights the events from the cross-cultural segment of the project.

Poland’s Educational System: A Context for Needs

Funding bodies and major institutions invest money and time in projects that serve a perceived need. The following
story highlighted the Polish educational situation and its needs during the transition from communism to democracy.

In the September 20, 1992, edition of the Warsaw Voice, an English language Polish newspaper, a young United States Peace Corps volunteer recounted a rather telling story (Pudlis, 1992, September 20). He taught English at a Polish secondary school. Before one of his classes, he invited some of his English speaking Polish colleagues to observe his class and critique his lesson and his teaching. The content of the lesson involved the meaning of English prepositions. The young volunteer asked his students to stand on their desks to capture the essence of on. When he explained that under was in contrast to on, the students crawled under their desks.

After the lesson, he turned to his colleagues and asked for their professional critique. To his surprise, the Polish teachers offered no reply. Prompted again, one of the Polish teachers responded that they had no idea of how to approach the critique of another teacher. He told the volunteer that during their professional careers, such critique was impossible—not even considered as an option between teachers.

Polish Education Under Communism

Between 1946 and 1989, Poland’s education system, much like that of other nations in the Eastern and Central European communist bloc, was a hierarchical structure in
which all curricula, methods, objectives, and examinations came from the Ministry of National Education. No doubt, some teachers employed slight variations of teaching styles and relatively innovative methods, but the watchful eye of the state-appointed supervisor made these activities difficult to sustain.

Kozakiewicz (1992) described some of the major aspects of the previous educational model. His key descriptor was *uniformity*. Uniformity in the previous educational model was essential for the development of *homo sovieticus*—a socialist citizen who exemplified the values of a classless, egalitarian, and collective society (Melosik, 1991). Marxist-Leninist philosophy and scientific method based on dialectic materialism were the foundations of education. The implementation of this model required that all schools of a particular sort (e.g., vocational or college preparatory) and at a particular grade level teach the same lessons from the same book with the same methods at the same time. This model reflected the communist interpretation of equality and egalitarianism through education.

Communist educational philosophy required that all students share, unquestioned, the beliefs of the state. Evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of a Marxist-Leninist argument was dangerous and threatened the state as the one true belief system in the world (Heyneman, 1991). In addition, state-controlled "parallel education" (e.g.,
television, films, comic books, magazines) acted to forward the goals of the school's mission.

The end of the communist government in 1989 brought Polish society to a period of monumental transition. The transformation to democratic institutions hastened the need for a different approach to education. What did this mean to Poland? How was it to be implemented? What stood in its way?

Obstacles to Transition

Many contextual barriers confronted the officials at the Ministry of National Education during their quest to transform Polish education. Three of these obstacles posed a distinct threat to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

Heading the list was suspicion. Coming from a dogmatic experience during the communist era, Poles exhibited skepticism about the slogan system of democracy. Many parents and teachers considered political ideology of any sort with distrust. In their eyes, the previous school system was part of the problem, not part of the solution. Many of the teachers remained in place after the revolution, and one-third of them were former communists. This situation bred a sense of distrust toward what and how they were teaching (M. Zahorska-Bugaj, personal communication, April 15, 1994).
This skepticism turned to cynicism over the vocabulary and processes of democracy. In many instances, Marxist-Leninist rhetoric used the same words employed by the forces of transition to democracy. For example, freedom, justice, and equality described communist goals of the past. In addition, public participation in the previous government's election process resulted frequently in reports of a 99% turnout.

So, many Poles asked, What is the difference? Ensonced in the mind-set that didactic teaching was the best way to promote learning, teachers, students, and parents envisioned the "new" schools as simply mimicking the old schools by giving the students a curriculum with the new "right answers":

The overwhelming majority of teachers (with, perhaps, the exception of high school teachers in larger urban areas) are deeply conservative in their adherence to the old teaching routines. There is a widespread lack of understanding among them of the foundations of democratic systems, the free market economy, and the political processes currently underway in post-communist countries. Fear of change and passivity are common . . . (Kulerski, 1992, p. 82)

A second major obstacle to the development of a public school system based upon democratic ideals was the sheer weight of financial need in the physical and human resource areas of education. For instance, Kozakiewicz (1992) reported that the Polish school system was in need of 90,000 classrooms on the primary and secondary school levels. In addition, new texts, teaching materials, films, and example
lesson plans in the area of democratic citizenship education lacked sufficient funding for research and development.

The Polish Roman Catholic Church constituted the third major obstacle to the realization of schools that educate for democratic citizenship. A major player in assisting Solidarity during the darkest days of martial law, the Church emerged from the revolution with a great deal of power. After the fall of communism, a vast majority of the Polish population remained registered Roman Catholics. With this statistic as a lever, the Church demanded its "fair share" during the reconstruction of Polish society.

One of the Church's post-revolutionary demands included mandatory religion classes in the primary and secondary school curricula. This demand became a reality in 1992, and the result was the infusion of 20,000 catechists into the teaching force.

In a less than hidden sense, the Church used its power to check the spread of anti-Christian beliefs in society, some of which involved the democratic ideal. These anti-Christian beliefs ranged from a loosening of censorship laws to the questioning of Church authority on matters of state policy such as abortion.

**Bases for Change**

Despite the obstacles confronting Polish schools as they ventured onto untested ground, there were powerful, contextual resources from which to draw. Historically,
Poland considers itself a member of the Western tradition (Osiatynski, 1990). Copernicus, Kosciusko, Chopin, Curie, and Paderewski are but a sample of Poland’s Western heritage.

With regard to democratic tradition, in 1791, the Polish government developed a constitution based, in part, on that of the United States. Imperial designs engineered by Russia, Prussia, and Austria-Hungary ended Poland’s short-lived democracy by tripartitioning the country from 1794 to 1918. Between the re-establishment of the Polish state after World War I and benign dictator Piłsudski’s ascendance to power in 1926, Poland emerged as a democratic state. Under the leadership of General Piłsudski, Poland maintained many of its democratic institutions. The fall of Poland to the forces of Nazi Germany in September, 1939, initiated a 50 year lull in democratic processes and institutions. Nonetheless, a context for democracy was set.

Another contextual source from which transition could flourish was higher education. After the communists took power, the spirit of intellectual freedom appeared broken in the primary and secondary schools, but not as much in the universities. Consequently, there was a semblance of independent thinking and teaching that carried on through the critical days of martial law. The maintenance of some intellectual freedom in higher education enhanced the possibility of change from the previous Polish school system
under communism. In line with reform and indicative of this possibility, the post-communist government’s plan to allow local authorities (gmina) more control of schools remained on track, in principle, for 1994.¹

Polish Teacher Education in Transition

Given this situation, the state of teacher education in Poland became an important consideration. If the Polish school system was to make a transition from the previous model to schools that educate for democratic citizenship, what teacher education and professional development programs were in place, and what were the plans for the future?

In the 1970s, the low number of students in primary and secondary schools forced the government to decrease the number of teacher education programs. This resulted in a crisis of numbers in the more populated Polish school system of the 1990s. Consequently, the Ministry of National Education increased the teaching force through the certification of students with only a secondary school education. As more teachers are graduated from pedagogical institutes and universities, this program will disappear. Nonetheless, this situation raised serious concern over the competence level of a portion of the Polish teaching force.

The Sejm elections held on September 18 and 19, 1993, allowed a coalition of former communists to gain control of Poland’s government. Decisions since this election slowed the process of localizing school control. In 1994, local communities had the opportunity to increase their base of control over schools. However, the financial possibilities and necessary arrangements for such control were limited.
(Ministry of National Education Department of Teacher Training, 1992).

In light of this situation, the Ministry of National Education acted to revise teacher certification standards through the inclusion of more courses in pedagogical studies. On the other hand, teacher education practices based on the previous model, concerned mostly with lecture and examination preparation skills, prevailed. The value of increased pedagogical requirements based on the previous model was dubious in the eyes of the Ministry. Many Polish teacher educators had yet to move from preparing preservice teachers in the didactic and expository methods of the past to methods the Ministry considered more appropriate in preparing teachers for a democratic society.

Many Polish teachers certified under the new mandate of increased pedagogical preparation still prized their content far above their teaching methods (Kozakiewicz, 1992). In some cases, newly graduated teachers deemed their discrete teaching methods courses as worthless and reverted to imitating their content lectures as the best way to teach their primary and secondary school students (Polish Ministry of National Education Department of Teacher Training, 1992). This situation prompted the Ministry to conclude that teacher knowledge of content guarantees little ability to understand the role of subject matter in student learning, or its methodological implementation in the public school
system, unless appropriate changes occurred in teacher education.

The problem became one of developing teacher education courses (both pre- and inservice) that fused content and method in order to avert teacher disillusionment with their pedagogical preparation. The Ministry viewed the lack of "hands on" experience for the preservice teachers in the Polish schools as part of the problem. For this reason, the Ministry expressed interest in a teacher education model based on the professional development schools evolving in the United States and described generally by Zimpher (1990).

With these concerns in mind, the Ministry of National Education appealed to the Higher Education Council (a group of academics who set standards for all higher education) to accept a new curriculum for preservice teacher education. The Ministry sought new requirements for certification that included an increased number of hours in revised pedagogical studies and more time spent observing and student teaching in primary and secondary schools. In teacher education centers conducted through the kuratoria, or local authority of the Ministry, the Ministry increased requirements for certification to include pedagogical studies aimed at replacing the previous teacher education model.

Regarding the professional development of inservice teachers, the Ministry reduced the number of hours a teacher spends in class to eighteen per week. Through this
reduction, the Ministry hoped to encourage teachers to get together at their school sites and plan for the implementation of a curriculum based on the role of schools in a democratic society (Director of Teacher Training in the Polish Ministry of National Education, personal communication, December 7, 1992).

To help in developing a smooth transition to education in a democracy for both the veteran teachers and new teachers, the Ministry initiated an induction program. The induction program benefitted veteran teachers as well as new teachers. The methods and ideas brought to the schools with the first graduates of the new preservice programs aided this development. In addition, the Ministry gave financial incentive to teachers who wished to return to graduate school to take advantage of new methods of teaching intended to improve the role of schools in a democratic society.

Problems of Time and Transition

Embedded in this background were the following questions: How will the development of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship take place in a vacuum created by 45 years of Marxist-Leninist pedagogy? In addition, how will the educational system of an emergent democracy develop these new methods and courses? Obviously, Poland was not void of the intellectual capacity and historical context needed to develop democratic citizenship education. However, a European Community-Gallup
poll conducted two years after the fall of communism underscored the urgency. This poll revealed that 54% of the people in post-communist Eastern and Central Europe were dissatisfied with democracy ("Democracy's Promise," 1992).

At a 1990 conference of post-communist education officials held at the Madison House in Washington, D.C., the Director of Teacher Training in the Polish Ministry of National Education noted the urgency of the situation when he said, "We [Poland and the other post-communist nations of Europe] need to start over. We are trying to fill an empty well with an empty bucket in a very great hurry" ("Amendment," 1991, p. 80).

In response to this need, many educators steeped in the democratic tradition flocked to the aid of the emerging democracies of Eastern and Central Europe. The aforementioned meeting at the Madison House was a case in point. During this meeting, random seating arrangements at one of the meals brought together the Director of Teacher Training at the Polish Ministry of National Education and the Director of the Mershon Center's Citizenship Development for a Global Age program. This serendipitous meeting spawned the "Schools and Democratic Society" project.

Addressing the Need

After this chance meeting, the Citizenship Development for a Global Age Director and the President of The Ohio State University travelled to Poland to present the Ministry
of Education with a pledge of collaborative assistance in developing education for democratic citizenship in Poland. One of the major components of this pledge involved the development of a preservice teacher education course on schools and democratic society. To secure adequate funding, the Ministry and the Mershon Center developed a proposal for this project. A private endowment saw fit to fund the major portion of this effort at a level of $100,318.

The proposal presented a process through which the Center and the Ministry sought to develop a preservice teacher education course plan. Initially, the plan involved a 17 month time line designed to bring five educators from Polish teacher education programs to the Center for a 14 week curriculum seminar. The time line spanned from April, 1992, to September, 1993, and the 14 week cross-cultural aspect of the project made up the middle section of this plan. The final event in this process, an international conference in Warsaw to unveil the course plan in September, 1993, took place in December, 1993, thus extending the project time line to 20 months.

Direct and Indirect Needs

In the proposal to the funding body, two major goals of the project grew from the direct and indirect needs of Poland’s teacher education programs. Directly, the Project Co-Directors envisioned servicing two needs:

the proposed project directly addresses Poland’s need to provide new teachers with explicit training on the
organization and operation of schools in a democracy as part of their preservice teacher education program. At the same time, the project also responds directly to Poland's need to begin retraining the teacher educators responsible for preservice teacher education. If one keeps in mind the old saying, "the best way to learn something is to teach it," the project will have a very significant impact on teacher trainers by giving them a new course on "Schools and Democratic Society."

(Proposal for "Schools and Democratic Society" Project, February, 1992, p. 6)

Indirectly, the proposal cited that

the procedures used to create the new course . . . will contribute indirectly to the development of a democratic civic culture in Poland by involving educators and scholars across Poland in a discussion of the place of schools in promoting democracy in Poland. As Polish scholars and educators participate in various ways in the development of the course they will necessarily deal with such questions as: How do democratic values apply to the Polish situation? What civic knowledge and skills do Polish teachers need? What role can and should schools play in civic education? (Proposal for "Schools and Democratic Society" Project, February, 1992, p. 6)

Meeting the Needs

Given the goal of meeting these direct and indirect needs, implementing the project entailed the development of a curriculum seminar--the reason for the cross-cultural aspect of the project. The Project Co-Directors and Senior Consultant envisioned this seminar as a strategy for group problem-solving and decision-making. Researchers at the Mershon Center developed this seminar idea in the 1970s, and the model contained four basic characteristics appropriate to the goals of the "Schools and Democratic Society" curriculum development project:

1. a focus on a specific curriculum problem or goal,
2. adequate time for a small group to study, discuss, and react to new information related to the curriculum problem,

3. an aggressive and knowledgeable Seminar Director who can provide suggestions for applying new ideas to the curriculum problem under study and can facilitate the group’s work, and

4. development of strong group identification on the part of the Seminar participants. (Proposal for "Schools and Democratic Society" Project, February, 1992, p. 7)

After the appropriation of funds, the project began in earnest. Filling the five openings for Polish participants was the immediate objective of the Project Co-Directors. As per an agreement between the Project Co-Directors, the Polish Project Co-Director chose the participants. The areas targeted for applicants were Poland’s colleges of education, higher pedagogical schools, and universities involved in teacher education.

On July 15, 1992, a fax transmission from the Ministry of National Education in Warsaw crossed my desk. This fax listed the five participants chosen by the Polish Project Co-Director. I started immediately on securing the necessary paperwork for bringing our guests to the Center. In addition, I needed to make preparations for work space in a venerable structure whose usefulness as an institutional home passed long ago—the old Mershon Center.
The Setting, the People, and the Events

The Setting of the Project

The Center

The Mershon Center on the campus of The Ohio State University was the hub of activity for the cross-cultural aspect of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project. In the fall of 1992, the Mershon Center occupied two locations on the campus of the University.

The physical setting. The older of the two sites housed the Center Director’s office, the Citizenship Development for a Global Age Program, and much of the Center’s staff. The newer location housed the other two Center program areas—Foreign Policy Analysis and the Program on International Security and Military Affairs. These two programs operated in a building that acted originally as living quarters for visiting scholars and was across the alley from the present Mershon Center.

Located at the southern tip of the campus, the older site of the Mershon Center occupied a former medical school fraternity house and the adjacent building, built originally as a home. A cinder block causeway connected the two buildings. Condemned by the City of Columbus, the old Center received two reprieves over time in light of a promise from the State Legislature that a new building was in the offing. The present Center, large enough to combine
Center activities from the two former sites, opened in the fall of 1993.

The old fraternity house was the site of most of the project’s curriculum seminars and housed the work space for the Polish educators. Not unlike its original purpose, the old Center had an atmosphere more akin to a home than a multi-disciplinary social science center on a major American campus. The three story edifice, neglected for some time due to the promise of a new home for the Center, creaked with every step and shuttered with every large delivery or furniture movement. Nonetheless, when the doors of the old Center closed in the fall of 1993, many a faculty and staff member felt a sense of sentimental lose.

The offices for the Polish educators were on the first floor of the old building in what served the medical fraternity as a parlor, complete with a boarded-up fireplace. In this room sat modern work stations, or carrels, for the Polish educators. The windows in front of the room opened to the porch and main entrance of the Center. On the opposite side of the room, a computer occupied a large table. In an effort to hide cracks and peeling paint, the project staff adorned the walls of the room with posters depicting the skylines of major American cities.

Between this office and the end of the hallway entrance to the Center was a room that, in addition to housing the Ohio Geographic Alliance, contained a small library of books
bought with project funds. This library was an accumulation of materials that the project staff thought would aid the Polish educators during their work at the Center.

The offices of the Citizenship Development for a Global Age Program Director and his secretary occupied half of the second floor. The Program Director’s office was directly above the Polish educators’ office.

A large meeting room dominated the top floor. This room was the site of most of the curriculum seminars and several presentations built into the "Schools and Democratic Society" project. The meeting room contained twelve large tables and accompanying chairs that allowed for reconfiguration of the room when necessary. In the back of the third floor was the office of the Citizenship Development for a Global Age graduate research associates. This room housed four graduate students and looked out on the alley behind the Center.

The intellectual setting. The Center occupied this site since 1967 when the Mershon Center for Education in National Security became a reality. The Center became a reality because of a large sum of money bequeathed to the University by one of its alumni--Colonel Ralph Davenport Mershon. In his will, Ralph Mershon stipulated that half of the endowment go to the general funds of the University for use at the administration’s discretion. Mershon earmarked the other half of the endowment for a program at the University
that "shall best promote, encourage, and carry on civilian-military education and training in the United States and its territories" (Nordstrom, 1970, p. 3). This latter portion of the endowment became the financial base of the Mershon Center.

From the probation of Ralph Mershon's will in 1954 to 1967, a University committee awarded funding for projects from this half of the endowment to scholars working on civilian-military education and issues of national security. In 1967, the University Board of Trustees established the present configuration of the endowment in the form of a multi-disciplinary center dedicated to national security, public policy analysis, and citizenship education. Twenty years and numerous projects later, the Center Director acted to incorporate the many projects into "cluster areas" known as programs. In 1987, the Citizenship Development for a Global Age Program took shape as one of three major programs at the Center.

CDGA, the acronym used commonly for the Citizenship Development for a Global Age Program, began operations with a focus on Ralph Mershon's request that his endowment support citizenship education for democracy as a matter of national security. From 1987 to 1992, CDGA faculty and staff--drawn from not only the United States, but also many other parts of the world--enhanced this mission with nationally and internationally recognized scholarship in
pre-collegiate citizenship education and global education. CDGA’s growing prominence in education for democratic citizenship projects in Eastern and Central Europe began with the aforementioned meeting at the Madison House in 1990.

The University

Aside from the Center and CDGA’s credentials for conducting the cross-cultural aspect of "Schools and Democratic Society," the University offered certain amenities that appealed to Poland’s Ministry of National Education. Established in 1870 as a land grant institution for higher education, the University’s main campus lies in an urban setting three miles north of the Ohio State Capital and downtown Columbus, a city with an estimated metropolitan population of 1.3 million people.

In 1992, the University housed 21 colleges and 20 libraries containing an estimated 7 million volumes. In the same year, the student population of the main campus and the five extension campuses approached 53,000 undergraduate and graduate students representing the 50 United States and over 100 other countries (The Ohio State University Bulletin, 1992).

The College of Education at The Ohio State University was a close associate of the project. The Global and Social Studies Education Program within the College’s Educational Studies Department was the home program area of the CDGA
Director during the project. He maintained a half-time position in the College and a half-time position at the Center. The other three faculty members of the Global and Social Studies Education Program participated in the project on various levels. Also, the project involved several members of the College’s Educational Policy and Leadership Department, particularly experts in areas of school governance and structure in a democracy.

The People in the Project

Several key people involved in the project appear in two or more of the five cases. In order to avoid repetition throughout the cases, the following is a brief description of those people with accompanying pseudonyms. In the case studies displayed in Chapter V, descriptions of the individuals listed below are, at times, more complete than these miniature encapsulations. Those expanded descriptions pertain to individuals who played major roles in the Polish educators’ personal construct change and development concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

The Project Leaders and Faculty

The "Schools and Democratic Society" project had two Project Co-Directors. In addition, several Project Faculty led seminar sessions, workshops, and classes that were integral to the course plan’s development.
Jim Gaudet, a political scientist and educator, was the American Project Co-Director of "Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland" of which "Schools and Democratic Society" was a part. Professor Gaudet was the CDGA Director and served at the Mershon Center since 1972. In addition, Gaudet taught half-time in his program area at the College of Education--Global and Social Studies Education. He was the Seminar Director for the "Schools and Democratic Society" curriculum seminars.

Tadeusz Kluszewski was the Polish Project Co-Director of "Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland" and the Director of Teacher Training in the Polish Ministry of National Education. Dr. Kluszewski's expertise in early childhood education and psychology led him to develop the first private kindergarten in communist Poland. After the fall of communism, he joined the Ministry of Education. Dr. Kluszewski’s position in the Ministry placed him at the heart of teacher education reform in post-communist Poland. As an overall Project Co-Director, Dr. Kluszewski visited the "Schools and Democratic Society" project in December, 1992, as part of the draft course plan's evaluation team.

Thompson Livingston was one of the project's Senior Consultants and co-directed the curriculum seminar sessions with Gaudet. A professor emeritus in The Ohio State University College of Education, Livingston's areas of expertise ranged from interprofessional leadership in
educational problem solving to higher education administration. At one time, Professor Livingston served as Dean of The Ohio State University College of Education.

Floyd Baker was a Senior Consultant to the project. Originally slated as Seminar Coordinator, Professor Baker’s schedule precluded his intense involvement. His role became that of project organizer for activities at The Ohio State University College of Education. These activities included school visits, guest lectures, and mini-seminars on topics pertinent to the project goal. Baker was a professor in the College of Education.

Graham More, a professor in and Director of the Global and Social Studies Education Program at The Ohio State University, conducted a class in middle and secondary school social studies teaching methods during the fall quarter of 1992. The Polish educators attended his class so as to participate in and observe an American teacher education course based on social studies education. An offshoot of this experience led the Polish educators to attend More’s seminar in simulation and games in social studies education, which he taught during the same quarter.

Lew Simmons, a long time friend and associate of Jim Gaudet’s, acted as an unofficial Senior Consultant to the "Schools and Democratic Society" project. He was the Senior Consultant to the overall project. Dr. Simmons taught social studies education and curriculum and instruction at
Indiana University before concentrating all of his time on his directorship of the Social Studies Development Center in Bloomington, Indiana. Simmons' expertise was the teaching of democratic constitutionalism on the pre-collegiate level. He conducted a workshop early in the project that focused on teaching the principles of democracy. In addition, Simmons was an evaluator of the draft course plan.

Cliff Johnson, an associate professor of Global and Social Studies Education at The Ohio State University, ran several seminars for the Polish educators on the economic dimensions of American education. Johnson's academic background in economics and social studies education led him to establish a Center for Economic Education at the University. During the project, he was this center's director.

John Goryl, a member of the Mershon Center's Senior Faculty, ran several sessions with the Polish educators on civic leadership skills.

**Ancillary Project Staff**

In addition to the activities of the core group, the project schedule called for meetings and outings designed to highlight various aspects of education in a democratic society. The following brief descriptions represent the people responsible for conducting these ancillary meetings, tours, and mini-seminars.
Professor Baker, in his capacity as a Senior Consultant to the project, organized several workshop sessions on the politics of education. One of the presenters was Harold Reese, a professor emeritus in The Ohio State University College of Education. Reese’s scholarly forte was the philosophy of education, and his recent book on citizenship in a democratic society acted as the base of his workshop. T. S. Williams, an assistant professor of education and a professor in The Ohio State University College of Law, conducted a workshop on the rights of students in a democratic society. Marc Campbell, an associate professor in the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership at The Ohio State University, organized a one day seminar on the organization of schooling in America with emphases on the structure and governance of the system. This group comprised the faculty of the politics and education portion of the project that was distinct from, but related to, the curriculum seminars held at the Mershon Center.

Two other people factored into the thoughts of the Polish educators on the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Lorraine Fisher-Stevens was an assistant professor in the Global and Social Studies Education Program in The Ohio State University College of Education. She ran the student teaching portion of the program area through a professional development schools approach. Stemming from her program area association with
Gaudet, More, and Johnson, Fisher-Stevens had several informal meetings with the Polish educators on the sociology of education and teaching methods. In addition, she and a clinical professor from the professional development schools presented their work to a combined audience of the Polish educators and 16 Central and Eastern European teacher educators and Ministry of Education officials in October, 1992.

The second person was Dennis Littlejohn. Littlejohn hosted the Polish educators on a tour of the Social Studies Development Center during their scheduled trip to Bloomington, Indiana. He was Lew Simmons’ assistant at the Social Studies Development Center.

Of course, this list is not complete. Many other people interacted with the Polish educators throughout the project, but these other people remain attached to individual cases. Due to their singularity, I left their descriptions within the cases.

The Polish Educators

Finally, the "Schools and Democratic Society" project had five course plan authors. This group was the focus of this study. Each of the upcoming cases begins with the individual’s autobiography. Yet, their names and brief descriptions appear below so as to give the reader a sense of what is to come.
Norbert Kwak was a political scientist from a pedagogical institute in Kraków, Poland. His participation in the project was the result of a recommendation to Tadeusz Kluszewski. He was the only Polish educator not personally known by Kluszewski prior to the project.

Maria Podolska was a member of the Psychology Faculty at Warsaw University. Her work in conflict resolution in all areas of society was the focus of her endeavors. She, like Kwak, taught preservice teachers in Poland.

Trained in clinical psychology, Wittek Wojcik was a teacher educator in a major university located in Kraków. His varied academic career included projects in creativity stimulation and social psychology.

Rosza Moczynska, a sociologist, worked with pre- and inservice teachers at Warsaw University. In addition, she taught at an elementary school in Warsaw and served on the Community Council of the Warsaw suburb where she lived.

Thersa Kobuczeuska left Poland shortly before the fall of communism. A spokesperson for the Solidarity movement, Kobuczeuska spent a total of eighteen months in prison for her anti-government activities. Professionally, she served as Vice-Dean of the Psychology Faculty at Warsaw University. Her departure for Amsterdam in 1987 marked a reunion with her Dutch-Polish husband, whom she had not seen in seven years. From 1987 to 1989, she continued her anti-communist
activities with a new career--broadcast journalism for Radio Free Europe.

The Events of the Project

The project schedule (see Appendix A) included not only the curriculum seminar meetings, but also special workshops and guest lectures, field experiences, and recreational activities. Setting the stage for all of these events required a focused organizational effort during the summer of 1992. When the Poles arrived, coordinating all of these efforts, and more, became the driving concern of the CDGA staff throughout the project. In order to succeed in the goals of the project, the cross-cultural experience needed the full attention of the project staff and faculty. The 14 week experience, from arrival to course plan evaluation, began at the airport.

Arrival and Living Quarters

My first experience with the Polish educators in the United States occurred at Port Columbus International Airport. Norbert, Maria, Witek, and Rosza arrived on Delta Airlines at 6:40 p.m. on Monday, September 14, 1992. Thersa, traveling from Amsterdam on Trans World Airlines, arrived later the same evening. Gaudet, Johnson, two other graduate students, and I met the group at the airport.

Although we knew many particulars about our guests, we did not have photographs from which to identify them when they disembarked the plane. Fortunately, a familiar face
came through the gate. I remembered Witek Wojcik from our meeting with prospective participants in Warsaw the previous July. He introduced us to the others, and we went to the baggage claim area.

With the four educators from Poland on the ground, Cliff Johnson and I drove them to their home for the duration of the cross-cultural aspect of the project--Harrison House. We arrived at approximately 8:00 p.m. The staff had yet to prepare the rooms, so we sat in the lounge off of the lobby and ate a snack donated by a local fast food chain. By 9:00 p.m., Jim Gaudet arrived with Thersa. The rooms were ready at 10:30 p.m., and a tired group began their first night in the United States on the "Schools and Democratic Society" project.

The Harrison House was a privately owned apartment complex on the north edge of the campus across from the basketball arena. The complex catered to the University's students and visiting scholars. Built in the 1970s, Harrison House was twelve stories high and contained a lounge, television room, computer room, and laundry room on the first floor.

The apartments were suites. The suites opened to a configuration that resembled an inverted "T". The left half of the "T's" cross was the kitchen--complete with range, microwave, and refrigerator. The right half of the "T's" cross was the washroom and shower. The vertical stem of the
"T" was a living room with a table, two chairs, and a sofa. Windows on the far wall of the vertical stem allowed ample light into the living room.

Two doors, one on each side of the top of the stem, opened to the bedrooms. Each bedroom contained two beds and two desks. Large windows on the far wall of each bedroom opened to the same direction as those in the living room.

Thanks to the efforts of the project staff and the Polish-American Club of Columbus, the Polish educators had cooking utensils, telephones, and televisions in their suites. The Center supplied an electric typewriter, a computer, and most other necessities for individual work by the educators on days when they worked at "home."

In relation to the campus, the Harrison House was a short walk from the College of Education and its library. The main library, in the heart of the University’s academic hub known as the Oval, was a slightly longer walk. The Mershon Center was as far south from the Harrison House as one could venture and still remain on campus. Nonetheless, the walk took approximately twenty minutes. A few bicycles donated by the Polish-American Club of Columbus aided the group on days when weather permitted.

I mention these living conditions because I spent a great deal of time at the Harrison House. Many an interview took place at the tables in the living rooms and at the desks in the bedrooms. In addition, we had many discussions
in the living rooms, some of which became observations for my reflexive journal.

**Getting Adjusted**

On September 15, 1992, the project began officially. During the first week, paperwork involving the Polish educators' meal plans, identification cards, pay checks, and university privileges consumed a great deal of time.

The meal plan was the same as that of a university student. The University had several commissaries throughout campus, and once the Poles received their identification cards, they could eat at any of the facilities. They ate primarily at two dining halls—one a block east of Harrison House and the other two blocks north of the Mershon Center.

As visiting scholars, the Polish educators enjoyed all the privileges of a student or staff member. These privileges included use of the athletic facilities, libraries, student unions, and any events on campus that required an identification card for admission. During the first week, the project staff organized an orientation to the University through the Office of International Scholars and a walking tour of campus organized by the Ohio Student Union.

On Sunday, September 20, we took a bus tour of Columbus. This tour acclimated the Polish educators to their new urban surroundings. Columbus’ public
transportation system afforded easy access to the downtown shopping facilities and fine arts attractions.

By the end of the first week, the Polish educators left jet lag, orientation, and a short seminar on word processing behind them. The core elements of the project began in week two.

The Curriculum Seminars

With the exception of two seminars held at the other Mershon Center building, all curriculum seminars took place on the third floor of the old fraternity house. The curriculum seminars met 14 times during the cross-cultural aspect of the project. Based on the model developed by Mershon researchers and described in the funding proposal, Jim Gaudet and Thompson Livingston conducted these seminars.

These seminars were the heart of the course plan development. Issues, concerns, debates, and arguments concerning the process and product surfaced during these seminars. Course plan format, content, teaching methods, and internal evaluation of the Polish educators' modules were topics of discussion during the curriculum seminars.

By design, the curriculum seminars took place infrequently during the first part of the project. Gaudet and Livingston believed that the Poles needed time to investigate the resources available through the University and the Center staff for accomplishing their work. For instance, one of my tasks during the previous summer
involved the accumulation of syllabi from American preservice teacher education courses related to the project goals. These syllabi were to serve as American course plan models. I gathered 11 syllabi from Columbia University, Northwestern University, Stanford University, and The Ohio State University. I gave copies of the eleven syllabi to the Polish educators, and they needed time to compare and contrast these syllabi with their ideas. This situation exemplified the need for a slow start to the curriculum seminars.

Once the Polish educators’ ideas on format developed, the curriculum seminars increased in frequency. Discussion and debate on elements of content and teaching methods prompted this increased frequency.

Special Workshops and Guest Lectures

Workshops and guest lectures dotted the Polish educators’ formal schedule. Most of these events took place in the first half of the schedule for the same reason that the seminars did not clutter the first half of the schedule—opportunities to explore possibilities of methods and content for the course plan. Four special workshops highlighted the schedule.

The first of these workshops took place in the third week of the project. Lew Simmons travelled to Columbus to present a three day workshop on the principles of democracy.
Simmons discussed content and methods when addressing the West’s democratic tradition.

A two day workshop on civic leadership skills was the second event in this category. This workshop occurred during the fourth week of the project. Conducted by John Goryl from the Mershon Center’s Senior Faculty, this workshop highlighted ways to approach the development of democratic leadership skills in young people.

As part of his Senior Consultant duties, Floyd Baker organized three workshops on schools and democratic society. The first of these workshops took the form of a one day seminar led by Marc Campbell and took place in the fifth week of the schedule. This seminar focused on the organization of schooling in America with specific regard to structure and governance. During the sixth week, Baker and Harold Reese conducted three full days of seminars at the College of Education. These seminars concentrated on the politics of education from both philosophical and practical standpoints. In that same week, T. S. Williams concluded Baker’s special workshop agenda with a one session seminar on the rights of students in principle and in practice. All of these workshops involved outside readings assigned by the presenters before their presentations.

The last special workshop on the schedule of formal events addressed the economic dimensions of American education. This workshop, run by Cliff Johnson, appeared on
the schedule as a one day affair. Due to the myriad issues brought to the table by Cliff Johnson and the Poles, the workshop lasted two days during week seven.

**Field Experiences**

Field experiences comprised the third major component of the schedule. Broadly defined, these events included school visits and university courses.

The most extensive field experience on the schedule lasted for 10 weeks of the project. This event was the middle and secondary school social studies methods course taught by Graham More (see Appendix D for the syllabus of More’s course). The Poles attended More’s class from start to finish during the fall quarter. This experience gave them some indication of how American educators approached the task of teaching preservice teachers. Two important developments grew from this experience. The Poles decided to attend voluntarily More’s graduate level course on simulations and games in the social studies that met one night a week during the fall quarter. In addition, they based the modular construction of the "Schools and Democratic Society" course plan on More’s concept of lesson plan and unit development.

Several, shorter field experiences dotted the Polish educators’ schedule. During week two of the schedule, the Polish educators attended a conference at the Fort Hayes Career Center in Columbus. This conference, entitled
"Connecting Citizens and Schools," concerned ways in which education and other professions could work together in solving American educational problems.

On October 2, the Poles visited Kenyon College in Gambier, Ohio, for a meeting with social scientists and students. This field experience came about at the request of our project officer at Pew Charitable Trusts of Philadelphia. One of his former classmates was a professor of political science at Kenyon. This classmate's interest in political change in Poland resulted in the Poles' visit to this small, private, liberal arts institution. This experience gave the Poles an opportunity to experience a higher education setting that contrasted well with The Ohio State University. In addition, several Poles cultivated friendships with faculty and students at Kenyon.

During the fifth week of the schedule, the Poles ventured to Bloomington, Indiana, where Dennis Littlejohn hosted them on a three day tour of the Social Studies Development Center and the ERIC publishing facilities. Computer searches for literature related to the course development was a result of this field experience.

The Poles visited two schools during their cross-cultural experience. One school was an elementary school located in a lower middle class area of Columbus. This visit occurred in week seven. The other school visit took
place during week eight. This visit was to an upper middle
class middle school in suburban Columbus.

In weeks 9 and 10, the field experiences came to a
close with two conferences, both of which included
presentations by the Polish educators. In week nine, the
Poles attended a two day conference entitled "Educating for
Democracy: Looking to the 21st Century" held at Ohio
Wesleyan University near Columbus. At that conference,
Thersa and Norbert presented a paper on the challenges of
democracy in Central Europe. The following week, the entire
project went to Detroit, Michigan, for the National Council
for the Social Studies Annual Convention. At the
conference, Rosza, Thersa, Witek, and Maria presented a
paper entitled "Polish Schools and the Challenge of
Democracy."

Recreational Activities

Aside from the schedule devoted to project completion,
recreational activities played a part in the personal
construct change of the Polish educators as they considered
the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

The recreational activities flowed from three main
sources: the project, the Polish-American Club of Columbus,
and acquaintances made during the course of the cross-
cultural experience of the project. These recreational
activities played varying roles of importance in the Polish
educators construct change and development, so I left them
within the case studies. Briefly, though, these recreational activities ranged from a college football game to the Columbus International Festival. In addition, many American acquaintances offered recreational opportunities to the Poles. Most prevalent among these acquaintances were members of the Polish-American Club of Columbus.

Given the setting, people, and events of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project, what happened with the Polish educators' constructs of the role of school in educating for democratic citizenship? In Chapter V, I look at each of the Poles and myself with respect to this question.
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CHAPTER V

THE CASES

Introduction

Chapter V displays the cases of the five Polish educators as constructed through the methodology described in Chapter III. Each case begins with the Polish educator's autobiography followed by a brief comparison of his or her first and last definitions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. The middle section of each case describes personal construct change and development during a cross-cultural experience. I display these changes and/or developments in a thematically chronological manner. Each case concludes with a summary relating the case to the three main questions that emerged during the study.

The final section of this chapter entails a comparative analysis of the five Polish educators regarding construct change over time as viewed through the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.
The Case of Norbert Kwak

His Autobiography

I was born in Czestochowa—the Polish town with the reputation for the Black Madonna cult—in 1954. I spent my childhood years in Miechów, a little town twenty-five miles north of Kraków. In Miechów, I attended elementary and secondary school. In secondary school, I was a member of the Scouts and, at the same time, a member of the Union of Socialist Youth. I was a member of the School Board of the Union of Socialist Youth.

After graduation from secondary school, I started to study sociology at Lublin Catholic University (Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski) in Lublin. After a year, I moved to Jagiellonian University in Kraków. I studied sociology there as well.

As a student—sociology student, second year—I became a member of the Polish United Workers’ Party (Polska Zjednoczona Partia Robotnicza) [OC: The PZPR was the Polish communist party]. As a sociology student, I was also an active member of the Socialist Union of Polish Students (SUPS)—a student organization in Polish universities. Being a Party member since 1976, I was involved in training activities. I was responsible for training members of the Union in the sociology department’s branch of the SUPS. In other words, I used to prepare instructional materials for candidates to the Party at the university level.
In 1980, I graduated with a master's degree in sociology. My thesis was *Totalitarian State and Society in Sociological Writings*. After graduation, I started to work at the Mining and Metallurgy Academy in Kraków (Akademia Górniczo-Hutnicza). I was an instructor of political science in the Social Sciences Department of the Academy.

Yet, having been a student of sociology, I started to study political science at the Jagiellonian University Law Department. In 1984, I received my second master's degree in political science. The thesis was on the history of political education in Poland during the Partition Period; the title was *The Polish School of Political Science--1911-1914*.

In 1984, the Council of the School of Political Science at Jagiellonian University accepted my design for a dissertation entitled *Elite Theories in the Anglo-American Sociology of Power*. The thesis was completed in 1988, and in 1989 I received my Ph.D. in political science.

During my sociological and political science studies, I learned a lot about democracy. I obtained books that were hard to get at that time. I got them for my theses and dissertation. This process, and talking to people about democracy, led to my interest in democracy.

I began teaching in 1980, the age of Solidarity, so it was easier for me to teach about democratic systems and phenomenon not only in Poland, but also abroad. I taught
classes in political science. At this time, there was no obligation to teach Marxism and to prove "the superiority of socialism over capitalism." I also paid attention to political doctrines and their development. I showed my students the dynamics of the political thought of the workers' movement since the time of Marx. Another that I taught was liberalism. Third, I taught about the development of the Church's social teachings. I liked to show students different views.

In 1984, I lost my teaching position at the Mining and Metallurgy Academy. This was because of the fact that in 1981 I gave back my Communist Party book and left the Party just before marshall law was executed. For two months, I was unemployed.

In 1985, I was offered a job as an instructor at the Pedagogical Academy, Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna, in Kraków. Now, I am an assistant professor of political science in the Social Sciences Department of the Pedagogical Academy. I teach contemporary political systems, democracy, and social studies methods. My lectures and classes are with preservice teachers as well as inservice teachers. In 1991, I was elected a co-director of the Pedagogical Academy--in my charge are student affairs and planning teachers' duties, lectures, and classes.

I am not involved in any kind of political activity. I am a member of the Polish Sociological Association and the
Polish Political Science Association. I used to be the executive secretary of the Polish Sociological Association, Kraków chapter. My professional activity is shared between political science, political systems, democracy, and social studies problems, methods, and teacher education.

I am married to my wife Halina since 1978. I have two daughters. Kasia is 12 years old, and Madzia is 10 years old.

Frankly speaking, it was decided randomly that I be invited to be in this project. In my pedagogical school, I teach students how to teach the social sciences. I always liked to take part in any project connected with developing curricula for the social sciences as subjects in the primary and secondary schools.

In July, 1992, the President of my academy received a letter from the Ministry of National Education. They were searching for someone to develop a new shape of social science; someone who was ready to partake in a project to develop curricula for teachers that could help shape democratic citizenship attitudes and skills for their pupils. The President called me into his office, and during the conversation it was decided that I would be pointed out to the Ministry as a person who might take part in the project.

I liked this very much. I had prepared extracurricular materials in the science of democracy before I joined this
project. They were designed for only about ten hours of class time, but I was teaching part-time students, preservice teachers, and inservice teachers. For this purpose, these materials were fine.

**Last and First Thoughts**

Norbert Kwak sent me his last reflection after his return to Poland. In this reflection, he defined the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship as follows:

The basic information which is to be taught at schools is knowledge on the principles of democracy. Its pillars are sovereignty of the people, government based upon consent of the governed, majority rule, minority rights, guarantees of basic human rights, equality before law, due process of law, constitutional limits on government—to name but the most important.

Students should be taught that democracy is based upon values of tolerance, pragmatism, cooperation, and compromise; a democratic society is a humanistic, pluralistic, and rational one.

But, a citizen in a democracy should also be an active person. So, education in schools should involve training in the following skills:

- acquiring and using information about the political situation in one’s environment, from newspapers, books, media, other people;
- making decisions—it is a skill useful and necessary not only for decision-makers in the body politic, but also for leaders in associations, interest groups, and so on;
- making judgments, which are based on standards: justice, ethics, practicality;
- communication of ideas and points of view to others;
- cooperating and working with others in achieving mutual goals; and
- promoting interests in organizations and institutions.

Besides, schools should be a kind of field for experience, a practice range, where students, with the
help of teachers and parents, would be active in self-
government, for instance.
To fulfill the role, school should be democratic
itself; teachers should be "enlightened" citizens, and
students should be considered subjective.

Clearly, Norbert defined the knowledge, skills, and
attitudes he believed essential to the role of schools in
educating for democratic citizenship.

When this last reflection arrived on my desk at the
Mershon Center, I matched this definition to the first
definition Norbert offered in early October, 1992. Upon
comparison, the three sub-constructs remained the same, but
the glaring difference was in the depth of description. In
October, 1992, Norbert wrote that the role of schools in
educating for democratic citizenship should include

. . . knowledge about democracy, a system of values
which are democratic and their relevant beliefs, and
readiness to be active--to take part in a democratic
process.

If it is expected that the role of schools is to
educate young people to be citizens, schools should
give students knowledge about democracy and internalize
values of a democratic society. In addition, students
should be trained in certain skills which would be a
base for civic activity. So, there are "civic" duties
of schools.

Given this change in depth of construction, yet
steadfast maintenance of the three sub-constructs, what did
Norbert experience during the cross-cultural aspect of
"Schools and Democratic Society" that expanded his ranges of
convenience concerning knowledge, skills, and attitudes?
Norbert's Construction of "Knowledge"

In Norbert's first reflection, he defined the knowledge relevant to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship as simply "knowledge about democracy." He went on to note that "the Ministry must make a course in democracy required for certification." Yet, he did not define the "knowledge about democracy" necessary for this course.

During our first interview, Norbert deferred to his scholarly pursuit, political science, in defining precisely what he meant. In his definition of the knowledge necessary for democratic citizenship, Norbert included contemporary models of democracy on the state level--"forms of government in different countries and how they work."

Early in his cross-cultural experience, Norbert construed "democratic citizenship" more clearly through what Kelly (1955) termed "the contrast end" employed when one refers to "elements at the opposite pole of a construct" (p. 137). Norbert's experiences with the PZPR, particularly the party's educational goals, exemplified the contrast end of "democratic citizenship" and anchored the opposite pole of that construct.

For instance, Norbert described the "new soviet man" as the contrast end of "democratic citizen":

The new soviet man is a man created first to live in the socialist, communist society. This is ironic. The "new man" in communist ideology was to be thoroughly devoted to the community, to the social roles--one of
many who have fulfilled the ideal of socialism. There was no privacy or individualism, just collectivism. In one extreme version, it was a man who lived for the party and the state, not for himself. This is a theoretical version. In Polish tradition, it was a man who would fulfill the special plans set up by the government and by the party.

The role of schools in a communist society was "to create such people through all the subjects in education. This was done through the process of indoctrination." Norbert’s observation coincided with Kozakiewicz’s (1992) point that ideology drove the knowledge needed to mold the soviet citizen.

Expanding the Knowledge Sub-Construct Through Cross-Cultural Experiences During School Visits

Within the first three weeks of the project, the Polish educators visited an elementary school in a lower middle class area of Columbus. Professor Alice Tognatti from the College of Education led this field experience at the request of Floyd Baker. She explained to the Polish educators that the school was a "typical American elementary school, unlike some of the alternative schools in the Columbus Public School system."

Upon his exposure to the resources available to the students at this school, Norbert began to clarify the "likeness end" (Kelly 1955, p. 137) of his sub-construct concerning knowledge. He noted the large library facilities and the number of books, particularly comic books, that
acted as conditions and resources conducive to studying the mechanisms of democracy.

In addition, the materials for teachers that acted as knowledge resources on democracy expanded Norbert's understanding of the "material bases for teaching and learning." These resources included a typical variety of textbooks and teachers' guides that populate the teachers' resource room in so many American schools. When publishing houses release a new text or supplementary materials, they tend to send complimentary copies to schools upon request.

I accompanied the Polish educators on their visit to this school. In many ways, the students and teachers' resources were typical of what I knew about public elementary schools. Apparently, such knowledge-based resources were sparse in Poland, at least in Norbert's opinion. Since he had two daughters attending a Polish elementary school, I had no reason to doubt the basis of his judgment.

Between our first and second interviews, Norbert's reflections abandoned his narrow sub-construct of knowledge about democracy as exclusively the understanding of political systems. He no longer referred to knowledge as a construct limited in range to content. He referred to knowledge as something that aided students in their individual development and problem-solving skills. Being a member of Poland's higher education community, Norbert
referred to his college students and the constraints of the Polish university system in this regard:

My students must attend prescribed classes. There is little possibility of choice in the social sciences. These are very small choices. We should allow the students to make up their own curriculum. Students in Poland go to class about thirty hours a week. They are in class too many hours. They do not have time to go and learn on their own like here.

Norbert began to expand his sub-construct's range of convenience through not only experience with American pre-collegiate education, but also the university contexts he experienced. These contexts included the vastness of The Ohio State University and the myriad ad hoc opportunities offered to a student at that university, and the personalized aspect of study he witnessed in the smaller, liberal arts environment of Kenyon College.

Construct Modulation Through Cross-Cultural Awareness

As the weeks passed, Norbert's knowledge sub-construct continued to change shape considerably into the methodological applications of knowledge important to democracy in Poland as well as the content that specified this knowledge. In his reflective journal, he attributed this to Professor More's social studies methods course and the curriculum seminars with Jim Gaudet and Thompson Livingston:

I have learned much about different methods of teaching, but they must be adapted to Polish curricula, to Polish programs. A great deal of work is before us! Books, papers, and other materials that I collected are of great importance. General instructions on how to use them were given by Professor More. . . . On the
other hand, our curriculum seminars during this last period of time were a very important experience in creating modern ways of teaching.

At the mid-point of the project, I asked Norbert about his shift toward knowledge application when describing the knowledge sub-construct. Norbert indicated an expansion of his focus of convenience with regard to the knowledge necessary for schools to teach when educating for democratic citizenship. He noted the widening of his knowledge sub-construct's focus after witnessing, first hand, an American presidential election: "It has given me profound knowledge; knowledge of 'how' which has expanded my knowledge of 'what.'" His observation of the American electoral process gave him a source from which to develop a sense of applied knowledge in a democratic society.

He went on to note that his construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship shifted from the previously assumed primacy of knowledge to a broader construct system of knowledge, skills, and attitudes working together through the educational process: "I'm even more convinced than before that the content of teaching—knowledge—plays a substantially smaller role in educating for democracy than does practice. If you know 'how,' you have skills; knowledge gives you the 'what.'"

Theory Versus Practice

Soon, Norbert began to define his construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship by
enunciating further, and in different terms, the contrast end of the knowledge sub-construct. On November 11 and 12, 1992, the Polish educators and I attended the "Education for Democracy: Looking to the 21st Century" Conference at Ohio Wesleyan University.

In his reflections on this experience, Norbert offered me a look into his sharpened construct dichotomy:

Although the distance between Columbus and Delaware [OC: location of Ohio Wesleyan University] is but several miles, the "distance" in ways of thinking on democracy and on how to teach it is in thousands of miles. To me the conference was an infant. Papers presented were completely uninteresting because the problems were no longer problems to us; we resolved them a long time ago during our work at the Mershon Center. The Mershon staff has gone far beyond these introductory problems (for example, What should we teach about democracy? What skills should a citizen possess that will make him an effective person?) to problems of creating the most effective ways of teaching and training in skills. . . . If democracy is to work it will require a certain level of political competence in the citizens. This is connected with our project. Teaching about democracy and training in democratic skills is, in fact, making a citizen more competent.

Now, the contrast end of Norbert's knowledge sub-construct included not only educating for communist citizenship, but also that which extended only to the basic knowledge and skills needed in a democratic society. The permeability of his construct system began to allow for change and development in the area of knowledge necessary in educating for democratic citizenship.
Global and Multicultural Education

Another point of contrast emanated from our last two interviews. Noted earlier, the Polish educators and I constructed these interview questions collaboratively. Global and multicultural education emerged as an area of interest to the Polish educators when considering the knowledge necessary for defining the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. To Norbert, these concepts held little value: "I learned a little about global education in More's class, but I am not interested. After being explained, multicultural education is also not important for Poland."

Being a doctoral student in Global and Social Studies Education, I maintained contrasting beliefs. With the expanding nature of global systems and values, particularly the value of democracy, I found Norbert’s responses a bit disconcerting. However, when I reflected upon the Polish situation, I understood his position better. With regard to history, Polish education is taught in a global context. Unlike the United States, Poland sits as a cross-road between East and West. This situation requires Polish history teachers to approach their subject matter within a globally expanding historical context. From what I gathered during discussions of this issue with the Polish educators, the "knowledge that contact and exchange among civilizations has been more or less continuous for the last two thousand
years" (Kniep, 1987, p. 73) grounded the Polish history curriculum.

With respect to a need for multicultural education, Poland is not a very diverse nation. Traditionally, the largest Polish minority was Jewish. The Third Reich saw to this minority's elimination from Polish society. Today, Poland has a very small percentage of minorities. Non-Polish ethnic groups comprise only two percent of Poland's population (Hoffman, 1993). These minorities are so small in number that Poles take little notice of the diverse cultural traditions of these groups. These realities do not preclude the need for multicultural education as a possible basis for greater human understanding in a democracy, but this information helped to clarify Norbert's point in my mind.

Norbert's change concerning the knowledge necessary for fulfilling the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship centered upon the permeability and modulation of this sub-construct. At first, Norbert referred to his knowledge of communist citizenship development as a point of contrast, and he spoke of the content of democratic political systems as essential knowledge. As his construct system absorbed his experiences, his concerns with the application of knowledge gained more emphasis than the content of knowledge. His likeness end of the knowledge
sub-construct began to absorb and expand on the skills necessary when educating for democratic citizenship.

Norbert's Construction of "Skills"

At the beginning of his cross-cultural experience, Norbert construed the skill development necessary for schools when educating for democratic citizenship through his existing superordinate construct system—the previous social model of communism. Not unexpectedly, his initial interview offered a construction resembling his early interpretation of knowledge—a crystallization of the contrast end:

In a totalitarian society, men were subjected to the general plan of the future based on ideological ideas. There was no place for individuality, independent thinking, activity in the community which is not accepted by the state. It was the creation of a kind of slave.

In addition, Norbert viewed skills through the sub-construct of knowledge: "Skills are knowledge of how to live in a democracy."

Unlike his initial construction of knowledge, Norbert was more explicit about the types of skills needed in a democratic society. He mentioned participation in public life, voting, and solving community problems as the skills on which schools in a democracy should concentrate. In our first interview, he expressed the need for these skills to become operationalized through social relations in schools, not only between teachers and students, but also between teachers and the community. These two tracks, skills for
students and skills for teachers, ran throughout his cross-cultural experience.

**Student Skills in a Democratic Society**

On October 26, 1992, the Polish educators attended classes at one of Columbus' alternative public elementary schools. This alternative school exemplified the Deweyan tradition. The school had no bells, few classroom restraining walls, and classes of mixed age groups.

Building on skill development as a goal in educating for democratic citizenship, this experience opened Norbert's sub-construct of skills to include enactment of the process as well as knowledge of the process:

This school impressed me because for the first time I saw a different framing of the teaching/learning process. The students were mixed in age. They were sitting on the floor and listening to the teacher. I was impressed that in America, you try to give the students democracy in elementary school. This school reminded me of an "academic workshop." For example, students were given a problem about the American electoral system, and they searched for solutions by themselves using resources in the room.

Afterward, Norbert confided to me that before this school visit he thought such an alternative school could never work in Poland on a large scale. He read about some alternative schools in Poland and even met a few teachers from these schools, but he gave this type of school little chance to succeed in Poland. Now, he thought that alternatives to the standard lecture and recitation could work. He needed to see an alternative school in action, and, ironically, he saw his first alternative school in the United States. This
experience exemplified Norbert's construction system variation as he successively construed the replications of events.

**Skill Development as a Change Agent**

By late October, Norbert began to concentrate his construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship on the subconstruct of skills. This movement coincided with his decreasing mention of knowledge. At this time, he told me that "there is a great role for the school to not only give knowledge to students, but also to make them skillful."

He turned this realization to his task for the project-developing modules for the preservice teacher education course: "My first vision [OC: of the course plan modules] was different. It dealt with topics, but it had no specific method of making students skillful in thinking about democracy and taking part in social life." What, then, were the objects and events that occupied Norbert's subconstruct of skills?

Norbert envisioned the objects and events that defined his construction of skills needed in a democratic society as leadership, making judgments, communicating interests, decision-making, and problem solving. Having taught mainly through lecture, Norbert's experiences with and interpretations of these skills modulated his construct on educating for democratic citizenship. Leadership skills
were part of the two day workshop conducted by John Goryl. In addition, making judgments, communicating interests, and decision-making were integral parts of Jim Gaudet’s extensive work with the Basic Citizenship Competency Project in 1979. Problem solving was central to Graham More’s social studies methods course. These experiences occupied Norbert’s construct system on expanding levels throughout the project.

Norbert’s cross-cultural experiences with American education altered his construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship through the skills necessary, in his eyes, for realization of educational transition in Poland. Polish teachers needed to develop these skills in order to teach them, and Norbert’s self-directed charge became the integration of skill development into his portion of the "Schools and Democratic Society" course.

**Teacher Skills in a Democratic Society**

Norbert’s expanding skills sub-construct spilled into teacher skills in a democratic society after his experience with student skill development on the elementary school level and during his experiences with the social studies methods course and the curriculum seminars. During the middle portion of the cross-cultural aspect of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project, Norbert mentioned with increasing frequency the types of skills needed for teaching
in a transitional democracy. He believed that teacher education in general, and the skills contained in the course plan in particular, should include myriad aspects of his cross-cultural experience.

Teacher skills for a transitional democracy. Norbert’s experiences with More’s social studies methods class and the curriculum seminars with Gaudet and Thompson brought about change in his sub-construct of skills with regard to teacher education. Before his participation in the project, Norbert viewed himself and his colleagues as basically lecture and recitation teachers: "In my country, professors only lecture, but here, a man with academic experience shows his students through questions. In political science, I used to teach with lectures. Knowledge and evaluation were the emphasis. Skills were absent."

As the project progressed, Norbert spoke and wrote about the specific skills he envisioned necessary for teacher preparation in Poland. The use of primary sources, concept learning, decision trees, role playing, simulations, pro/con analysis, and civic writing emerged as skills to be developed in teacher preparation courses: "If you are going to prepare teachers’ skills, you should use active methods of teaching."

Norbert’s expanding storehouse of teaching methods for skill development solidified throughout the methods course and the curriculum seminars. Additionally, our trip to the
National Council for the Social Studies Annual Convention in Detroit, Michigan, broadened his determination that skills and knowledge share positions of importance in education. Reflecting upon the conference, Norbert noted that

social studies teachers in the United States have a serious, professional hinterland: books, handbooks, maps, instructional materials, software, and so on—all you need for the art of teaching. . . . There should be more subjects in social studies in Polish schools, and, at the same time, subjects should be up-to-date in content and methods.

Near the end of the cross-cultural portion of the project, Norbert's skills sub-construct broadened considerably with regard to focus of convenience. He noted the experiences with More's classes, the curriculum seminars, school visits, and the National Council for the Social Studies Annual Conference as major events in the change and development of this sub-construct. Norbert came to the realization that his experiences with skills necessary for education in a democracy would change his life as a teacher: "I am sure that I have to change my way of teaching . . . but now my methods will be more useful for training skills. Now, I think that the most important thing in teaching is skills."

Skills in the "Schools and Democratic Society" course plan. As Norbert experienced the various cross-cultural objects and events through his construct system, he abandoned much of his previous construct system regarding skill development in educating for democratic citizenship.
He reformulated his interpretation of the skills that schools should develop in students as they educate for democratic citizenship.

A similar transmutation occurred with regard to the course plan. Norbert noted the exchange of ideas during curriculum seminars as an arena for incorporating skill development into the preservice teacher education course. If skill development in children was critical to an emerging democracy, then skill development in preservice teachers was equally critical: "The most important way of teaching is not knowledge, but skills. Skills are always based on knowledge, but I think that our consensus on the topics [OC: for the course plan] is just right. What we needed most was skills."

Norbert came to this realization during a critical point in the course plan development. Momentum slowed in the middle of the project. Throughout the first half of their visit, the Polish educators experienced many aspects of American schooling with regard to democratic citizenship. They visited schools, conferences, special workshops, and attended seven curriculum seminars with Gaudet and Livingston. Yet, stagnation was apparent. On Friday, November 6, the eighth curriculum seminar convened.

During this all day seminar, the group—including Gaudet, Livingston, and me—came to grips with the need to develop a concrete course plan. What would be the topics,
and how would they be taught? Lead time for the course plan development was slower than expected. Now, time for the development of a draft was short.

To Norbert, the day’s stormy discussions clarified the needs of the course plan: "I came to realize the importance of helping students develop teaching skills during our famous seminar on the topics. I realized that Jim Gaudet was right. He proposed a plan that was new and not a stereotypical course. We agreed."

As the second half of the cross-cultural experience passed, Norbert and his colleagues developed a draft course plan that enhanced necessary knowledge with skill development methods. Norbert saw the advantage of this course as not only helping preservice teachers in their classrooms, but also in "organizing social life outside the school in the local community." From the eighth curriculum seminar sprang the assignment of topics. Norbert’s modules were "Parental Participation in Schools" and "The Distribution of Resources for Education." Now, he had a concrete base on which to employ his changing sub-construct of skills in relation to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship:

Skills will empower people and students if they deal with public life. If they have skills, they will be successful in public activity. These skills can help develop leaders. If a person is skillful in expression and judgments, then they can become leaders.
Along with the necessary knowledge and skills, what abstractions from this cross-cultural experience contributed to the change and development of Norbert's superordinate construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship with regard to the sub-construct of attitudes?

_Norbert's Construction of "Attitudes"_

Early in Norbert's cross-cultural experience, references to present Polish attitudes imposed by past indoctrination occupied his attitudes sub-construct. Similar to knowledge and skills, he construed the attitudes relevant to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship more so through the contrast end as opposed to the likeness end of the sub-construct.

As the "Schools and Democratic Society" project progressed, Norbert's abstractions of his cross-cultural experiences led to the development of a likeness end to his attitudes sub-construct. His attitudes sub-construct developed to include not only barriers to democratic citizenship, but also the necessary change in the Polish school system that would allow the system to become an agent for democratic attitudinal development in Polish society.

---

1 In contrast to the varying definitions of knowledge and skills among the Polish educators, when they talked or wrote about attitudes necessary in educating for democratic citizenship they were generally consistent. For the most part, they defined attitudes as groups of related democratic beliefs on which people based their likes and dislikes, feelings, and opinions. Within this broad definition, each of them experienced different abstractions of reality that contributed to their constructions.
In addition, Norbert began to construe the role of society in assisting schools to develop democratic attitudes as a part of the quest to educate for democratic citizenship. *Barriers to Democratic Attitude Development in Schools*

In Norbert's first reflection, he referred to the need for schools in a democracy to develop attitudes that encompass "a system of democratic values and relevant beliefs." Nonetheless, Norbert went on to express this system in terms of what it is not. These abstractions of reality that defined the barriers to education for democratic citizenship included indoctrination and learned helplessness with particular emphasis on the role of parents.

Norbert believed that Polish society, not unlike the other nations of the former Eastern and Central European communist bloc, suffered from learned helplessness. This recalcitrance toward public life and community activity acted as a barrier to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Since teachers and parents grew up in such a society, attitudes toward democratic change through education met a wall of passivity "that is visible in the relationship between schools and parents."

To Norbert, this parent/school relationship reflected the indoctrination of an entire society through communist philosophy over a 45 year period:

It is the same as the helplessness of the society. People do not get involved in the life of the school.
They go to get their children's scores, but nothing else. Parents say there is no time. They say that they must work. They think that school should teach their children without parental involvement.

I explained to Norbert that this condition was not exclusive to post-communist societies. For 16 years, I experienced the same thing on many an occasion, particularly during my five year teaching career in the inner city of Chicago. In my experience, parents of lower income families maintained a sort of learned helplessness through their low station in a seemingly oppressive capitalist society.

Norbert did not disagree. However, he noted that in Poland, parents did not want to improve the process of education. Their attitude reflected a residual sense of immutable soviet citizenship reproduction through the educational system of the state. He pointed out that Polish parents had no ideas about schooling, so they allowed schools to do what they normally did—indoctrinate. In effect, he noted my failure to recognize that in an established democracy, it appeared as if parents played an important role in the attitudinal development of their children. I pressed him on this, but being early in his cross-cultural experience, he had no concrete evidence. Eventually, he would have this evidence, and, in a gentle sort of way, he would not let me forget his point.

*Attitudinal Change Agents in a Democracy*

Several weeks passed after this early exchange of ideas. On a rainy Thursday night in early November, I asked
the Polish educators if any of them would like to attend and observe a meeting of a volunteer organization. Norbert was the only Pole to accept my invitation. The occasion was a session at the Columbus Chapter of the Red Cross. This session concerned a new Red Cross program entitled "Global Diversity and Me." From its inception, I was a consultant to this program. This volunteer program trained non-educators to teach lessons to pre-collegiate classes in the Columbus Public School system about appreciation of cultural diversity in their communities. Local teachers assisted the volunteers with some teaching methods related to this content.

That evening, I was one of the "trainers" for a group of nine volunteers. They ranged in profession from college students to business people. Norbert sat attentively throughout the various training presentations. During a break, he asked every one of the volunteers why he or she volunteered to work in the schools. On the way home, he brought me back to our discussion of attitudes in a democratic society that he believed were so critical to schools in their attempt to educate for democratic citizenship.

To Norbert, this experience exemplified the likeness end of the attitudes sub-construct essential to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. He told me that people such as these volunteers did not develop in
every society. Their parents and schools had much to do with this attitude toward fellow citizens, and he believed that this experience broadened his thinking beyond school as a change agent for students to a change agent for society:

Different people from different social groupings came together on a volunteer basis, and they wanted to do something for others. Democracy on a small community level really works; people can act on a social level that helps to make a community better. There is a humanness about this. This is a very important attitude. To accomplish this, the teacher can be an organizer in the local community.

As time passed, Norbert indicated more examples of how education for democratic citizenship emerged in everyday societal attitudes he encountered during his cross-cultural experience. He noted the amiable disposition of shopkeepers, the helpful attitudes of the students at Harrison House, and the willingness of strangers to help him figure out directions. I told him that he was either seeing what he wanted to see, or he was extremely lucky.

Maybe he experienced a bit of both. Norbert travelled to New Haven, Connecticut, via New York City on December 12 to visit a prominent American political scientist at Yale University. Upon his return, I asked him about New York City. He acknowledged the poverty, but he continued to insist that even in those conditions, people reacted differently than in post-communist countries. On December 16, I wrote in my journal that

maybe he didn’t see the worst of America, but, by his description, he came quite close. Nonetheless, Norbert still sensed an attitude of "humanness" in New York
that must be the result of living in a democratic society. He still believes that schools can help to create this attitude if society supports the schools.

Six days later, the project concluded and Norbert left for Poland. His attitudes sub-construct, like knowledge and skills, started with the contrast end as represented by his anticipation of events based on previous experiences in communist Poland. Through his cross-cultural experiences, he developed a likeness end of his attitudes sub-construct that centered upon the coactive roles of schools and society in developing attitudes necessary for democratic citizenship.

**Summary**

The change in and development of Norbert’s superordinate construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship during his cross-cultural experience followed a distinct pattern. At first, Norbert relied on his previous construct system with regard to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Basically, he drew upon his construct system developed during his life in communist Poland. His anticipation of events was psychologically channelized through this system.

Initially, Norbert construed each of his sub-constructs—knowledge, skills, and attitudes—through the contrast end of these sub-constructs as they related to educating for democratic citizenship. As his field of
experience broadened during the project, clarification of
the likeness end of these sub-constructs emerged. Norbert's
construction shaped and was shaped by his pre-existing
system.

What Were the Changes?

In addition to this overall pattern, the sub-constructs
of knowledge, skills, and attitudes took on different
meanings for Norbert. Knowledge, his main concern at the
start of his experience, moved from the exclusivity of
"what" to include knowledge about "how"--from knowledge for
the sake of knowledge to the application of essential
knowledge as a role played by schools in educating for
democratic citizenship.

The sub-construct of skills emerged as an important
construction during Norbert's cross-cultural experience.
The need for skills in developing democratic citizenship
grew from his changes in the sub-construct of knowledge.
Reasoning through a problematic situation became essential
to Norbert. The use of case studies, decision trees,
problem solving exercises, and the various methods employed
in simulations highlighted his skill abstractions from this
experience.

With regard to attitudes, Norbert moved from the
contrast end of what a communist civic attitude entailed to
the need for Polish society to adapt a democratic habit of
mind in order to promote democratic citizenship development
in schools. Through this developing sense of coactivity, Norbert began to see the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship as one that included the projection of democratic attitudes to not only students, but also the community.

What Experiences Delimited the Construct?

The experiences abstracted by Norbert during the project included two key events at the contrast end of his constructions and several key events and objects at the likeness end of his constructions. These objects and events delimited his construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. With regard to the contrast end, Norbert viewed his experience at the "Educating for Democracy: Looking to the 21st Century" conference as an approach to his curriculum development task that offered what not to do while accomplishing his goals. In addition, Norbert viewed his exposure to global and multicultural education as something that, at least for the present, held no value in defining the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship in Poland.

The likeness end of his superordinate construct included his school visits; experiences with university life on the large, state university level and the smaller, private college level; the social studies methods course; the curriculum seminars; the National Council for the Social Studies Annual Convention; the Red Cross meeting; and his
trip to New Haven via New York. Throughout, Norbert noted his cross-cultural experiences with people on a daily basis as events crucial to his superordinate construct change and development.

What Was the Role of His Previous Constructs?

In construing each of the sub-constructs, Norbert began with his previous experiences as a base. These experiences resulted in a precise construction of the contrast ends of the sub-constructs. At the start of our experience together, he described succinctly what the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship did not include based on his experiences with the Polish communist party, the Socialist Union of Polish Students, and his perception of Polish society in general and parental involvement with schools in particular.

As Kelly (1955) noted, our processes are psychologically channelized by the way in which we anticipate events. Norbert entered the cross-cultural portion of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project with preconceived notions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship based upon his life in communist Poland. These notions centered upon the contrast end of the superordinate construct. During his involvement in this cross-cultural experience, Norbert’s previous anticipations blended with these experiences to develop a distinct set of likeness ends for his subordinate constructs of knowledge,
skills, and attitudes. Concomitantly, his construction process developed a concrete vision of his superordinate construct—the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship in his native Poland—as evidenced in his final reflection and noted earlier.

The Case of Maria Podolska

Her Autobiography

I consider the request to deliver my life story by no means another opportunity to boast about every single step of my academic career. Quite the contrary. To me, a life story is but a presentation of facts and events that deserve due attention, especially when looked at from the perspective of today.

It was a pure coincidence that I was born in Szczecin, a small border town close to the former East Germany, on January 7, 1948.

My mother and her immediate family had been deported from Vilnius—then a Polish city in Lithuania; now, it is the capital of Lithuania—to a forced labor camp in Germany. My father’s family was Polish, too. Their roots were in Lwów—again, a former Polish city now in Ukraine. When the Soviet’s invaded Poland’s Eastern territories, my father’s family, like many other Poles, were deported to Siberia. At that time, my father, who was the eldest son, had already been in the Polish Army.
Taken as a prisoner of war on the battlefield, my father was sent to the cflag (POW camp for officers) in Braunsweig, Germany. There, he met my mother. When she became pregnant, they decided to return to Poland, which was to be their "new fatherland." They obviously did not want their child to be born among "those Germans."

As the roots of my mother's family and my father's family were in lands that no longer belonged to Poland (Lwów and Vilnius were annexed by the Soviet Union), it was very difficult for the offspring of both families to assimilate in this new reality, let alone to accept the political changes. Even though they always thought of themselves as Polish people, the column called "country of birth" on their identification documents read "the Soviet Union." No wonder that their evaluation of the most recent events was unique--different from the official version.

When the war ended, my mother took a job as a teacher. She studied for her MA diploma and continued to work at various elementary schools in Radom (a town located about 50 miles south of Warsaw) until retirement. My father's commitment was in line with his scope of interest in the humanities. When the war broke out, he was a sophomore in the Department of Psychology at Lwów University. After the war, working as a representative of municipal authorities, he devoted his energy and resourcefulness to helping orphans
and handicapped children. It goes without saying why I decided to study psychology.

I still remember how difficult it was for me to play the role of a "rebellious teen" in our home. I was allowed to smoke cigarettes in front of my parents. Actually, I never smoke. They always let me listen and take part in any conversation about "family affairs," no matter how serious or how far the issue was above me. They even consented to let me go on holidays with my boyfriend. He and I were both of age then, yet still living with our parents. The boyfriend in question, whom I have known since we were in the last year of high school, is my husband. The trust and confidence my parents had in me discouraged me from taking any liberties.

Considering the above information and the fact that I was an only child and was brought up in a fascinating, multi-generational family, I feel there was little left for me to do but be a good high school student. I passed my final exam in 1966. From my perspective, the so-called "natural course of events" was to study and graduate in psychology from Warsaw University in 1971.

People often asked me who I was. Then came the answer: "I am a Slavonic woman from Central Europe." I do feel justified to give such a reply. The following facts from my family history support this:

- We are of mixed blood. My mother’s grandmother was Byelorussian and my father’s grandmother was Czech.
We are, in a sense, a melting pot; a unique mixture of the culture and tradition of "Kresy" (the lands of pre-war eastern Poland), whose peoples, Poles as they were, had not only created their own local staples, customs, cuisine, and Christmas carols, but also missed no opportunity to emphasize their sense of local identity.

A considerable part of the family is scattered throughout Europe. Two of my father's brothers, who fought in the Battle of Britain, settled in England and never returned to Poland. After the war, my grandmother's sister and her daughter stayed in Germany. A number of my relatives live in Byelorussia and Lithuania.

From my academic years I can recall two facts that I think have had a considerable influence on me: first, a trip to Western Europe in 1967; and second, the fact that I belong to the generation of the March, 1968, protest in Poland. In fact, my political awareness started to mature at that time.

The Psychology Department of Warsaw University has always been under the strong influence of American achievements in humanistic psychology. Our "gurus" were Maslow, Rogers, and Lang. Fully immersed in their world of psychology, I was also fascinated with the philosophy, music, and lifestyle of the "flower child" generation. Even today, being a scholar with twenty-three years of experience in my field, I wear blue jeans to my lectures. So far, I have never heard anyone complaining that my outfit affects the listeners' perceptions of my lecture. It feels good, doesn't it? Frankly speaking, I feel indebted to my students who, younger and more dynamic as they are, never
let me indulge in a comfortable slow-down, which might result in a kind of intellectual slothfulness. I must admit that I enjoy my work at the University enormously.

Immediately after graduation, I went on to complete the course work of my doctorate in three years. I completed this work in 1974. I was married the same year, and my daughter, Dominika, was born. Three years later (1977) I was awarded my Ph.D. Only once have I taken a long break from academic activities. This was a six week maternity leave in 1978 when my son, Bartek, was born.

An American scholar might say that my academic career lacks "mobility." Personally, however, I don’t think that I need more of it. My University is my native harbor. I leave it to attend conferences and conventions, to hold lectures, and participate in fellowships.

In December, 1981, when I was at a conference in France, martial law was introduced in my country. Since it was virtually impossible for me to return to Poland, I chose to move to the University of Tilburg in Holland where I stayed for five months. It was there that I gave deep thought to an idea of emigrating from Poland. Yet, each time the idea recurred, my husband would reject it flatly. As a matter of fact, whenever he was to choose between our independent scientific careers in a democratic country and our families that we had temporarily left behind in Poland, he would invariably favor the latter. Being a psychologist
fully committed to research on social phenomena, he was also very well aware of his role as a scientist. He simply knew better where he belonged. Anyway, how many of us believed during those years that one day a democratic Poland would reappear like it did in 1989?

I have worked at the University for nearly half of my life. My projects were educational psychology, psychology of educational processes, psychology of school communities, teachers' psychology, and conflict management in educational settings. Since 1991, I have been cooperating with Partners for Democratic Change (American NGO), as well as with American trainers whose concerns were the problems of negotiation and mediation (CDR, Boulder; Community Board, San Francisco; Interaction Associates, Boston and San Francisco; NICE, Washington).

I am now a specialist in educational programs for peer mediation, conflict resolution, and prejudice reduction at the Centre on Negotiation and Conflict Resolution at Warsaw University. To promote peaceful measures of conflict resolution, I held a series of lectures and training sessions in Sofia, Bulgaria (1991); Prague, Czech Republic (1992); and Budapest, Hungary (1992). I also held a workshop in Northern Ireland. The subject was ethnic conflicts, and the participants were instructors, trainers, teachers, and students of seven nationalities. Obviously, it was a challenge for me and my skills as a trainer.
(Coach?). In 1991, I was among the founders of ENCORE (the European Network for Conflict Resolution in Education).

At present, I am involved in the activities of ISPA (International School Psychology Association), which corresponds to my major task at the University. I am preparing my students to be school psychologists (therapists?, coaches?). Recently, I have also been concerned with children's rights in Poland. I am a tenured lecturer at the Helsinki Foundation School of Human Rights and do research on the social awareness of children's rights.

There were a few events in my life that considerably affected my mind as a scholar majoring in the humanities. These include my visits to Southeast Asia (Indochina), South America, and North America. It is true that travel broadens the mind, and it was the case with me. The things I saw on other continents made me look at my country's social and educational problems from a different perspective.

I am glad that our children still find us attractive as both parents and partners. We all do our best to spend as much time together as possible, which is not an easy job to do.

To scare away the specter of pauperism, my husband and I are in the swing of things at the moment. That means that I am not afraid of my coming old age. Quite the contrary, I am continually learning how to appreciate more and more of
the qualities that our lives have acquired since we moved to live in a rural area outside, yet not far away from, Warsaw. And here, day by day, I discover more and more charms of every journey inside myself. The fact that I have managed to perform that task is another proof to support the statement that, all in all, I have so far been living a fairly successful life.

As far as the project is concerned, I have worked for twenty years in the area of school psychology. As a result, I have been dealing with schools for a long time. During this time, I have thought about how I can make my psychology functional for teachers, parents, and students. For four years, I was responsible for teaching psychology for all the teacher education departments. This was a core course at Warsaw University. I was always interested in how psychology could be used in the school setting. What would be transferable and useful for schools? This included educational administration.

Two years ago, I started working with conflict resolution for schools. I trained myself to be a person responsible for the area. I wanted to be responsible for implementing this in Poland. It is very weak there. I trained a lot of teachers. The teachers found it useful. There is a waiting list for this training. I knew that the training was not enough. It was only four days long. Since there was such a great response, why not make it required
through the "Schools and Democratic Society" course plan? Tadeusz Kluszewski agreed. It would touch people in a more systematic manner.

In addition, I like this curriculum development work. It links schooling to the imperatives of democracy. This is inside of me. I believe in this ideology. I like the philosophical approach and the work that shows the process of democratization. You can understand more about what is going on around you. I like working with the process, and the project, as a common task, is a process in itself.

**Expanding Her Range of Convenience**

The notion that a person abstracts reality through any of a finite number of constructs is key to personal construct theory. A person chooses the appropriate construct based upon the construct’s range of convenience with regard to the context at hand: "The range of convenience of a construct would cover all those things to which the user found its application useful" (Kelly, 1955, p. 137).

Context, in the terminology of personal construct theory, is the range of elements to which a person may apply a construct. A person applies a construct’s range of convenience to selected elements in his or her perceptual field in order to make a distinction between and to create an association with those elements. As a person encounters new contexts, the construct system changes and/or develops.
At the start of the project, Maria Podolska’s pre-existing superordinate construct’s range of convenience maintained a framework from which to build a set of distinctions and associations during her cross-cultural experience. These existing distinctions and associations emerged in her initial definition of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

In her first reflective journal entry from October 1, Maria anticipated the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship during Poland’s transition to democracy:

... it is of utmost importance to elaborate education programs that would promote such knowledge, skills, and attitudes as follows: the ability to (a) recognize the other side’s valid rights and legitimate points of view, (b) manage conflicts, and (c) tolerate each others differences.

Recognition of a person’s rights and opinions, conflict management, and toleration of difference were the initial elements of Maria’s knowledge, skills, and attitudes sub-constructs.

In the same reflection, Maria indicated that the previous school system in Poland was not conducive to this sort of mission. The previous model represented the contrast embedded in her pre-existing range of convenience based on her experiences in Poland:

Previously, all schools in Poland were state-governed. They were functioning according to a well-defined pattern. The studies of teachers, students, and parents were clear. The teachers were obligated to carry out a unified, centrally planned curriculum.
Students were expected not to disturb them in the realization of this goal, and parents were responsible for any trouble or problems the school system had with their children.

Maria's pre-existing construct system offered a vision of certain knowledge, skills, and attitudes as a basis for change from the role of schools in the past. She entered her cross-cultural experience with a clear distinction between the likeness end and contrast end of her superordinate construct concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

In her final reflection, Maria offered a definition of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship that highlighted the change and development in her range of convenience during her cross-cultural experience. Maria's abstractions over time remained within the specific sub-constructs of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Nevertheless, the range of convenience she constructed through abstractions of contextual elements during her cross-cultural experience revealed a depth of definition absent from her first reflection.

Taken from her last reflection, the following definition of the sub-constructs of knowledge, skills, and attitudes to which schools must attend in educating for democratic citizenship indicated her depth of change and development. These changes and developments stemmed from not only Maria's personal, informal experiences, but also the formal work of the group in developing the course plan:
What was especially important for me was that the concept and theory of democracy transcended the simple concept of government and elections and was really a cultural concept about a radically new way of life. By having the opportunity to rethink these issues under close critical intensity of the group, we avoided the problem of replacing one form of ideology (communism) with American liberalism. Democracy became an idea that generated from our own critical reflection of these issues.

Schools must become a democratic environment both in terms of their stated ideals and in their means. Our role in proposing such a course is to empower teachers to take on the challenge of change to a new society with its new values and institutions. As agents of social change, teachers will be able to recognize the utility of democratic procedures and skills.

The curriculum for teaching social skills would include how to deal with conflict, how to communicate, and other psychological skills (group decision making, cooperation, assertiveness).

Couched in terms of both the role of the school and the purpose of the course plan, this final definition reflected Maria’s superordinate construct through a changed and expanded range of convenience. Over time, what elements did Maria choose from her cross-cultural experience with reference to the sub-constructs of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that expanded and changed her range of convenience concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship?

Maria’s Construction of "Knowledge"

Maria’s sub-construct of the knowledge schools should address in educating for democratic citizenship expanded in range of convenience on two levels during her cross-cultural experience. One level involved the meaning of knowledge about democracy that students need in order to function
within the context of their culture. Related to cultural
context, the other level of knowledge included global
education as an aspect of the school's mission in educating
for democratic citizenship. This mission involved teaching
about Poland's new position as a democracy in an
interconnected world.

**Defining Knowledge in Context**

As noted in her opening reflection, Maria entered her
cross-cultural experience with a sub-construct of knowledge
that included "the other side's valid rights and legitimate
points of view." During our first interview in early
October, I asked her to define further this notion of
knowledge schools should address in educating for democratic
citizenship. In her response, she noted that knowledge
about democracy was the key. I asked her to elaborate on
the elements included in this sort of knowledge:

Knowledge of democracy includes some basic concepts and
terms viewed from different perspectives. For example,
it includes values of tolerance, pragmatism, and
cooperation. It also includes dilemmas, such as the
concept of majority rule versus minority rights.

The elements of her sub-construct included certain values
that mirrored her opening reflection--tolerance, pragmatism,
and cooperation. Concepts of democracy viewed through
various perspectives were elements that comprised the
"knowledge of democracy."

However, she went on to include specific content that
should accompany knowledge of these values and perspectives.
This content was essential to the role of schools in their quest to educate for democratic citizenship: "One must not forget the economic and political aspects of democracy. There are also different ways in which democracy functions. And lastly, there is the institutionalization of democracy."
In addition, Maria cautioned that examples out of context would serve no purpose in defining essential knowledge for Polish schools during the transition to democracy: "If we have no experience to draw on when studying a glossary of terms, these terms and concepts are merely second-hand knowledge."

During the first three weeks of the project, Maria noted the importance of maintaining the context of the Polish experience when defining the knowledge essential to democratic citizenship. She began to question the appropriateness of some formal project events as these events related to the needs of the Polish educational system in educating for democratic citizenship. In particular, she referred to two events during the first three weeks of the project.

Between September 27 and October 6, the Polish educators experienced two special workshops at the Mershon Center. A workshop by Lew Simmons addressed the teaching of democratic principles. John Goryl conducted a workshop on the development of civic leadership skills in a democratic society.
Maria's ensuing reflections indicated the development of national context as an important aspect of her knowledge sub-construct when viewing the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Her abstractions from these two workshops reflected the need to keep national context in mind when experiencing the cross-cultural events of the project. In her reflection on these two events, Maria wrote the following:

It was also apparent that there were many concepts that do not translate well to the Polish experience. The material was so far out of our educational area, that any attempt on my part to teach it to my future teachers would be viewed as an indoctrination attempt. It would be much more useful to present this material in the context of a European or Polish example.

In her reflections from October 17, Maria reiterated her concern over the meaning of knowledge in context: "In the United States, when one teaches about civic responsibility there is a concrete, well accepted document to refer to which is the Bill of Rights. We have no such document to refer to for civics."

From this point forward, Maria defined her sub-construct of knowledge through the criterion of applicability to the Polish context. For instance, on October 28, I asked her to elaborate on the knowledge necessary for schools to address when educating for democratic citizenship. The project was in week seven, and the impermeability of her sub-construct maintained the structure of a filtering device that screened knowledge on
the basis of applicability to context: "The content and level of the constitutional law of the United States is not applicable. All these cases from the Supreme Court did not help." This remark referred to the Polish educators' trip to the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University during the fifth week of the project. There, Dennis Littlejohn and Lew Simmons conducted a seminar on the connection between social studies education and constitutional law. Maria saw no value in this particular experience.

Maria experienced a similar situation in late October. Several days after the trip to Bloomington, Cliff Johnson held a seminar on the economic dimensions of American education for the Polish educators. Maria's reflections on this workshop indicated an appreciation of the issue, but again, she saw no applicability to the Polish context:

Though theoretically the discussion was valuable, the real question appears to be: What does this mean practically? How do we make the transition from a bureaucratic, socialist economy to a market economy? Though the market is important, it does not appear that it is the real solution to the social, political, and cultural problems we face in Poland.

The impermeability of her knowledge sub-construct was firm with regard to a likeness end anchored in Polish context.

When the cross-cultural portion of the project reached the mid-point, the Polish educators' began to focus on the task of course plan development. Maria talked and reflected less on the applicability of knowledge to the Polish
context. Yet, the notion of replacing one ideology (communism) with another ideology (American democracy) concerned me throughout the project. How would the project accomplish the goal of developing a course plan for Polish preservice teachers if it contained a core of American knowledge about democracy? How would such a course plan apply to Polish schools in their attempt to educate for democratic citizenship if preservice teachers carried ideas extant from the Polish context into their elementary and secondary classrooms?

During our fourth interview on December 11, I asked Maria about the possibility of replacing one ideology with another ideology through the course plan. I told her that my observations of the curriculum seminars, particularly after the mid-point of the project, did not indicate to me a clear resolution concerning the exportation of American democracy as an aspect of the project. I noted that although the topics in the course plan were applicable to American education, the content was exclusively Polish. My opinion seemed to mirror salient remarks from the evaluation team that reviewed the course plan a week earlier. She agreed:

> In the beginning, I was concentrating on obstacles or barriers in our society. Now, I am concentrating on ways of instituting democracy as a way of life. The meaning of democracy has not changed. So, I’m satisfied that our final product is not just about democratic government or economic issues. . . . I’m more convinced that we need not teach democracy as a
form of government and bring examples from America. It must be the exercising of democracy in our own context. Maria's sub-construct of knowledge, after the initial recognition of contextual importance, was impermeable with regard to inapplicable examples from America.

In our last interview on December 19--three days before her departure for Poland--I asked Maria if there was any value to her experience in the United States with regard to knowledge about democracy that schools should address. In her response, she noted that her experience was very helpful in defining the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship with regard to knowledge:

Fortunately, we developed a meaning of democracy that was a way of thinking, not only a form of government. We were working with a broader sense of democracy. The stress on majority rule and minority rights helped me to realize this. I knew this before, but the discussions during seminars stressed the difference in reality here and in my country.

By abstracting experiences and evaluating the applicability of these experiences with regard to Polish context, Maria satisfied her goal in the project. She abstracted that which served the purpose of Polish schools in a transitional democracy.

With regard to the knowledge necessary for Polish schools to take up in educating for democratic citizenship, her sub-construct remained the same. As noted in her opening definition, Polish schools in a transitional democracy needed to promote knowledge that helped students
to "recognize the other side’s valid rights and legitimate points of view."

Over the course of her cross-cultural experience, Maria abstracted certain elements that expanded this definition without compromising its original structure. She abstracted those elements from her cross-cultural experience that transferred readily to the "radically new way of life" that she envisioned for Poland and noted in her final definition. **Global Education in the Polish Context**

Within the context of her cross-cultural experience, Maria abstracted knowledge of global interconnectedness as an element of knowledge that served the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Her acceptance of the knowledge that nests Poland in a global context was a tacit part of her pre-existing superordinate construct. During her cross-cultural experience, Maria explicated her belief that knowledge of one’s place in an increasingly global context was essential to democratic citizenship education.

Maria noted this realization in our last interview when I asked her about experiences during the project that applied to the Polish context: "I would like to stress the concepts to which I have become more sensitive while being here. Global understanding was important." This position represented a change in her sub-construct of knowledge during the course of her cross-cultural experience—a change from an implicit notion to an explicit understanding.
Due to the makeup of the project staff, the Polish educators' exposure to global education was inevitable. Gaudet, Fisher-Stevens, More, and Johnson were members of the Global and Social Studies Education Program Area in the College of Education. In varying degrees and with varying emphases, each of them was recognized as leaders in the field of global education.

Maria tested her sub-construct of knowledge important to educating for democratic citizenship with their ideas. Early in her experience, she noted the lack of need to "single out" such knowledge in Polish schools. Global education, by definition in the Polish context, was already a reality: "For me, global education is not an important topic. Maybe the global environmental topic would be more applicable. Poland already concentrates on a global perspective."

This remark came from our second interview on October 28. I did not pursue the issue. My inclination as a doctoral student in global and social studies education was to discuss the issue of global education as it related to education for democratic citizenship. However, when I considered the amount of exposure Maria would have to global education during the course of the project, I decided to delay my pursuit of this issue.

In her next reflection, though, Maria showed more interest in global education—-not as necessary knowledge for
Polish students, but as necessary knowledge for American students: "From our Polish tradition of teaching history and geography, there was always emphasis on the European and world perspective--much more than appears to be present in America."

In early December, the Polish educators and I developed collaboratively the fourth round of interview questions. Prominent among their concerns was global and multicultural education. When I asked Maria about the role of knowledge about the world that indicated the interconnectedness of cultures, she noted the position of Poland historically and geographically: "We don't stress such a term in Poland because we teach with a global perspective. This is caused by our size and location."

During this interview, I began to realize that Maria was not diminishing the importance of global education in Polish schools. She believed that Polish education, as a matter of course, dealt with a global perspective through essential historical and geographical knowledge that already addressed the importance of this point in realizing Polish citizenship.

Her point concerning the role global education plays in expanding the knowledge base necessary for democratic citizenship was simple. In Poland, schools assumed the importance of this knowledge. Polish education could not ignore the position of other cultures and the role other
nations played in defining Polish citizenship. Jews, Mongols, Turks, Germans, Russians, and Austrians, to name only a few, penetrated and shaped Polish culture over time. These cultures were aspects of Polish society that needed to be included no matter what sort of citizenship education existed in Poland. To Maria, approaching education for democratic citizenship in a global context was obvious.

Maria pointed out that America was the society that needed to increase the notion of global education in schools: "In America, it is different because your opinions are based on only materials and immigrants. In Poland, it’s easier because we live in the same neighborhood with many countries and cultures." When, in our last interview, Maria mentioned the importance of global education as a distinct aspect of citizenship education, I realized that this point was the emergence of a tacit assumption into an explicit understanding, not an aspect of her cross-cultural experience that was totally new to her sub-construct of knowledge.

Maria’s Construction of "Skills"

As noted in her autobiography, Maria entered her cross-cultural experience with an extensive background in conflict resolution skills and training. Throughout her experience, her sub-construct of skills occupied a range of convenience that built upon conflict resolution.
Her initial definition of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship indicated this inclination toward conflict resolution as an essential skill. She believed that schools in a democracy needed to develop in students "the ability to manage conflicts." The cross-cultural experience afforded Maria the opportunity to abstract certain methods by which teachers could help students develop essential skills in a democracy. These skills included, but were no longer restricted to, conflict resolution.

In addition, Maria abstracted elements of her cross-cultural experience that heightened the importance of the school’s role in addressing the skills needed for life in a democracy. By offering a climate that was conducive to the modeling of democratic skills by teachers and promoting democratic skills in students, the role of schools in a democratic society was important in developing skills for adulthood in a democratic society.

**Essential Skills for Teaching in a Democratic Society**

Although Maria’s opening reflection defined the skills necessary for schools to engender in students as "the ability to manage conflicts," she did not identify any methods by which teachers can promote conflict resolution as a skill necessary for democratic citizenship. Over the course of her cross-cultural experience, Maria experienced two events through which she expanded her skills sub-
construct. Her abstractions from these two events expanded her sub-construct to include particular methods essential for teaching democratic citizenship. These two events were the curriculum seminar and the social studies methods course. On October 17—five weeks into the cross-cultural experience—Maria reflected on the importance of these two events to her thinking on skills essential in educating for democratic citizenship.

From the curriculum seminars, Maria abstracted the work of Jim Gaudet that highlighted the basic competencies needed to function in a democratic society. Gaudet developed this set of competencies in 1980. These competencies included:

- gaining and using information,
- decision making,
- making evaluations and judgments,
- communication,
- cooperation,
- estimation of the need and possibility to engage in a situation, and
- striving for one’s interests.

Gaudet and Livingston introduced these competencies throughout the early weeks of the curriculum seminar sessions. These competencies became the focus of discussion during the curriculum seminar held on October 8. To Maria, "the content of the entire seminar was very useful. I found the material on basic citizenship competencies very useful." These competencies, when coupled with the need for conflict
resolution skills, represented a broadened range of convenience for Maria's skills sub-construct.

The process of course plan development was another aspect of the curriculum seminar Maria abstracted from her experience and added to her skills sub-construct. By mid-October, Gaudet and Livingston began to quicken the course plan development process. This movement in the direction of organizing the curriculum seminars toward a focused task was part of the strategy of the curriculum seminar model.

As noted in Chapter IV, scheduling events in the field early in the Polish educators experience acted as a context for moving quickly toward course plan development as the remainder of the 14 weeks passed. Mershon Center researchers developed this curriculum seminar process in the 1970s, but not based on the learning curve associated with the abstraction of cross-cultural experiences that would become a basis for curriculum development. Gaudet and Livingston adjusted the process to start slowly and to accelerate over time in order to accommodate this learning process.

This sort of strategy takes precise and organized planning. In order to complete a draft course plan by early December—the target date for an evaluation of "Schools and Democratic Society"—Gaudet and Livingston reminded the Poles of their task with increasing urgency as time passed. Time in the beginning gave the Poles a chance to abstract
elements from their cross-cultural environment that might be applicable to their charge. Now, time needed to be spent on developing these abstractions and their pre-existing construct systems into a coherent course plan.

Maria viewed this process in a positive light. At the end of the Mershon Center portion of the project, she abstracted the teaching skills embodied in Gaudet’s leadership abilities that moved the process to a conclusion. This abstraction came to light during our last interview. I asked Maria to recount any aspects of her experience that she believed useful in constructing skills teachers need when educating students for democratic citizenship. She referred to Gaudet’s ability to organize and focus a group as an essential skill for dealing with a problem: "I must mention Jim because of the way he organized the group’s work. From the formal aspect, he was a perfect example of how to build a team to focus on a topic."

A second event that entered Maria’s perceptual field and became important to her construction of teaching skills for democratic citizenship was Graham More’s social studies methods course. On October 17, Maria reflected on the aspects of More’s course that she abstracted as important to the skills teachers need in order to foster democratic citizenship in students:

There is one course that I attend each week with great excitement. The course of More’s is my favorite course each week. Dr. More is an inspiring teacher, and it is nice to be an observer of his teaching methods as well
as a participant in his course. I find his own personal way of teaching to be gifted and inspirational. This has prompted me to observe my own teaching methods and do some work to keep my own methods from becoming routine and stale.

Maria wrote this reflection four weeks into More’s course. I was a student in More’s course 17 years earlier. I knew the course changed over time. However, I also knew Dr. More’s dedication to problem solving through reflective inquiry and active teaching methods was at the heart of his beliefs in educating for democratic citizenship.

I waited two weeks before asking Maria to elaborate on the specific teaching methods she abstracted from More’s course. My interest was in the methods she believed to be of value in developing student skills for democratic citizenship. Maria and I conducted our second interview on October 28--approximately the mid-term of More’s course. I asked her about the specific methods she abstracted from his course:

Generally, I am impressed by the professionalism of his teaching strategies. For example, I see that some parts of his teaching methods--inquiry, simulations, case studies--can be very good material to adopt for future teachers and a good source of information about the formal aspect of the teaching process. My twenty years of experience were not so professional. I concentrated on lecturing in the didactic way.

In our fourth interview, Maria brought together three aspects of her thinking on essential skills for teaching in a democracy. These aspects included teacher educator skills; preservice teacher skill development; and the skills necessary for citizens in understanding different points of
view, understanding controversial issues, and resolving conflict. Again, her reference was to More’s course:

When I think about my college students, I have to use more of these techniques. I was asking them what they think when I gave them some readings, but I was not really concentrating on what they were really thinking. I really don’t know if I was giving them the opportunity for critical thinking and finding out what they think as an outcome of the course.

I prefer active teaching and learning, especially if you have to think about diversity—different points of view, controversial issues, or conflict of values. You can’t do this from an autocratic position or lecturing. The only way to do it is by using active teaching methods like inquiry, simulations, role playing, and games. When dealing with such content, you can’t separate the method of teaching.

The notion of pragmatism that linked Maria’s three aspects of skill development was an abstraction from her experience with More’s course that led to an important task.

Before the Polish educators left Ohio for Poland on December 22, they decided that Maria would be the co-author of a volume that would eventually accompany the course plan. This volume was a set of auxiliary methods for teaching the topics of the course plan. The auxiliary methods volume included selected practical methods for teaching the course and exemplary lesson scenarios for each of the course modules.

Between Gaudet and the curriculum seminars and More and his methods course, Maria abstracted elements of the skills necessary for teachers in a democracy. These skills expanded her range of convenience concerning the role of skill development in educating for democratic citizenship.
In her last reflection, she noted the importance of these abstractions in her final definition of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship: "As agents of social change, teachers will be able to recognize the utility of democratic procedures and skills."

The Role of Schools in Skill Development for Democratic Citizenship

Related to the skills teachers need to have and the skills students need to learn in a democracy is the role the school plays in the process of learning. During our first interview, Maria introduced me to her belief in this notion:

This list of skills comes to mind as 'first need skills' or emergency skills that need to be required by teachers and students in the school setting. I tend to review them from a psychological perspective as some basic capacities for active participation.

From her "psychological perspective," Maria envisioned the school as a context for skill development essential to democratic citizenship. She continued on this point during our first interview: "The training and use of skills, when used directly in school activities, gives teachers and students insight to democracy. This is needed for self-improvement and the transmission of acquired knowledge for democratic citizenship."

Over the course of her cross-cultural experience, Maria noted three events that embellished her pre-existing subconstruct of skills as they relate to the role of the school. These events included schools visits, a trip to
Washington, D.C., and a conversation with Lorraine Fisher-Stevens.

The field experience component of the curriculum seminar involved two school visits. One of these schools was an elementary school in the city that drew students from lower middle class families. The other school was located in an upper middle class suburb. This school was a middle school. Both schools were public schools.

By the time we conducted our third interview on November 11, our school visits were behind us. During this interview, Maria told me about these schools as practical applications of her original thoughts:

There are many ways to implement the necessary knowledge. School can be a promoter for the democratic process, so it must be a place to promote the knowledge and experiences of democracy. I never doubted democracy, but I now see schools as a place to promote the skills as well as the knowledge. . . . We have to give the necessary knowledge and skills for the teacher in the elementary and secondary schools from the perspective of his or her civic participation in the school setting as well as in the community. The effect of the process here has made me see the role of the teacher through a democratic lens.

In her journal entry from late November, Maria related the school visits to a trip she took to a conflict resolution session in Washington, D.C., one week before she wrote the following reflection:

My trip to Washington, D.C., was useful in helping me clarify the nature of living and working in a democracy such as the United States. There were 45 Americans from different backgrounds, ethnic groups, religious affiliations, and interests. They were leaders from government, policy, religious, political, and cultural organizations who were attempting to make themselves
stronger and better leaders for their causes. The goal was to help them become better at building coalitions and fighting prejudice.

To Maria, the bringing together of different and somewhat conflicting viewpoints in an effort to develop better conflict resolution skills was an indication of how skills learned in school can extend to skills necessary for living in a democratic society.

With less than a week remaining in the cross-cultural portion of the project, Maria asked if I would arrange for her to meet with Lorraine Fisher-Stevens. Fisher-Stevens' presentation to the Poles and the 16 Eastern and Central European teacher educators and education ministry officials in October touched upon Maria's course plan topic--"The Role and Position of the Teacher." Maria wanted Fisher-Stevens to evaluate the module and make recommendations. Professor Fisher-Stevens consented.

I did not attend the meeting between Maria and Fisher-Stevens. However, I drove Maria to Harrison House after the meeting. During our conversation, Maria mentioned that Fisher-Stevens gave a favorable review of the module.

In addition, Maria noted the similarities between her thinking and Fisher-Stevens' thinking on the role the school plays in developing the skills students need for democratic citizenship. Upon reflection of the meeting, Maria noted that Fisher-Stevens shared a serious concern about American schools that related to Maria's concern over schools in
Poland. They agreed that the role of the school was to create an atmosphere conducive to democratic skill development, but neither of them believed that "everyone is ready to share that role."

Within the next week, time was short and preparations for departure occupied the minds of the Polish educators. However, I noted in my journal the importance of Maria's abstractions from her meeting with Fisher-Stevens. In conversations with Maria during our last week together, I got the impression that her meeting with Fisher-Stevens was somewhat a lamentation over both Polish and American schools' lack of creating an atmosphere conducive to democratic skill development. However, I sensed also that this meeting gave Maria a feeling of community with the thoughts of American educators. The common link was the similarity of problems encountered when developing the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship in an established democracy or in a transitional democracy.

Maria's Construction of "Attitudes"

Maria entered her cross-cultural experience with an attitudes sub-construct limited by a focus of convenience that concerned tolerance of differences. By the end of her experience, she defined the attitudes necessary for schools to engender in students with a broader and more detailed sub-construct than she indicated in her original definition. In her final definition, she stated the following:
Schools must become a democratic environment both in terms of their stated ideals and in their means. Our role in proposing such a course is to empower teachers to take on the challenge of change to a new society with its new values and institutions. As agents of social change, teachers will be able to recognize the utility of democratic procedures and skills.

Maria's final definition reflected the "bottom-up" strategy of attitude development. She believed that this strategy must begin with the teachers in the schools. For a society in transition from communism to democracy, Maria believed the development of attitudes based on democratic values could help to surmount the barriers to change in a transitional democracy.

During her cross-cultural experience, the question for Maria was not the ends of democracy for Polish society that she could abstract from her experience. Her knowledge of psychology and political theory, along with the tradition of democracy in Poland, were aspects of her pre-existing construct system. Her quest was for the appropriate attitudes that schools could model and students could develop that would lead Poland through the process of transition to a democratic society.

Throughout her experience, Maria based her construction of attitudes on that which is the case in Poland, and she built a theoretical sub-construct of that which could be the case in Poland. In the categories of "what is" and "what ought to be," Maria concentrated on the role schools play in
developing attitudes necessary for the process of transition to democracy.

**Barriers to Democratic Attitudes**

During our first interview in early October, Maria presented a barrier she believed inherent to all schools that made the transition to democracy in Poland particularly problematic: "All education transmits values. School represents the social order, defends all traditional values and interests. It is resistant to social changes." I asked for her opinion on how Polish schools can approach a reconstruction of attitudes that would reflect a democratic perspective. Again, context played a role in her response:

> There is a question before I become more precise. What kind of previous experience do we have to shape attitudes toward citizenship? This is a crucial question. This can be taught based upon a negation of what was. Without a direct experience, you have a difficult time understanding democratic citizenship.

During the early portion of the project, Maria referred frequently to the twin barriers of social reproduction through education and the social psychology of Polish society after communism.

With regard to attitudinal barriers evident in Polish society after the fall of communism, Maria was most concerned with the attitudes of learned helplessness and intolerance. In our first interview, Maria explained both of these barriers. The barrier of learned helplessness involved a feeling in Polish society that "people have no control over the result of their actions. There are no
links between your effort and the outcome." To Maria, the barrier of intolerance was one of "the Polish human mentality. This means that there is intolerance for different points of view, including minority views."

Maria’s pre-existing structure of the situation in Polish society was evident in her first definition of the attitudes that schools needed to model for and develop in students. Her belief that schools should deal with attitudes that allow students to "tolerate each others differences" was a way of countering the attitudes of learned helplessness and intolerance evident during Poland’s transition to democracy.

During the sixth week of the project, Maria began to focus her concern on the role of Polish schools as agents for attitudinal change. Floyd Baker organized a three day seminar on the politics of education during week six. Professor Carolyn Beach, known for her critical perspective on curriculum and instruction in American schools, conducted a portion of this seminar. In her reflective journal, Maria noted the dilemma she faced in abstracting attitudes from her experiences in an established democracy that would apply to a developing democracy:

A dilemma raised by Beach is order versus intellectual freedom. The pattern of education taught in America is taught form the capitalist, republican, Protestant genre. In Poland, there is not a clear consensus on what values to teach. Our process is not a natural evolutionary process as the American process was.
Two weeks later, on November 11, Maria and I held our third interview. I asked her about the barriers she saw in Polish society in general and schools in particular that precluded democratic attitude development. She referred again to the time necessary for contextual, social evolution that Poland could not afford during the transition to democracy. Her experience in America indicated that a slow process of democratic attitude development led to unstated assumptions in the United States that did not exist in Poland:

For schools, there is no commitment or common agreement on democratic values in a school setting. I don't view Polish school as an open setting for teaching the democratic process because what is necessary in Poland is to build the context of experience that is suitable for democratic ideas. Now, it is still a vacuum. Here, you live under certain assumptions that do not need explanation because they are normal and taken for granted. In Poland, these assumptions do not exist.

At this point in her experience, Maria's sub-construct of attitudes contained a vision based on tolerance, but the elements she abstracted from her experience indicated the contrast end for her sub-construct. Her contrast end formed through experiences that did not apply to the Polish context.

Schools as Agents of Change

During our second interview, Maria and I began to pursue an avenue of questioning that concentrated on what she abstracted from her experience that could work in the Polish context. What could move Polish schools from being a
barrier to a role that addressed the attitudes necessary to help students live life in a democracy?

One way is by having a curriculum concerned with the political, social, and economic aspect of present day life in Poland. This is a possibility for the curriculum to engender thinking about what is happening and how to change things. Also, the schools must be a place for empowering people to do this.

I asked Maria to tell me how this sort of curriculum would fulfill the school's role as an agent of change:

It can help to think about real political participation by voting and helping to make a change if you participate in important decision making. This makes your voice valid. It is a point that must be implemented as early as kindergarten.

During the latter half of her experience, Maria began to abstract aspects of her cross-cultural environment that indicated the possibility that schooling could play an integral part in changing Polish attitudes. At the mid-point of the project, I asked Maria to weigh those events from her cross-cultural experience that indicated the process by which Polish schools could act as change agents toward democratic attitudes:

The insight from the States is that we must work much more cooperatively and engage all parties that are related to the school. This includes the students. We must have an equal share in deciding what is "school." I already knew this, but now I've seen it work on an operational level. It is possible.

By the middle of the project, not only had Maria changed her range of focus to include what Polish schools could be, but also to the process by which Polish schools could become change agents for democratic attitudes.
Given this changing construction, I waited several weeks before I pursued further the question of what attitudes schools should address and model in Poland's transitional democracy. During our fourth interview on December 11, Maria told me that her abstractions from visits to American schools, the curriculum seminar, and her trip to Washington, D.C., were elements of her experience that she added to her pre-existing belief in an attitude of tolerance necessary for democratic citizenship. Now, when I inquired into her attitudes sub-construct, she noted that "the basic values of justice, freedom, equity, and participation—these are the values. The moral standards are attitudes of tolerance, respect for others, and participation as a civic responsibility."

During our last interview, I asked Maria the following question: "If Polish schools were to be change agents for society, how would they accomplish this goal?"

Many times when I was thinking about the fruit of being here, I realized that there are more questions than answers. . . . I realized how school has to be open for the demands of the community. School also must take the community into account when developing the curriculum. There is no doubt that school in Poland has to initiate such a process of democratization. Teachers and the other agents of the school can prepare for such a role. They must be made aware of how to do this and how to initiate the process. I realized how important a role our syllabus can play in such a goal.

By the end of the project, Maria expanded her sub-construct of attitudes to include abstractions from her cross-cultural experience that helped her in realizing "what ought to be"
the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship in Poland.

The attitudes of tolerance and respect for others were elements of her pre-existing sub-construct. However, she saw ways in which school can operationalize these attitudes through participation of various groups in society as they collectively and collaboratively expand the role of the school to include the attitudes necessary for life in a democracy. She left her experience feeling that "Schools and Democratic Society" was part of her contribution in accomplishing this goal.

Summary

Kelly (1955) urged psychotherapists to explore the range of a client’s constructs in order to determine collaboratively the way in which the client anticipates events: "Until he [sic] understands how extensively the contrast is construed, he [sic] cannot realize the full import of the client’s thinking" (p. 72). However, our thinking is not static. Over time, we change and/or expand our construct system through experience:

As one’s anticipations or hypotheses are successively revised in the light of the unfolding sequence of events, the construction system undergoes a progressive evolution. The person reconstrues. This is experience. The reconstruction of one’s life is based upon just this kind of experience. (Kelly, 1955, p. 72)

The role experience plays in expanding one’s range of convenience is crucial to the change and/or development of our psychological channels.
In the case of Maria Podolska, she abstracted elements from her cross-cultural experience that both expanded and changed the way she viewed the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. These abstractions built upon a pre-existing construct system that framed the range of her superordinate construct with a distinct contrast end and an expanding likeness end.

What Were the Changes?

Maria's sub-construct of knowledge concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship changed from a tacit understanding to an explicit understanding of knowledge in context and knowledge of global interconnectedness. With regard to the context of knowledge, Maria filtered her experience through a lens that eliminated knowledge that was inapplicable to the Polish situation. Her exposure to American concepts of democracy based on the American experience had little chance of entering her sub-construct system. Global education, a tacit assumption in Polish education, surfaced during Maria's cross-cultural experience as an abstraction of necessary knowledge for American citizenship education.

Maria changed and expanded her sub-construct of skills during her cross-cultural experience. She entered her experience with a pre-existing sub-construct based on conflict resolution. Over time, her sub-construct maintained conflict resolution as a major aspect of skills,
but civic competencies and leadership skills driven by inquiry methods expanded her sub-construct. In addition, her sub-construct changed from the purpose of skills to the practice of skills. These practical skills included teaching methods based on simulations, case studies, role playing, and games.

As part of this expansion and transition of her skills sub-construct, Maria began to envision the role of schools as a bridge between childhood and adulthood. Skills for resolution of conflict and civic competence taught in schools seemed to carry to adult life.

Maria’s construction of the attitudes necessary for schools to model and, thus, engender in students expanded from tolerance to include respect for others and participation as a civic responsibility. The need to enhance attitude development in Poland contrasted with her experience in the United States where 200 years of democratic process and evolution molded the attitudes addressed by schools. During the course of the project, the contrast of American schools as a slow process of attitude development to the celerity with which Polish schools needed to progress heightened Maria’s belief that the course plan could contribute to the importance of schools as change agents toward a democratic Polish society.
What Experiences Delimited the Construct?

With regard to the sub-construct of knowledge, Maria abstracted four events from her cross-cultural experience that highlighted her urge to maintain knowledge for democratic citizenship within the Polish context. The presentations by Simmons (principles of democracy) and Goryl (leadership in a democracy) indicated lack of applicability to the Polish situation. The workshop at the Social Studies Development Center on constitutionalism and social studies education delimited the contrast end of Maria’s sub-construct. Johnson’s two day seminar on economics and education in a democracy, although intellectually stimulating, served no particular purpose for Maria.

Obversely, Maria’s experiences with the project staff on the knowledge promoted by global education brought to the fore the realization that global interconnectedness was a standing element of Polish citizenship education. This sort of education should continue to play a role in educating for democratic citizenship during Poland’s transition to democracy.

Maria’s skills sub-construct expanded on two levels—teacher skills and the role of schools in promoting skill development. With regard to teacher skills, Maria pointed to her experiences in the curriculum seminar with Jim Gaudet and the social studies methods course with Graham More. Gaudet represented the sort of organizational and leadership
skills needed in a democratic society that should begin developing in the school setting. More explicated the inquiry skills necessary for students in a democratic society by highlighting methods teachers should master in achieving this goal.

On the level of the school’s role in developing skills for students in preparation for democratic citizenship, three events were important. First, the field experiences at schools indicated the possibility that democracy can be practiced in the school setting. Second, Maria drew a line of connection between the role of schools and adulthood in a democracy during her trip to Washington, D.C., for a conflict resolution seminar. Third, Maria abstracted a sense of association with Fisher-Stevens over the problem of motivating schools to take up their charge of skill development for democratic citizenship.

Maria entered her cross-cultural experience with a clear contrast end for her sub-construct of attitudes that schools should address when educating for democratic citizenship. Attitudinal barriers embedded by 45 years of communism were the elements of this pre-existing sub-construct. However, her abstraction of Professor Beach’s thoughts on the slowness of the American experience in developing democratic civic attitudes through schools was a cross-cultural experience that highlighted the contrast end
of Maria’s attitudes sub-construct. Poland had little time to achieve this same attitudinal level.

However, the notion that Polish schools could become change agents toward democratic citizenship became evident to Maria during her experience. She abstracted school visits, the curriculum seminar process, and her trip to Washington, D.C., as elements of her cross-cultural experience that, if addressed on the level of teacher education and inservice professional development through the course plan, could accelerate the process of engendering democratic attitudes through Polish schooling.

What Was the Role of Her Previous Constructs?

Throughout her cross-cultural experience, Maria returned to the situation in Poland as her basis for abstracting elements from her cross-cultural setting. This pre-existing construct system was most evident in her construction of knowledge that needed to be addressed by schools in educating for democracy. Context was critical.

Maria’s previous experiences with conflict resolution formed a base from which she abstracted the skills necessary for schools to develop in students as an essential part of education for democratic citizenship. On the other hand, Maria’s experiences with the previous model of Polish schools formed a clear contrast end to her superordinate construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. This contrast end spanned all three sub-
constructs. The role of the previous system to promote learned helplessness and intolerance were aspects of Maria’s previous construction system that highlighted further the need for new directions in educating for citizenship in a Poland that was now a democracy.

The Case of Witek Wojcik

His Autobiography

I want to include three kinds of information in this autobiography: raw facts from my life, the facts I estimated as influential in my development, and the kind of hints which would enable the reader to connect the logic of my life with the recent history of my country.

I was born in 1947, in a very small and strange village in the southwest part of Poland. The terrain was very pictorial with the hills, forests, and small towns. The nearest prominent city was Klodzko (Polish for the German Glatz or Kladnitz), a 1000 year old town, usually treated as the fortress by all governors of this area because of its strategic location on a very important route from north to south. The very complex German facilities are still interesting spots for tourists.

The German or Silesian inhabitants developed almost a full culture in this mountain country. The new, Polish inhabitants had no skills desirable for living in this
environment. The fate of my own family was typical of this situation.

The early adulthood of my parents was interrupted by World War II. My father spent a couple of years in a POW camp in Hungary; my mother survived in the country in the eastern part of Poland. They married soon after the armistice and, similar to thousands of other people, decided to look for chances in the western part of Poland. They became part of a huge wave of inner emigrants.

At that time, the west of Poland was the WEST in the early United States' meaning. It was a relatively big land, partly disorganized, used by the communists as the field for a full-scale social experiment. From the other side, however, it was a "no-mans-land" full of any kind of Gypsies, escapees from the Red Army, and other strange people.

In theory, my family farmed. Actually, my father was involved in a couple of illegal businesses--first of all black money exchange and, therefore, out of the home. I have a brother and a sister.

I remember very well the political rituals of the period: parades, elections, and, of course, attempts at the collectivization of agriculture. Nobody from my family was a member or supporter of the Communist Party. My father frequently used very impolite vocabulary while speaking
about the "commies." We never became a part of common farming.

Concerning my home education, it is, of course, difficult to compare to American standards. However, I appreciated it very much. My mother is very sensitive and intelligent. Nevertheless, she has received only a basic education. We, the children, had enough freedom. Father had quite broad international experiences. He worked in Germany before the war and had many unusual adventures in Hungary. We had many books. The only dark side was the relationship between my parents, which became more and more difficult, and, after a few years, my father actually went away without a formal divorce.

In the mid-1950s, many people from the intra-emigrant wave mentioned above moved back to central and eastern Poland. In my opinion, it was caused by the prolonged instability of the political status of western Poland and many unsolved social and civic problems. For example, it was impossible to own the land or even a home because everything was under direct state control.

My father moved to the east, to the small town of Jasło. Because of a quite long distance to the school from my home village, I was transferred when I was six to relatives who lived in a very traditional country area in the mountains. These relatives lived in the south near the Slovakian border. I started my education in a small country
school as the wise outsider, in the opinion of the local children.

After two years, I was taken to Jasło. I would like to mention three things from my grammar school period. I have always read a lot. The range of my reading was from classic stories and poetry to the books about World War II, and from romances to the books about aviation. I started to think seriously about a military career. I was deeply involved in the Scouts. Finally, I tried to perform in sports in spite of my lack of a confirmed and distinguished ability in this area. I never had problems at school, and, frankly speaking, never made educational problems for my family.

In Jasło there was a very good high school. When I finished grammar school, I passed the entrance exam and became a high school student. At that time, I started to learn English. I chose English because it is the international language for aviators. English was also very popular among teenagers at that time. According to Polish standards, I received a good educational background, thanks partially to distinguished educators who were extraordinarily skillful in history, Polish, biology and, what is unusual, philosophy. I still planned a military career.

This last remark raises the question of my ideology and world view. It was a complicated subject, not easy to
describe even today. I will try to sum up this topic in a few points:

- I was educated as a traditional Roman Catholic and all that time actively participated in the life of the local church.

- Together with my friends, I was never a non-critical believer in the official ideology, but a rather serious opponent of the clearly visible, awful behavior of the regime. I also patiently collected information about historical crimes of the communists, with, I must stress, active support of some of the teachers from the school.

- I had nothing against the Russians as people, and never agreed with "official" unfriendly attitudes toward NATO, Americans, Germans, etc.

- I appreciated the army as an institution. In this matter, I was by no means an exception in my peer group.

In general, my ideology was contradictory, but I was sure that this state of mind was normal.

Polish local society developed its own patterns for survival strategies in dealing with communism. It was a mixture of conformism, private independence, bribes and corruption, illegal businesses, and official small local careers. There was no serious opposition in the western meaning. This phenomenon I met later in Kraków.

After high school, I made quite a strong effort toward joining the Polish Army (Ludowe Wojsko Polskie). With regard to the Air Force School, I was rejected because of the physical demands. In the Army Technical Academy, I failed the exam in math (what a pity!). Finally, I was fired out from the exam to OSU (Oficerska Szkoła Uzbrojenia-
-Officer’s Weaponry School). I was fired out for unknown reasons. I was informed that "I was smart enough for studying at any normal university."

Completely broken down, I came back home. For one year, I worked as an ordinary, semi-qualified worker in a winery. It was hard and wet work. Next, after a brief discussion with my former class leader and superficial study of the University proposal, I decided to study psychology, one of the most overcrowded and snobbish faculties during that time! Nobody believed that I had been accepted. In fact, I was male—a very rare bird among hundreds of girls—and I prepared carefully for the exams. I had very strong motivation to leave work in the winery, and, last but not least, I was recognized by a very influential professor (students named her "Bloody Mary") as promising.

In the mid-1960s, Kraków was a very specific university center with confirmed conservatives and a "right" reputation. The population of students in the town was big, comparable to The Ohio State University student population. Jagiellonian University was recognized as one of the best in Poland and in the city, of course. I was really proud of being a student at this University. My generation was the "second generation" of psychology students after the war. During Stalin’s time, psychology was simply banned in the camp (interesting idea, by the way).
We had access to recently issued Polish professional books and even access to small cutouts from western books and journals. We had many professors highly respected in the world, mainly in auxiliary disciplines. The Department of Psychology was new with many young scholars and enthusiastic students.

The main figure was a professor of general psychology who was as "red" as possible—connected not only with the Communist Party, but also directly with the secret police. He was very well educated and exceptionally skillful. He earned a strong confidence of authority, and the department had no strong outside control. "Chief" had a very good orientation about students and faculty members. He was dangerous in two situations: when somebody loudly attacked principles of the system, or even scientifically advocated religion, which he personally hated. Usually, people who acted in this way were fired very soon (never mind students or faculty). In everyday life, he was the object of the students' and faculty members' jokes because of his very colorful personality, ability to lie under any circumstances, and the ability to make a mess (in documents, scientific material, student records, etc.) beyond imagination.

After almost two decades, I can evaluate my professional training as follows. Together with my colleagues, I was quite well prepared theoretically.
received a very good general background. My weakest points were "tacit knowledge" in scientific inquiry and socialization in the international psychological society. There simply were no serious experimental projects and real cooperation with foreign universities in our institute. My present area of research and true professional love--social psychology--was taught by a strange person, an old man who used to drink notoriously, and we knew simply nothing about that topic. My generation developed it locally from scratch.

As a practitioner, I was able to use standard, basic tests used in clinical psychology. Only a few persons did real psychotherapy at that time in Poland, hence my knowledge of psychotherapy was small and bookish. Formally, I was graduated in clinical psychology.

Kraków was and still is a very strong cultural center. Students had the opportunity to be familiar with many kinds of art, even having very little money. I was by no means an exception.

Kraków was also a very important area for the Church, with many theological schools, strong social support, and bishops usually directly and openly against communism. The influence of the Church on students was strong, well organized, and appreciated. I was involved in that movement in several ways.
When I was a "sophomore," the serious political disturbances of 1968 came about. My dormitory, the only Jagiellonian University dormitory for boys, was one of the main nests of communist opposition in the city. We were inexperienced. The police were inexperienced in the struggle on the streets as well. From 1968, such disturbances were repeated periodically, and I was involved every time.

In 1971, I completed my professional education with one important exception—the masters thesis. I was late because my non-systematic style of work and the inability to concentrate on the most important task is, unfortunately, a permanent feature of my personality.

In the same year, I married Ewa, the girl I had known for three years. She was graduated in theoretical chemistry and was working on her Ph.D. thesis. We soon had our only child, Jacek.

I was also accepted for a job in an institution for delinquent boys. It was hard work. The group consisted of boys from 11 to 21 years of age with mental disturbances and frequently with serious criminal records. The staff was not easy to work with. Violence at work and drinking after work were an everyday practice. There was no preservice selection and training for staff, and the staff was unstable. Many people were unable to cope with the tension and fear. I personally learned much about practical
psychology and deviations of educational institutions during my three years in this occupation. When I was offered a position at the University, I accepted it without any hesitation.

What can I tell about my University career? I was very good as a teacher. I had no difficulties with the students. I love teaching. As an investigator, I was still non-systematic, without concentration and persistence. My work was too widespread and superficial. As a result, I have been working on my Ph.D. for a good many years. Frankly speaking, the organization of the scientific work in my institute was never too brilliant.

In the beginning of the 1980s, I met two men, both very innovative psychologists. One of them had several years of prison behind him. He tried to fight with the system as a young boy. He was an outstanding personality, but not without serious emotional problems. We started the ATAK project (code word ASSULT: in translation "Creative Activity Application Step by Step"). It was a project aimed at the stimulation of creativity in science and technology. One of my friends had magnificent skills for finding strange and interesting people to work with us. I learned very much directly and indirectly from him during our nine years of cooperation. We had troubles, of course, as a team: conflicts, arguments, etc. Nevertheless, a working technology for the stimulation of creative activity was
developed. I became more or less known in Poland as a specialist in this area. By chance, the project was found as very useful in conducting focus groups, business education, organizational psychology, and so on.

Our team was disbanded after almost ten years. My rebellious friend committed suicide—ironically, just a few months before the communist era ended. My other friend became one of the most promising Polish experimental cognitive psychologists. I shuttled between several projects until I was chosen for this project by Tadeusz Kluszewski.

I estimate my present situation as maybe the last opportunity to change my life, but this is a story that has yet to be told.

Witek's Modulation Over Time

According to personal construct theory, our anticipation of events regulates our abstraction of reality. Our pre-existing thoughts, developed over time, comprise the constructs through which we anticipate events. A construct's usefulness as a "referent for novel events" and its ability "to accept new subordinate constructions within its range of convenience" (Kelly, 1970, p. 19) modulate our construction of reality. New subordinate constructs expand our superordinate constructs' ranges of convenience.

In the case of Witek Wojcik, the modulation of his construction concerning the role of schools in educating for
democratic citizenship appeared to occur through the liberal permeability of this superordinate construct. His first and last reflections indicated discernable change as he defined the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

In his first reflection, Witek offered a definition of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship based on a superordinate construct with a range of convenience limited to the context of formal education:

The goals of any democratic phenomenon (action) at school are twofold. The first goal is to become at least a little bit more democratic than before.

The second goal is to offer pupils the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and procedures for understanding current social processes and, what is more important, to make the students able to participate in democratic social life (it may be better to say "participate in a democratic way or style"). This is an overwhelming task for everyone: school managers (principals), teachers, pupils, and community officials.

Within that same reflection, though, Witek offered a precursor of things to come during his cross-cultural experience. He alluded to the possibility of modulating his superordinate construct’s range of convenience to include not only the role of schools, but also the process that brings schools to the realization of educating for democratic citizenship and the societal implications of that role:

I am a strong believer in a bottom-up, long, and slow process of innovation in the educational system via:

1) building a system of knowledge;

2) teaching skills and procedures;
3) selecting and training the "agents of democratic changes";
4) organizing the "zone of effective influence"; and
5) evaluating results.

In his last reflection, Witek offered a broader construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. The system now included society as a whole and the role of the school in assisting societal transition to democracy:

In my honest experience, democracy is a very difficult system with enormous demands of skills, knowledge, and reflection. The role of the educational system in making this system work is by no means basic. The role is complicated, in part, contradictory, and multi-level.

Noticeable between the first and last reflections was Witek’s retention of his superordinate construct’s major elements—knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Yet, the knowledge, skills, and attitudes no longer remained indigenous to the system of schooling, but encompassed the associated living that defines a democratic society.

Metaphorically, Witek conceived of his cross-cultural experience as a hunting expedition with an unknown prey. For Witek, constructing the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship involved "hunting an unknown animal in a swampy jungle with the help of local tribe members, who were very clever in hunting a similar animal in a different terrain." Who were the main "tribe members," and what
"animals" comprised the menagerie of knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to educate for democratic citizenship?

**Witek's Construction of "Knowledge"**

As noted in Witek's autobiography, his disciplinary interests stemmed from social psychology—the investigation of sub-group behavior. As such, Witek's construct system appeared to approach the notion of "knowledge" through a framework of sub-groups within systems. For instance, in his first reflection he noted that educational change should build a "system of knowledge" about democracy. Yet, the content that undergirds this system (or sub-construct), changed over the course of his cross-cultural experience. This change reflected a modulation of the knowledge sub-construct with regard to content definition and global and multicultural education as they relate to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

**Witek's Changing Content Definition**

At first, Witek described the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship as the "medium between knowledge and skills." His sub-construct of knowledge included elements such as "centralization and decentralization, power of the majority and the rights of minorities, elitism, and populism."

Early in his cross-cultural experience, Witek held a conversation with another project staff member in which he indicated that his sub-construct of knowledge veered from
the compartmentalized disciplines frequently evident in formal education:

Today, I had a short conversation with Joe. He told me: "In the average American school, the teaching of social sciences is very conservative. Usually, social science means history, geography, and least of all economics. Only a few high schools teach social science in another way." School is always and everywhere the spearhead of conservativism.

In an interview that took place shortly after this observation, I asked Witek about this opinion. He believed that part of his group's task involved the development of ways to reverse this trend and, as a result, "make the probability of changes toward democracy at school as high as possible."

In my journal, I reflected on these data and noted that Witek was defining the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship as similar to the critical democracy referred to by American scholars such as Greene (1986) and Goodman (1992). In this version of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship, an important task is the critical analysis of what constitutes an operational democracy.

In addition, democracy as a habit of mind and way of approaching social interaction is at the root of coming to know how one is connected to the lives of other human beings (Dewey, 1916). This assumption is at the center of learning in a critical democracy and comes to fruition through a collective identity and collective responsibility while
maintaining the delicate balance between the values of individuality and of community.

The role of teachers in this sort of system is to develop "the combined power of increasing numbers of articulate people" (Greene, 1986, pp. 430-431). Schools exist in a critical democracy in order to develop the knowledge necessary for students to assess collectively and continuously their surroundings with a goal of reducing the pathology that accompanies acquiescence to the status quo.

Witek echoed this sentiment in our next interview when I asked him about the role ideology plays in determining the knowledge students need for democratic citizenship. He remarked that ideology has a great deal of influence on knowledge and teacher/student bias, and this situation needs to be avoided: "I mean that both teacher and student need to have a chance to express their expectations, conclusions, and everything else in the course."

However, as time passed, Witek's definition moved toward a definition similar to the compartmentalized version of knowledge prevalent in most Polish and American schools. This definition he offered near the end of his experience was similar to the definition that he discounted earlier in his experience: "Teaching history, economics, and all social sciences is a good vehicle for teaching about democracy."

Puzzled by this fragmentation in his sub-construct, I asked him to tell me what experiences led him to this
reversal. Three days before his departure for home, Witek and I held our last interview. He told me that this change was a "very strange thing":

I am really under the influence of Dr. Simmons for no known reason. From the very beginning, I was not that enthusiastic toward his point of view, but, it may be creative redundancy. During all of these lectures on the American Constitution, James Madison, the judiciary, and so on, I started to understand American democracy and democratic tensions.

Witek’s experience with Simmons, an avowed supporter of teaching democratic citizenship through the disciplines, modulated Witek’s definition of the sub-construct of knowledge. Witek’s sub-construct modulated to an understanding diametrically opposed to his construction of knowledge as noted at the start of his cross-cultural experience. His definition of knowledge now resembled a set of sub-systems--the compartmentalized disciplines. Global and Multicultural Education

"When I was first in Professor More’s class, I was almost sure that we have global education in our schools. Now that I’ve rethought it, we don’t." Witek informed me of his shift concerning global education in Polish schools during the middle portion of his cross-cultural experience--October 25, 1992.

Historical circumstances, Witek noted, placed Polish society in a better position than American society to infuse global education into the curriculum. The historical knowledge that constituted Poland’s heritage contained
myriad contacts with East and West. He viewed this situation as a necessary knowledge base for illustrating the many connections Poland maintained historically with the rest of the world.

Prior to World War II, the multicultural sub-groups within Polish society grew from Poland’s geographic position as a crossroad between Europe and Asia. During his cross-cultural experience, though, Witek began to expand his knowledge sub-construct of global education and its relationship to democratic citizenship by reflecting back on his previous construct system. His previous construct system included his experiences with Polish social science: "In social science, our situation with regard to understanding the rest of the world is horrible. Poles look at things with a very Polish position. This is something quite close to nationalism. It is ethnocentric, Polish-centric."

Through his experiences with Professor More, Witek realized that the knowledge necessary for democratic citizenship included the information that linked Poland to the rest of the world. By the end of his cross-cultural experience, he began to see all content areas of education as part of global education and, thus, education for democratic citizenship:

Every teacher has to have before his or her eyes during all teaching activity, including planning, deciding methods, etc., the question: "Does this content have relevance to a global perspective?" If you are
teaching about democracy, global education has to be a primary and vital part of your lesson. The same is true for multicultural education.

As his cross-cultural experience unfolded, Witek’s understanding of multicultural education expanded beyond ethnic diversity. After his first exposure to several interpretations of multicultural education based on discussions with project staff, Witek noted that we [OC: Poland] have no serious minorities in quantity. For us the most important minority is the handicapped. Otherwise, there are only small Byelorussian, German, or Jewish minorities. Another minority would be a religious minority. We do not have any blacks or Hispanics that make up large ethnic or social minorities.

As Witek’s contact with American society increased, his understanding of multiculturalism began to modulate beyond ethnicity. For instance, his mid-project experience with a Polish-American feminist created a sense of cognitive dissonance that fragmented his sub-construct of knowledge necessary for democratic citizenship. During an interview held in the eighth week of the project, he mentioned that this event helped him to construe a new aspect of multiculturalism integral to his knowledge sub-construct:

The task is much more difficult than when we arrived. For example, I was never serious about the feminist movement and once here, a girl from the Polish-American Club told me that in Poland, women are badly treated in all aspects of life. She had many examples. I’ve thought it over, and she is right! She told me that in America, the feminist movement is the aim of jokes and maybe some of the movement was not wise or serious. After several years, though, the position of women has improved.
Yet, throughout our interviews and his journal, Witek addressed multicultural education as something slightly different than my understanding of this term. To me, sub-cultures develop in a democracy that may run counter to the accepted definition of culture and, consequently, may run counter to the accepted norms of a democratic society at a certain point in time. To Witek, the word "culture" in a democratic society did not include knowledge of certain sub-groups: "There is no reason to contaminate culture with homosexuals, criminals, and similar groups. They are not culture. Africans, Poles, maybe even women are a culture." Knowledge about cultures based on social deviation did not constitute part of Witek’s sub-construct of the knowledge necessary for democratic citizenship.

Witek’s Construction of "Skills"

Compared to his skills sub-construct at the end of his experience, Witek’s sub-construct of skills necessary for schools to teach students in order to fulfill their role in educating for democratic citizenship appeared to have a minimal pre-existing structure. Unlike his changing sub-construct of knowledge, which grew from his academic background in social psychology, Witek’s cross-cultural experiences defined the skills sub-construct based on a vague notion of skills in his pre-existing system.

In light of Kelly’s (1955) Experience Corollary, Witek successively construed and reconstrued what happened, as it
happened, during his cross-cultural exposure to and experience with skills for democratic citizenship. This successive anticipation and construction of what schools should teach enriched his skills sub-construct's range of convenience. He expressed this construct development through teaching methods (means) and the role of schools in a democratic society (ends).

Teaching Methods for Democratic Citizenship

Skills for teachers and students. In our first interview, Witek described his pre-existing understanding of skills needed for teaching democratic citizenship as something that should be taught throughout one's preservice teacher education program, not just a single course such as "Schools and Democratic Society." He believed that in all teacher education courses, "responsible people must apply democratic rules and culture"--a sort of infusion across the preservice teacher education program, rather than a discrete course.

In addition, Witek believed that the teaching methods used to develop skills in pre-collegiate students should be the same methods used to teach preservice teachers. Early in his cross-cultural experience, though, he was not specific on what sort of teaching methods would nurture these skills. Actually, he did not even define the skills.

By the mid-point of the project, though, he began to distinguish between Polish teacher education and American
teacher education on the level of basic, necessary skills. For instance, he noted that Polish teacher education programs gave preservice teachers a sense of direction in developing teaching methods in theory, but not in practice. After several weeks of observing More's social studies methods class, Witek noted this contrasting relationship between the two poles of his skills sub-construct: "Professor More, for instance, insists that all materials for students must be included in case studies and modules. In Poland, things like this are not requested. Only those who are ambitious will do these things."

Over time, "these things" became not only the skills teachers needed in a democracy, but also the subject matter of skills that students needed to learn in a democracy: "I know that students do not have real control over their schools in a democracy, but due to their experiences, they will learn democratic behavior. . . . Broadly speaking, the active, inquiry, and conversational teaching methods are the best methods."

By early December, Witek defined, with increasing specificity, the teaching methods by which students can learn the skills necessary for democratic citizenship: "I've learned many things here, but these three--case studies, inquiry exercises, and communication skills--are the biggest and most important." While developing his sub-construct of skills that schools should promote in educating for
democratic citizenship, Witek abstracted case studies as most prominent during his cross-cultural experience:

Case studies are very powerful if used by a skillful teacher. There are no closed questions in good case studies. A good case is designed to release the student’s initiative, motivation, and inquiry. It is not a boring method. The output or ends can be used in other situations. Students can analyze their own lives with case studies.

However, I pursued Witek on the purity of case studies as a way of helping students to develop the skills necessary for democratic citizenship. I asked him if and how case studies can be abused as a method of teaching and learning in a democratic society. His response indicated that his pre-existing structure—formulated in an authoritarian society—was not abandoned during his cross-cultural experience:

Every method can be used in a democratic or undemocratic way. There are methods that are sensitive and insensitive to democracy. You can use a case study in an authoritarian way—looking for only one solution. Next, of course, if you do a case in an authoritarian way, students will act this way. An election under military control is considered democratic and is not democratic at all. In the same way, a case study used in a very authoritarian way is not a case study at all.

By definition, Witek believed that the case study was a method of teaching that developed automatically student skills for democratic citizenship when based on the criterion of "open-endedness."

Cross-cultural abstractions of necessary skills. Throughout his cross-cultural experience, I asked Witek about the objects and events that moved his sub-construct of
skills from a vague notion to an explicit set of elements. His abstraction of skills from More’s methods course was one example.

In addition, he noted a question that Lorraine Fisher-Stevens raised in the syllabus for her social studies methods class: "Who are you as a teacher?" Witek wrote in his journal that "this question is primary, and should be faced by any future teacher. During teacher training in Poland, we usually give many tasks, rarely asking our students similar questions." Witek believed that asking himself this reflective question throughout his experience helped him to sort out the value of the skills he learned during the project.

Witek also cited Livingston and Gaudet as role models of teachers with skills necessary in educating students for democratic citizenship:

It was by chance that Thompson Livingston and Jim Gaudet led our curriculum seminars, but it was a perfect solution because they were completely different in their reasoning and thinking. They complemented each other. For me, Jim was a very good problem solver and organizer of the existing knowledge of the group. Jim can organize many different ideas. On the other hand, Thompson Livingston was a very quiet instigator of discussions.

Organizing disparate ideas and stimulating open-ended discussion appealed to Witek’s interpretation of skills necessary for both teachers and students in a democratic society.
The Role of Schools in Developing Skills for a Democratic Society

Over the course of his cross-cultural experience, Witek developed his sub-construct of skills on two levels. One level was that of preservice teacher education skills, and the other level involved the skills teachers needed to develop in pre-collegiate students in order for them to fulfill their roles in a democratic society. Regarding the latter of these two sub-construct developments, Witek began to note the over-all role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship as the end of a process—a formal process called "schooling."

Witek believed that the skills necessary for democratic citizenship that students developed during formal education should mirror the skills needed in a society. In addition, to disaggregate knowledge from skills in this regard was unacceptable to Witek: "The combination of process and content is a crucial point. In real life, the process and content are synergetic. They ebb and flow."

Witek mentioned this thought to me near the end of his cross-cultural experience. Over time, I forgot this simple, yet essential, role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. After all, democratic citizenship becomes a legal reality in American society after most students have finished high school. Yet, the act of citizenship can be defined in many ways that predate the legal age of a citizen
to vote or serve in the military. For instance, Remy (1980) noted that

citizenship is not something that only adults "do." The fact that citizenship involves governance issues in many groups means that citizenship education can and should do more than simply prepare the young for an adult role. It is possible to identify rights, responsibilities and tasks of citizenship which children and adolescents encounter in the course of their relations with parents, teachers, other school personnel, peers, and a wide variety of adults in neighborhood and community settings. . . . In their daily interactions with peers and adults, youngsters deal with the problems of political life. (p. 64)

Indeed, Witek reminded me, young people have a life as citizens in a democracy.

Additionally, Witek left the United States with a set of new found assumptions that constituted his superordinate construct of the role of schools in a democratic society. These assumptions leaned heavily on the skills necessary to continue the process of democratic citizenship beyond formal education. In particular, his last stated assumption encapsulated not only his newly developed role of schools in relation to the health of a democratic society, but also the position of skills within that role: "School can teach for democracy, to produce people who can be involved and participate in the democratic process. Developing and using skills is the most important point. I finally realized democracy as a process."

Witek’s Construction of "Attitudes"

Witek’s sub-construct of attitudes modulated with cross-cultural experiences that portrayed democracy as a
process of change. These cross-cultural experiences included aspects of change that he believed focused his notion of related democratic beliefs as essentially societal and, thus, connected to schools. Again, his background in social psychology played a role in his interpretation of reality. His ability to analyze sub-group behavior afforded him a broad range of convenience while abstracting the attitudes essential to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

To Witek, the attitudes essential in educating for democratic citizenship were part of the larger "personality" of a democratic society. Democratic societal attitudes change and, in turn, mold the attitudes nurtured in school. The notion that schools reflect society, and in a democratic society attitudes fluctuate more rapidly than in an authoritarian society, became essential to his interpretation of the sub-construct of attitudes.

Basically, Witek’s changing sub-construct reflected the role of schools in approaching the emergent character of democratic societal attitudes rather than teaching fixed notions of attitudes essential for democratic citizenship. He developed this sub-construct through the change process he viewed as characteristic of schooling in a democratic society and societal pressures that influence the attitudes taught in schools.
Defining Democracy as a Process

Over the course of Witek's cross-cultural experience, he defined the fluctuating attitudes relevant to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship as part of a process. During the middle portion of his stay in the United States, I asked him about the events and objects that indicated and defined most succinctly this process:

What really impressed me was the behavior of people after the election [OC: the presidential election in November, 1992]. The election took place as I imagined it would. In Poland, after such an election, there would be great arguments. The losers would be bitter about the outcome. Here, people talked about it without aggression. The losers talked about it being a lose for only four years.

I continued to pursue his thoughts so that I could grasp the likeness and contrast ends of his range of convenience covered by this experience. Later in the same interview, I asked if his previous experiences indicated a "win-win; lose-lose" mentality after each of the few democratic elections held in Poland since 1989. He drew a picture that reflected the tentative nature of the democratic electoral process in Poland that contrasted with his cross-cultural experience:

I think it is deeper than this. People in Poland believe that it is categorical. Here, you know that there will be another election in four years. The Americans are not fanatics. Maybe there are few, but usually people are not fanatics here. From time to time during elections, our country looks like an asylum.

This example of contrasting democratic processes in a developing democracy and in an established democracy
represented Witek's expanding construct of democracy as a process. Yet, the process lacked clear definition.

Near the end of his stay in the United States, Witek reiterated this change concerning democracy as a process. He began to envision the process of democracy as a never-ending affair and the attitudes in a democratic society as fluctuating and not fixed or predetermined. During our fourth interview, he reflected on his cross-cultural experience as follows:

One of my troubles before was that I was upset because of the state of policy and the political landscape of my country. I was becoming a loser. An example would be that if somebody proposed a solution for Parliament, and it was not good, I was upset because I felt myself a loser. Now, I know that you can fight the next day in the same direction. I now know that democracy is a process that never ends.

Two developments took place over time. First, Witek appeared to resolve his sense of cognitive dissonance over the state of affairs in Polish politics. In a related yet distinct sense, his contrasting poles—the psychological state of society in Poland and in the United States with regard to the electoral process—began to represent the ends of a continuum rather than a strictly "either-or" dichotomy.

Social Pressures and a Changing School System

Witek viewed the attitudes most appropriate for schools to engender and embrace in a democratic society in a larger, societal context. Yet, various forces drive societal attitudes. These societal attitudes emerge in schools and can act as pressures on schools.
Schools, to Witek, reflected society, but change from within the school system was also possible. What, then, defined Polish societal attitudes as they related to schools in a transitional democracy? In addition, what attitudes did Witek abstract from his cross-cultural experience that were essential to the changing role of schools in Poland?

**Barriers to change.** On October 25, 1992, Witek noted the following: "My first vision of school in a democratic society has deteriorated. This deterioration is very closely related to our discussions with professors and our overall program [OC: the "Schools and Democratic Society" project]."

Not quite understanding the context of his concern, I asked him to which democratic society or societies he was referring. His response was very clear: "Polish society is very far from being an open society, and Polish school is very far from being an open school."

Given this point of view, Witek began to define the attitudes necessary for schools to educate for democratic citizenship as vacuous in the Polish context. He defined the contrast end of his attitudes sub-construct. He went on to mention that even the teachers in Poland who were best equipped to affect a changing school system were not ready for teaching democracy. The aforementioned concerns of the Ministry of National Education (1992) with regard to
teaching methods reflective of the previous educational system were at the base of Witek’s contrasting pole:

If you offer democracy as the subject of your class, then the real danger is to teach on the surface with formulas, theories, pictures, etc., without changing the factors that influence real life. This concerns the attitudes toward law and people.

These concerns reverberated from my first interview with Witek. During the course of our first discussion, he enumerated two obstacles to democratic attitudes in schools that reflected societal attitudes present in post-communist Poland. He noted that "'inside' there is no tradition":

Our schools have never been democratic. There is a barrier of knowledge. Teachers and students were not trying to behave in a democratic way. There were no habits, procedures, or schema. Nothing at all. I think that this is the main barrier.

Nonetheless, Witek did not describe the forces behind this undemocratic and intransigent attitudinal "tradition."

Over the course of the next few weeks, I probed further into Witek’s sub-construct concerning the attitudes that obstructed democratic citizenship in Poland. I asked him to elucidate the nature of Poland’s tradition. He noted two. They were parental complacency developed over 45 years of centralized, authoritarian government and the Roman Catholic Church.

With regard to parental apathy as an attitudinal barrier, Witek cited the refusal of parents to involve themselves in any aspect of schools. He believed this situation reflected the opposite of what parents should do
in a democratic society. In addition, his cross-cultural experiences led him to conclude that parental action should reflect an attitude supportive of democratic citizenship education: "We have no tradition of citizen action like the United States. None at all. I think that it will change slowly, but eventually. Schools must begin to treat parents as an audience or a subject of influence."

I asked Witek to elaborate on the reasons for this situation. He reminded me of the difference between American society, after more than 200 years of democracy, and Polish society on the heals of communism:

In Warsaw and Kraków it is bad because the social structure of big cities does not create a sense of community. It is not like Upper Arlington. We have ten blocks of apartments. People work in the city center and sleep in these blocks. Children simply play at the next construction site. These city blocks are monocultural in the following way. After the building of the blocks, very similar people get apartments there. If we opened ten blocks, everyone would be between 25 and 28 years old with one or no children. Now, you have a particular sequence of problems to solve. Kindergarten, primary school, and high school would be created in sequence. Everything would move together. This is mono-culture. There is no diversity.

I told him that many planned American communities after World War II were very similar to this situation.

However, Witek reminded me that "the mono-culture of Upper Arlington is due to money, not government planning." The lock-step homogeneity of Poland's urban society, particularly considering the social psychological vestiges of communism, was an attitudinal barrier to involving
parents in a life of active citizenship. This situation, he believed, ramified to the attitudes taught in schools.

Witek regarded the Roman Catholic Church as another barrier to democratic attitudes in Polish society and Polish schools. The Church in Poland was and remains a strong influence in society. In Chapter IV, I noted the role of the Church in overthrowing communism and the overwhelming number of registered Roman Catholics in Poland. This situation was not new to me.

However, Witek addressed the power of the Church with regard to the role of schools in a democratic society and the contradictory attitudes of the Church and democratic citizenship: "The Church appeared as the first influential, organized, and relatively rich political force after communism. The educational system is very important to the Church, and the Church has never been democratic."

I was born and raised in the United States and attended Catholic schools throughout grade school and high school. I taught in Catholic high schools most of my teaching career. To me, Witek's comments ran counter to my experiences. I learned about democratic attitudes during my elementary and high school education, and I tried to reflect these attitudes in my public life and professional life.

This bit of my autobiography notwithstanding, my extended family included many Polish immigrant relatives. Their devotion to the Church was strong and took primacy
over aspects of a democratic society that opposed the Church's teachings. To this day, I refrain from discussing with my immediate family certain issues that oppose Catholic attitudes, but reflect the attitudes of American democracy. One example is the right of a woman to have an abortion. In contemplating a society dominated by this attitude, I gained a perspective on Witek's appraisal of the Roman Catholic Church as a barrier to democratic citizenship in Poland.

The Roman Catholic Church and the vestigial affect of communist social engineering constituted the contrast pole of Witek's attitudes sub-construct. Given these two seemingly strange bedfellows, what did Witek abstract from his cross-cultural experience that could enhance the development of societal, and thus educational, attitudes for the newly formed Polish democracy?

Changing societal attitudes in relation to schooling. At the same time Witek described the contrast pole of his sub-construct, he abstracted aspects of his experience that favored the process of "going from an authoritarian to a democratic personality" in Polish schools. These likeness ends of the sub-construct surfaced during various meetings and seminar sessions throughout the project.

By the middle of his experience, Witek's attitudes sub-construct reflected those attitudes necessary for schools to succeed in educating for democratic citizenship. For instance, during the workshop with Harold Reese, Witek
abstracted a question that all teachers should ask themselves: "He [OC: Reese] proposed a kind of criterion for teacher self-evaluation by simply asking oneself 'What would I never do with students?' On a deep level, this is a useful way of thinking." I asked Witek why this was useful, and he pointed out the importance of keeping one's teaching behavior within the attitudes most exemplary of a democratic citizen.

Throughout his reflective journal, Witek mentioned the notion that democratic behavior and attitudes must be built from the bottom and reflect a consensus of ideas. As much as I pressed him for the essential attitudes for teaching democratic citizenship, he maintained the position that attitudes in a democratic society change by the very nature of that society, and no permanent attitudes can be set forth. In the introduction to the final module of the "Schools and Democratic Society" course plan draft—a module that Witek wrote—he made this point public:

[Preservice] students should be invited to examine the most fundamental assumptions of the democratic school through the perspective of a democratic society. They should consider not only the values of education that differentiate democracy from other political systems, but also those that are universal and stand above all political value systems.

To Witek, the likeness end of his attitudes sub-construct was open-ended and based upon the democratic habit of mind reminiscent of Kelly's (1995) "man-the-scientist" metaphor.
Summary

Witek's changing superordinate construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship modulated through abstractions that tended toward general observations as opposed to specific events. Each of the sub-constructs of knowledge, skills, and attitudes through which he defined the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship resembled large swaths of his metaphorical "swampy jungle." His background in social psychology appeared to frame his construct system in this regard.

Yet, Witek particularized certain objects and events from his cross-cultural experience. The presidential election, his encounter with a Polish-American feminist, and various abstractions from his previous construct system developed in Poland are but a few precise examples to which he referred during his experience.

Witek maintained simultaneously a broad, societal interpretation of his reality and a personal, psychological interpretation of his reality during the project. The modulation of his superordinate construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship seemed to balance with the fragmentation of his subordinate constructs. With regard to knowledge, he moved from critical democracy to discipline based citizenship education. Skills fragmented and broadened simultaneously on two levels--teacher skills and student skills. Attitudes
hugged the contrast end of his sub-construct, but he offered
a tacit set of attitudes based on the democratic habit of
mind.

What Were the Changes?

Overall, Witek's sub-construct of the knowledge
necessary for schools to include when educating for
democratic citizenship modulated most obviously with regard
to content definition and global and multicultural
education. In both instances, his sub-construct modulated
with respect to pinpointing the opposing poles of his
knowledge sub-construct. In the case of content definition,
the dichotomous poles vacillated between critical democracy
and division of content based on the accepted disciplines.
With regard to global and multicultural education, Witek's
construct modulated with a sense of fragmentation over the
admission and necessity of certain aspects of knowledge
sometimes associated with the terms "global education" and
"multicultural education" as these terms relate to the role
of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

Witek's abstractions from his cross-cultural experience
helped to expand his range of convenience concerning skills.
This expansion took him from a vague understanding to a
concrete set of elements with particular emphasis on case
studies. Before his participation in the project, he noted
that "I had assumptions that something had to be done, but I
had no assumptions as to how to do it." By the conclusion
of his cross-cultural experience, Witek believed that the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship should include "the rule of ends and means on every level of teaching. In other words, it is not just bookish knowledge, but also procedural knowledge--ways of thinking and acting."

Democratic societal attitudes, particularly those surrounding and embedded in schools in a democratic society, took on a different meaning for Witek, but in a vague form. Witek entered the cross-cultural phase of the "Schools and Democratic Society" project with definite constructions of undemocratic attitudes based on his experiences in Poland. However, as he construed his experience, he offered only glimpses of the attitudes needed in educating for democratic citizenship, and, then, only with regard to society as a whole. He reserved his judgment on attitudes throughout his experience. Of the three sub-constructs, attitudes seemed the most permeable.

What Experiences Delimited the Construct?

The modulation and fragmentation of Witek's construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship emanated from abstractions of his cross-cultural perceptual field. These abstractions centered upon people and events that related to his sub-constructs of knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

Witek's knowledge sub-construct dilated in two ways during his cross-cultural experience. These dilations
involved two people. With regard to content definition, Witek began his experience with a notion of knowledge related to critical democracy. His experiences with Lew Simmons' view of the discipline-based knowledge necessary for democratic citizenship moved Witek's knowledge construct away from concentrating only on that content which is necessary to critically analyze society.

Witek abstracted Graham More's explication of global and social studies education as something necessary in educating for democratic citizenship in Poland. Initially convinced that Poland's schools taught with a global and multicultural perspective, More's social studies methods class introduced Witek to a sense of Poland's global interconnectedness that went beyond its history. In addition, Witek broadened his sub-construct of knowledge concerning multiculturalism to include aspects beyond ethnicity in a democratic society.

Initially, Witek knew that teacher education in Poland required new forms of skill development, but he did not know what these skills should be. In addition, he envisioned a connection between teacher skills and student skills in a democracy, but, again, specificity was absent in his sub-construct. Witek's abstractions from More's social studies methods class and Gaudet and Livingston's role modelling modulated Witek's sub-construct. Graham More exemplified a pragmatic approach to teacher education that was unfamiliar
to Witek in Poland: learning by doing. Thompson Livingston promoted dialogue in a fair and democratic way, and Jim Gaudet synthesized disparate ideas into systematic approaches to a group task.

Over the course of his cross-cultural experience, Witek referred most often to the contrast pole of his attitudes sub-construct. Yet, his abstraction of societal aspects prevalent in an established democracy fragmented his sub-construct. Particularly, Witek’s growing notion that attitudes in a democracy are dependent upon the democratic process of change began to form after he experienced an American presidential election. In addition, Witek’s abstraction of a question from a presentation by Harold Reese became a sort of guide throughout his task on the project: "What should I never do with students in a democracy?"

What Was the Role of His Previous Construct?

Kelly’s (1955) Modulation Corollary did not specify that change in a person’s construct system is dependent on all antecedent aspects of our construct system. However, this tacit proposal, embedded in the theory of personal constructs, appeared to be the case with Witek.

Regarding the sub-constructs of knowledge and skills, Witek’s previous construct system indicated a base on which to build his superordinate construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. For instance, he
entered his cross-cultural experience believing that content should revolve around the knowledge necessary to critically analyze society. Considering Witek's seemingly strong opposition to communism throughout his college career, this belief seems logical. With regard to skills, Witek's previous construct system indicated to him that Polish teacher education was lacking in this area. Being a Polish teacher educator, this position also appeared steeped in Witek's previous experience.

With regard to attitudes in a democratic society, Witek's previous construction gave him a strong basis for defining the contrast end of his superordinate construct concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. The vestigial landscape of communist social engineering and the return of the Catholic Church to openly influence acceptable societal beliefs constituted Witek's previous construct system with regard to attitudes.

The Case of Rosza Moczynska-Szymanski

Her Autobiography

"Moczynska" is my family name. "Szymanski" is my husband's name. I am 45 years old now. I was born on December 31, 1947, in Warsaw. This means that I was born two years after World War II. I spent all my life in Warsaw, or in the nearest suburb of Warsaw. My parents were
also tied to Warsaw all their lives. So, I am a second generation Warszawan.

Both my parents belonged to a very peculiar social strata in Poland—the intelligentsia. My mother worked as a publisher in a Polish publishing house. My father was a historian. He specialized in the history of Poland and France in the nineteenth century. History wasn’t only a profession for him, it was also his great love. He worked all the time, even during weekends, holidays, and while in the hospital. History was the main target of his life.

Today, I live in a small house, in a small village fifteen miles from Warsaw, with my husband, two daughters, two cats, and three dogs.

My husband is an economist by profession, and politics is his main occupation. He is the leader of a political party. It is a very small party, but rather significant in Poland. He is my second husband. The first one was a historian. My oldest daughter is from my first marriage. She is eighteen years old now. Next year, she will finish her secondary school, and I think she will apply to Warsaw University. My second daughter is eleven years old now. She is at the elementary school. I work as a sociologist at Warsaw University.

As a child, I was very scared in school. I was very shy, and it was difficult for me to answer questions from the teacher. In Poland, it is a custom to go to the
blackboard to answer a question. Sometimes, I would lose my confidence. I didn’t like formal learning. I read books. I had no time to prepare my studies. Even when I prepared my lessons, I was not always successful because I couldn’t answer very well. Also, our school books were so boring. There was a lot of useless and stupid information that we had to learn.

I also remember some nice teachers. One of them was very brilliant and nice, and I still try to have contact with her now. Not all the teachers were terrible. Nonetheless, when I sat at my desk in school, I always thought about how to improve this situation. Perhaps this is my motivation for doing this project.

I studied sociology and economics at Warsaw University. I had the luck to be in school in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Following the death of Stalin in 1953 and the events of 1956\(^2\), the situation in Poland improved, and in school we could learn not only communist ideology but also math, history, and so on. Also, the situation wasn’t bad at the University until 1968. We had very brilliant scholars and relative freedom.

\(^2\) In 1956, anti-Soviet riots occurred in cities throughout Poland. To satisfy disgruntled Polish society, the PZPR named Władysław Gomułka as first secretary of the party. He replaced the Russian-born defense minister with a Pole, reinstated an anti-communist priest as the Roman Catholic cardinal, and decreed that collective farming was no longer compulsory.
It was a very interesting period in Polish history from 1965 until 1968, especially at the University. But this situation seemed dangerous for the authorities, and after a few days of riots in March 1968, they closed the University and dismissed the best scholars and students from the University. It was very exciting, but also a gloomy period in my life. I was very afraid to see how the authorities reacted to the criticism. I was expelled from the University for a few months. My father also had some troubles.

I have always been interested in the problems of schools. I started out in the University and went to a lecture on education and did a little research in high school classrooms. This became my masters thesis—the pecking order in classrooms.

After finishing my first degree, I had some problems in finding work. I had the reputation that I was not "obedient." After two years of looking for a job, I was able to find one. After 1970, old sins were forgotten. I started to work in the Polish Academy of Science as an economist, but after a year I started working at the University in the Sociological Institute. I was always interested in history, and I joined a seminar on the history of social class and mentality in Poland. I did my doctorate in 1980 on the role of the intelligentsia in Polish society in the nineteenth century.
For some years I specialized in the social history of Poland in the nineteenth century. The censorship and the bureaucracy enhanced the difficulties of somebody who wanted to do research. Also, the results couldn't be published. Yet, many of my brave colleagues made very interesting studies. I was too lazy to provoke troubles and had to solve my family problems.

After my divorce, I had to return to my parents' apartment. To start a new life, we (me and my new husband) decided to build a small house. It wasn't as simple as in America. There was a shortage of everything. There were even no nails. Especially, we had a very small sum of money. We had to do almost everything by ourselves. Our house is really "handmade."

My husband got involved in the Solidarity movement in the 1980s. He had no time to build our house. "Fortunately," General Jaruzelski stopped Solidarity. So, my husband, after a few weeks in jail, came back and worked on our house. In 1982, I bore my second daughter, Agnes. I decided to stop working and devote my time to bringing up my children. Frankly speaking, I had to because both my daughters were ill all the time. They had numerous flues, anginas, pneumonia, etc. After five years, I returned to my work in sociology.

My life changed in 1989. I engaged in reforming the school. I decided to become a candidate for municipal
counsellor. My life started to be very exciting, but also demanding.

Now, I teach in a primary school and prepare new curricula on civics. In addition,

- I try to work on manuals for secondary school.
- I teach prospective teachers and teacher inservice at the University.
- I'm in the local community council.
- I take a part in sociological research on comparing the public and non-public schools in Poland.
- I try to prepare my postdoctoral thesis, and sometimes I feel that I'm crazy!

I joined this project for several reasons. My childhood experience with school may have been one. Also, during the Solidarity period of 1980, I was engaged with a group of sociologists, historians, and psychologists who were involved in curriculum changes in high schools. This was a project on civic education. We prepared some materials for teachers. We finished in 1981. Our book was taken by the police and destroyed. In 1980, it was OK to do this kind of work, but in 1981, during martial law, these efforts were disallowed.

In 1986, I went to my daughter's school for a parents' meeting. When I saw what was happening, I got involved again. There were many problems between the parents and the principal, and I was made the spokesperson for the parents. As a result, I became involved in an educational movement to
change Polish schools. I began to read papers and books on this issue and returned to my sociological background.

These are the reasons why I was interested in this project. A combination of schools, schooling, sociological interests, teaching, and democracy are put together in this project. That is why I inquired about the project.

From the Theoretical to the Actual

Kelly (1955) compared a permeable construct to a theoretical formulation—flexibly constructed and open-ended. A construct, like a theory, "accepts a wide variety of experimental ventures, some of which may even be antithetical to each other" (p. 81).

In the case of Rosza Moczynska, she began her cross-cultural, experimental venture with a question: "What should, and what could, be done to promote the democratic school with a democratic curriculum, democratic values, and democratic relationships in our very authoritarian [Polish] society?" Rosza raised this question in her first reflection on the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. She went on to note that schools have a small chance to change society in a transitional democracy, but the chance exists.

Rosza offered a tentative answer to her question concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship and the possibility of that role to change Polish society. Her first reflection offered a definition
with, in her words, a "theoretical character." She noted that Polish schools will need:

new programs, new curricula, especially from social science, but also in the science curriculum. Now, our schools give a lot of information (too much), but they don’t teach thinking. The school should promote also some values and skills which will help in the life of a democratic society. For example: respect for other human beings, competency in discussion, negotiation, etc. The students should be encouraged to participate in the social lives of their school and the local community.

In theory, Rosza’s vision of Polish schools in a transitional democracy included the exploration of new purposes for knowledge and the promotion of certain values and skills. The sub-construct framework of knowledge, skills, and attitudes was evident.

However, in her last reflection, Rosza concentrated exclusively on attitudes as the crucial sub-construct in defining the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. She developed a belief that the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship revolved around the democratic character of the school and the school’s role in developing this character in students:

My way of thinking about the role of school in a democratic society is rather stable. The democratic school should help in creating democratic attitudes among the students. The school should be a sort of laboratory of democracy. All the obstacles I see in democratizing the school pushes me to organize research on all these barriers. I want to investigate the students and the teachers.

By the end of her experience, Rosza believed that if schools
are to educate students for democratic citizenship, then
schools should model democracy.

Given this hypothetical proposition, what aspects of
Rosza's cross-cultural experience during the "Schools and
Democratic Society" project brought her from a theoretical
superordinate construct of knowledge, skills, and attitudes
to an actual superordinate construct concerning the need to
develop democratic attitudes? What changes occurred in her
sub-constructs of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that
brought Rosza to this position?

Rosza's Construction of "Knowledge"

As evidenced by her first reflection, Rosza believed
that knowledge needed to be reevaluated in Polish schools if
these schools were to educate for democratic citizenship.
In this regard, Rosza addressed her sub-construct of
knowledge through its purpose rather than its content.

Defining the Purpose of Knowledge

Rosza began her cross-cultural experience by
questioning not only the amount of knowledge, but also the
purpose of knowledge taught in Polish schools. By late
October, her thoughts on the purpose of knowledge in
educating for democratic citizenship began to crystallize.
I asked her to define the role of schools in educating for
democratic citizenship now that a month and a half of the
project was complete. She began with the purpose, not the
content, of knowledge: "It is still difficult to tell, but I
think that one of the roles is to educate people to give
them more knowledge about democracy and how it is possible
to live in a democratic society."

In illustrating this point, Rosza reflected upon the
availability of knowledge in the United States and how this
availability operationalized the purpose of knowledge in a
democracy:

Here [in the United States], education creates the
independent, self-governing human being. Once more,
you have gorgeous public libraries in the United
States. Two years ago, I saw a library in a local
community [OC: Rosza visited the East Coast and Chicago
two years earlier]. It wasn’t an academic one. I was
amazed to see it. The system of libraries of that kind
has created American society.

Rosza believed that American society put stock in knowledge
availability in order to enhance human development. To her,
the purpose of knowledge in a democratic society was to
promote the edification of the human condition. A
democratic society achieved this purpose by affording access
to knowledge. Schools needed to begin this process by
alerting students to the purpose of knowledge as well as the
content of knowledge.

However, an experience at the National Council for the
Social Studies Annual Convention gave Rosza an opportunity
to add a cross-cultural event to the contrast end of her
sub-construct of knowledge. During the third week of
November, all of the project staff and participants went to
Detroit, Michigan, for this convention. We attended a
session on the use of computers as data bases in the social
studies classroom. After the presentation, an American teacher asked the presenter how a teacher can hide the information from the students.

Rosza, upon reflection of this incident, reeled back to her previous construct system:

I felt at that moment as if I was in Poland! The status of teachers depends on their level of knowledge. Their knowledge equals a sum of information, not a way of thinking, asking, looking for solutions to the problems . . . so, if all information is on the computer, and even much more than any teacher knows, the teacher will lose his position. It is simple, and it is funny.

The threat to teachers posed by students with access to knowledge may be a cross-cultural phenomenon. After reading her reflection, I told Rosza that my experience in faculty lounges during my teaching career contained many instances of teacher indignation over the large amount of information obtained by some of their students. I agreed with her. The cognitive dissonance brought about by this scenario was sort of "funny."

Near the end of her cross-cultural experience, Rosza expressed the purpose of knowledge in educating for democratic citizenship in no uncertain terms: "It is needed to deal with social problems. One must be able to see the whole process. It could be dangerous when the knowledge is provided by isolated events."

This interview response from December 13, 1992, triggered my memory of an earlier interview I conducted with Rosza. Throughout the cross-cultural aspect of the project,
various "content" workshops and seminars took place. These workshops lessened as the mid-point of the project neared. During our second interview, Rosza referred to these workshops as follows:

All this other information I already know. It's not so revolutionary for me. The general ideas of the principles of democracy I know. The system of law I didn't know, but it only applied to the development of my mind. I can see democracy in America more broadly, and perhaps my lectures will be better, but I can't see any direct influence.

That which constituted the content of knowledge necessary for schools in educating for democratic citizenship was not new to her sub-construct. For Rosza, making this content available to students, for the purposes of improving themselves and their society, held the position of importance. Rosza's sub-construct of knowledge retained this sense of purpose throughout her cross-cultural experience.

In her last reflection, Rosza returned to the purpose of knowledge as equally critical to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship as was the content of knowledge. In addition, she reiterated the hypothetical proposition that schools, in order to educate for democratic citizenship, needed to operationalize the content. Schools needed to give knowledge a purpose in resolving the problems of a transitional democratic society: "In our Polish universities, even under the soviet regime, we studied the works of Montesquieu, Locke, and de Tocqueville. The
current political scientists find the problems of contemporary democracy much more complicated than you wanted us to learn." To Rosza, devising the purpose, not accumulating the content, of knowledge in a democracy was paramount to her sub-construct, and, thus, her cross-cultural learning process.

Over the course of my association with Rosza, I began to reconsider the difference between the content and the purpose of knowledge in educating for democratic citizenship. Throughout my teaching career, my construction of the knowledge that schools needed to address in educating for democratic citizenship centered upon content. I took for granted the relatively easy access to content provided to our society through public libraries and schools. To me, the purpose of that knowledge was a tacit assumption—application to the problems of a democratic society.

Rosza’s abstraction of her cross-cultural reality concerning knowledge made explicit my assumption. Her abstraction of knowledge as serving a purpose in a democratic society other than information for the sake of information surfaced in our first interview: "History of democratic ideas is an important part of knowledge. People must see a connection between values and government. They have to see the types of authoritarian society and have a chance to compare. This is both skill and knowledge." Over time, Rosza addressed the sub-construct of the skills
necessary to operationalize the knowledge available in a
democratic society.

Rosza’s Construction of "Skills"

Throughout her cross-cultural experience, Rosza
believed that teachers and students should maintain a
synergetic relationship in order to realize an education for
democratic citizenship. This relationship surfaced with
regard to the skills necessary for teachers and students to
practice in a democratic society.

Over time, Rosza noted the sub-construct of skills that
should be developed in educating for democratic citizenship
through comparisons to her previous structure. The cross-
cultural abstractions of objects and events that related to
the theory and practice of skills in a democracy and
Teaching methods that support these skills focused her sub-
construct.

However, near the end of her cross-cultural experience,
she added a caveat with regard to active methods in the
classroom as a means to skill development. This caveat
indicated a distinct constriction of her sub-construct. Her
vision of skills was a position based on skills for
democratic citizenship, not skills for the sake of frivolous
time wasting that damaged the intent of the learning
process.
Theory and Practice in Educating for Democratic Citizenship

Initially, Rosza defined her sub-construct of skills through her previous construct system. Reminiscent of her early life in school, Rosza noted that democratic change in Poland did not imply automatic change in the teaching skills that promoted better, democratic relationships between students and teachers. In her first reflection, Rosza described the continuing lack of a democratic climate in Polish schools. This undemocratic climate limited the development of skills beyond the didactic transmission of citizenship:

They [OC: older teachers] are unchangeable, but they create the climate of the school. One way to keep their positions in a school is to maintain the patrimonial system. The student is not a partner in a process of teaching, but a child who must be protected and educated. The good student is the obedient student.

In our first interview, Rosza elaborated on this point: "Our teachers have great knowledge of psychology, but they don’t know how to practice it in real life." These sentiments reminded me of Kulerski’s (1992) concern that Polish teachers are still "deeply conservative in their adherence to the old teaching routines" (p. 82).

From early October to mid-November, I had several discussions with Rosza about the teaching methods that launch democratic theory into practice. In addition, one of her two topical responsibilities in the course plan, "The Position and Role of the Teacher," grew from her strong
conviction that "Polish schools stress mostly the role of theoretical knowledge. I was convinced that the schools need some other methods of teaching. . . . In school we need much more practice than theory."

Over the course of these discussions and my curriculum seminar observations, Rosza offered me an increasingly precise construction of her skills sub-construct. In our third interview, she stressed that "the school should be, as Dewey said, a laboratory for democracy. The teacher should encourage the students to think independently, to express their points of view, to ask questions, and to show how and why to participate in public life."

I asked her to elaborate on her experiences during the project, and what abstractions formed her likeness end of the skills sub-construct. She mentioned the presentations of John Goryl and Cliff Johnson, not during this cross-cultural aspect of the project, but when the project staff travelled to Poland in late June, 1992:

I want my students to be able to express their ideas and their points of view as the American people do. It was your group of American scholars like Goryl and Johnson who showed me how it could be done. I became engaged in this project after their presentations during the seminars in Mietne.

To Rosza, engaging activities that involved the teacher and the student in solving problems and voicing concerns represented the synergetic aspect of the necessary skills in educating for democratic citizenship.
Near the end of her cross-cultural experience, I asked Rosza to reflect back on her time in the United States and indicate any examples of how skills developed for active participation in a society emerged during her experience. She referred collectively to her experiences at conferences, in schools, and observations of Americans in her every day, cross-cultural experience:

The role of schools in America is to convince people that they have the right to express their point of view. A housewife or garbage collector has that right. It is part of your culture, but it is also an effect of your schools. The students have the right to express themselves. This is a very important skill for democratic citizenship education.

In addition, Rosza referred to the Conference on Connecting Citizens and Schools as an example. The entire group attended this conference during the second week of their cross-cultural experience. This conference attended to issues of American education through an inter-professional perspective. To Rosza, the fact that "ordinary citizens" could express their points of view on the subject of education indicated the role that democratic skill development can play in adult society:

There were a lot of people from different parts of society who worked as partners and could express their feelings. I think that this can be happening due to their education. To some extent it's because they went to school here and not in Eastern Europe.

To Rosza, this way of thinking and acting was "against all my school and university experience."
A personal tragedy truncated Rosza's cross-cultural experience. In March, 1993, I travelled to Warsaw to meet with the group on the progress of the course plan. On a free Sunday afternoon, Rosza and I lunched at a small cafe on Nowy Swiat, the "Fifth Avenue" of Warsaw. Again, I asked Rosza about the cross-cultural experiences she abstracted with regard to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. She recounted her experiences with teaching methods that developed the skills necessary to express one's concerns in a democratic society. Also, Rosza's response reaffirmed her belief in Dewey's philosophy of education: "I saw some pragmatism in American schools. Don't just look at the theory, but look at life."

The Caveat

Immediately prior to her unexpected departure, Rosza and I discussed the teaching methods that help students develop the above noted skills for living in a democracy. She reiterated her fascination with the methods used in Mietne, yet with some reluctance. I asked her why: "It's about the permissiveness in teaching. It's a problem because you want to have your schools as a very attractive place for students who are not too interested in making a career."

She cautioned me on the use of active teaching methods for the sake of making teaching more attractive for students. My confusion on this constriction of her skills
sub-contract prompted me to ask for an explanation:

The inquiry process is a difficult task. When you show that learning is so frivolous through simulations, games, and role playing, the learner doesn’t understand the seriousness of learning. Learning is sometimes very hard work. When you want to show people that learning is frivolous, it could be confusing to students.

We did not resolve this issue over her new found concern about active teaching methods. A rap on the door of Rosza’s Harrison House apartment reminded us that we had a date with another Polish educator to do some shopping that Sunday afternoon. Two days later, extenuating circumstances sent Rosza back to Poland. Her father died unexpectedly.

Rosza’s Construction of "Attitudes"

During our last interview together, Rosza supported my observation of a discernable pattern in her way of viewing the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship: "As a sociologist, I always look for a relation between the social environment and schools." Throughout her cross-cultural experience, Rosza viewed, with increasing importance, the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship within the context of societal attitudes.

As indicated in her last reflection, attitudes became the most important of her sub-constructs concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Her experiences in Polish society, when compared to certain aspects of American society, defined attitudes necessary for a democracy by reinforcing the likeness and contrast ends of
her sub-construct. Additionally, she held forth the question of whether or not schools in a democracy can have any influence in changing societal attitudes, particularly in Poland. Her cross-cultural experience during the project gave her a basis for comparison on this issue.

**Defining Democratic Attitudes**

Rosza's definition of the attitudes that schools should engender in students as part of their role in educating for democratic citizenship changed very little throughout her cross-cultural experience. Her cross-cultural experience appeared to confirm her beliefs on the types of attitudes that should and should not be part of one's education for democratic citizenship.

The contrast end. Throughout the project, Rosza believed that changing societal attitudes in Poland was a daunting task. Forty-five years of authoritarian rule over Polish society defined clearly the hierarchical attitudes of that society and the presence of these attitudes in post-communist Polish schools: "Present day Polish schools fit the model of the authoritarian society very well. It is an authoritarian institution." Rosza offered this thought in our first interview. I asked her about the reasons for this situation now that Poland was a democracy, and she indicated that this was a vestige of the communist past. In the previous model of schooling, "the hidden role was to create
people who should be obedient to governmental power. It was to create a hierarchical society."

The likeness end. Given the contrast of authoritarian attitudes evident in Polish schools and in Polish society, Rosza proposed various democratic attitudes during her cross-cultural experience that helped to define the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Rosza realized these attitudes before her cross-cultural experience. Nonetheless, certain cross-cultural experiences in the United States added strength to the likeness end of her attitudes sub-construct.

From the beginning of her stay in the United States, Rosza defined the attitudes that schools should promote in a democracy as tolerance, openness, and self-respect. In her opinion, the way in which Polish schools could accomplish this goal was through increased tolerance on the part of teachers toward their twin constituencies—students and parents: "My advice is to change attitudes toward children and parents. . . . The teachers must become friendlier and more tolerant."

During the middle portion of our curriculum seminar schedule, I noticed that Rosza became deeply concerned over democratic attitudes in society and schools. This concern surfaced most frequently when the group discussed her course plan module on the relationship of schools to the local community. When I asked her about any experiences during
the project that highlighted this sub-construct’s
development, she noted two cross-cultural experiences that
contributed elements to the likeness end of her attitudes
sub-construct. These two elements played an important role
in her conviction that "a change of attitude is very
important. This is both for the teachers as well as society."

First, Rosza believed that her experience in More’s
social studies methods class gave her a definition of the
role modeling that teachers can employ in developing
democratic attitudes in the classroom:

He has the capacity to discover in his students the
best features of their character. He stimulates
students by creating a very special climate of human
relationships where the student was supposed to be a
quite open-minded person. I think that he also showed
me the real role of the teacher—the democratic teacher
in the democratic society.

I told Rosza that More’s emphasis on helping students to
develop open-minded attitudes was evident when I took More’s
methods course and simulation course seventeen years
earlier. She told me that he reminded her of two of her
favorite teachers. I considered myself lucky.

Second, Rosza mentioned Harold Reese’s short workshop
on the philosophy of education in a democracy. His
presentation buttressed the likeness end of Rosza’s
attitudes sub-construct because of his reference to the need
for "partnerships" between parents, teachers,
administrators, students, and the community in a democracy.
This notion of partnership was an attitude expressed by Rosza in an earlier interview: "The democratic school has to have a relationship between parents, community, and teachers. There must always be a connection between them. The school can be one step ahead, but not more." Reese’s presentation appealed to her beliefs. In Rosza’s course plan module on the relations between the school and local community, she noted the challenge of schools to develop the attitude of partnership in post-communist Poland.

The Role of Schools as Attitudinal Change Agents in Society

Although a seemingly impossible task, Rosza believed that schools could play a role in changing attitudes in Polish society: "School can not change society, but they can give it a little push." The knowledge and skills necessary for schools to address in educating for democratic citizenship play a part in this task, but, according to Rosza, developing democratic attitudes meets head on with certain barriers in Polish society.

**Barriers to change.** Rosza mentioned consistently three major barriers to democratic attitudes that could deter the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. These barriers were the school, the adolescent sub-culture, and the Church. Rosza’s concern over these three barriers surfaced early in her cross-cultural experience. The following data stem from her first reflection and our first interview.
With regard to Polish schools, Rosza noted that they can "retard change. They can protect traditional society against change." She attributed this attitude in schools to the central control of the Ministry of National Education over time: "There are barriers inside the school--teacher attitudes, parents' attitudes, and students' attitudes. Schools are still under the pressure and control of the Ministry. They actually want to have it this way. It is easier."

Related to the barrier of schools was the barrier of Poland's adolescent sub-culture. Rosza believed that the residual aspects of authoritarianism that prevented the development of democratic attitudes lingered in the minds of Poland's teenagers:

The values of the adolescent sub-culture in schools are also very authoritarian. The students are accustomed to their authoritarian school. They don't like it; they don't appreciate it, but they know the rules. New methods of teaching are very rarely appreciated by them. . . . When the old, authoritarian rules collapse, the students think that there are no rules at all. It discourages teachers from continuing any reforms.

Third, the Roman Catholic Church posed a serious threat to the development of democratic attitudes in schools by its powerful position in Polish society. Rosza's evaluation of the Polish Roman Catholic Church led me to believe that its deep rooted presence in Polish attitudes may be the most insurmountable barrier to the development of democratic values: "The Church doesn't like when people disagree. People have to be obedient. They should not have the right
to choose. The Church has the money; power; and the confidence, influence, and spirit of the people."

**Agents of attitudinal change.** The attitudes embedded in Polish schooling, the Polish adolescent sub-culture, and the Polish Roman Catholic Church concerned Rosza as she abstracted objects and events from her cross-cultural experience. Obviously, her perception of these attitudinal barriers did not change while in the United States. However, her construction of the attitudes she perceived during her cross-cultural experience indicated the development of certain vehicles for attitudinal change in Poland.

By the mid-point of the project, Rosza saw a glimmer of hope in the charge to educate for democratic citizenship in Polish society as this charge referred to attitudinal change. She referred to More’s social studies methods class as the type of preservice teacher preparation that could develop democratic attitudes in Poland’s future teachers. She abstracted from his course a way of thinking that indicated needed change in Polish schools: "I think the change of attitude, as I have told you, is important. If it’s applicable or not, we’ll see. The crucial point is changing the way of thinking. For this purpose, Dr. More’s class is the most important experience." She reiterated the point that teachers, if they are to have any role in developing democratic attitudes in Polish society, must
highlight the best aspects of their students’ abilities and model an open-minded attitude.

As noted earlier, our last interview took place in Warsaw. When I asked Rosza to reflect back on that which she abstracted from her cross-cultural experience, she focused on the type of person in Polish society who could help to change Polish attitudes to a democratic direction. To Rosza, her experiences in the United States reminded her of the Polish intelligentsia of the nineteenth century. This group was the subject of her dissertation.

Rosza saw similarities between American democratic attitudes and the attitudes of the Polish intelligentsia of the nineteenth century:

With pleasure I saw in America and in all of our conversations that the ideal of the Polish intelligentsia of the nineteenth century fits the ideal of the democratic society—the same idea that the good citizen should be open to the problems of society and be engaged.

She proceeded to note that these attitudes are very popular among today’s Polish intelligentsia. In addition, Rosza believed that her experience in America and in the project brought to light a vision of purpose for this intelligentsia—a purpose dedicated to the enhancement of and modeling of democratic attitudes in Poland:

This work is the task or challenge for the intelligentsia. They have a duty to work for society and those who are not as educated or clever. This is in my background and it is the most important part of your thinking that I experienced in America.
The necessity of open-minded attitudes and societal involvement were aspects of Rosza’s superordinate construct from the beginning to the end of her experience. Rosza’s attitudes sub-construct did not change over time. However, her cross-cultural experiences triggered recognition of an aspect of Polish society that could act as a change agent toward democratic attitudes--the intelligentsia.

**Summary**

Construct change need not accompany construct development. In Rosza’s case, her superordinate construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship did not change over the course of her cross-cultural experience. Rosza’s new experiences and new events were added discriminatively to those which her superordinate construct already embraced. These experiences and events reinforced Rosza’s superordinate construct. Kelly (1955) defined this sort of development and reinforcement as a construct’s "permeability": "A construct is permeable if it will admit to its range of convenience new elements which are not yet construed within its framework" (p. 79).

With regard to her subordinate constructs of knowledge, skills, and attitudes, Rosza added new elements that supported her pre-existing construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Her shift in emphasis toward the subordinate construct of attitudes
represented a greater development in that subordinate construct. This shift did not appear to change her entire superordinate construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

What Were the Changes?

In the case of Rosza, there were no discernable changes in her construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. With regard to knowledge, Rosza maintained the position that the purpose of knowledge in a democracy was crucial to educating for democratic citizenship.

Rosza’s construction of the skills necessary for teachers and students in a democracy remained stable. She entered the cross-cultural experience with a construction of skills that included independent thinking skills, the ability to express one’s point of view, asking questions, and participation in public life. In the realm of teaching methods for developing these skills, Rosza cautioned against methods for the sake of methods.

Tolerance, openness, and self-respect were likeness ends of Rosza’s attitudes sub-construct that remained firm throughout her experience. Rosza maintained the contrast ends of this sub-construct through experiences with Polish schools, the sub-culture of Polish adolescents, and the Polish Roman Catholic Church.
What Experiences Delimited the Construct?

Rosza construed various elements during her cross-cultural experience that delimited her superordinate construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. For instance, accessibility to information through libraries and computers enlarged Rosza’s range of convenience concerning the purpose of knowledge.

Expressing one’s concerns and points of view defined Rosza’s skills sub-construct. Rosza’s experiences with everyday American society and her observation of the Conference on Connecting Citizens and Schools exemplified these skills.

Rosza perceived Professor More’s attitude toward preservice teacher education as an element of her cross-cultural experience that buttressed the likeness end of her pre-existing subordinate construct concerning attitudes. Her pre-existing subordinate structure included attitudes of open-mindedness and free expression.

What Was the Role of Her Previous Constructs?

Many cross-cultural events and objects permeated Rosza’s pre-existing superordinate construct and expanded her pre-existing range of convenience. For example, aspects of democratic attitudes evident in American education and American society connected with the role the intelligentsia could play in changing Polish societal attitudes. Both of Rosza’s parents were members of the Polish intelligentsia,
and her dissertation concerned the role of the Polish intelligentsia in Polish society. Her pre-existing structure, based on these experiences, abstracted aspects of her cross-cultural experience that focused the attitudes necessary for democratic citizenship.

Rosza’s subordinate construction of knowledge and skills began with experiences during her pre-collegiate education. These experiences appeared in her autobiography. Early in her life, Rosza construed these experiences into an urge to change Polish schools. Poland’s transition to democracy gave Rosza a chance to satiate this urge.

Also, Rosza arrived in the United States with a pre-existing skills sub-construct. Her previous experience with Goryl and Johnson’s teaching methods for democratic skill development were part of her pre-existing skills sub-construct. During her cross-cultural experience, this part of her pre-existing system emerged as a connection point for new experiences. These new experiences related to solving problems and expressing thoughts as necessary skills for democratic citizenship.

The Case of Thersa Kobuczewska

Her Autobiography

I was born on August 20, 1945 in Słupsk, Poland. This city is in the northern part of Poland that was German before World War II. After the war, my mother was moved
from the eastern part of Poland to this region. My mother was an actress. The family of my father was moved to the southwest, mainly Wrocław. My father was an army officer. He joined the second Polish army. This army was organized by the Soviets during the war. The Soviets took people from the camps to join this army.

I don’t remember much that was special from my early life. My parents were very young when they married. They were 18 years old, and they weren’t too interested in children. Since my father was travelling a lot, my mother went with him, and my grandparents took care of me. They were my mother’s parents. Then, my younger brother was born in 1949. This made my mother settle down a bit. When my father received an appointment in the headquarters of the Army, we moved to Warsaw. In 1951, my youngest sister was born.

I attended an elementary school that was called TPD (a school run by the Association of the Friends of Children). Before the war, the TPD was a progressive education organization. After the rise of communism, the communists absorbed this organization to show that an inflated number of communists lived in pre-war Poland. Nonetheless, this program was soon to be abandoned.

Only one thing remains with me from my elementary school experience. I was left-handed, and they made me write right-handed. As a result, I had a hard time for
several years. Otherwise, I liked my school, my teachers, and I liked to learn.

Later, I attended one of the best high schools in Warsaw. A lot of children from prominent families studied at this school. In this school, we had a lot of things that the majority of Polish high schools didn't have. For example, we had not only Russian, but other foreign languages like English, French, and German. We also had a few really good teachers--older, pre-war teachers--who were well educated, especially in math, physics, and chemistry. Many prominent scientists graduated from my school. The other feature of this school was that we did not have a lot of political indoctrination that I assumed was the case in other schools because we were from families with prominent Party members.

We had a substantial education and a sort of freedom in this school. The effect of this situation was that along with a few famous mathematicians and physicists, a lot of people who became prominent activists against communism were graduated from my high school.

Since this school was so good, I had no problem entering Warsaw University in 1963. I could have chosen from many disciplines, but I chose psychology. The psychology department was extremely competitive for admission.
My mother died in 1960. I entered Warsaw University and got married while I was still a student. I was very close to my brother and my sister after my mother died because my father's professional travels took him away from Warsaw a lot, and we had to manage by ourselves.

I loved my university life. However, during the first year, I was not sure if I wanted to study psychology. I felt this way because, in this first year of study, we studied everything but psychology. This is kind of idiotic because if you want to keep students in the department, you should show the students what they are going to study. I was going to other departments to see if I liked them, but I did not like anything.

I passed my first year exams, but got low grades. There was even a time when the possibility existed that I would not make it. If you didn't pass your first year of exams, you were kicked out of the department. So, since I couldn't find anything else that I liked, I stayed with psychology.

During the second year, we finally had classes in psychology, and I really liked it. So, I became a very good student. Now, I was happy with my choice and looked forward to continuing my studies in psychology.

Warsaw University was different than American schools. We did not have to work like American students. We studied for free, so we didn't have to work. We had a lot of free
time as students, and during these years there was a very rich student life in Warsaw. Student culture was very well developed with theater, cabarets, and especially a very vibrant intellectual life. We had seminars on philosophy and social issues that were informal, and prominent scholars were honored to spend this informal time talking with students about issues.

Then, 1968 came. I was not involved directly in the student movement for the freedom of science and against censorship. However, this movement was not explicitly anti-communist or related to leftist movements in Western Europe or the American student movement. I was not directly involved because during the last year of my study, I was working on my masters thesis and doing empirical research and working with delinquent boys in a small town. During this year, I had an offer to stay in the Department after graduation. The position was that of a young assistant professor.

But, of course, 1968 was a disaster for me on both the private and young scholar's level because the atmosphere at the University was awful. It came under very strict party and secret police supervision. A lot of the best scholars and professors were fired, and all these things happened during a huge anti-semitic propaganda movement. These scholars began to emigrate. This was a disaster for my private life because a majority of my friends left Poland.
I finished my Ph.D. in 1973, and I was elevated to the position of adjunct professor in the Faculty of Psychology.

Now came some years when I really enjoyed doing research in psychology. At that time, I think I was developing rapidly as a scientist. Fortunately, this period of my life was connected with a kind of openness in Poland, including at the universities. This took place after Gomulka’s regime collapsed and Gierek took over as head of the government. He was more open to the West. The control that followed 1968 was loosened. We started to be really oriented on the Western scientific model. People started to arrive to Poland who were scientists from America and Western Europe. Polish scientists began to travel to the West. This was a very good period of time for anyone’s personal development at the University.

However, about 1976, one could see that Gierek’s dream to build the communist version of a society of consumption did not work. It was obvious, for example, that the stores that were full of goods from the West at the beginning of the 1970s became empty; that many promises he gave people did not work.

Also, the so-called freedom Gierek undoubtedly gave Poles met its systemic limits. When the effects of this new found freedom began to appear on a large scale (e.g., in scientific research), the authorities became aware that they had allowed too much of a strain on communist ideology.
When the summer of 1976 came, in the end of June I believe, the government enacted a huge increase in the price of commodities, mostly meat. There were huge riots against this move in a few big Polish factories. The two most important events were in Ursus—a big factory for making tractors near Warsaw—and in Radom’s big metal factory that produced everything from sewing machines to military equipment. There were also protests in other places, but, for instance in Gdansk, it was much weaker because of the pacification that occurred after 1970.

These protests were a disaster. Many people were arrested and beaten badly. At that time, the "path of health" was put into use. This was when the police would build a road by standing on both sides of the path and a person that was arrested was forced to go through this path and be beaten by the police. After you went through this path, you were unconscious from the beating.

A few months later, the Committee for the Defense of Workers was established. Formally, this committee had a few very prominent Poles who published a statement about the abuse of human rights and the treatment of the workers. A lot of new active groups started to organize around this committee. For example, there were people who collected money to help the arrested workers’ families; people who cooperated with lawyers who were brave enough to defend the workers in the courts; and people who began to publish
underground papers. Eventually, the core of this group began to use the law against the communists in a way the communists could not contest them.

At this point, I started to share my life between academic activities and something we called social activity with the above noted initiatives. I believed that this was proper and just.

In 1979, thanks to one of my professors, I left to America. It was a one year exchange to the University of Kansas in Lawrence. It was a very important experience for me on two levels. First, of course, it was a big scientific adventure. I had the opportunity to work in a seminar with Jack Brehm, a prominent social psychologist. Thanks to him, I also met one of the biggest names in psychology—Fritz Heider.

The second level was the experience of American democracy and American life. This was the first time in my life that I felt really free, and I could operationalize the concept of freedom.

I also learned the consequences of democracy from the simplest experiences. For example, Polish society, with all of its idiotic communist slogans based on no barriers between social classes, was fragmented and hierarchically built. If you belonged to the intelligentsia, the worker was nobody to you. Of course, during my stay in America, I had the opportunity to meet representatives of different
social groups, and all of them had a sort of dignity. For instance, one time I met a chimney cleaner. We were equal. He was good at cleaning chimneys, and I was a good young scientist. We were equal people in our professions. I had a lot of such experiences, and I think that they influenced me very much.

I was back in Poland in the summer of 1980. Things began to happen quickly. I became engaged in the Solidarity movement. One level of my engagement was connected with my university position. I was involved in many initiatives to regain freedom for the universities through a new law about education in Poland, new proposals on education on different levels including the universities, and against censorship.

The second level of my involvement was on the professional level. Being a social psychologist, I was very useful for very different activities of the Solidarity movement. For example, I was teaching workers in factories to defend themselves from manipulation by state representatives. I was helping them in the negotiation processes with management. I was an adviser to the Solidarity Council on many social issues. I was involved in research about the movement--about the situation and problems of groups within the movement like teachers or women workers.

During this period, I also spent a lot of time with my students. A new regulation at Warsaw University was
instituted that allowed students to have an important voice in selecting the Vice Dean of the Department of Education and Student Affairs. As a result, when the new academic year started in the fall of 1980, I was nominated for Vice Dean of the Psychology Faculty. Then, martial law came.

I was arrested almost immediately. Martial law was instituted on December 13, 1981. There was a list of people to be arrested and interned. I was on the list. I managed to avoid being arrested the night of martial law, but they got me two days later. I was released at the end of June, 1982. I went back to the University, but not as Vice-Dean.

I was now underground, as were all activists. The authorities tried to make us emigrate from Poland, and they managed to make our lives relatively difficult. For example, often there were 48 hour arrests, because no reason was needed for the first 48 hours of an arrest. They would search your apartment and other things while you were in custody.

In 1987, there was an amnesty for those who were in prisons at that time. Also, I got information that I could go abroad on a regular passport. This meant that I could finally go abroad and come back to Poland. Before, I was offered only a one-way passport. So, I went to Holland where my second husband lived. He’s Dutch. I stayed there for awhile because it turned out that I could be very useful
for supporting the movement as somebody who knew it very well and with the cooperation of Radio Free Europe.

For two years I worked exclusively at passing information from Poland through Amsterdam to Munich and back to Poland. This information was from Solidarity contacts and my network in Poland. These contacts gave me access to information sometimes only several minutes after an event took place in Poland. Of course, this meant a lot of planning on the part of my Polish counterparts because they had to pass the information through communications that were monitored by the secret police. This was possible, though, because telephone communications between Poland and Holland were very good. The communists didn’t care about a small country like Holland, but Germany, for instance, was different. Communications with Germany, from Poland, were difficult.

In 1989, this task was completed when the Round Table took place, and I returned to Gdansk and stayed there until the first free presidential election when Walesa was elected. I was a spokesperson for Solidarity. Then, I returned to Amsterdam and mostly my activity involved being a bridge for different Polish-Western initiatives. Being Polish and living in the West, I could help both sides.

I became involved in this project when Tadeusz Kluszewski called me in Amsterdam and told me that he had a problem recruiting a group of scholars to go to The Ohio
State University to prepare a syllabus for Polish teacher training. He wondered if I was interested. I did not know if I was interested, but I did not have anything else to do at the moment, so I said that I would go.

Experiences and Choices Over Time

In the Choice Corollary and the Experience Corollary, Kelly (1955) noted that we pick and choose abstractions from our experiences based upon our existing construct system. Our system changes and/or develops with our various abstractions from experience. We adjust our anticipatory hypotheses about reality through the choices we make during our lifetimes.

In the case of Thersa Kobuczewska, her definition of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship changed after the collapse of communism in Poland. She recounted this change in her first reflection.

On October 2, 1992, she wrote in her journal that, before the collapse of communism, her definition was clear and uncomplicated: "I thought that defining the role of the school [in a democracy] was quite simple. It provides students with a knowledge about democracy, democratic institutions, values and procedures, as well as organizing their democratic experiences." Her only concern was at the operational level, where "teachers' incompetence, the 'stupid' curriculum, etc." would be a problem.
However, after the fall of communism, Thersa realized that she was mistaken: "I was wrong. My point of view was based on the naive, idealistic, and static concept of democracy." For Thersa, the concept of democracy, whether in a transitional or an established democratic society, became increasingly complex after she experienced the fall of communism.

Poland’s transition to democracy moved from a hope to a reality after the return of free elections in 1989. At that time, Thersa’s understanding of democracy as a static concept began to change. As Poland’s transition to democracy began to unfold, she realized that "when evaluating democracy within its own standards, the results are ambiguous and very often discouraging."

The ambiguity that leads to frequent discouragement remained evident in Thersa’s definition of democracy at the start of her cross-cultural experience: "One can say that democracy is a process of solving problems in situations that are really ill defined."

Based on her experiences during Poland’s transition from communism to democracy, Thersa’s definition of democracy modulated from a hypothetical and fixed definition of democracy to one of ambiguity grounded in a realization of the difficulties common among democratic societies. Democracy and the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship took on a different meaning for
Theresa as she moved from life outside the democratic experience and under totalitarianism to an understanding of life inside a transitional democratic experience after the collapse of totalitarianism.

Theresa related this personal history of her changing definition of democracy at the start of her cross-cultural experience. In light of her changing definition of democracy, what choices had Theresa made while abstracting elements from her background that defined the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship? Her first journal entry gave an indication:

... any civic education program must include not only knowledge and procedures to develop skills specific for the subject, but also to develop unspecific ones, such as interpersonal skills, tolerance for nonconformity, and the ability to deal with ambiguity and conflict.

Last, but not least, civic education must stimulate curiosity for other people and for the society as a whole. Such an approach, I believe, can increase a student's capacity to collect relevant experiences from many other sources. This can, at least to some extent, protect him/her from any indoctrination, which I perceive to be one of the biggest threats to educating for democratic citizenship in a democracy.

Over the course of her cross-cultural experience, Theresa continued to elaborate on the threat of indoctrination. She pointed frequently to indoctrination as a danger to democratic societies and how these societies educate students for citizenship.

To Theresa, indoctrination thrived on ideology. In a totalitarian society, ideological indoctrination was the accepted norm. This sort of ideological acceptance in a
society that called itself "democratic" corrupted the very notion of democracy.

In her last journal entry, Thersa defined again the democratic society with the scepter of ideology's "perfect figure" fixed firmly in her thoughts:

First, democracy is a process by its very nature. It differs upon place and time in both practice and its "ideal form." Second, this process is not "natural" in the sense that since once it has been started, it will develop toward the "perfect figure." It has its "ups" and "downs." The democratic process can be violated.

To survive and to develop, democracy must be nurtured on different levels of society, by average, "unimportant" people. If so, the individual must learn about this necessity as well as the means for supporting the democratic process. He/she has to learn about the advantages of democracy in comparison to other forms of societal organization; about threats to democracy; its developmental possibilities; and also about the power of a single person to influence, change, and improve things.

In this definition, the role of a citizen in a democracy protects democracy from becoming an immovable ideology rather than a continuous process.

In December, Thersa offered me her last definition of the school's role in educating citizens for life in a democracy. Thersa formed her final definition through a series of questions. These questions concerned the responsibility of the school in preventing the corruption of democracy:

The question remains, however, if school is able to take this responsibility. There are several threats to education for citizenship in school.

First, some of them are connected with the quality of curricula. Are we able to provide children with proper knowledge and skills in this very delicate and complicated domain? How can we avoid a kind of
indoctrination (even based on good intentions) when presenting democracy as superior to any other forms of social organization? How can we teach children to differentiate between the possible and the impossible, and the worthy of effort and the meaningless? How can we make them idealistic enough to take a risk for the sake of the common good and be realistic enough to meet bravely failure and helplessness?

Second, there are problems of teachers' personal civic attitudes and beliefs. How do they influence students? How can we help teachers to distinguish their private resentments and preferences from what they should teach the children of other citizens?

Last but not least, how can we avoid pressure on the educational system from different interest groups like political parties, the Church, business lobbies, etc.?

Unfortunately there are no easy (if any) answers for such questions. We can focus public opinion on schooling. We can try to make all society feel responsible for the education of the young generation. We can encourage the best scholars to concentrate on these issues. Even if we will be effective with all of it, there is no guarantee of final success. But, we have to keep trying.

A comparison of Thersa's first and last reflections revealed two levels of consistency in her definition of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

First, her superordinate construct maintained the sub-constructs of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Second, her construct system, based on her previous experiences before and after the collapse of communism, filtered her choice of objects and events in her cross-cultural experience. With regard to the latter, her concern over the indoctrination of democracy reflected the possibility of offering "old wine in new bottles" to the Polish educational system and society.

What, then, were the objects and events Thersa chose to abstract from her cross-cultural experience that highlighted
the contrast and likeness ends of her superordinate construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship? What experiences indicated the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that schools needed to address in order to fulfill their role in nurturing democratic citizenship—a notion of citizenship that involves participation in a process and not allegiance to a fixed doctrine? In contrast, what events and objects cautioned her on the ideological pitfalls in American education for democratic citizenship that should be avoided in Poland?

**Thersa's Construction of "Knowledge"**

From the beginning of her experience, Thersa believed that knowledge was a partner with skills and attitudes in dealing with life in a democracy. The following comment from her first reflection exemplified her belief that knowledge was a necessary component in educating for democratic citizenship and her belief that knowledge was on a level with the sub-constructs of skills and attitudes: "I do believe that knowledge and intellectual as well as emotional skills are necessary to approach and solve any problem."

The importance of knowledge in educating for democratic citizenship remained constant during Thersa's cross-cultural experience. We conducted our last interview on December 20, 1992—two days before her departure for Amsterdam. During that interview, Thersa recounted the construction of her
experience in the United States. She reflected on the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship, and she cautioned that this sort of education must not "neglect the meaning of knowledge." The meaning of knowledge in a democracy related crucially to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

The issue throughout Thersa’s stay in the United States was not the need for knowledge in educating for democratic citizenship. Her assumption of its necessity was clear and consistent. Her concern centered on the way schools define knowledge in a democracy—ideologically or democratically.

Defining Knowledge Ideologically

Thersa’s definition of ideology resembled one offered by Bell (1961) when he noted that

ideology makes it unnecessary for people to confront individual issues on their individual merits. One simply turns to the ideological vending machine, and out comes the prepared formulae. And when these beliefs are suffused by apocalyptic fervor, ideas become weapons, and with dreadful results. (pp. 399–400)

During our first interview, Thersa paralleled this definition in relation to knowledge and the role of schools in Polish society under communism: "In the sense of content, school was supposed to maintain the totalitarian organization of the society."

This description of the role of knowledge in educating for citizenship in a totalitarian society was similar to the role of knowledge in any society’s schools as defined by
Thersa in her first reflection. Somehow, she thought, knowledge maintained a position of unquestioned acceptance in schools:

School is always a "few steps" behind current developments within society. Such "conservatism" seems to be natural: school tends to provide students with a knowledge which is broadly shared, properly confirmed, consistent, and recognized as meaningful. One can say, then, that school prepares students for life in the past rather than in the future, or even the present. The conservative nature of school with regard to knowledge perpetrated an ideological perspective when educating for democratic citizenship. The notion of a "fixed" body of knowledge was antithetical to democracy.

Changing the notion of fixed knowledge in schools was problematic for Thersa. If students understood knowledge as permanent, how could they learn to look at democracy as a process in which knowledge changed in content and usefulness?

Over time, Thersa reflected on this problem through her experience as a scientist. Her pre-existing construct system with regard to knowledge centered upon the investigation of phenomena. Thersa's scientific background was evident in her definition of democracy as "a process of solving problems that are really ill defined." However, upon reflection of her teaching career with university students, Thersa noted that inquiry methods useful to educating for democratic citizenship did not satiate her students' desires for fixed "information": "In Poland (and I
think generally in Europe) students expect to be provided with a kind of formal knowledge (theories, definitions, experimental data, names of scientists)."

I understood Thersa’s point on this matter. However, an event that highlighted her point entered my field of experience over the course of the following spring. During the spring quarter, 1993, my classmate Joe and I taught one of the social studies methods courses in the College of Education. Throughout the course, Joe and I reflected on the inclination of some preservice students to teach fixed information. This attitude about learning how to teach seemed a bit strange. Some of the students’ concerns were not aimed at evaluating the types of methods one can use in educating for democratic citizenship when applying knowledge to the problems of life in a democracy. Instead, their reaction papers and class participation indicated to us that the transmission of fixed information was adequate for the task of educating for democratic citizenship.

I reflected on this situation through my past experience as a preservice teacher. I remembered my undergraduate career in preservice teacher education courses while I majored officially in history. I lived in a state of seemingly constant cognitive dissonance over "getting it right" for my history professors and "using it right" for my education professors. The content scholars gave a prescription, and the methods teachers emphasized a process.
Eventually, these two positions met in a synergetic relationship during my teaching experience in secondary social studies classes.

In addition, my experience with the methods course in the spring of 1993 prompted my memory of a journal entry written by Thersa during the middle portion of her cross-cultural experience. Her reflection related to this problem over knowledge as fixed and knowledge as a tool for solving problems.

We attended the Ohio Wesleyan University "Conference on Educating for Democracy" on November 12 and 13, 1992. Afterward, Thersa noted with disdain that some scholars responsible for democratic citizenship education in the United States could take an ideological view of their role. In her journal, Thersa wrote the following: "If I limit my trip to the United States to this conference, I would never try to teach 'citizenship' in Poland because it confirms my main fear that some people are very ready to prepare ideological prescriptions for others."

Thersa went on to express her disappointment in the presenters' lack of knowledge concerning American education. This cross-cultural experience added to Thersa's contrast end of the sub-construct of knowledge in educating for democratic citizenship. The notion of "ideological prescriptions" necessary for schools in educating for democratic citizenship confirmed her thoughts that any
society, even a democracy, can ideologize knowledge into a prescription for life.

Defining Knowledge Democratically

To Thersa, the application of knowledge to problems in a democracy was the proper use of knowledge. Specification of fixed bits of information did not fulfill this task. Rather, as she noted in our first interview, "I believe in the power of knowledge for the social life of people."

During the course of the project, Thersa's experience with More's methods class highlighted the need to blend content with inquiry in developing the knowledge necessary to solve problems in a democracy. More's course dealt specifically with reflective inquiry as a method of teaching social studies. Very much a proponent of Dewey's philosophy of education, More centered his course on the relationship of knowledge to the process of how we think through a problem in a democratic society.

Reflecting on More's course, Thersa wrote the following entry in her journal on October 7--three weeks into More's methods course: "After more than 20 years of teaching students, I have found something that is really new for me. . . . There is the very stimulating application of the 'inquiry' approach to education."

In the same reflection, however, Thersa began considering the "lack of knowledge about how we can organize our lives after the collapse of communism." In order for
people to participate in a democratic society, she believed that skills essential for democratic citizenship were equally crucial to knowledge when "solving problems in situations that are really ill defined."

**Thersa's Construction of "Skills"**

Thersa's knowledge sub-construct developed rather than changed during her cross-cultural experience. Her vision of knowledge in a democracy represented the likeness end of her sub-construct if that knowledge served a purpose in solving problems. This axiom applied also to the development of new knowledge in the form of solutions to problems. In contrast, the opposite pole of her knowledge sub-construct enveloped the use of knowledge as a fixed entity. This sort of knowledge could be used as a weapon against democracy if applied ideologically through indoctrination. In the course of refining this differentiation, Thersa probed her cross-cultural experience for the skills necessary to operationalize knowledge as defined for democratic citizenship.

During the course of her 14 weeks in the United States, Thersa noted two related levels of skills necessary for schools to emphasize in educating for democratic citizenship. One level involved the skills necessary for students to develop during their education for democratic citizenship. The other level dealt with teacher preparation skills appropriate for familiarizing pre-collegiate teachers
with teaching methods aimed at helping students achieve the proper use of knowledge in a democracy.

Skills for Students in a Democracy

Thersa began her cross-cultural experience with an imprecise notion of the skills that students should learn for life in a democratic society. However, she noted in our first interview that "an individual can participate in the society only when they are developed in a social-psychological sense." She went on to define the social-psychological sense as "skills of interaction combined with knowledge of self-worth."

Unspecific as her skills sub-construct's elements were at the start of the project, the social skills that students needed to learn in a democracy became clearer through several cross-cultural experiences during the project. These experiences included a workshop on leadership, a field trip to a school, and the social studies methods course.

On October 5 and 6, John Goryl conducted a workshop on leadership skills in a democracy. Thersa abstracted this event as something that built upon her sub-construct framework of social skills in a democracy: "He proposed to help children at school to develop leadership competence by stimulating the same skills that are needed for adult leaders, like the ability to speak to big audiences."

Thersa abstracted this experience because it bred a sense of continuity between childhood and adulthood in a
democracy. This workshop also gave her reason to reflect on Polish classrooms after communism. The residual, authoritarian personalities of Polish teachers needed to be changed because "for Polish education, the hidden assumption is that those two worlds—'the world of children' and 'the adult world'—are totally different and should be separated to some degree."

Thersa highlighted the need for social skill development in problem solving after the Polish educators visited a suburban elementary school on November 2. As part of this field experience, she visited a third grade mathematics lesson. During the class, the teacher asked the students to divide into groups of four. Each group had to decide how to spend $14.00. In her journal, Thersa described the scene that followed:

Then, a common decision making process started. The teacher was very concerned about the children following democratic rules. She was stressing the right of everybody to express one's own opinion, the importance of listening to others, etc. The children were amazingly competent in this process. I liked the idea of such exercises in school very much.

During our next interview, Thersa referred to this sort of democratic skill development activity as a "positive approach to educating for democratic citizenship. Teachers must give students the possibility to solve problems and exercise their abilities on the issues. It cannot be given through simple, traditional prescriptions."
On December 12, I interviewed Thersa for the fourth time. Her experience with More's social studies methods class had passed. The quarter at Ohio State was over, and the Polish educators were near the end of the cross-cultural portion of the project. She reflected upon her experience in More's class and mentioned the aspects of social skills he emphasized in his course--inquiry based social skills for democracy. I asked her how she would explain this type of skill:

It depends on to whom I was supposed to explain it. I could call it active teaching, or problem solving teaching, or teaching based on the personal experiences of the students. Methods and techniques are prepared so that the student can exercise different social roles and positions for themselves.

More's use of role playing, psycho-dramas, and simulations represented to Thersa some of the ways that schools in a democracy can develop inquiry skills in children. These skills, like those displayed in Goryl's workshop and in the third grade classroom, embodied the role of schools in educating students to be life-long inquirers and problem solvers through the development of social skills.

In addition, Thersa noted the "crucial" aspect of such skill development as "putting someone in someone else's shoes. In this sense, the technique is important. Asking questions of 'How?' or 'Why?' is different than questions of 'When?' or 'Is it true?'" This notion of sociality, prominent in the theory of personal constructs, was a bedrock of skill development for Thersa. The techniques
used for helping students to understand the constructions of others exemplified the interpersonal skills needed to deal with ambiguity and conflict and to develop tolerance for nonconformity. As noted in her opening reflection, Thersa believed these skills indispensable in a democracy. Over time, she developed a construct that defined these skills.

Preparing Teachers' Skills in a Democracy

During the middle section of the project, Thersa's skills sub-construct began to focus on the role of the teacher educator in a democratic society. This shift seemed appropriate. "Schools and Democratic Society" was a course plan was for teacher educators in Poland. By mid-project, the intensity of the curriculum seminars reflected the Polish educators urge to complete their task.

On November 22, Thersa wrote to me about the present situation of Polish teacher education—a residual of the communist legacy—in comparison to her experience during the project. She began with a comparison of Polish teacher education before World War II and during the communist era:

Before World War II, we had some famous, excellent teachers and "teachers of teachers," but during the communist period, there was negative ideological selection for education. As an effect, involved in education were only "second rate" scientists, not good enough to succeed in other academic disciplines.

Thersa believed that the state of education in post-communist Poland reflected this situation: "I imagine that these people [OC: teachers formerly loyal to communism] could teach citizenship again, but all they would do is add
the word 'democratic,' and it will be the same ideological garbage. That is why the key point is to have competent people."

Again, Thersa referred to More's social studies methods course when she spoke or wrote of what teacher education should be in a democracy. To prepare competent teachers, higher education needed teacher educators who could embody teaching methods for democratic citizenship education. Thersa believed this posture in teacher educators to be the key to successful teacher education in a democracy:

I like that More is ready to take responsibility for what he is teaching his students. He doesn't treat himself as an object that stands between the knowledge and the students. He is not a transmitter of knowledge. He is much more. He's taking responsibility for convincing them, or making them believe that there are worse and better ways to teach. It is a big responsibility because one can be mistaken.

Teacher educators taking responsibility for their charge in developing teachers for a democratic nation's schools became essential to Thersa during her cross-cultural experience.

Thersa's sub-construct of skills for teacher educators in a democracy emerged over the second half of her cross-cultural experience. These skills reflected the skills students needed to learn in a democratic society. In our final interview, Thersa noted the importance of her cross-cultural abstractions concerning skills for teachers to develop and teacher educators to exemplify:

[An] important impact is the issue of teaching methodology. Somehow, this helped me to feel better about my concerns over ideological indoctrination. The
inquiry approach and the variety of techniques give me a kind of self-confidence that shows me that we are able to avoid a ridiculous repetition of what the communists were doing, but only with a different ideology.

What, then, constituted Thersa's sub-construct with regard to the attitudes "that avoided a ridiculous repetition of what the communists were doing?" What did she abstract from her cross-cultural experience that defined her sub-construct of the attitudes necessary for schools to address while educating for democratic citizenship?

**Thersa's Construction of "Attitudes"**

Thersa Kobuczewska entered her cross-cultural experience with two essential attitudes that schools needed to foster while educating for democratic citizenship. In her opening reflection, Thersa defined these two attitudes as tolerance for non-conformity and tolerance for ambiguity.

During the course of her cross-cultural experience, Thersa chose additional attitudinal elements that schools as institutions can foster in educating for democratic citizenship. These additional elements blended with her pre-existing pair.

In her last reflection, the likeness end of Thersa's attitudes sub-construct indicated an expanded range of convenience that included these additional elements. At the end of her cross-cultural experience, these elements included the civic attitudes and beliefs of teachers and the
role that teachers' attitudes and beliefs play in educating for democratic citizenship.

Between her first and last reflections, Thersa defined the barriers to democratic attitude development in Polish schools that are indigenous to the social, political, and economic conditions evident in Poland's transition to democracy. Paradoxically, ideology as a barrier to and an acceptable aspect of education for democratic citizenship became part of her attitudes subconstruct.

Barriers to Democratic Attitudes in Poland

Thersa's autobiography indicated an intimate association with communist philosophy and mechanisms before 1989. This association was antagonistic. By waging a campaign against communism, Thersa learned well the object of communist desires in her totalitarian Poland--ideological indoctrination. After the success of Solidarity in terminating the monolithic domination of communism in Poland, Thersa experienced the growing pains of a democracy in transition. These pains ramified to the attitudes of society and burdened the schools in their charge to educate for democratic citizenship.

Residual ideology. At the start of her cross-cultural experience, Thersa defined the role of ideology in Polish schools and society as the contrast end of her attitudes subconstruct. In our first interview, she delineated
ideology from democracy. Thersa offered the following construction based on these dichotomous poles:

Ideology is consistent. Democracy is a set of values, and ideology is a prescription for life in the sense of the whole society and the individual. Democracy is not a prescription. Democracy asks you to keep some values. Democracy says, "Keep the values and try your best to fulfill them." Ideology gives you the prescription on how to fulfill the values.

Thersa and I discussed this comment in relation to my teaching experience. In my years as a teacher in American schools, I noticed many people who believed dogmatically in "democracy" and taught democratic values in a doctrinaire manner. Her position was that "democracy" taught dogmatically was something other than democracy. By definition, democracy could not be taught in this manner.

The dogmatic attitude of teachers in any society reminded Thersa of the "totalitarian structures of minds" that she confronted throughout her years as a psychologist in a communist society:

The totalitarian system, since it was assumed to influence people in the global sense, not only was filling some content into human minds, but also was trying to shape them in a formal sense. As an example, it produced closed minds consisting of mental tools for perceiving the world in the categories of "black" and "white" that result in intolerance for ambiguity. By this, I mean that people were searching for a clear and final answer for any question.

Closed-mindedness and intolerance of ambiguity--residuals of communist ideology--represented social-psychological obstacles to democratic attitudes in Polish society and Polish education.
The Church. Throughout her cross-cultural experience, Thersa noted that the fall of totalitarian communism did not automatically open avenues for the development of democratic attitudes in Poland. Actually, she believed that the fall of communism opened the way for other forms of totalitarian thought to enter the scene, particularly the Roman Catholic Church. In our first interview, she noted that "the Church is a totalitarian institution. At least it is producing ideology that concerns every area of an individual's life—not just spiritual, but also political and economic."

This report contains several references to the social power of the Catholic Church in Poland. In Thersa's case, the role of the Church in Poland's transitional democracy was a source of cognitive dissonance. The Church played a key role in the overthrow of communism. During many of our discussions on the Solidarity movement, Thersa referred to the Church in extremely positive terms. However, Thersa believed that the priests, nuns, and brothers who assisted in the downfall of communism were no longer the voice of the Church: "Now, I think that the Church will try it's best to prevent 'unhealthy' influences in education, like from the democracies of the so-called 'decadent West.'"

Barriers of transition. For Thersa, attitudinal barriers to democratic citizenship did not stem exclusively from ideology. The downfall of communism left vacuous pockets in social thought that were being filled by
institutions such as the Church. However, the economic and political transition to democracy offered additional barriers to the development of attitudes conducive to democratic citizenship.

In our first interview, Thersa noted that "political and economic instability influences any area of life, including schooling." She likened the intolerance for economic and political ambiguity in transitional Poland to a "corrosion of values," whether these values are democratic or not.

Her construction of the situation in Poland revealed the need for schools, as a mechanism for social development, to fill quickly this growing vacuum of values. In our second interview, she was not ready to accept her cross-cultural experience with American schools as a method by which Polish schools could assist in filling this vacuum with attitudes essential to a democratic society:

I'm still not sure, and probably won't be until the end of our interaction here, if schools can be really helpful in education for democratic citizenship in a country in which there is a kind of consensus for democracy, but it is not yet built... People are losing something faster than gaining in this transition.

Attitudes Schools Can Foster in a Transitional Democracy

Thersa's thoughts on the barriers to the development of democratic attitudes in Poland remained constant during her cross-cultural experience. However, her construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship that
can overcome these barriers began to form during the middle of her experience.

In our last interview, Thersa reiterated her definition of the attitudes schools can foster in educating for democratic citizenship: "I'm talking about the democratization of the Polish school. For me, that means flexibility, openness, the connection of education with the present life of society, and a kind of humanization of schools and education." An event Thersa chose from the middle portion of her cross-cultural experience highlighted the objects and events she experienced in constructing this conclusion.

On October 8, the Polish educators visited a Columbus elementary school in a lower middle class neighborhood. A fairly typical public elementary school by my experience, Thersa noted that the attitude of the school struck her as very different from her experiences in Poland:

It was the approach and attitude toward kids. I was very impressed when the vice principal said, "Maybe the school is the only place where children are safe, and they were very glad that we could make such a place for them."

In her journal, Thersa detailed her experience in one of the school's classes: "It was a mathematics lesson--'objectively' not the easiest one about which to express concern and warm feelings--but still, the teacher was acting in such a manner." She went on to note that attitudes promoting the acceptance of ethnic and racial differences,
teachers' patience with children, and security of the learning environment that allowed students to express their interests were aspects of schooling vastly different from her experiences in Poland.

In our next interview, I asked her how this experience compared to her previous construct of schooling. She told me that "mostly, when you go to school, you listen to teachers yelling at kids and complaining. Sometimes, I think that teachers are the only people in Poland who don't like kids!" With regard to Thersa's definition of the democratic attitudes that schools can foster in students, this school visit built a foundation for the likeness end of her sub-construct.

Teacher Values in a Democracy

At the mid-point of Thersa's cross-cultural experience, she developed a fragmentation in her superordinate construct system of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. This fragmentation concerned the function of a teacher's values in educating for democratic citizenship.

Throughout the course of her stay in the United States, Thersa cautioned that ideological indoctrination of democracy in Polish schools after the fall of communism was nothing more than a change of slogans--old wine in new bottles. However, her experience with Harold Reese's workshop on the philosophy of education in a democracy raised an issue she had not considered earlier: "I don't
want to say that I agree with him on everything, but what I’ve learned is that ideology does not have to be connected with indoctrination."

Thersa made this comment during our second interview, and my confusion over this comment begged more information. She expanded on this comment:

I thought that maybe it’s not a stupid idea that when one is teaching teachers to give them a kind of moral paradigm that will help them to recognize that some ways of influencing students are more just than others.

I asked her to explain how someone like herself, an activist against the ideological numbing of social consciousness, could now differentiate ideology from indoctrination. She explicated this change, and this change carried through to the end of her experience:

What Reese meant by ideology was a set of values. It is more of an awareness of the values you are promoting while you are teaching. This is very important because everyone is promoting something. He called it the ideology that is basic to education in a democracy.

From this point on, whenever Thersa defined her attitudes sub-construct in relation to teacher values and ideology, she included the "democratic personality" as the likeness end of this sub-construct.

Near the end of her stay at the Mershon Center, I asked Thersa if she would identify the democratic personalities she abstracted from her experience. She noted three. In no discernable order, they were More, Gaudet, and Livingston.

With regard to More, "I think that it is the way in which he perceives the world. He is curious about the
world, and he makes no assumptions about the world. He accepts differences. This is a democratic posture in a teacher."

In references to Gaudet and Livingston, Thersa abstracted their attitudes of cooperation and tolerance during the project, specifically during the curriculum seminars:

I learned from them that cooperation gives a sort of free space for the transformation of experiences. First of all, this is based on the tolerance of "teachers" and the active approach of "students" instead of the "giving-taking" behavioral pattern.

Thersa couched these references to Gaudet, Livingston, and More's democratic personalities within the context of her experiences that related directly to the project.

She saw these experiences as valuable on the level of what a teacher should be in a society struggling through transition to democracy. In addition, she referred to these three people as having the democratic attitudes necessary for cooperative efforts in developing democratic citizenship education programs between established and fledgling democracies--no prescriptions, but related beliefs steeped in tolerance, cooperation, and open-mindedness. She believed that students could learn these attitudes through teachers who "treat the basic values of democracy as their own. At least they behave like that. Somehow, it works."
Summary

Kelly (1955) referred analogically to an impermeable construct as an hypothesis that leaves "no doubt about its being wholly shattered or left intact at the end of an experiment" (p. 81). He went on to explain that permeable constructs, like theories, are "stated in an open-ended form. A theory, then, both provokes and accepts a wide variety of experimental ventures, some of which may even be antithetical to each other" (p. 81).

Before and immediately following the downfall of communism, Thersa had two distinct, yet related, constructs of democracy. These two constructs included two versions of her superordinate construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. As she moved through her cross-cultural experience, construct change and/or development continued in her sub-constructs of knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for schools to consider in educating for democratic citizenship.

Her background in scientific inquiry, anti-communist political activism, and teacher education in Poland developed her theoretical notions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Her superordinate construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship provoked and accepted a wide variety of experimental ventures, including the seemingly antithetical acceptance of ideology as part of a democratic attitude.
What Were the Changes?

With regard to the changes concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship, Thersa went from a position of "what" should be done in a post-communist democracy to "if" it could be done in a post-communist democracy. Her changing superordinate construct came to light in her aforementioned first and last reflections.

Specifically, Thersa entered her experience with the position that knowledge was important in the education of young people for democratic citizenship. Over time, her knowledge sub-construct developed to include the application of content to the inquiry processes necessary for confronting problems and issues in a democratic society. Related to the application of knowledge, Thersa's subordinate construct developed from a fixed body of information with ideological overtones to a fluid construction of knowledge. This development became an important aspect of Thersa's sub-construct of knowledge in a transitional democracy's schools as they educate for democratic citizenship.

Thersa's sub-construct of skills developed during her cross-cultural experience. Her sub-construct of skills expanded in range of convenience to those skills necessary for pre-collegiate students and teachers in a democracy. At the base of her sub-construct was the application of skills that could operationalize knowledge through the inquiry
process. Thersa’s abstraction of skills that represented a bridge between childhood and adulthood in a democracy grew from the base of her skills sub-construct.

Teaching methods representative of the goal of bridging the gap between childhood and adulthood were techniques that adapted well to the social-psychological growth of the child. These teaching techniques included role playing, simulation, psycho-dramas, and problem solving exercises based in social experiences relevant to the life of the child.

Thersa’s construction of the attitudes schools needed to reflect in practice and engender in students began with tolerance for ambiguity and tolerance for non-conformity. These attitudes represented the opposing pole of her sub-construct in relation to her prior experiences. She noted residual ideological attitudes, the Polish Roman Catholic Church, and the economic and political barriers present in Poland’s transition to democracy as elements of the contrast end of her attitudes sub-construct.

Over the course of her cross-cultural experience, Thersa abstracted two levels of change in the sub-construct of attitudes. On the level of teacher values, Thersa reversed her stand on ideology to include no longer those values that represent a "moral paradigm" for teachers in a democracy. In a related sense, the notion of a teacher’s civic beliefs embodied in a "democratic personality"
represented the second level of change. She left her cross-cultural experience noting the importance of flexibility, openness, and the belief that education is connected to the present life of society as important changes in the attitudes necessary for teacher educators and teachers in a democratic society.

*What Experiences Delimited the Construct?*

Thersa's abstractions from Professor More's social studies methods class represented the most prevalent experience with regard to the likeness end of her knowledge sub-construct. The application of knowledge to the resolution of problems in a democracy and the need to rethink the value of knowledge, as opposed to the belief in fixed knowledge, highlighted this experience. Additionally, her experience with scholars at the Ohio Wesleyan University "Conference on Educating for Democracy" represented new experiences that defined the contrast end of her knowledge sub-construct. Her disdain over scholars in a democracy who ideologized knowledge rubbed against the likeness end of her sub-construct. In so doing, Thersa's abstraction from this experience gave her sub-construct of knowledge a precise level of clarity.

With regard to skills, Thersa highlighted three delimiting abstractions from her cross-cultural experience. First, John Goryl's leadership workshop highlighted the skills necessary for schools to develop in children as they
learn to be democratic citizens. This experience represented a bridge between childhood and adulthood in a democracy that enlarged Thersa's sub-construct.

Second, seeing students in an elementary classroom share thoughts and procedures on how to spend $14.00 gave Thersa a chance to test the buoyancy of her changing sub-construct while experiencing new events. The cooperative efforts of the students and the encouragement of the teacher represented the skills needed to live and work in a democratic society.

Third, More's social studies methods class represented to Thersa the same sort of experience as the elementary school visit, but in relation to teacher education. More's ability to teach prospective teachers through the skills he valued as necessary to teach pre-collegiate students in a democracy expanded Thersa's sub-construct of skills.

The attitudes Thersa constructed through the "moral paradigm" that represented her fragmentation on the role of ideology in education emerged from the workshop with Harold Reese. Thersa experienced the "moral paradigm" during a school visit to a lower middle class Columbus public school. As abstracted by Thersa, the "warm and friendly" attitude of the teacher represented a basis for her construction of the "democratic personality." The professional habits of More, Gaudet, and Livingston--as they performed their roles in the project--reflected this personality.
What Was the Role of Her Previous Constructs

Thersa's prominent role in the collapse of Polish communism and her ambitious attitude toward scientific inquiry acted as aspects of her previous construction of the knowledge necessary for schools to apply as they educate for democratic citizenship. Thersa's ideologically subdued high school education, her shock over the expulsion of Polish scholars after 1968, and her experiences with average Americans during her time in Lawrence, Kansas, were aspects of her previous superordinate construct that pointed toward the unacceptable role of ideologized knowledge. These experiences represented the contrast and likeness ends of her previous superordinate construct with regard to knowledge.

Thersa's experiences with Polish teachers and teacher educators revealed a distinct contrast end to her sub-construct of skills. The inability of Polish teachers to view students as future citizens and the persistence of "second rate" scholars in the Polish teacher education programs were aspects of her pre-existing construct system in relation to skills.

With regard to attitudes, Thersa's explication of the barriers to education for democratic citizenship in Poland were elements of her superordinate construct's contrast end. The Church, residual ideology, and the political and economic pains of transition to democracy represented these
pre-existing elements. These elements were a basis for evaluation of that which she experienced during her cross-cultural experience as possibilities for Polish education. Although cross-cultural experiences that could be applied under Poland’s transitional conditions emerged in each of Thersa’s sub-constructs, sub-construct development regarding democratic attitudes in and through Polish schooling appeared ascendent.

Across the Cases

The preceding five sections of this chapter presented construct change and development over time and on a case-by-case basis. The construct under investigation was the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. I termed this construct a "superordinate construct." A superordinate construct exists as one of many in a person’s overall construct system. Additionally, a superordinate construct binds together various, but related, sub-constructs (Kelly, 1955, 1970).

During the data gathering and analysis process, three sub-constructs emerged. These sub-constructs were knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

Concomitantly, three questions emerged during this study. These three questions drove the construction of the cases in this chapter. These questions were:

- Assuming the Polish educator’s constructions of the role of schools in educating for democratic
citizenship changed during their intensive cross-cultural experience, what were these changes?

- Which cross-cultural experiences of the Polish educators delimited their constructs of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship?

- How did the Polish educators' previous constructs blend with their cross-cultural environment and shape their construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship?

In light of my twin missions (describing and interpreting change and development within the three subconstructs and addressing the three questions raised by this study), this section involves the analysis of similarities and differences across the five cases. This sort of analysis offers the reader an overview of the five Polish educators' constructions of their superordinate construct over time and during a cross-cultural experience.

Kelly's (1955) Individuality Corollary provided the basis for this analysis. In this corollary, Kelly noted two aspects of how we construe the world around us. First, "persons differ from each other in their construction of events" (p. 55). Second, although there are individual differences between people's constructions of objects and events, the possibility remains that we can construe another person's experiences along with our experiences of the same object or event and come up with similarities.

In the first part of this section, I address these similarities and differences within the categories that emerged during the study and that comprised the knowledge,
skills, and attitudes sub-constructs. The second part of this section looks at the three sub-constructs across the cases and within the three questions.

**Across the Cases Categorically**

In Chapter III, I discussed the data analysis phases of this study. In the final phase, the three major categories, or sub-constructs, of knowledge, skills, and attitudes subsumed 12 minor categories. To illustrate the categorical similarities and differences of the five cases, Table 4 is a reproduction of Table 3 with a slight adjustment. Now, the names of the Polish educators occupy the minor categorical cells that emerged under the knowledge, skills, and attitudes sub-constructs.
### Table 4

**Final Data Analysis Cross-References by Case**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norbert, Maria, Rosza, Thersa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Agents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norbert</td>
<td>Norbert, Maria, Rosza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing School System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Witek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norbert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Maria, Witek, Rosza, Thersa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Witek, Rosza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global and Multicultural Education</td>
<td>Norbert, Maria, Witek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Schools in a Democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria, Witek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Pressures on Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Witek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>Norbert, Maria, Witek, Thersa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory versus Practice</td>
<td>Norbert</td>
<td>Rosza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norbert, Thersa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thersa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At best, this table provides a sense of case-by-case comparison through an illustration of the minor categories that emerged during each Polish educator’s cross-cultural experience.

What this table does not tell us is the Polish educators’ individual perceptions of cross-cultural experiences shared in common. Also, this table does not tell us how I interpreted the data on a case-by-case basis within the minor categories displayed above and with regard to the many cross-cultural events and objects experienced.
individually by the Polish educators outside the common, formal aspects of the project.

I resolved these inadequacies of Table 4 within each of the case studies developed previously in this chapter. However, the similarities and differences of the Polish educators' personal constructs concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship appear in neither the individual cases nor Table 4. The next part of this section contains this aspect of the study. How did the Polish educators construe comparatively their cross-cultural experiences with regard to the knowledge, skills, and attitudes sub-constructs of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship? A comparative view of the answers to the three emergent questions from this study deals with this question.

Across the Cases by Question and Sub-Construct

This part examines the similarities and differences between the five Polish educators as they abstracted objects and events from their cross-cultural experiences. Three questions and three major categories emerged during this study. This cross-case examination takes place through the answers to each question and within the sub-constructs of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that comprised the Polish educators' constructions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.
Question One

Assuming the Polish educators’ constructions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship changed during their intensive cross-cultural experience, what were these changes?

Throughout Kelly’s (1955) theory of personal constructs, he noted the similarity and difference between construct change and construct development. For purposes of analysis, I stayed with Kelly’s ideas on this comparison and contrast with regard to construct change and construct development.

In brief, a changed construct—although possibly maintaining aspects of another, previous construction—takes on a different meaning for a person than the meaning of his or her previous constructions. In contrast, construct development, noted in the Modulation Corollary, is the expansion of a person’s pre-existing construct system. Pre-existing contrast and likeness ends attract new objects and events.

However, change and development can occur together during a person’s abstraction of events from his or her field of experience. Thus, a person’s constructions can both change and develop under certain experiential conditions and over time.

Knowledge. Over the course of the project, two of the Polish educators—Norbert and Witek—exhibited a changing
sub-construct of knowledge necessary for schools to address when educating for democratic citizenship. Norbert entered his cross-cultural experience with a belief in essential knowledge established a priori and deemed worthy by experts in the field of political science, particularly the area of democratic governments. During his time in the United States, Norbert’s knowledge sub-construct changed from a fixed body of information about democratic systems. At the end of his cross-cultural experience, he defined his sub-construct as knowledge that was useful to a person as he or she functions in a democratic society.

In one sense, Witek’s knowledge sub-construct changed in a seemingly opposite direction. Shortly after entering his cross-cultural experience, Witek defined the sub-construct of knowledge as information that would challenge critically the procedures and values of a democratic society. By the end of his experience, Witek defined knowledge necessary for schools to address in a democracy as a discipline-based approach emanating from the social sciences and history.

In another sense, Witek’s construction of the knowledge involved in global and multicultural education changed from knowledge already present in Polish schools to a greater need for knowledge of global interconnectedness and understanding of multicultural differences. The knowledge of global systems and values and multiple perspectives
heightened in importance over the course of Witek's cross-cultural experience as he reflected upon the need to change the ethnocentric views he perceived to be the case in Polish schools and society.

Two Polish educators developed further their pre-existing sub-constructs of knowledge during their cross-cultural experiences. They were Thersa and Maria.

Thersa never abandoned her belief that knowledge used ideologically was antithetical to educating for democratic citizenship. However, during her cross-cultural experience, Thersa developed a purpose for knowledge in the classroom that went beyond knowing "what" to knowing "how" knowledge should be applied to solve problems in a democracy.

During her cross-cultural experience, Maria's pre-existing sub-construct of knowledge developed from a tacit understanding to an explicit understanding of the need for knowledge of global interconnectedness when educating for democratic citizenship. The same sort of development took place with regard to knowledge about democracy. From the beginning of her cross-cultural experience, Maria filtered her abstractions of knowledge about democracy through pre-existing needs spawned by the Polish context. Knowledge that applied to schools in post-communist Poland helped to expand and develop her sub-construct. Knowledge indigenous to the American context and untransferable to the Polish situation had no value.
Rosza's sub-construct of knowledge did not change during her cross-cultural experience. Throughout her cross-cultural experience, Rosza believed that knowledge necessary for schools to employ in educating for democratic citizenship was knowledge that could be applied to make a person's day-to-day life in any democracy a better life. Her abstraction of knowledge accessibility in the United States strengthened this belief. Her sub-construct remained stable throughout her experience.

**Skills.** In a broad, comparative sense, all of the Polish educators' sub-constructs of the skills necessary for schools to develop in educating for democratic citizenship modulated during their cross-cultural experiences. In varying degrees, the educators entered their cross-cultural experience with a notion of skills that highlighted education for democratic citizenship. These skills contrasted with their pre-existing constructions of education in a totalitarian society. In addition, all of the Polish educators referred, in some fashion, to two related tracks regarding the sub-construct of skills—teacher skills and student skills. However, the level of modulation varied on an individual basis.

The cases of Witek and Norbert indicated the most modulation. In his initial definition, Witek noted "procedures for understanding current social processes and, what is more important, to make the students able to
participate in democratic social life" as the skills schools needed to develop when educating for democratic citizenship. Throughout his experience, Witek expanded the range of skills teachers can develop to accomplish this goal. Over time, Witek developed a skills sub-construct based on procedural knowledge in a democracy. He expanded and clarified his skills sub-construct by abstracting inquiry methods of teaching and learning, particularly case studies.

Norbert’s initial construction of the skills Polish schools should address after the fall of communism was a vague notion that centered on "certain skills which would be the base for democratic activity." Over time, Norbert abstracted specific aspects from his experience that defined these "certain skills" as problem solving skills. Norbert abstracted further the specific methods teachers in a democratic society should use to develop these skills in students. These abstractions included case studies, decision trees, and simulations.

Rosza, Maria, and Thersa entered their cross-cultural environment with more specific skills sub-constructs than those of Norbert and Witek. Rosza entered the project with an already developed skills sub-construct. As a college professor and elementary school teacher, Rosza noted the importance of independent thinking skills, the ability to express one’s point of view, asking questions, and learning to participate in public life as the skills necessary for
schools to develop in students as these schools educate for democratic citizenship. Although these skills remained constant throughout her cross-cultural experience, Rosza experienced the implications of these skills on an adult level during her day to day life in American society.

Maria's vast experience in conflict resolution skill development provided a mature framework for expansion of her skills sub-construct. During the project, Maria took advantage of her pre-existing skills sub-construct by abstracting teaching methods that would enhance further a teacher's ability to help students develop skills necessary for life in a democracy. Over the 14 week cross-cultural experience, Maria added teaching techniques for developing civic competency skills that included simulations, case studies, role playing, and games.

The cases of Maria and Rosza indicated one aspect of change worth noting. During the course of their cross-cultural experiences, Rosza and Maria moved from a position on the sub-construct of skills steeped in the purpose of skill development (ends) to a position that emphasized the practice of skill development (means). In both cases, the practical application of skills to problem solving in a democracy became an essential aspect of their skills sub-constructs.

Thersa entered her cross-cultural experience with a skills sub-construct braced by scientific inquiry into the
problems of society. She expanded the range of convenience for this sub-construct with certain abstractions during her cross-cultural experience. Thersa's most noticeable change occurred with her realization that inquiry skills developed through schooling enhance the society as a whole when students begin to function as adults in a democratic society. In order for schools to participate in this realization, teachers needed to develop skills and techniques that helped students to move seamlessly from childhood to adulthood in a democratic society.

Attitudes. Of knowledge, skills, and attitudes, the Polish educators' sub-constructs of attitudes offered the most dissimilarity in change and development. This dissimilarity indicated clearly the idiosyncracy of our psychological channels as we anticipate events (Kelly, 1955).

Both Witek and Norbert entered their cross-cultural experiences with vague notions of the attitudes schools should promote in educating for democratic citizenship. The similarity between these two cases ended at this point.

In Witek's case, the vagueness of his attitudes sub-construct maintained a high level of permeability. To Witek, attitudes in a democratic society were fluid, and the only criterion for attitudes in a democratic society were those attitudes that emerged from the democratic habit of mind. Witek believed that no particular attitudes
transcended time in a democratic society. Attitudes in a democratic society emerged and changed because of the nature of democracy—a process with no fixed conclusion.

Norbert's abstractions from his cross-cultural experience changed his attitudes sub-construct. Initially, his sub-construct included a broad, undefined range of convenience—"a system of values which are democratic and their relevant beliefs." Over time, Norbert built, from his cross-cultural abstractions, a set of attitudes schools should address that included tolerance, pragmatism, cooperation, and compromise. These attitudes constituted a foundation for coactive efforts between the school and society in promoting democratic citizenship.

Theresa entered her cross-cultural experience with two essential attitudes that schools needed to foster in a democracy—tolerance for non-conformity and tolerance for ambiguity. Theresa maintained the status of these attitudes over time. However, she experienced certain objects and events in her cross-cultural environment that moved her construct's range of focus from attitudes students need to learn to the attitudes teachers need to model. Most prominent among these attitudes was "the democratic personality" that reflected the attitudes of flexibility and openness. In addition, Theresa resolved a sense of cognitive dissonance over ideology in a totalitarian society and in a democratic society as these ideologies referred to teachers.
A "moral paradigm" based upon the democratic attitudes exhibited through democratic personalities became an aspect of ideology acceptable in a democracy.

Maria's first definition of attitudes necessary for schools to nurture when educating for democratic citizenship contained one element—tolerance. Over time, Maria expanded her sub-construct to include a participatory attitude toward civic responsibility as an attitude necessary for schools to engender in teachers and students.

One case exhibited no change in the attitudes sub-construct. Rosza entered her cross-cultural environment with a set of attitudes necessary for schools and teachers to model so that students could learn the value of these attitudes in a democracy. These attitudes were tolerance, openness, and self-respect.

**Question Two**

Which cross-cultural experiences of the Polish educators delimited their constructs of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship?

Kelly (1955) noted that a construct "is an interpretation of a situation and is not itself the situation which it interprets" (p. 110). Question One addressed the interpretations made by the Polish educators. Question Two probed their situational, cross-cultural choices of objects and events that defined their
superordinate constructs of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

Whether the Polish educators’ sub-constructs changed, developed, or remained stable over time during their cross-cultural experiences, all of the educators mentioned certain common objects and events worth abstracting. Additionally, several of their individual pursuits outside the formal project schedule represented experiences from which they abstracted objects and events of note in delimiting the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

Knowledge. Norbert, Witek, and Thersa each mentioned More’s social studies methods class as an element of their experience they abstracted with regard to their knowledge sub-constructs. In Witek’s and Thersa’s cases, this abstraction involved the application of knowledge to problem solving in a democratic society.

From More’s class, Norbert and Witek abstracted elements of global and multicultural education. Norbert abstracted elements from More’s course that indicated to him the already present aspect of global education in the Polish educational system. Norbert’s abstractions from More’s explanation of multicultural education delimited his knowledge construct because he believed this knowledge to be unimportant to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship in a homogeneous Poland.
Obversely, Witek opened a new channel for understanding the Polish education system's need for global and multicultural education. He began his experience thinking that global and multicultural education were already aspects of Polish education. Upon reflection of More's course, he reconsidered the need to introduce more knowledge of global and multicultural issues into the curriculum as Polish schools educate for democratic citizenship.

Two Polish educators abstracted Lew Simmons' work in the project with regard to their knowledge sub-construct. Simmons worked with the Polish educators on two occasions during the project—a seminar on the principles of democracy at the Mershon Center and a seminar on constitutionalism and social studies education at Indiana University. Witek and Maria abstracted these experiences in opposing fashion. To Witek, Simmons represented change from a critical view of knowledge in a democracy to one steeped in the discipline-based tradition of the social studies. Maria abstracted elements from Simmons presentations that worked to define the contrast end of her knowledge sub-construct—that which was not applicable to the Polish context.

Norbert and Thersa mentioned the conference on "Educating for Democracy: Looking to the 21st Century" at Ohio Wesleyan University in a similar fashion. Norbert expressed a lack of value in this experience as he abstracted elements associated with the contrast end of his
knowledge sub-construct—simple presentations on basic information about democracy. Representative of his original definition of knowledge, this conference occurred during the latter third of Norbert's cross-cultural experience. To Norbert, the thoughts offered by the presenters represented a weak starting point for a task of his group's nature rather than an enrichment of their progress to date. Thersa reflected on this conference as more "ideological prescriptions" that were familiar to her in communist Poland and had no applicability to teaching for democratic citizenship.

Four of the Polish educators abstracted elements from several other experiences shared commonly, but mentioned only in their individual cases. Norbert noted the following elements of his experience as instrumental in his changing knowledge sub-construct: schools visits, his comparative analysis of Polish higher education to his experiences at The Ohio State University and Kenyon College, and the realization of knowledge as "how" as well as "what" during the presidential campaign and election.

Maria reflected on the lack of knowledge applicability to the Polish context represented by Goryl's leadership seminar and Johnson's economics and education in a democracy sessions. In addition, Maria's interplay with knowledge of global interconnectedness prevalent in American educational concerns made explicit her thoughts that this sort of
knowledge already existed in Polish schools and was an obvious necessity for democratic citizenship in all national contexts.

Rosza pointed toward her abstractions of knowledge availability as a key aspect of knowledge for democratic citizenship. These aspects emerged during a computer presentation at the National Council for the Social Studies Annual Convention and her experiences with American public libraries. Data from our interviews, her journal entries, and my observations indicated no cross-cultural delimitation of the content essential to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Her construction at the end of her experience resembled closely her initial construction.

Thersa’s case involved no elements outside the above noted comparisons. She delimited her knowledge sub-construct through her experiences in More’s methods course and at the Ohio Wesleyan University conference on "Educating for Democracy: Looking to the 21st Century."

Skills. The five Polish educators delimited their skills sub-constructs through several common experiences during the project. The events most commonly abstracted were the curriculum seminar, More’s social studies methods course, and school visits.

Norbert, Maria, and Witek noted the importance of their abstractions from the curriculum seminar as they delimited their skills sub-construct. Norbert saw Gaudet’s work on
citizenship competencies as a heuristic for skill development. In addition, Livingston and Gaudet introduced Norbert to aspects of skill development in students that teachers should master methodologically when teaching for democratic citizenship. From the curriculum seminar, Norbert abstracted the use of primary sources, concept learning, decision trees, pro/con analysis, and civic writing as elements that delimited his skills sub-construct.

Maria and Witek mentioned repeatedly Gaudet's ability to exercise organizational leadership in a democratic style. This style included the bringing together of disparate ideas to focus on a common task. Witek abstracted from Livingston the ability to promote dialogue as essential to a teacher's bank of skills in educating for democratic citizenship.

Norbert, Maria, Witek, and Thersa abstracted elements from More's methods class that became essential to skill development in both teachers and students. Norbert believed that teachers in schools could re-enact reality through simulations that promoted democratic citizenship in Polish society. To Maria and Thersa, More's course represented the role of schools in teaching "skills for life" in a democracy. More's use of inquiry oriented teaching methods as he taught preservice teachers to teach pre-collegiate students highlighted their delimitation of the skills sub-construct. In addition, Thersa abstracted the skill of modelling one's beliefs as a teacher in a democracy from her
experience with More's methods class and his simulations and games class.

Gaudet and Kluszewski incorporated school visits into the project schedule as a part of the Polish educators' field experiences. Their intention was to offer firsthand experiences to the Polish educators that represented schools in a democratic society. Tangentially, these experiences offered Norbert, Maria, and Thersa an opportunity to abstract elements that delimited the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship with regard to skills. For Norbert, Maria, and Thersa, these visits offered evidence of the role skills can play in practicing democracy in the classroom through methods reliant upon cooperation on the part of the students and encouragement on the part of the teacher.

In two cases, John Goryl's leadership workshop merited attention with regard to skills. Norbert noted Goryl's emphasis on the skills necessary for engendering collaborative leadership in a democracy. Norbert abstracted these skills as essential to hurdling the barrier of learned helplessness left over from communism. Thersa abstracted the same basic point as Norbert, but she extrapolated further the value of leadership skills. The skills addressed by Goryl implied a bridge between childhood and adulthood absent in Polish citizenship education under communism and during Poland's transition to democracy.
Singly, Norbert noted an aspect of the National Council for the Social Studies Annual Convention that delimited his sub-construct of skills. He abstracted the many skills-related resources available to teachers that facilitated their ability to teach democratic citizenship. In addition, these resources represented tools for helping students to develop skills necessary for life in a democratic society.

Outside their formal project experiences, Norbert and Rosza noted the importance of some social, cross-cultural experiences when reflecting on the skills schools need to promote in educating for democratic citizenship. During their stay in the United States, Norbert and Rosza commented on the obvious role schools play in developing everyday skills for adulthood in a democracy. Both of them mentioned aspects of American society that indicated a level of societal cooperation and collaboration not clearly evident in Poland. These abstractions emanated from their daily interactions with people as they moved through their cross-cultural experience.

Attitudes. As noted earlier, the change and development of the Polish educators' attitudes sub-constructs indicated very little room for comparison. Similarly, only three experiences mentioned by two or more Poles appeared to delimit their attitudes sub-construct on a comparative
basis. These experiences were school visits, the curriculum seminar, and the social studies methods course.

With regard to the school visits, Maria and Thersa noted elements that contributed to their attitudes sub-construct. For Maria, her experiences in the schools indicated a promotion of the attitudes of tolerance and participation that contrasted with the intolerance and learned helplessness exhibited in Polish society. Thersa abstracted the attitudes of teachers she observed that represented the attitudes essential to a teacher's "moral paradigm" when teaching students in a democracy and for democratic citizenship.

For Maria and Thersa, the curriculum seminar acted in similar fashion to the school visits. In Maria's case, the attitudes of Gaudet and Livingston during the curriculum development seminars portrayed a picture of the role certain attitudes can play in the process of learning and development in a democratic society. Livingston and Gaudet's penchant for drawing out and entertaining all ideas was an attitude Maria believed essential to a teacher in a democracy.

Thersa abstracted these same qualities from her experience with Gaudet and Livingston during the seminars. The attitudes of Livingston and Gaudet represented the "moral paradigm" as a professional, attitudinal habit.
In Rosza’s and Thersa’s cases, More’s social studies methods class acted similarly to the curriculum seminar. Rosza abstracted aspects of More’s attitude toward his preservice teachers that embodied the attitudes necessary for schools to exhibit in educating for democratic citizenship. These attitudes included an "open-mindedness" that led to an atmosphere of free expression in the classroom. For Thersa, More’s personality with his students added an element to the likeness end of the teacher’s "moral paradigm." More’s "democratic posture," represented by his acceptance of human differences, embodied this element.

In delimiting their attitudes sub-constructs, the Poles abstracted aspects of their formal and informal cross-cultural environment that were unique to each case. Norbert referred to his experiences outside the project that included aspects of daily life in American society such as his visit to a Red Cross training session and his trip to New York. These events contributed attitudinal elements that indicated to Norbert how schools can work toward enhancing adult democratic citizenship on a broad, societal basis.

Maria’s experience with Professor Beach’s seminar buttressed the contrast end of her attitudes sub-construct. Maria abstracted Beach’s point on the socially contributive, yet slow, process of democratic attitude development through schooling. To Maria, this slowness of attitudinal change
could imperil the role of Polish schools in educating for
democratic citizenship in a transitional democracy.

Witek’s everyday experiences in American society
indicated to him that democratic attitudes mean different
things to different people. Additionally, these attitudes
take on different meanings at different points in time. He
specified no particular democratic attitudes that schools
should model for students other than the overarching
democratic habit of mind.

Thersa’s most notable non-comparative abstraction was
the presentation by Harold Reese. His introduction of
ideology as a given aspect of a teacher’s attitudes
fragmented her sub-construct. Thersa molded this
fragmentation into a democratic "moral paradigm"--an
acceptable aspect of ideology in educating for democratic
citizenship.

Question Three

How did the Polish educators’ previous constructs blend
with their cross-cultural environment and shape their
construction of the role of schools in educating for
democratic citizenship?

In addition to the Individuality Corollary, two aspects
of Kelly’s theory of personal constructs played a role in my
cross-case analysis of the answers to this question. First,
I returned to the Fundamental Postulate: "a person’s
processes are psychologically channelized by the way in
which he [sic] anticipates events" (Kelly, 1955, p. 46). We experience innumerable objects and events throughout our lives, and our interpretations of these objects and events lay a groundwork for our construct systems. We channelize our ensuing experiences through our existing construct systems. Through our channelizing, our construct systems change and develop over time.

Second, we choose events and objects from our fields of experience that attract to our constructs' likeness and contrast ends in an effort to delimit our system and our superordinate and subordinate constructs. In so doing, we draw a basis of experiential comparison between at least two objects and/or events with at least one other contrasting, but related, object and/or event.

Obviously, the five Polish educators entered their cross-cultural experience with some sort of superordinate construction concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. I based this observation on data from the Poles opening reflection in which they defined this superordinate construct. However, throughout our time together, the Poles expressed aspects of their previous superordinate construction concerning the school's role in educating for democratic citizenship that were not in their first reflections. These pre-existing constructions indicated likeness and contrast ends of their constructions as they experienced their cross-cultural environment.
Again, I dealt with these pre-existing structures through the subordinate construct categories of knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

Certain patterns developed during the Polish educators’ cross-cultural experiences with regard to their pre-existing constructs. The likeness and contrast ends of their previous constructions were my basis for comparison of these patterns.

Knowledge. Regarding knowledge, three of the educators—Norbert, Witek, and Thersa—referred exclusively to their previous constructions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship as a contrast to their cross-cultural experiences. Maria viewed her knowledge sub-construct’s previous role as a likeness end. Rosza’s pre-existing sub-construct served as both a likeness and a contrast end of the knowledge schools should address when educating for democratic citizenship.

Norbert, Witek, and Thersa referred to their previous construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship as a contrast that filtered and blended with their cross-cultural experience. In Norbert’s case, his pre-existing sub-construct of knowledge revolved around his profession—a professor of political science. His previous construction of knowledge essential for democratic citizenship contained information about different democratic systems. Over time, this construction did not
fade entirely, but abstractions from his cross-cultural experience put this sort of knowledge in a contrasting light. Over time, Norbert construed knowledge essential to democratic citizenship as knowledge of a process. In stark contrast, Norbert's notion of the "new soviet man," something he knew from his communist party affiliation and tasks, combined with the role of knowledge in the previous Polish school system to represent a contrast end steeped in indoctrination.

In Witek's case, his previous activities against communism during his college years exemplified a distinct contrast to fixed knowledge. His view of knowledge as a force for deconstructing the pathology of the status quo grew from these experiences. The status quo under deconstruction was communism. During his cross-cultural experience, this critical use of knowledge extended initially to democratic citizenship education.

Theresa's previous construction of knowledge that contrasted with democratic citizenship was her experience with knowledge as ideology. Her experiences in an ideologically subdued high school, her extensive work in psychological research, and the horrors she experienced during the expulsion of her colleagues in 1968 combined to build a contrast end involving the ideological use of knowledge in educating for democratic citizenship.
In contrast to Norbert, Witek, and Thersa, Maria viewed her previous construction of the knowledge sub-construct as an important likeness end that filtered knowledge during her cross-cultural experience. Maria evaluated and abstracted elements from her cross-cultural experience through a pre-existing knowledge sub-construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship in Poland and not the United States. She applied this likeness end to knowledge of global interconnectedness—something needed in American education, not Polish education.

One Polish educator exhibited a construction of her cross-cultural experience based on both the likeness and contrast ends of her pre-existing construction. Rosza’s experiences as a student in the previous educational system indicated a contrast to the knowledge necessary in educating for democratic citizenship. Rote memorization of fixed knowledge that eschewed independent pursuit of knowledge plagued Rosza during her childhood years. On the other hand, she had built a career as not only a university professor, but also an elementary school teacher. During the last years of communism in Poland, Rosza experimented with knowledge as part of a process. In her elementary school teaching, this sort of knowledge stood in opposition to a fixed body of information. This experience built a likeness end of her knowledge sub-construct that acted as an indicator for her cross-cultural abstractions.
Skills. During their cross-cultural experiences, three of the Polish educators relied on their previous abstractions concerning skills as contrast ends of their constructions. They were Norbert, Witek, and Thersa. The other two educators--Maria and Rosza--looked to their pre-existing skills sub-con structs as both likeness ends and contrast ends.

Norbert, Witek, and Thersa raised certain abstractions from their previous experiences that acted as contrast ends during their cross-cultural experiences. In Norbert’s case, the learned helplessness he described as an element of communist society in Poland exemplified the contrast end of his pre-existing skills sub-construct. Norbert contrasted his cross-cultural experiences with those experiences he encountered during the communist plan for citizenship. In the communist plan for citizenship, there was no room for individuality, independent thinking, or community activity unless planned by the state authorities.

Thersa and Witek’s pre-existing skills sub-construct reflected a contrast end on the level of teacher education. To Thersa and Witek, communist ideology precluded the development of teaching skills necessary for teachers to employ in educating for democratic citizenship. In addition, the simplicity of teacher skills necessary to transmit didactically a fixed philosophy attracted "second
rate scientists" to the teacher education profession in Poland.

Maria's and Rosza's pre-existing skills sub-constructs indicated likeness and contrast ends for abstracting elements from their cross-cultural experiences. In Maria's case, her association with conflict resolution skill development acted as a lens through which to filter the skills she encountered in American education for democratic citizenship. On the contrast end, Maria, not unlike Norbert, pointed to the learned helplessness of Polish society as an appropriate societal condition that ramified to the skills teachers used in the previous educational system--didactic transmission of ideology as the basis for citizenship education.

Unlike the other Polish educators, Rosza experienced teaching demonstrations by Goryl and Johnson in Poland and before her 14 week stay in the United States. Her abstractions from this experience gave her a likeness end for teacher skills and student skills in educating for democratic citizenship that carried over into her cross-cultural experience. Also, her efforts in teaching elementary students in pre-democratic Poland acted as experiences through which she could assess the likeness of her experiences in the United States. On the level of contrast, Rosza built a pre-existing construct based on her
experiences as a youth in Polish schools--skills of memorization intended to develop ideological loyalty.

**Attitudes.** The data gathered and analyzed for this study revealed only one Polish educator who relied partially on a pre-existing attitudes sub-construct that represented the likeness end. Rosza’s family background in the Polish intelligentsia and her academic pursuit of the intelligentsia’s role in nineteenth century Poland were abstractions of her previous experiences that built a likeness end for her attitudes sub-construct. Certain abstracted elements from her cross-cultural experience represented the democratic attitudes she experienced in Poland as a daughter and as a scholar.

The other Polish educators couched their pre-existing attitudes sub-constructs in terms of contrast to their cross-cultural experience. Rosza, although maintaining a likeness end, also defined a contrast end of her attitudes sub-construct based on her pre-existing system. In all five cases, this contrasting pole involved barriers to democratic attitude development in schools. These barriers were societal and psychological.

Norbert, Maria, and Thersa mentioned the barriers brought about by residual communist ideology as an attitude of learned helplessness--the need for direction from authority. Socially, this attitude prevailed in Poland and exacerbated the pains of transition to democracy. Schools
reflected this attitude from administrators to teachers and students. Additionally, this attitude prevailed in the relationship between the schools and the parents and community. For Norbert, Maria, and Thersa, this systemic attitude of learned helplessness appeared to be the greatest barrier for Polish schools to hurdle in their plight to educate for democratic citizenship.

Rosza and Witek viewed this same pre-existing attitudinal barrier as a sort of social engineering. Forty-five years of communist totalitarianism bred a residual ideology steeped in learned helplessness. This learned helplessness was an attitude that ramified in social conditions as basic to life as housing, schooling, and economic security.

An attitudinal barrier mentioned prominently by Witek and Thersa was the Polish Roman Catholic Church. As schools moved toward fulfilling their role in educating for democratic citizenship, Witek and Thersa saw the teachings of the Church as a barrier to democratic values and beliefs. To Witek and Thersa, the absence of official beliefs after the fall of communism invited a struggle to fill this vacuum. This struggle raged between the fixed beliefs of the Church and the "open-mindedness" of democracy.
CHAPTER VI

GROUNDED ASSERTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

This chapter contains three sections. The first section is a brief synopsis of the study.

The second section is a discussion of grounded assertions. I derived these assertions from data on the three questions that emerged during my research.

The third section presents the implications of this study for future public policy in developing democracies and established democracies. Public policy decision-makers involved in or considering collaborative activities to enhance education for democratic citizenship in emerging democracies comprise the target audience for this discussion. In addition, the third section addresses the implications of this study for research in cross-cultural psychology. This discussion includes the use of a naturalistic design in and the application of Kelly’s personal construct theory to further cross-cultural psychological research.
A Synopsis of the Study

The conclusion of Poland's "Round Table" talks in April of 1989 and the ensuing elections in June, 1989¹, triggered a movement in Poland toward the realization of an assumption. The preference for democracy over the axioms of communist philosophy lay at the heart of this assumption.

However, realizing this assumption in a world occupied by many established democracies posed a dilemma for Poland. Poland faced the paradox of joining the ranks of nations who now saw Poland as "fair game" in the global free market economy. Moving a nation from communism to democracy in a highly competitive global environment became a daunting task for the new democracy.

In contrast, established democracies offered social, political, and economic models for Poland's consideration during its transition from communism to democracy. Through thoughtful consideration of these various models, Poland had an opportunity to work toward the realization of a democratic society by adapting that which was applicable to its situation. Also, Poland had the advantage of hindsight. Many current problems and issues in established democracies had roots in past mistakes. Poland sought to turn this historical knowledge into an advantage by attempting to

¹ These elections were the first free elections for membership in the Sejm--the Polish parliament--since November, 1938.
avoid past mistakes that continued to plague established democracies.

**Addressing a Need for Educational Change**

Given this situation, the Polish government realized the need to view systemically all areas of society and concentrate on those aspects of society for which change was essential and feasible. One primary sector of the social system targeted for change was education—specifically education for citizenship. With the vestiges of a Marxist-Leninist past clearly evident in the pre-collegiate curriculum, the Polish Ministry of National Education moved to exploit the positive aspect of the aforementioned paradox—exploring and abstracting from established democracies that which was applicable to the Polish situation.

One of the efforts for change involved a collaborative project between the Polish Ministry of National Education and the Mershon Center of The Ohio State University. With funding from the Polish Ministry and three major private and governmental American funding bodies, these two institutions embarked on a project entitled "Education for Democratic Citizenship in Poland." This project involved the development of a primary school civics course, five Centers for Civic and Economic Education, a curriculum framework for pre-collegiate civic education, and a preservice teacher education course on the role of schools in a democracy.
All of these components involved cross-cultural experiences for Poles and Americans. Two of these components included prolonged visits to the United States by Polish educators. This study concerned the cross-cultural experiences of the teacher education course plan development team. The title of their project component was "Schools and Democratic Society." This team was in residence at The Ohio State University for fourteen weeks in the fall of 1992.

Carrying Out the Study

As a Graduate Research Associate at the Mershon Center during this project, my assignment was to coordinate the cross-cultural aspect of "Schools and Democratic Society." My charge involved the planning of formal and informal experiences for five Polish educators during their stay in the United States.

Given this task, I developed a research project on the changing constructs of the Polish educators as those changes related to their cross-cultural environment. The construct I chose to explore was the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

Educating for democratic citizenship is an assumed responsibility of schools in a democratic society. Based on this assumption, I perceived the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship as a construct related to the task of the Polish educators.
My charge during the project led to my close association with the educators. In light of this association, I developed a desire to understand the views of the educators as their views emerged naturally from the cross-cultural context of the project. Thus, I designed a study based on naturalistic inquiry.

This design included qualitative data gathering techniques such as interviews, journals written by the Polish educators and myself, observations, and project documents. Data analysis based on the constant comparison of data within and between the five cases brought to light three major categories through which the Polish educators viewed the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. These categories were knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Within these major categories, 12 sub-categories emerged.

From the many inquiry modes within the naturalistic paradigm, I chose to approach my research tasks hermeneutically. My proximity to the Polish educators warranted this approach. Based on the hermeneutic principal of interpreting texts from a specific perspective, I applied George Kelly’s theory of personal constructs to analyze and interpret the data. In addition, by approaching the research hermeneutically, my thoughts intertwined with those of the Polish educators throughout the 14 weeks of data gathering and analysis.
From this research process came five distinct case study narratives. These narratives chronicled construct change and development concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship during a cross-cultural experience. As part of the hermeneutic process, my constructions changed during this research experience. These changes acted as a sixth case study that spanned the cases of the Polish educators.

Grounded Assertions

In Chapter III, I noted the works of Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Strauss (1987) in the development of grounded theory. This process is inductive. Emerging from the data, hypotheses formed in one context grow into a theory as data from other, related contexts indicate similar hypotheses.

However, Addison (1989) challenged and adjusted this definition of grounded theory on two levels. Addison formed these challenges and adjustments from his background as a constructivist psychologist and hermeneutic researcher.

First, grounded theory does not allow for interpretation from a specific perspective. The role of the researcher remains value-free and detached from data offered by the respondents. Second, the researcher, although learning about the context and thus the views of the respondents, fails to note the challenges and changes to his or her preunderstandings. By adding interpretation from a
specific perspective and introspective analysis of one's preunderstandings on the question or problem, the researcher engages in what Addison termed "a grounded interpretive method" (p. 42).

During this study, I pursued data gathering and analysis through a grounded interpretive method. In addition, the uniqueness of this project precluded the formulation of a theory based on similar projects. In light of this situation, I termed this section "Grounded Assertions." What follows are not theories, but statements drawn from a specific context. Similar to Kelly's (1995) aforementioned analogy, these assertions resemble more closely brittle hypotheses (impermeable constructs) rather than theories (permeable constructs) grounded in data gathered across several sites.

The following assertions are time and context bound, and they resemble generalizations only with regard to the natural setting in which I conducted the study. These assertions, or findings, refer to the questions that emerged during the study.

Question One

Question

Assuming the Polish educators' constructions of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship changed during their intensive cross-cultural experience, what were these changes?
Grounded Assertion

From five distinct, pre-existing constructions, the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship changed and/or developed with regard to the skills and attitudes needed to apply knowledge to the problems of life in a developing democracy.

Discussion

Each of the Polish educators entered his or her cross-cultural environment with a pre-existing knowledge of democracy. This knowledge grew, in varying degrees, from the educators' longtime scholarly pursuits in Poland. All of them were university professors and four of them held doctoral degrees in the social and behavioral sciences. Their backgrounds included study of the works commonly associated with Western democracy. Their pre-existing knowledge of democratic systems, democratic political philosophy, and democratic social theory gave them a starting point from which to conceptualize the application of this knowledge as a definitive aspect of schools in a democratic society. Given their scholarly backgrounds, the data gathered during this study indicated that the Polish educators' changed and/or developed their superordinate constructs regarding the methods that teachers could use to enhance students' skills.

Through inquiry-based methods designed to solve social problems, the Polish educators envisioned the development of
democratic attitudes in students. Teacher modelling of these attitudes was an essential abstraction from their experiences. The collaborative, synergetic relationship between teachers and students in approaching problems in a democracy represented the democratic process. This process involved the application of knowledge through skills that, when steeped in democratic attitudes, fulfilled the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

**Question Two**

**Question**

Which cross-cultural experiences of the Polish educators delimited their constructs of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship?

**Grounded Assertion**

As the post-communist Polish educators experienced their cross-cultural environment, abstractions of objects and events related to skills and attitude development delimited their superordinate construct of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. Concomitantly, their abstractions of extant knowledge about democracy and knowledge inapplicable to the Polish context waned in importance.

**Discussion**

This assertion relates directly to the first assertion. The Polish educators abstracted elements from their cross-cultural environment that represented the change and/or
development of their superordinate construct. These abstractions centered upon the application of knowledge to problems in a democratic society and the attitudes that facilitate cooperative efforts in solving these problems. In addition, these abstractions increased over time.

However, one can argue against this assertion. For instance, the project, as designed by Kluszewski, Gaudet, and Livingston, focused early on knowledge about democracy in an effort to "front-load" this information. Close scrutiny of the curriculum seminar syllabus indicates a drop in activities related to the sub-construct of knowledge after the first one-third of the project. School visits, the social studies methods class and simulation and games class, and an increased number of curriculum seminars occupied most of the latter two-thirds of the formal project schedule. This behaviorist interpretation of the syllabus schedule exposes a well-organized agenda aimed at pulling the Polish educators toward a concentration on skills and attitudes during the intense latter stages of the project.

The data do not indicate this situation to be the case. The research process was continuous. My observations occurred on a daily basis. Interviews with and reflections by the Polish educators dotted the time period at close intervals. Consequently, I began forming this assertion during the first one-third of the project. As the Polish
educators abstracted the content of democracy during the early part of their schedule, they noted this information's applicability or lack thereof to the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship in Poland. Even Witek, who moved from a critical perspective on knowledge to a discipline-based position on knowledge, never abandoned the notion that knowledge was something applied through the democratic process, not a free-standing aspect of democracy.

In addition, the Poles were not limited in their choice of experiences during the cross-cultural aspect of the project. Their experiences with daily life in an established democracy were not choreographed. For example, their ability to access the vast resources of America's largest university was the same for them as for any regular staff member or faculty member. Even at the conferences in which they participated, the project staff offered recommendations for sessions the Poles might attend only upon request.

When viewed through a constructivist lens, the Polish educators' interpretation of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship was a matter individual choice in abstracting objects and events that delimited their superordinate constructs. Their cross-cultural experiences included a wide and diverse range of such objects and events. How they went about exploring their
perceptual field, like their abstractions of certain elements, was a matter of choice.

**Question Three**

**Question**

How did the Polish educators' previous constructs blend with their cross-cultural environment and shape their construction of the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship?

**Grounded Assertion**

The Polish educators' pre-existing construct systems afforded likeness and contrast ends to their superordinate construction based on their abstractions from their lives in a communist totalitarian society and the vestiges of that society during Poland's transition to democracy. These pre-existing constructs extended in ranges of convenience beyond schools to society in general.

**Discussion**

Given the fact that all of the Polish educators lived in communist Poland, this assertion seems somewhat obvious. However, the dissimilarity in their experiences with communism converged on one aspect of life in both communist and post-communist Poland—learned helplessness. Defined variously as barriers to transition, the notion that people needed direction from authority to live their lives defined the contrast end of the Polish educators' pre-existing construct systems. During their cross-cultural experiences,
the Poles abstracted elements that reflected possibilities for changing this situation in Polish schools and Polish society.

To each educator, the belief that society could be changed through schooling held little, if any, possibility. Although the role of schools as a major societal change agent was not realistic to the Poles, each of them believed that schooling, when linked to the community, could contribute to the development of democratic attitudes.

Also, the Polish educators formed the belief that certain skills developed through schooling could engender democratic attitudes in future adult generations. The data relating to experiences outside the formal aspects of the project—abstractions by the Poles concerning life in an established democracy—that blended with the formal aspects of the project indicated this belief. Their abstractions, based on their pre-existing constructs, pointed toward the inseparability of means and tentative ends when viewing democracy as a process.

Implications

Given these grounded assertions, what does this study imply for the audience I targeted in the "Rationale for the Study" section of Chapter I (p. 3)? This audience includes post-communist Ministries of National Education and American governmental and non-governmental institutions as they seek
to collaborate on future, cross-cultural projects concerned with the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

In addition, what does the methodology and theoretical framework of this study imply for future research in cross-cultural psychology? What are the implications of the grounded assertions of this study as they relate to possible future research on the "Schools and Democratic Society" project and new projects of a similar sort?

For Public Policy Decision-Makers

In 1991, the Citizens Democracy Corps listed 178 American non-profit organizations providing voluntary, collaborative assistance in education to Central and Eastern Europe. In their 1993-1994 report, the Citizenship Democracy Corps listed 354 such projects.

Although these efforts represent a wide range of applied and basic research, the dramatic growth of education-related projects over two years is evidence of a remarkable phenomenon. First, these numbers represent projects started only since 1989--the year communism began to collapse in Eastern and Central Europe. Second, more than 176 projects started in the two year period between the first and second reports. These numbers indicate that the trend is not slowing down.

\[^2\] One must consider that some projects from the first two year period finished before 1993. As a result, the number 354 represents an increase of more than 176 projects.
In light of this trend, what recommendations do the assertions from this study offer policy makers in the United States and Central and Eastern Europe as they contemplate collaborative projects in education, particularly education for democratic citizenship?

**American Public Policy Decision-Makers**

I consider recommendations for American public policy decision-makers first for one reason. Howard (1991), Garonzik (1993), and Citizens Democracy Corps (1994) noted the willingness of American governmental and non-governmental organizations to support democratic initiatives in Eastern and Central Europe. Efforts by other established democracies lag far behind.

In contrast, Eastern and Central European governmental organizations set guidelines for needs, but they rarely publish requests for funding proposals. This situation is the result of there being little money available in developing democracies to support such projects. Financial assistance from established democracies is essential.

Given this situation, American funding bodies solicit project proposals for collaborative efforts aimed at democratization in Eastern and Central Europe. The following recommendations for American public policy decision-makers stem from this study. Yet, some of the recommendations are relevant to not only democracies
emerging from communism, but also to democracies emerging from civil strife and colonialism.

First, as American public policy makers look to the educational needs of developing democracies, a recommendation from this study is to request and fund proposals that offer a wide range of experiences. In "Schools and Democratic Society," the cross-cultural component of the project offered 14 weeks of a broad field of experiences. As evidenced by the curriculum seminar schedule (Appendix A), the Polish educators had the opportunity to explore many aspects of American education, social life, and professional development that revolved around a core element represented by the curriculum seminar. The free exchange of their abstractions from ancillary activities took place among the group at the Harrison House apartments. In addition, during the curriculum seminars and cross-cultural social events, the Poles took the opportunity to explore further the meaning of many ancillary cross-cultural experiences. The relationship of events and objects to the task at hand, as well as the variety of these events and objects, was a crucial aspect of the Polish educators' experiences.

This implication leads to the second recommendation. What is not evident from Appendix A is the flexible nature of the "Schools and Democratic Society" curriculum seminar schedule. Appendix A is the final, and seventh, version of
the schedule. Schedule changes took place as the project unfolded. My assertions from Question One and Question Two of this study emerged as a consequence of the schedule’s flexibility. The Poles and Americans worked to adjust the schedule to fit the changing and developing constructs of the Poles and any unforeseen, task-related needs that arose during the project. Two instances of flexibility noted in this study were Maria’s trip to Washington, D.C., and Norbert’s trip to New Haven. Public policy decision-makers should look to projects that are capable of offering such flexibility.

The third implication of this study is the length of such a project. Many requests for proposals concerning educational reform in Eastern and Central Europe are short in length of cross-cultural components. I know this from reading myriad requests for proposals over the past three years.

The basic notion of "prolonged engagement" as a requirement for participant observation in a naturalistic study applied also to the Polish educators during this project. A naturalistic researcher engages a culture for long periods of time to make sure first impressions are not merely "skin deep." The Polish educators' prolonged engagement with their cross-cultural environment allowed them to go beyond a passing glance at aspects of American education. This depth of engagement allowed for penetrating
analysis of what, on first impression, might have seemed applicable to the Polish context, but was exposed later as valueless. The opposite situation—eventually garnering value from experiences construed initially as meaningless—was also the case in some instances. As noted in several cases, what the Polish educators saw initially was not what they took away from their experiences.

A fourth implication of this study for American public policy decision-makers is the need to explore the backgrounds of the post-communist participants. Assertions from Questions One and Three of this study revealed that (a) the Polish educators’ knowledge of democracy was greater than the Project Co-Directors had anticipated and (b) the strengths of the educators could have been matched to their course plan development tasks earlier in the project than was the case.

An exploration of potential participants’ pre-existing construct systems, possibly through analysis of autobiographical and interview data, could facilitate progress toward a project’s goals. Additionally, knowledge of prospective participants’ ranges of pre-existing constructs could facilitate decisions by public policy makers with regard to funding and possible project merit.
Decision-Makers in Ministries of National Education

The fourth implication noted above also applies to Ministries of National Education in developing democracies. The need to explore the backgrounds of prospective participants in such projects should be a matter of collaboration between project co-directors from the established and developing democracies. Yet, the initial process, regardless of prerequisite criteria generated collaboratively, is in the hands of the Ministry. So, this implication applies to both partners.

The second implication for Ministries of National Education is an outgrowth of the recommendations regarding variety of experiences and flexibility of scheduling noted above. All of the assertions generated by the data from this study indicate the applicability of certain knowledge, skills, and attitudes from an established democracy to a developing democracy. The five Polish educators left with a course plan indicative of some experiences not yet available to Polish students, teachers, and teacher educators. Their choices of that which can be imported into the Polish

---

3 In this section, I refer to Ministries of National Education because, initially, "Education for Democratic Citizenship" was a collaborative effort between the Mershon Center and the Polish Ministry of National Education. However, since the conclusion of this study, a non-governmental Polish organization, The Open Society Foundation, became a major partner in the ongoing project. As a result, the recommendations in this section can apply to non-governmental as well as governmental organizations in developing democracies.
educational system with regard to education for democratic citizenship stemmed from myriad experiences in their cross-cultural environment.

With this finding in mind, Ministries of National Education should consider carefully the scope and sequence of programmed, cross-cultural experiences in collaborative projects of this nature. The Ministry's responsibility to the mission of the project must not end when the participants leave their country.

Although not noted in the case studies, I did note in Chapter III a methodological aspect of the research related to this implication. At the end of our 14 weeks together, all of the Polish educators pointed toward a particular value that came from their participation in this study. This value arose from my pursuit of the singular, repetitive question, "What is the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship?" Throughout the research, this question focused on the role of schools in Poland, not necessarily any other country. By admission of the Polish educators, repetition of this question was a constant reminder of their task. They believed that absence of this constant reminder may have allowed them to stray somewhat from their task.

The absence of such an "in-project reminder" implies that Ministries of National Education must monitor the scope and sequence of such cross-cultural projects as they unfold.
To abandon the participants in a sea of cross-cultural experiences may result, as noted by the Poles, in a miscalculation of that which can be imported to their national context.

For Research in Cross-Cultural Psychology

In Chapter II, I indicated that little naturalistic inquiry on Kelly’s theory of personal constructs appeared in the literature. Regarding cross-cultural psychological research, I found no use of Kelly’s theory outside a few quantitative studies.

When one considers that cross-cultural psychology pursues generalizations across cultures, this dearth is understandable. Kelly’s meta-theory of psychological processes concerns the individual’s construction of reality, not issues concerning the existence of a singular reality.

However, the use of qualitative methods based on a hermeneutic approach to naturalistic inquiry and an analytical framework based on the theory of personal constructs is how I conducted this study. In Chapter III, I explicated my reasons for these choices. In light of these choices, what does this study offer the field of cross-cultural psychology with regard to naturalistic inquiry and Kelly’s theory of personal constructs? In addition, what does this study imply for further research on "Schools and Democratic Society" or future, similar projects?
Naturalistic Inquiry and Kelly’s Theory in Cross-Cultural Psychological Research

The assertions from this study formed over time. These assertions emerged during the cross-cultural experiences of the five Polish educators. My use of qualitative data gathering techniques allowed me to explore deeply the thinking processes of the five Polish educators as they construed the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship.

When the occasion arises to envelop oneself in a cross-cultural project, naturalistic inquiry offers the researcher a chance to work closely and consistently with respondents. The opportunity for a prolonged engagement with a different culture, whether the respondents visit the researcher’s culture or vice versa, offers the researcher depth of understanding not available through quick research visits aimed at gathering quantitative data for comparison to other cultures.

This point may be the most fundamental advantage of naturalistic inquiry in cross-cultural settings if research is intended to expand the knowledge-base of the social and behavioral sciences. Not only reality as seen through the researcher(‘s’) interpretation(s), but also reality as seen through the respondent(‘s’) interpretation(s) is crucial to building this base. In order to gain a sense of the respondent’s culturally indigenous interpretation, the
researcher must try to understand the respondent's interpretation on the respondent's cultural-psychological terms--the emic perspective. In turn, the introspective aspect of hermeneutics allows for the researcher to explore his or her own preunderstandings of the problems or questions that emerge during a study. Kelly (1955) termed this process the creativity cycle.

It must be cautioned, however, that no one can present the thoughts and psychological processes of another person with complete purity. As Geertz (1983) noted:

The trick is not to get yourself into some inner correspondence of spirit with your informants. Preferring, like the rest of us, to call their souls their own, they are not going to be altogether keen about such an effort anyhow. The trick is to figure out what the devil they think they are up to. (p. 58)

At best, prolonged engagement, qualitative data gathering methods, and constant comparative data analysis give the researcher an opportunity to develop what Hanvey (1987) termed "cross-cultural awareness," and I prefer to term "the first approximation of an ideal form." Based on Kelly's (1955) Individuality Corollary, this first approximation is the best rendition of a person's thoughts carried out by another person. The ideal form of a person's thoughts can be achieved only by each individual person.

Although the naturalistic inquirer can never see the world exactly as seen through the eyes of another beholder, I can state safely that the assertions from this study represent a first approximation of the Polish educators'
thoughts. I make this claim because, like the constructivist Beethoven, I asked them if the case studies accomplished this goal, and they offered confirmation.

In this regard, the nexus between naturalistic inquiry approached hermeneutically and the theory of personal constructs served my research objective in this study (p. 79). In addition, this nexus offers a model for further research in cross-cultural psychology, particularly with regard to projects such as "Schools and Democratic Society."

**Next Steps**

Two recommendations concerning further cross-cultural psychological research on "Schools and Democratic Society" and similar projects emanated from this study.

First, this study explored the changing and/or developing constructs of five Polish educators on the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship. This study concentrated on their cross-cultural experiences in the United States during an organized project with a different, but related, topic—schools and democratic society.

A follow-up question lingers. What did the five individuals abstract from their experiences regarding their superordinate constructs that emerged in their professional careers as Polish teacher educators? Stated differently, what residual aspects of their cross-cultural experiences emerged in their teaching of the role of schools in
educating for democratic citizenship after they returned home and over time?

In order to get at these questions, research in Poland is a necessary next step. Further research on the residual aspects of the Polish educators' cross-cultural experiences could germinate from the three assertions offered in this report.

Part of this research, namely interviews with the Polish educators, could be carried out in English. However, observations in the Polish educators' classrooms is an essential part of the next step. This observational aspect of further research requires collaboration with Polish researchers familiar with the naturalistic paradigm and the theory of personal constructs. Of course, Polish researchers could conduct the entire next study.

Second, as a prototype, "Schools and Democratic Society" has no basis for comparison. Yet, the final version of the course plan is now in the hands of Ministries of Education throughout Central and Eastern Europe, scholars at Central and Eastern European and American universities, and public policy decision-makers in American governmental and non-governmental funding organizations. Coupled with the increasing number of collaborative education projects between American and Eastern and Central European interests (Citizens Democracy Corps, 1994), this exposure leads me to believe that similar projects are forthcoming.
Given this broad exposure of "Schools and Democratic Society," the possibility of future projects offers the possibility for undertaking similar studies. As more cross-cultural psychological studies emerge from future collaborations, the grounded assertions from this study can function as a basis for comparison. This basis involves the change and/or development of personal constructs concerning the role of schools in educating for democratic citizenship as investigated through naturalistic inquiry and analyzed through Kelly's theory of personal constructs.
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MERSHON CENTER CURRICULUM SEMINAR:
"SCHOOLS AND DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY"
Mershon Center Curriculum Seminar
SCHOOLS AND DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

James P. Gaudet
Seminar Director

Thompson T. Livingston
Senior Consultant

Floyd Baker
Senior Consultant

The goal of this seminar to provide a team of five Polish educators with the training, instructional materials, background readings, field experiences, and assistance from expert consultants they need to develop a complete first draft of a Course Syllabus for a two-semester college course on "Schools and Democratic Society." This Course Syllabus will serve as a model for fulfilling a new Ministry requirement that all students training to be teachers in Poland take such a course in order to be certified to teach any subject. The Course Syllabus will present the course rationale, objectives, readings/assignments, and bibliography; all student materials (readings) for the course; and a "Resource Guide" for the instructor containing additional readings and materials.

SEMINAR COMPONENTS

The Seminar will take place from September 14, 1992 to December 22, 1992. During this 14 week period the Seminar will have four components:

1. **regular meetings** of the five participants with the Seminar Director, Consultants and Coordinator to discuss progress, readings, and any issues relevant to the seminar;

2. **special workshops and guest lectures** on key topics related to the politics and governance of education in a democracy;

3. **field experiences**, visits to professional social studies education meetings, schools, school board meetings, and the like; and

4. **individual work**, study of seminar material and curriculum writing undertaken individually or in small groups during work times not occupied by components 1 to 3.
SEMINAR FACULTY AND STAFF

E. Graham More, Professor of Education, The Ohio State University
Lewis L. Simmons, Professor of Education and Director of the Social Studies Development Center, Indiana University
Clifford C. Johnson, Associate Professor of Education and Director of the Central Ohio Center for Economic Education, The Ohio State University
John Goryl, Senior Faculty Political Science, Mershon Center, The Ohio State University
Greg Hamot, Project Coordinator

SCHEDULE FOR SEMINAR AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

Unless otherwise noted all Workshops and Weekly Seminar Meetings will be held in the Mershon Center 3rd Floor Conference Room.

* = Activity includes Civics Course (USIA) Project participants

Week 1 (September 14)

9/14 - 6:15 pm Arrival, Port Columbus Airport (Clemens, Hamot, Gaudet)

* 9/15 - 11:00 am Cathy Creagar, Fiscal Officer Mershon Center (Complete OSU paperwork; obtain OSU identification cards)

* 9/16 - 9:00 am Orientation to Curriculum Seminar and Mershon Ctr
          10:00 am Computer Workshop, Session 1
          2:00 pm Campus Tour

* 9/17 - 10:30 am Orientation to OSU (Office of International Scholars)
          2:00 pm Computer Workshop, Session 2

* 9/18 - 9:00 am Orientation to OSU (Hamot, Clemens)
          11:00 am Computer Workshop, Session 3

* 9/19 - 4:00 pm Reception and Dinner at James Gaudet's home

* 9/20 - North Commons Open for Meals
          2:00 pm Tour of the City of Columbus
Week 2 (September 21)

* 9/21 - 10:00 am  Meet Dr. Tilman Tee, President, The Ohio State University  
    - 11:00 am  Discussion of "Products" to be Developed (Gaudet, Clemens, Hamot)

9/22 - 1:30 am  Library Orientation
    - 3:00 pm  Discussion of Syllabus (Livingston, Gaudet)

* 9/23 - 10:00 am  Orientation to NCSS Meeting (Clemens, Hamot)
    2:00 pm  Social Studies Methods Course (More, Rm 243 Arps Hall)

* 9/26 - 8:30 am  Conference: "Connecting Citizens and Schools" - Fort Hayes Career Center
    - 7:30 pm  Reception: Columbus Polish-American Club (St. Margaret of Cortona, 1600 North Hague Ave)

Week 3 (September 27)

* 9/27 - 11:00 am  Workshop on Principles of Democracy, Session 1 (Simmons)

* 9/28 - 8:30 am  Workshop on Principles of Democracy, Session 2 (Simmons)
    2:00 pm  Social Studies Methods Course (More)

* 9/29 - 9:00 am  Workshop on Principles of Democracy, Session 3 (Simmons)

10/2 - 9:30 am  Kenyon College Visit

* 10/3 - 12:00 pm  Lunch with OSU Slavic Studies Students (Flying Tomato Pizza)

Week 4 (October 5)

* 10/5 - 8:00 am  Workshop on Civic Leadership Skills, Session 1 (Goryl)
    2:00 pm  Social Studies Methods Course (More)

* 10/6 - 9:00 am  Workshop on Civic Leadership Skills, Session 2 (Goryl)

10/7 - 2:00 pm  Social Studies Methods Course (More)

10/8 - 9:00 am  Everett Elementary School Visit (Dr. Alice Tognatti)
Week 4 (cont'd.)

- 3:00 pm Syllabus Development Seminar (Livingston, Gaudet)
  *
- 7:30 pm Mershon Conference: "Mass Media Technologies and Democracy"
  Address by Daniel Schorr, Senior News Analyst, National Public Radio
  (Optional)

* 10/9 - 9:30 am Mershon Conference (Cont.) (Optional)

* 10/10 - 9:30 am Mershon Conference (Cont.) (Optional)
  *
- 8:00 pm Dance: Columbus Polish-American Club

* 10/11 - 9:30 am Mershon Conference (Cont.) (Optional)

Week 5 (October 12)

10/12 - 2:00 pm Social Studies Methods Course (More)
  *
- 4:30 pm Reception OSU Faculty and Graduate Students (Mershon Center)

10/13 - 4:00 pm Organization of Schooling in America: Structure, Governance &
  Reflections on the System (Dr. Marc Campbell) - 440 Ramseyer Hall
  *
- 7:00 pm Depart for ERIC Center at Indiana University

* 10/14 - TBA Workshop on Using ERIC and Teaching Democracy (Simmons, ERIC
  Staff)

* 10/15 - TBA Workshop on Using ERIC (Cont.)

* 10/16 - TBA Workshop on Using ERIC (Cont.) + Depart for Columbus, Ohio

* 10/17 - 9:00 am Syllabus Development Seminar (Livingston)
  11:00 am OSU v. Northwestern University Football Game and "Tailgate" Party
  hosted by Jim and Jane Gaudet

Week 6 (October 19)

10/19 - 1:30 pm Workshop on the Politics of Education Session 1 (Baker) - 440 Ramseyer
  Hall
Week 6 (cont'd.)

10/20 - 1:30 pm  Workshop on the Politics of Education Session 2 (Baker) - 440 Ramseyer Hall

10/21 - 9:00 am  Workshop on the Politics of Education Session 3 (Baker, Reese)
                 440 Ramseyer Hall

2:00 pm  Social Studies Methods Course (More)

10/22 - 1:00 pm  Economic Dimensions of American Education (Johnson)

* 10/23 - 10:00 pm  "Student Rights: Principles and Practice" (Dr. T. S. Williams)
                     440 Ramseyer Hall

Week 7 (October 26)

10/26 - 9:00 am  Douglas School Visit (9-12:00)
                 - 2:00 pm  Social Studies Methods Course (More)

10/27 - 9:00 am  Syllabus Development Seminar (Livingston, Gaudet)
                 - 2:00 pm  Economic Dimensions of American Education (Johnson)

10/28 - 2:00 pm  Social Studies Methods Course (More)

* 10/29 - 7:00 pm  Conduct Presentation on Project for Central Ohio Council for Social Studies (COCSS) Dinner Meeting (cancelled)

Week 8 (November 2)

11/2 - 8:30 am  Worthington Estates School Visit (8:30-10:00)
                 - 2:00 pm  Social Studies Methods Course (More)

11/3 - 9:00 am  Syllabus Development Seminar (Livingston, Gaudet)
                Presidential Election

11/4 - 2:00 pm  Social Studies Methods Course (More)

11/6 - 9:00 am  Syllabus Development Seminar (Livingston, Gaudet)
Week 9 (November 9)

11/9 - 9:00 am Syllabus Development Seminar (Livingston, Gaudet)
- 2:00 pm Social Studies Methods Course (More)

11/11 - 9:00 am Syllabus Development Seminar (Livingston, Gaudet)
* Veteran's Day

11/12 - 1:15 pm "Educating for Democracy: Looking to the 21st Century"
Ohio Wesleyan University

11/13 - 9:00 am "Educating for Democracy: Looking to the 21st Century"
Ohio Wesleyan University

11/14 - 7:00 pm Dinner with Drs. Terri and Graham More

Week 10 (November 16)

11/16 - 2:00 pm Social Studies Methods Course (More)

11/17 - 9:00 am Syllabus Development Seminar (Livingston, Gaudet)

* 11/19 - 12:00 pm Departure for National Council for Social Studies (NCSS) Annual
Meeting, Detroit

* 11/20 to 11/23 National Council for Social Studies Meeting

* 11/23 - 10:00 am Departure for Columbus

Week 11 (November 23)

11/25 - 9:00 am Syllabus Development Seminar (Livingston, Gaudet)

11/26 - Thanksgiving Holiday
Week 12 (November 30)

11/30 - 2:00 pm  Social Studies Methods Course (More)

12/2  - 9:00 am  Syllabus Development Seminar (Livingston, Gaudet)
           - 2:00 pm  Social Studies Methods Course: Last Class (More)

12/3  - 9:00 am  Syllabus Development Seminar (Livingston, Gaudet)

Week 13 (December 7)

12/6  - Brunch with Dr. and Mrs. Cliff Johnson
       - Dr. Tadeusz Kluszewski visits Project, Mershon Center, and College of Education (12/7,8,9)

12/7-9  Working Conference With Scholars to Review Draft Syllabus (Livingston, Gaudet)

Week 14 (December 14)

12/22  - Depart for Poland
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INFORMED CONSENT AGREEMENT
Informed Consent Agreement

I, ____________________________________________,

after having read Gregory E. Hamot's proposed dissertation design, understand that I will
have access to all the data that is pertinent to my personal participation in this study;
understand the purposes of this study; and agree that the researcher is the owner of the data
generated by this study. It is understood that the outcomes of this study are a negotiation of
mutual realities, and I reserve the right to require amendments or deletions of any portions of
the study that I find inappropriate as they refer to my role in the study. Also, I reserve the
right to disengage myself from this study at any time as long as I have explained my reasons
to the researcher.

Signature:  ____________________________________________

Date: ________________________________
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CODED DATA FROM AN INTERVIEW
Question #1(d): What has shown you this?

<All these meetings with people in need for expression of ideas in America have shown me this.>

<When you see the people during meetings in Poland, they really can't express their thoughts. They don't know how to do it. Some fanatics or professionals can do it.>  

<The role of school in America is to convince people that they have the right to express their point of view. A housewife or garbage collector has that right. It is part of your culture, but it is also an effect of your schools.>

<The students have the right to express themselves. This is a very important point for democratic citizenship education.>
Generally, we can’t create a democratic society if the people are ashamed to express their point of view. This does not fit my definition of democracy. (Democracy, for me, means the participation of citizens in public life.)

Question #1(e): Anything else?

What also convinced me of the importance of this role of the school was our first conference at Fort Hayes Career Center [OC: Conference on "Connecting Citizens and Schools"]. There, I saw very ordinary people who could express their point of view. This, for me, was very exciting.
APPENDIX D

SYLLABUS FOR E. GRAHAM MORE’S
SOCIAL STUDIES METHODS COURSE
EDUCATIONAL STUDIES 639

Ed. Stds 639 should be a course in which educational theory is combined with sound classroom practice. Yet, a break between the practical and the philosophical seems to me illogical. Pursuit of the practical makes sense only as it is done within the context of clearly justified purpose. By the same token, theoretical discourse on education will likely be meaningful only as it relates to that which you will do as a teacher—which means primarily relating to and working with kids. We'll attempt to blend the two dimensions in the hope that you'll complete the quarter knowing a bit more clearly what you want to do as a teacher, why you want to do it, and how you might go about bringing off what you have in mind. At another level perhaps we should begin to reconsider what we want to be as human beings, why we want to be that way, and how we can relate to other people in ways that are consistent with our values and goals.

At the heart of our study, it seems to me, should be a cluster of basic, persistent questions to which all teachers or aspiring teachers should constantly address themselves. Consider:

"What should be the basic goals of education?"
"What should be the basic goals of the Social Studies?"
"What are my goals as a teacher? How do they relate to the goals identified above?"
"What do I see as my role(s) as a teacher working in the Social Studies?"
"What role(s) do I expect my students to assume in my Social Studies classes?"
"What should be the role of content in Social Studies classes?"
"What assumptions do I make about the nature of learning and the nature of thinking? Are they valid? Why? What are the implications of these assumptions for my teaching? For my relations with other people?"
"What should be the role of the community in the teaching of the Social Studies?"

If we can persistently raise questions of this type and launch a serious search for answers to them, our fleeting time together promises to be profitable. Not that firm and unchangeable answers will emerge during the quarter. They won't—or shouldn't. If we bring final and absolute closure to such questions, we wither intellectually and dry up as teachers. Yet, you as a teacher will make countless teaching/human decisions, often at a split second's notice. Ideally those decisions will be based upon your best thinking and the best evidence available when that point of decision arrives. Grappling with the various dimensions of questions such as these, it seems to me, should be the primary focus of the quarter. Activities for the quarter should be selected for their value in helping us to address the questions. I hope that each of us—myself included—will emerge at the completion of our study with a clearer picture of where we as teachers are going and why we are going there (purpose), and with increased understanding of how our goals might be achieved (methodology and content).
A Sampling of Expectations

This list of expectations is necessarily incomplete. I anticipate that by the time we reach the end of the quarter you will have developed a working understanding of the items listed, but I also expect that you'll cultivate insights, understandings, skills, ideas, and attitudes that I've not anticipated and have not included. For now, let's assume that you'll become familiar with a wide range of teaching techniques and strategies, and that you will have developed a well-reasoned personal/professional position regarding the teaching of social studies. It seems reasonable to expect that as a part of this you'll be able to do the following:

1. Identify, justify and recognize the implications of your philosophy of teaching; particularly as regards the selection of content, the development of teaching strategies, and the creation and identification of teaching materials. (Consider the key questions listed above.)

2. Develop a working understanding of the following:
   a. Simulations--What are they? How and when should they be used? Where can they be found? What is the rationale for their use?
   b. Case Studies--What are they? How and when should they be used? Where can they be found? What is the rationale for their use?

3. Understand and be able to carry out inquiry oriented teaching. You should know thoroughly what is meant by inquiry, should be able to identify problems that could legitimately be inquired into a secondary social studies class, and should be able to describe how you as a teacher would lead your students through the inquiry process.

4. Be familiar with the potential of the media for teaching. You should, for example, be able to make color transparencies, use the thermofax duplicator, discuss and demonstrate a wide variety of uses of the newspaper in the social studies, and recognize the potential of photography as a teaching tool.

5. Develop a working familiarity with organizations such as the National Council for the Social Studies and with professional publications such as Social Education.

6. Be aware of the wide variety of teaching sources available for use in the Social Studies.

7. Be familiar with techniques for dealing with values of the Social Studies.

8. Improve in your ability to lead discussions.

9. Become familiar with problems and promises related to student teaching and to the job market.
10. Begin to develop a file of teaching materials.

11. Understand the relationship between teaching goals, instructional strategies, and evaluation.

12. Construct a variety of test items that are consistent with your teaching goals.

13. Be familiar with the Global Education Movement.


15. Develop a series of modules which can be used effectively in your teaching.

Responsibilities

In order to achieve these expectations, it seems to me that we are obliged to share a number of responsibilities. I am responsible in large measure for making the course a viable, interesting, and worthwhile experience. You in turn are responsible for helping to achieve these goals. I don't want to bore you. At the same time I don't want to be bored. You must not only feel free to discuss issues and ideas dealt with in class—you must do it if our dialogue is to have desired payoff. I am assuming that class sessions, group meetings, conferences, etc. will be worthwhile and that you will attend. Lax attendance will ultimately be reflected in the final grade for the course. If you're having problems with attendance, please see about them. I am also assuming that you will read the books and articles recommended and that it makes sense to do so. I hope that you'll extend far beyond the recommended reading, however, in search of answers to questions you have about teaching social studies. In the final analysis your responsibilities, as I view them, are not to me, but to yourselves and to other members of the class.

More specifically, you'll be expected to:

1. Complete all of the reading assigned during the quarter.

2. Develop a series of teaching modules to be submitted and evaluated. These assignments will emerge during the quarter. (Other brief writing assignments will be made during the quarter.)

3. Begin to develop a file of teaching materials. Include materials gotten from at least five free and/or inexpensive sources.

4. Develop a series of exemplary test items to be submitted and evaluated.

5. Successfully complete a final writing assignment, the nature of which remains to be determined.

6. Participate actively and constructively in class discussions and activities.
Field Experiences

If you wish to observe in the schools during the quarter, please notify me in writing. I will make every attempt to make arrangements for such experiences on an individual basis.

Required Text


Evaluation

Your final grade in the course will be based on the following:

- 50% - The accumulation of grades on your modules and other written assignments.
- 25% - Final Examination or Exercise
- 25% - Contribution to and participation in class activities.
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