Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on International Law and Legal Policy
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37069

Personal Construct Theory as a Meta-theoretical Framework for Contemporary Cognitive Personality Psychology

Jingkai Sun

Department of Psychology, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia
2461249812@qq.com

Abstract. Modern cognitive personality psychology has come up with numerous theoretical approaches to the way people familiarize themselves with the world. Nonetheless, conceptual fragmentation has also been facilitated by growing specialization in theory and relationships between these perspectives are more difficult to comprehend. This paper reinterprets Personal Construct Theory (PCT) as a meta framework for integrating contemporary cognitive theories within a common constructive perspective. It reconceptualizes personal constructs as dynamic systems in which knowledge is structured, implemented and revised. In this sense schema theory explains how knowledge is organized, mental model theory explains how organized knowledge operates through internal simulation and predictive processing theory describes how it is validated by comparing what is anticipated and experienced. A combination of these processes is construed as being functionally interrelated parts of an ongoing constructive system and not as separate theoretical explanations. This unification offers a more consistent conceptual vocabulary of cognitive personality psychology that facilitates cumulative theoretical advancement in the field and minimizes obstacles to interdisciplinary communication. PCT can also offer a more accessible theoretical basis on which psychological knowledge can be applied to other related fields by initially enhancing conceptual coherence within psychology.

Keywords: Personal Construct Theory, cognitive personality psychology, meta-theoretical framework, conceptual integration, predictive processing

1. Introduction

In the last few decades, the cognitive personality psychology has produced numerous theoretical approaches to explain how people perceive, structure and use knowledge. Schema theory, mental models, predictive processing and knowledge organization have all made valuable contributions to understanding certain facets of cognition. Overall, these theories have contributed significantly to the understanding of cognition and personality [1, 2].

Nevertheless, the accelerated evolution of modern cognitive theories has also led to a growing conceptual fragmentation. Different theoretical vocabularies are often used to describe similar psychological phenomena and theories that work at different levels of explanation are often considered as independent frameworks. Although each of the perspectives offer useful explanations

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37069

in their respective fields, comparatively little effort has been made to explain how these perspectives can be interconnected in a consistent theoretical framework [2, 3].

In terms of theory building, scientific advancement relies on increasing explanatory power as well as enhancing conceptual coherence. With the ongoing development of cognitive personality psychology, theories that deal with the same psychological phenomena ought to be ideally related by a more cohesive conceptual framework and not divided by more and more specialized terminology. This type of framework can help minimize unnecessary conceptual fragmentation, facilitate cumulative theoretical development within the discipline and provide a clearer conceptual basis for communication across related fields.

One approach to this problem is the Personal Construct Theory (PCT) [4]. PCT views human cognition not as a series of discrete cognitive processes but rather as an ongoing constructive process whereby individuals construct, modify and use their own systems of meaning in order to predict events. While PCT has been most commonly discussed in the context of personality psychology and psychotherapy, the theoretical principles of PCT may apply more broadly [5].

This paper thus reinterprets Personal Construct Theory as a meta-theoretical framework of modern-day cognitive personality psychology. It states that PCT offers a conceptually consistent and parsimonious model of knowledge organization, revision, and application in multiple contemporary theories of cognition. This paper investigates the possibility of these approaches being considered as parts of a shared constructive process based on the Personal Construct Theory by analyzing its relationship with schema theory, mental models, predictive processing, and other related views. By so doing, it will be able to play a part towards a more unified view of cognitive personality psychology.

2. Theoretical foundation of Personal Construct Theory

2.1. Constructive alternativism

Conventional theories of personality psychology have tended to assume that people experience an objective reality and then act on it cognitively and behaviorally, with reality acting as an external point of reference in psychological processes. In this view, the differences between individuals are mostly explained by the differences in traits, cognitive abilities or emotional processes. Personal Construct Theory (PCT) starts with a very different assumption. Instead of passively accepting reality, people construct and make sense of experience by developing personal systems of meaning which change over time.

This is the view of Constructive Alternativism which suggests that events do not have one inevitable psychological meaning. Rather, the same event can be construed in a variety of ways depending on the way in which past experiences have been organized within the construct system of an individual. As such, it is not the external events per se that dictate psychological responses but rather the meanings that individuals make out of those events [4].

Notably, Constructive Alternativism does not presuppose that any interpretation is as valid as another. Kelly did not deny the reality; he simply said that various constructions must be judged based on their ability to predict and effectively respond to future events. In this sense, personal constructs do not just play a role of representing experience but aiding in successful anticipation by constructive revision over time. This focus on anticipation distinguishes PCT from many descriptive theories of personality and gives it the theoretical basis to re-evaluate personal constructs as dynamic organizational principles instead of being static cognitive categories [4, 5].

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37069

2.2. What is a personal construct

Despite the fact that Personal Construct Theory was initially presented as a theory of personality, the personal construct is usually regarded as a rather inert cognitive entity. Constructs have been defined to be categories, bipolar dimensions or mental structures of interpreting experience. These characterizations reflect significant features of constructs but may downplay the idea that construct systems are constantly being reconstructed in the process of experience and thereby limiting the explanatory reach of PCT for learning, adaptation and psychological development [4, 5].

The argument of this paper is that personal constructs are not to be construed as rigid cognitive patterns, but as dynamic organizing principles which direct the ongoing organization, revision and use of knowledge. Their main role is not simply to categorize experience, but to facilitate more effective anticipation by allowing people to recognize significant patterns, contrast expectations with real results, and constantly improve future interpretations. Change in this interpretation is not an exception to the construct system; it is a necessary feature of its normal functioning.

Construct systems are thus more like self-maintaining systems than repositories of knowledge. As people learn new things, incongruence between expected and experienced outcomes reveal the shortcomings of existing constructs and provide opportunities for reinterpretation. Existing constructs are therefore revised in order to maintain their adaptive function and improve future anticipation. Therefore, psychological development should be seen as a continuous constructive process rather than gathering pieces of knowledge.

In this perspective, understanding takes up a central position within the constructive process. Knowledge accumulation per se does not necessarily enhance anticipation unless significant relationships between experiences are constructed. Personal constructs thus play a role in understanding by organizing isolated experiences into interpretative frameworks that can be used for prediction and action.

More to the point, the correlation between understanding and anticipation is a two-way relationship. Understanding shapes anticipation by organizing meaningful relationships within experiences, whereas the success or failure of anticipation continuously refines existing understanding. Constructive activity must then be regarded as a dynamic circle where understanding and anticipation are mutually reinforcing each other in a continuous interaction with experience.

This is also the reason why learning cannot be separated when it comes to personality development. Instead of being seen as separate psychological activities, learning, understanding and personality development can all be considered as various manifestations of the same constructive process whereby people are constantly reorganizing their knowledge in a bid to enhance anticipation. Understanding emerges from the organization of meaningful relationships among knowledge and experience, not simply the accumulation of knowledge.

3. Integration with contemporary cognitive theories

3.1. Schema theory as organized knowledge

The schema theory offers a powerful explanation of the way in which prior knowledge is structured and how this structure facilitates constructive processes like perception, interpretation and learning. Instead of considering knowledge as separate bits of information, it highlights that past experiences are structured into systematic cognitive patterns that influence the interpretation of new circumstances. By doing so, schema-based organization affects the selection of information,

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37069

retrieval of memories, and cognitive development because it defines what prior patterns are applicable to current experience [6, 7].

In the approach outlined here, schema theory refers to a particular aspect of the constructive process rather than being a stand-alone theory. Schemas account for how construct systems structure prior knowledge into coherent mental representations that can then be used to interpret and anticipate. The function of this organization is described by Personal Construct Theory. Knowledge organization is not the end point of cognition, but the basis for mental simulation, anticipation and revision [8].

The difference also helps to understand the connection between schema theory and personal constructs. This paper does not consider schemas and constructs as the same, but instead, considers schemas as the knowledge organization aspect of the constructive system. They explain how knowledge is structured, but do not account for the subsequent constructive processes through which organized knowledge is refined through experience. Therefore, schema theory can be interpreted as a description of one of the functional elements of the overall constructive cycle suggested by PCT [2].

Schema theory thus is not a rival to Personal Construct Theory. It explains the component of knowledge organization of a bigger constructive process. This maintains the explanatory power of schema theory but puts it in a larger context that can relate various modern cognitive theories.

3.2. Mental models as knowledge in operation

Based on the schema theory which stresses the importance of organizing previous knowledge, the mental model theory is concerned with how people cognitively represent and simulate the outside world to reason, problem solve, and predict potential outcomes. Mental models enable internal manipulation of organized knowledge in a way that enables one to explore hypothetical situations before acting upon them. The existing knowledge is therefore cognitively active: possible meanings, courses of action and outcomes can be tested by using construct systems prior to individuals interacting with real situations [9].

In this context, the theory of mental models does not compete with Personal Construct Theory but supplements it. Schema theory describes the organization of knowledge; mental model theory describes the use of organized knowledge in simulation. Construct systems do not support anticipation unless they can be used to assess alternatives and anticipate outcomes. The operational phase of the constructive process is therefore mental simulation: it uses construct systems to prepare for action.

In the Personal Construct Theory, anticipation is based on having structured knowledge and constantly verifying the effectiveness of the current construct systems in making sense of experience. One possible mechanism underlying this process is mental models which enable people to predict what might happen before they engage with the outside world. Construct systems are constantly tested and modified through a series of simulation-experience-feedback cycles in response to differences between expected and real results [9].

The theory of mental models therefore characterizes the working aspect of the constructive system that is suggested by PCT. It does not describe why constructive activity happens; it describes how organized knowledge is made functionally active in anticipation and revision. The theory of mental models thus takes a complementary role within the larger framework as opposed to being an alternative explanation.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37069

3.3. Predictive processing as construct validation

Based on the functioning of construct systems, predictive processing explains cognition by the creation and constant updating of predictions of the outside world. Instead of being passive in responding to sensory input, people are active and make predictions about what will happen in future and match them with experience. The difference between prediction and observation, or more generally, prediction error, offers a foundation to update internal cognitive systems and assess whether current constructs can still be used to support successful anticipation [10, 11].

The validation mechanism of the larger constructive system, in its turn, is referred to as predictive processing. Schema theory describes the organization of constructs and mental model theory describes how they are operationalized by internal simulation. Predictive processing describes the way in which those constructs are assessed with experience. Prediction error is not just a computational signal then, but it may suggest that an existing construct system needs additional evaluation or revision [10].

Notably, this interpretation is not the same as considering prediction error as a mechanism of correcting errors. In Personal Construct Theory, revision does not imply that a construct has failed but is an aspect of the adaptive process by which construct systems stay responsive to new experience. Constructive revision thus constitutes the natural process through which construct systems retain their adaptive role and at the same time retain their ability to predict future events. Prediction error may therefore lead to additional assessment and adaptation in varying environmental conditions [11].

Predictive processing is therefore the construct validation aspect of the larger framework that PCT proposes. It gives an elaborate description of the testing, updating and maintenance of constructive systems by continued interaction with experience. Along with schema theory and mental model theory it constitutes one functional part of a single constructive process based on Personal Construct Theory.

3.4. Integrating contemporary cognitive theories through PCT

The above analyses indicate that schema theory, mental model theory and predictive processing cannot be considered as rival explanations of human cognition. Instead, each theory focuses on a different functional aspect of the constructive system by which people structure, function and constantly revise their knowledge. Taken separately, these theories give partial explanations since each of them dwells on a specific level or stage of the constructive process. They can however be interpreted in terms of Personal Construct Theory to be seen as complementary parts of one constructive system.

This re-interpretation also helps to clarify the various levels of explanation at which these theories are working. Schema theory is mainly a theory of knowledge organization into relatively stable cognitive structures. The mental model theory describes how systems of organized constructs become operational by simulating them internally, allowing people to consider potential situations prior to taking action. Predictive processing also describes the validation and revision of constructive systems by comparing the anticipated and actual experience. Personal Construct Theory, on the other hand, does not restrict itself to describing any one of these mechanisms. It offers a more general conceptual scheme to describe the way in which knowledge organization, internal simulation and predictive validation all play their part in the continuous construction and reconstruction of human understanding.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37069

The importance of this reinterpretation is not to present a new competing theory of cognition, but to offer a shared conceptual language through which one can relate the existing theories in a constructive system. Knowledge organization, mental simulation and predictive validation can thus be considered as functionally related aspects of the same constructive process instead of being separate psychological processes. This reduces unnecessary conceptual fragmentation within cognitive personality psychology and gives a more coherent basis on theoretical integration and communication with other fields that rely on models of human cognition.

4. Discussion

4.1. Theoretical contributions

The current research paper is a contribution to the literature on the Personal Construct Theory and cognitive psychology of personality in three related ways. First, it reinterprets Personal Construct Theory (PCT) as a meta-theoretical framework capable of organizing several contemporary cognitive theories within a common constructive perspective, instead of considering PCT as a classical theory of personality. Second, it reconceptualizes personal constructs as constructive systems that are dynamic and continuously organize, operate, validate, and revise knowledge by interacting with experience. Third, it suggests a shared conceptual language in terms of which schema theory, mental model theory, and predictive processing can be interpreted as characterizing different functional parts of the same constructive system as opposed to being distinct traditions in theory.

These are not independent contributions but mutually supportive. They collectively give a more conceptually coherent explanation of PCT and offer a potential model for integrating contemporary cognitive personality psychology.

4.2. Implications for psychological theory

The results of the present study indicate that future progress in cognitive personality psychology may require both new theories and greater conceptual integration. As science becomes more and more specialized, the same psychological phenomena are described using different theoretical terms, which makes it harder to integrate theories. A more consistent conceptual system might thus help cumulative knowledge building by clarifying relationships between concepts, minimizing unnecessary conceptual redundancy, and facilitating comparisons of theoretical claims across studies [2, 3].

More to the point, conceptual coherence should first be achieved within psychology itself before broader interdisciplinary collaboration can be expected. Without a coherent conceptual language, a discipline will not easily offer a consistent theoretical basis to other disciplines. In this sense, theoretical integration is not only a matter of simplification, but a precondition of the further development of psychological science.

4.3. Implications, limitations, and future directions

Enhancing conceptual coherence in psychology can also make psychological knowledge more accessible to other disciplines such as education, learning sciences, human–computer interaction and artificial intelligence. By integrating concepts rather than forcing researchers from these fields to

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37069

work with multiple overlapping theories, greater conceptual coherence may offer a stronger basis for interdisciplinary research and application [3, 5].

However, the current research is still more of a theoretical one, and the suggested framework has not been studied yet in terms of systematic empirical comparison of various cognitive and personality-related phenomena. Future studies can thus take two paths; generalizing the framework to other cognitive theories and empirically testing the explanatory value of the framework in various settings. Such work could test whether the proposed relationships among knowledge organization and construct revision provide a useful account of how constructive processes operate in practice.

Finally, theoretical integration has the potential to enhance conceptual unity in psychology and allow psychological knowledge to become a more accessible and straightforward source of future interdisciplinary research.

5. Conclusion

This paper reinterprets Personal Construct Theory as a meta-theoretical framework for integrating contemporary cognitive theories within a common constructive perspective. The proposed framework unifies knowledge organization, mental simulation, anticipation, validation, and revision by conceptualizing schema theory, mental model theory, and predictive processing as various functional elements of the same constructive process without having to consider these processes as separate theoretical systems.

It is not that there are many theories in psychology, but that related theories tend to be formulated in terms of different conceptual systems. A clearer conceptual structure can reduce unnecessary theoretical fragmentation and offer a better basis for the cumulative advancement of research in psychology. This kind of coherence is also a prerequisite for interdisciplinary exchange: psychological knowledge must be clearly organized within the discipline before it can be readily understood and used outside of it. By offering a more accessible and economical conceptual terminology, PCT may thus contribute to the communication of psychological theoretical insights in areas such as education, human-computer interaction and artificial intelligence. Psychological progress also relies on linking up knowledge in ways that make this field more integrated, accessible to future cross-disciplinary growth.

References

[1] Cervone, D. (2004). The architecture of personality. *Psychological Review, 111*(1), 183–204.
[2] Bittermann, A., McNamara, D. S., Simonsmeier, B. A., & Schneider, M. (2023). The landscape of research on prior knowledge and learning: A bibliometric analysis. *Educational Psychology Review, 35*, 58.
[3] Botella, L. (2026). Commentary: Still becoming—The ongoing emergence of personal construct psychology in a fragmented century. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*. Advance online publication.
[4] Kelly, G. A. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs*. W. W. Norton & Company.
[5] Winter, D. A. (2026). Personal construct psychology—Still going strong at 70? *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*. Advance online publication.
[6] Farzanfar, D., Spiers, H. J., Moscovitch, M., & Rosenbaum, R. S. (2023). From cognitive maps to spatial schemas. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 24*, 63–79.
[7] Igarashi, K. M., Lee, J. Y., & Jun, H. (2022). Reconciling neuronal representations of schema, abstract task structure, and categorization under cognitive maps in the entorhinal-hippocampal-frontal circuits. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology, 77*, 102641.
[8] Tokuhama-Espinosa, T., Simmers, K., Batchelor, D., Nelson, A. D., & Borja, C. (2023). A theory of mental frameworks. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, 1220664.
[9] Johnson-Laird, P. N. (1999). Deductive reasoning. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50*, 109–135.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.37069

[10] Sprevak, M., & Smith, R. (2023). An introduction to predictive processing models of perception and decision-making. *Topics in Cognitive Science*. Advance online publication.
[11] Furutachi, S., & Hofer, S. B. (2026). Rethinking predictive processing. *Annual Review of Neuroscience, 49*, 471–494.