Elżbieta Wiścicka

Expertise in Teaching

Annales Neophilologiarum nr 8, 203-217

2014

ANNALES NEOPHILOLOGIARUM 8
Rok 2014

*ELŻBIETA WIŚCICKA**
Uniwersytet Szczeciński

EXPERTISE IN TEACHING

1. Developing expertise in teaching

Various studies on expertise in teaching (e.g. Berliner 1987) examine the characteristics of expert teachers and how these characteristics differ from the characteristics of novice teachers. The studies analyze and compare the cognitive processes in which expert and novice teachers engage when they teach, and the reflections they have on their teaching. Therefore, as Tsui suggests, "expert teachers provide models of successful teaching that could serve as the scaffolding for novice teachers to attain a greater degree of competence" (2003: 2). These models, that is **the knowledge** and **skills** teachers develop, are created by cognitive processes, and are closely connected with the specific contexts in which expert teachers work.

2. Experts versus experienced nonexperts

The question of how and why some teachers become experts while others simply remain experienced nonexperts is an important question that should be addressed. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1993, cited in Tsui 2003:3) emphasise the importance of understanding of the knowledge base and subject-specific knowledge of expert teachers, and how expert teachers develop this knowledge.

* Elżbieta Wiścicka – doktor, Katedra Filologii Angielskiej, luiza54@op.pl

Studies of expertise have pointed to experience as a crucial factor in the development of expertise (Dreyfus and Dreyfus 1986). Nevertheless, mere experience may not result in the development of expertise. As stated by Tsui (2003), some teachers never seem to improve, despite a lengthy period of service. There is a familiar saying that *there is a difference between teachers with twenty years' teaching experience and those with one year's teaching experience repeated twenty times*.(Ur 1996: 317). This means that experience will only contribute to expertise if teachers are capable of learning from it. Learning from experience means reflecting on teaching practices, and this ability to reflect on experience is precisely what distinguishes experts from experienced nonexperts and from novices.

Indeed, monitoring and self-regulation are highly important for experts in order to maintain their expertise. Eraut (1994: 155) gives two reasons why experts need to be reflective:

> Too many theories of professional expertise tend to treat experts as infallible, in spite of much evidence to the contrary. Not only do professionals succumb to many of the common weaknesses which psychologists have shown to be regular features of human judgments; but some allow aspects of their expertise to decay and become a little less relevant or even out of date. Thus there is a need for professionals to retain critical control over the more intuitive parts of their expertise by regular reflection, self-evaluation, and a disposition to learn from colleagues. This implies from time to time treating apparently routine cases as problematic and making time to deliberate and consult.

Ultimately, *reflection* is a prominent feature characterising the concept of expertise. Experts, therefore, should not only possess a highly organised and sophisticated range of knowledge but also be able to self-monitor and self-evaluate their own performance. Thus expertise should be seen as a continuous process, and not as a state. This aspect has been highlighted by Bereiter and Scardamalia (1993, quoted in Tsui 2003:17). They claim that experts are equipped with plenty of experience and knowledge accumulated over time and revised through practice; therefore, the investigation of how experts develop their expertise over time is crucial but should not be analysed in terms of expert-novice comparison but rather by "an expert" versus "experienced nonexpert" problem solving approach. Hence their observation that the critical difference between experts and nonexperts refers to the types of problems that experts and nonexperts solve. They maintain that experts solve problems which they consider challenging and a little

above their competence, which in turn leads to their development, while nonexperts tend to address problems for which they do not have to make such an effort. Another concept in Bereiter and Scardamalia's theory of expertise is what they call "the process of expertise" (in Tsui 2003: 19). The fact that experts make conscious efforts to solve problems leads to a development of routines. Therefore, they enrich their repertoire of routines and scripts and can deal efficiently with problems encountered previously and, in this way, are mentally free to engage in problem solving at a higher level. It is true that after some years of practice everybody is ready to use patterns and procedures, but the crucial difference between experts and experienced nonexperts is that experts look for new ways in dealing with old problems and do not seek to resolve their problems by applying safe and routine practices, whereas nonexperts reduce their problems to a level which can be dealt with by learned patterns and routines.

There are three aspects of expertise most frequently mentioned in the Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986), and Eraut (1994) theories of expertise. These are:

1. expert performance,
2. the critical features which distinguish experts from novices or nonexperts,
3. how expertise is acquired and developed.

The first aspect, *expert performance,* is considered automatic, effortless and fluid. The second aspect, *the critical features which distinguish experts from novices or nonexperts,* poses some difficulty because there are debates as to whether expert knowledge is intuitive and tacit. Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) suggest that expert performance is marked by experience which distinguishes experts from novices. For Eraut (1994), routinised performance is not a feature of expertise; only the ability to consciously analyse and deliberate upon problems sets experts apart from novices. The third aspect, *how expertise is acquired and developed*, has been addressed by Bereiter and Scardamalia (1993), who point to the fact that experience is often mistaken as expertise, and they propose the investigation of how experts acquire and maintain expertise. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1993, quoted by Tsui 2003: 21) perceive "the development and maintenance of expertise as a process in which experts continuously reinvest their mental resources, freed up by the acquisition of relevant knowledge through experience, in problematizing what is taken as routine, in reformulating problems and in solving them". As stated before, conceptualization of expertise as a process, but not a state, adds a different dimension to the discussion on the expert-novice comparison.

3. Characteristics of expert and novice teachers in the preactive, interactive and postactive phases

Studies of expert versus novice teaching and teachers' mental processes involved in planning and decision making were based on an informational processing model of the mind in cognitive psychology (Calderhead 1996). These analyses focused on the 'preactive' and 'interactive' phases suggested by Jackson (1968), and *postactive phase* put forward by Clark and Peterson (1986). According to Reynolds (1992: 4–5), the three phases are not bounded by time; on the contrary, they may blend one into another, as in the example she gives: "while teachers grade student papers (an interactive task), they may reflect on how the students' responses met or did not meet their expectations (postactive task). They may then use this information to plan the next day's lesson (preactive task)" (ibid: 4–5).

However, the *preactive phase* refers to planning the lesson and the activities in which a teacher is involved, such as choosing materials, deciding on the activities, evaluating and selecting relevant teaching methods and techniques. *The interactive phase* refers to the lesson itself, where teachers interact with students in the classroom. The *postactive phase* refers to teachers' reflections on their own teaching and students' responses in order to find out the strong and weak points of the teaching and learning process, and therefore refine their own teaching practices.

3.1. The preactive phase

The process of planning and the mental plan, a result of thinking, is the most important activity for the experts. Calderhead (1984: 69) points out that

> …it is in planning that teachers translate syllabus guidelines, institutional expectations, and their own beliefs and ideologies of education into guides for action in the classroom. This aspect of teaching provides the structure and purpose for what teachers and pupils do in the classroom.

Expert teachers are mostly involved in creating mental plans. Many studies on lesson planning (e.g. Calderhead 1984, Livingston and Borko 1989, Richards 1998) reported that expert teachers planned their lessons mentally, and sometimes at odd moments such as when watching TV, driving home or taking a shower.

Novice teachers, however, planned their lessons meticulously, noting down what they were going to say and what they would write on the blackboard. In some cases, when they lacked confidence and had discipline problems, they scripted their lessons and delivered them to students as mini lectures so as to avoid any embarrassing situations. It is also the present author's contention that this important difference between novice and expert lesson planning stems from the fact that expert teachers are better equipped, and much better prepared for planning. Because they are more experienced, they can recall previous lessons and make selective choices regarding the content of the lesson they are going to teach. They are also ready to use previously-mastered routines. Expert teachers believe that there are many contingencies in the classroom which may affect the development of the lesson; they are therefore prepared to introduce changes to their original plans if need be. Similarly, expert teachers are able to anticipate possible problems in the lesson, with the result that they are able to deal with those problems by means of contingency plans. By contrast, novice teachers find it difficult to anticipate problems in the classroom and are extremely reluctant to depart from their plans.

Tsui (2003: 29) points to four main characteristics of *preactive* thinking on which novice and expert teachers differ. **The first** emphasises expert teachers' autonomy in the planning process, whereas novice teachers' planning is governed by rules and models. According to the model put forward by Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986: 21), these rules are based on theoretical thinking, and therefore may not be related to a particular context. The first stage of this model defines the novices' actions as guided by rules and a set of objective facts and features related to the skill, with the contexts in which the actions take place not being taken into consideration. Furthermore, novices are neither taught nor given examples of situations in which they should violate the rules in order to successfully proceed with the task. It is clearly pointed out by Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986: 22) that

> The beginning student wants to do a good job, but lacking any coherent sense of the overall task he judges his performance mainly by how well he follows learned rules. After he acquires more than just a few rules, the exercise of his skill requires so much concentration that his capacity to talk or listen to advice is severely limited.

Because of this, novices often evaluate their own performance by how well they follow the rules. Expert teachers, however, are far more flexible in this respect and are aware of the contextual factors which they need to consider in their

planning. Due to their experience, they are ready to depart from the original plan and take responsibility for their decisions.

Expert teachers' efficiency in lesson planning is **the second characteristic** which differentiates novice from expert teachers. Expert teachers are more efficient in their lesson planning because not only do they spend less time planning, but the time spent is also more effective due to their repertoire of routines which they can refer to when planning, having taught similar lessons before. Expert teachers are far more flexible and responsive to contextual factors than novices, which is **the third characteristic** of the *preactive stage*. Expert teachers perceive context as an integral part of their teaching, whereas novices tend to ignore it.

The fourth characteristic highlights the planning thoughts of expert teachers. The expert teachers' thinking process integrates their knowledge of the curriculum, the students, teaching methods and strategies, the classroom setting, the school and parents' expectations and other contextual variables. Clark and Peterson (1986) report that experienced teachers' planning is very modest in the sense that they do not use a linear, rational planning model. Novices or beginning teachers, on the other hand, need a linear model to structure their planning before they develop their own planning style that is compatible with their own way of teaching and the teaching context. Teachers' decisions in the preactive phase are strongly influenced by their understanding of students. It appears that beginning teachers may see students in different ways from those in which good experienced teachers see students. Reynolds (1992:10) observes that novices tend to perceive their students as having individual differences, with the result that they do not take into consideration their students' prior knowledge of the subject matter and their prior class performance as often as experienced teachers do.

All in all, expert teachers create lessons which enable students to connect what they already know to new information. They know the subject matter well enough to explain it to students. Expert teachers know their students in ways that allow them to adjust the content to be taught, materials and instructional activities to their students. The present author shares the opinion that novices possess subject matter knowledge to an extent which enables them to create appropriate lessons, yet they seem to do so in a more artificial way. They often have problems explaining particular aspects of the language to their students, they have problems seeing the pedagogical implications of student differences, and, for these reasons, are often unable to adjust materials and instruction to individual students.

3.2. The interactive phase

There are certain crucial differences in the manner in which expert and novice teachers attend to classroom events. How they respond to classroom events is crucial for successful performance. In the course of the lesson many events in the classroom occur simultaneously and teachers somehow must respond to them. Novice teachers are mostly overwhelmed by the number and diversity of the events they should deal with during the lesson, and find it very difficult to assign any meaning to them, being able only to make descriptive comments of the events.

In the course of the lesson the teacher responds to his or her students' understanding and participation and is more often than not forced to redirect the lesson. These unplanned, indeed difficult to predict, situations call for improvisation on the part of the teacher. The way teachers manage this process of teaching is done, according to Clark and Peterson (1986, quoted in Richards 1998), by applying "routines" which refer to a set of procedures established over time to control and coordinate learners' behaviour. Accordingly, experienced teachers teach using **well–established routines**. Berliner, in the description of his study which analyzed more and less experienced teachers, signifies the importance of the routines:

> […] the experts had routines for beginning the class. They seemed to possess routines to introduce themselves, explain new rules, get lots of student information, and to 'groove' the students. These routines are the shared, scripted, virtually automated pieces of action that constitute so much of our daily lives. In classrooms, routines often allow students and teachers to devote their attention to other, perhaps more important matters inherent in the lesson. In [a study] of how an opening homework is conducted, an expert teacher was found to be brief, taking about one-third lesson time than a novice. She was able to pick up information about attendance, and about who did or did not do the homework, and identified who was going to get help in the subsequent lesson. […] In contrast, when the novice teacher was enacting an opening homework review she was not able to discover quickly who did or did not do the homework, she had problems with taking attendance, and she asked ambiguous questions that led to inadequate assessment of the difficulty level of the homework. At one time the novice lost control of the pace, and never did learn which students were going to have more difficulty later on with the lesson (1987: 72).

The routines which teachers use often go unnoticed by them, because they are so natural and automatic; nevertheless, they constitute the basis for their expertise. Berliner (1987: 73) comes to the conclusion that "Automatization of behavioural routines along with clarity in one's mental script about how things should occur is not expertise, but those factors probably constitute a great deal of the necessary conditions for the development of expertise".

In interactive teaching, many events take place simultaneously at a rapid pace, and there are observable differences as to how expert and novice teachers perceive and monitor these events.

Berliner (1987) gives an account of such differences when relating to novice/expert information for beginning instruction. In the study, the sample groups of novices and expert teachers were asked to comment on how they would begin instruction in a situation where they would have to take over a class from the previous teacher. The common strategy adopted by the novices was to review content with their students. These reviews focused on providing the students with feedback; for example, "Novice: I'd ask them where they were in the text, and the next day I'd review important concepts that they'd already covered because it didn't seem they understood it well" (Berliner 1987: 73).

From the account given, it is obvious that for the novices the students were in fact not the source of information of where to start. Therefore, they would not try to find out from the students themselves what they had actually learned of the material covered, but they [the novices] would proceed with revision of what, to them, seemed basic. The expert teachers, in contrast, would first elicit information from the students in order to assess their knowledge of the subject matter, and then proceed with the review exercises. One expert indicated he would first interact with the students and assess what they remembered before proceeding with the new material. Although both groups, expert and novice teachers, planned to review student work to obtain information from students, the way they perceived this revision was different. The novice teachers approached the revision as a chance to correct student errors, whereas the experts introduced the revision procedures in order to elicit from the students how much they already knew, and then act accordingly. According to Berliner (ibid.), this is a subtle but important difference in the conceptualisation of the work with the students as perceived by both groups.

Selectivity is another dimension on which expert and novice teachers differ. The term *selectivity* means here "an ability to separate important from salient

incidental information" (Corno 1981, cited in Tsui 2003: 34). Various studies discuss the importance of selectivity in teaching (e.g. Clark and Peterson 1986, Berliner 1987).

Shavelson and Stern (1981) also observed selectivity in the interactive teaching of expert teachers. The expert teacher does not consider a large number of *alternative routines* when the lesson does not go according to plan. In most cases, s/he considers one *alternative routine*, provided it is available in his or her repertoire of routines developed from previous teaching. If the routine is not available, then the teacher reacts spontaneously and continues teaching. In such situations, the teacher decides whether or not to include this action in future planning.

Considering the kinds of events which expert and novice teachers perceive to be worth their attention, novice teachers were found to attend more to student behaviour, and were more concerned with *discipline problems,* leaving aside instructional objectives. The studies presented by Kagan (1992) and Virta (2002) support this opinion. Experts, however, were far more selective in their class management, focusing mainly on meaningful activities. They were mostly concerned with how much their students were engaged in meaningful activities, with the result that they tried to minimize off-task time. Reynolds (1992) discusses this aspect of novice/expert teacher differentiation and states that competent teachers tend to ignore minor distractions and instances of misbehaviour and deal with potentially serious disruptive problems. They use a repertoire of management techniques in a particular sequence starting with eye contact and movement through the classroom to talking to the disruptive student in private to determine his or her level of awareness about behaviour and ask for explanations for it. They try to get the student to accept responsibility for the behaviour and make sure the student understands why his or her behaviour is unacceptable. Further on Reynolds observes that expert teachers reflect on the problem students who are not cooperative and "make distinctions between students who 'could not' and 'would not' do their work; they have a repertoire of strategies to engage students in work" (Reynolds 1992:13).

There is yet one more difference which pertains to the novice and expert ways of problem representation and problem solving. Experienced teachers' analyses of classroom events not only *reflect* knowledge of classroom procedures and principles of effective classroom teaching, they also provide *justifications* for their comments. Berliner (1987) points out that the experts in his study ap-

peared to perceive and analyse content, instructional and curricular issues at a substantially deeper level than novices. They used homework or test information as a source of information which had caused or would cause their students' success or failure. In contrast to novices, experts, through analysing students' work, managed to extract information regarding which concepts were difficult for students, and which content required immediate attention. The following example is illustrative:

> Expert: The student who had four incorrect [story problems] really understood it better than the student that had two incorrect because of the questions he missed. The way he missed his, he really got the concept. He missed partial problems so he did understand it. So I felt as though the boy that had the four incorrect answers had a better understanding of the chapter. I think he could have helped most of the other students in practically all areas because he did understand those story problems (Berliner 1987: 74).

Novices' responses, however, were far less reflective, tending to focus on the more 'surface' information, as in the following example:

> Novice: I didn't go over the tests too much, except just getting the scores. I looked at the grades the students got on the tests. I noticed their grades corresponded to some of the comments of the back [of the cards]. The one [card] said they were having problems and had a low test score. But I didn't spend a long time looking over the tests (ibid.).

Summing up the characteristics of novice and expert teachers in the interactive phase, it is important to emphasise, first of all, **efficiency** in processing information in the classroom. Expert teachers are very efficient in their teaching because they are able to "make sense of and recognise patterns in a large quantity of simultaneously transmitted information within a short period of time" (Tsui 2003:38). The second characteristic is **selectivity** in processing information. Expert teachers consider students' learning as the most important element of the teaching and learning process; they therefore select information in such a way so as to maximise their students' learning. Because expert teachers have a ready repertoire of routines, they are thus able to respond to students' needs and unanticipated classroom events. Their ability to *improvise,* which helps them to respond appropriately to a variety of unexpected events, is a consequence of the repeated use of routines. The expert teachers' teaching is therefore *automatised* to a large extent and this, in turn, gives them greater space to analyse

problems at a substantially more profound level. Most of all, expert teachers are able to offer interpretations and solutions which are based on principles.

In brief, expert teachers create classrooms in which students want to learn. They develop good rapport and empathy with students. They maximise time which is spent on involving students in meaningful activities and minimise time which is spent on waiting for activities to get started and making transitions between activities. In addition, they establish and maintain rules and routines which are appropriate and fair to students. Novices may have difficulty in creating a learning atmosphere in their classrooms and problems with establishing rules and routines. This is mainly due to the fact that they have problems understanding the classroom environment. Expert teachers use appropriate techniques to present the subject matter and take on different roles at different stages of the lesson in order to help students learn effectively. They relate new material to that already learned and to students' previous experiences. In addition, they observe students, assess their needs and try to adapt instruction to meet these needs. They model learning to help students develop metacognitive strategies. Novices, on the other hand, find it difficult to perform teacher roles and execute all these tasks smoothly, mainly due to a lack of experience and, thus, a lack of well-developed instructional routines. In the present author's opinion, the importance of selectivity, and an ability to separate crucial elements of information from irrelevant or unimportant at a particular moment of teaching is a step towards the teacher's improvement, and this should be emphasised in novice teacher training right from the very start.

3.3. The postactive phase

Reflection is one of the principal characteristics of expert teachers. They reflect on their own teaching and students' responses in order to find out strengths and weaknesses in the teaching and learning process. Furthermore, they use various forms of assessment not only to evaluate their students but also to evaluate their own teaching methods, and thus refine their own teaching practices in order to enhance student learning. Unfortunately, this is not the case with novices. Reynolds (1992) points out that beginning teachers do reflect on their practice, but their reflections appear to be less focused than experienced teachers' reflections. To the beginning teacher, everything seems important and worthy of comment.

Studies on experience and expertise (e.g. Berliner 1987, Calderhead 1987, Lowyck and Clark 1989, Tsui 2003) have led the present author to conclude that experienced teachers differ from less experienced teachers or inexperienced teachers in many profound ways. Their experience has given them enough personal knowledge to create their own opinions of the students and events that occur in the classroom. Novices, on the other hand, have facts, concepts and principles, but very little personal experience. Experienced teachers use their rich base of personal experience when they label students or give their own meaning to classroom events. Kolodner (1983, cited in Berliner 1987:75) discusses how memory evolves as one progresses from a novice to an expert:

> Two things happen in that evolution. First, knowledge is built up incrementally on the basis of experience. Facts, once unrelated, get integrated through occurrence in the same episodes. Second, reasoning processes are refined, and usefulness and rigidity of rules is learned… Because experience is vital from the evolution from novice to expert, experience is organised in long-term memory, and guides reasoning processes…When a person has only gone to school and acquired book knowledge, he is considered a novice. After he has had experience using the knowledge he has learned, and he knows how it applies both to common and exceptional cases, he is called an expert…Experience serves to turn unrelated facts into expert knowledge.

Experienced teachers exhibit *memory for information* which is different from the memory of less experienced teachers. They perceive different things, and therefore remember different things. In the process of teaching, they evaluate their students by using their personal knowledge. They use their unique memory to analyse student work, and the same cognitive processes are used to develop plans for instruction which differ from those of the novices. The overall performance differences between less and more experienced teachers discussed in the above mentioned studies lead to the conclusion that experience can change a person. However, the same studies emphasise the fact that some teachers did not seem to have profited from years of accumulated experience. Nevertheless, the present author is of the opinion that **motivation** and **reflection** are the key factors which can transform novice teachers into expert teachers. Constructive research into the two salient issues, the influence of experience on the thoughts and actions of teachers, and the nature of the skills possessed by expert teachers, will expand the knowledge base about teachers and teaching.

4. Concluding remarks

The above discussion has outlined a gateway to expertise in teaching. In the present author's contention, it is important to be clear about the true meaning of the **concept of expertise**. The importance of differentiating between *expertise* and *experience* is crucial in the process of teacher development. Only then does *experience* contribute to *expertise* if teachers are capable of learning from their experience. Therefore, reflecting on teaching practices is a key element in the process of becoming an expert. Another key element is a highly sophisticated and well-organised level of knowledge which teachers need to possess in order to teach well. The combination of these two elements can guarantee teacher development and finally expertise in teaching. However, the ability to self-monitor and self-evaluate one's performance is **a continuous process**, and not a state. The present author is of the opinion that, in order to maintain expertise, teachers should perceive their previously *learned patterns and routines* as 'tools', which may help them to solve challenging problems. If these 'tools' are used skilfully and thoughtfully, and the teachers are not reluctant to make an effort and take risks in order to find new ways of solving their teaching problems, they are well on the way to becoming experts. And this continuous effort to look for new ways in dealing with challenging problems is precisely what differentiates experts from nonexperts. Since the latter tend to reduce their problems to a level which is easily dealt with, they can solve them by previously learned patterns and routines.

It stands to reason that the difference between novice and expert teachers is even more considerable than between experts and experienced nonexperts, because novices lack the experience that nonexperts have accumulated over a period of teaching. They need time to develop their own planning style which will be compatible with their way of teaching and the teaching context. They should learn how to select meaningful activities from among those which are irrelevant or unimportant. In addition, they must learn to ignore minor distractions and deal with potentially more serious discipline problems.

With all this taken into consideration, it is reasonable to emphasise reflection and self-monitoring as early as possible in teacher training programs. This may help novices to adopt a reflective and critical approach to their own teaching, thus helping them to be more autonomous in their decisions, and giving them guidelines for pursuing expertise in teaching.

Bibliography

Bereiter C., Scardamalia M., 1993, *Surpassing Ourselves – An Inquiry into the Nature and Implications of Expertise*, Open Court, Illinois.

Berliner D., 1987, *Ways of thinking about students and classrooms by more and less experienced teachers*[in:] J. Calderhead (ed.), pp. 60–83.

Berliner D.C., Calfee R.C. (eds), 1996, *The handbook of educational psychology*, Macmillan, New York.

Bereiter C., Scardamalia M., 1993, *Surpassing Ourselves – An Inquiry into the Nature and Implications of Expertise*, Open Court, Illinois.

Calderhead J., 1984, *Teachers' Classroom Deciasion-Making*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, London.

Calderhead J., 1996, *Teachers: beliefs and knowledge*, [in:] D.C. Berliner, R.C. Calfee (eds), pp. 709–725.

Clark C., Peterson P., 1986, *Teachers' thought processes*. [in"] M. Wittrock (ed.), pp. 255–297.

Corno L., 1981, *Cognitive organising in classrooms*, "Curriculum Inquiry" vol. 11, pp. 359–377.

Dreyfus H.L., Dreyfus S.E., 1986, *Mind over Machine*, Macmillan, New York..

Eraut M., 1994., *Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence*, The Falmer Press, London.

Jackson P.W., 1968, *Life in Classrooms*, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York.

Kagan D.M., 1992, *Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers*, "Review of Educational Research" vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 129–169.

Kolodner J., 1983., *Towards an understanding of the role of experience in the evolution of novice to expert*, "International Journal of Man-machine Studies" vol. 19, pp. 497–518.

Livingston C., Borko H., 1989, *Expert – novice differences in teaching: A cognitive analysis and implications for teacher education*, "Journal of Teacher Education" vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 36–42.

Lowyck J., Clark Ch.M., 1989, *Teacher Thinking and Professional Action*, Leuven University Press, Leuven.

Reynolds A., 1992, *What is competent beginning teaching? A review of literature*, "Review of Educational Research" vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 1–35.

Richards J.C., 1998, *Beyond Training*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Tsui A.B.M., 2003, *Understanding Expertise in Teaching*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ur P., 1996, *A Course in Languge Teaching*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Virta A., 2002, *Becoming a history teacher: observations on the beliefs and growth of student teachers*, "Teaching and Teacher Education" vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 687–698.

Wittrock M. (ed.), 1986, *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, Macmillan, New York.

Summary

The aim of this paper is to examine the characteristics of expert teachers and how these characteristics differ from the characteristics of novice teachers. The presented analysis is based on the research dealing with the cognitive processes which are behind the activities of expert teachers and novice teachers, as well as the differences in the self- evaluation. It stands to reason that it is important to highlight the characteristics of the experienced teachers, which constitute their professional expertise, in order to better prepare novice teachers for their job. The analysis in question was based on the preactive, interactive and postactive phases where the preactive phase refers to planning the lesson, the interactive phase refers to the lesson itself and the postactive phase refers to teacher's reflections on their own teaching. In conclusion, the importance of reflection in the process of teacher development is emphasised. A critical analysis of one's teaching practices is a key element in becoming an expert.

Keywords: novices, experienced teachers, experts, reflection, motivation

WIEDZA EKSPERCKA (ANG. *EXPERTISE*) W NAUCZANIU

Streszczenie

W niniejszym artykule dokonuję porównania cech charakteryzujących nauczycieli ekspertów oraz cech typowych dla początkujących nauczycieli. Opieram się na badaniach, które poddają analizie procesy kognitywne, jakie zachodzą podczas działań nauczyciela profesjonalisty i nauczyciela początkującego, a także różnice dotyczące oceny własnego nauczania. Ważne jest bowiem wskazanie tych cech zawodowych nauczycieli, które składają się na ich profesjonalizm, po to, aby lepiej przygotować nauczyciela początkującego do jego przyszłej pracy. W opracowaniu tego problemu skupiłam się na analizie trzech faz działania nauczyciela.Faza pierwsza to *faza przedaktywna* (ang. *preactive phase*), w której analizowane są decyzje nauczycieli dotyczące planowania lekcji, ćwiczeń, a także doboru odpowiednich materiałów dydaktycznych. Faza druga to *faza interaktywna* (ang. *interactive phase*), która obejmuje przeprowadzenie lekcji i interakcje zachodzące pomiędzy nauczycielem i uczniami. Faza *postaktywna* (ang. postactive phase), obejmuje analizę odbytej już lekcji, w tym jej słabych i mocnych punktów. Liczne badania potwierdzają wyeksponowanie motywacji i refleksji jako dwóch zasadniczych czynników, które mogą pomóc początkującym nauczycielom stać się z czasem nauczycielami profesjonalistami. Ważne jest, aby sam nauczyciel postrzegał rozwój umiejętności samokontroli i samooceny własnego nauczania jako proces pożądany o charakterze ciągłym, który oparty jest na wyuczonych wcześniej wzorcach postępowania.

Słowa kluczowe: początkujący nauczyciele,doświadczeni nauczyciele, nauczyciele, eksperci, refleksja, motywacja