

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON IMAGINATION AND EDUCATION

VANCOUVER

14TH-17TH JULY, 2004

'CREATIVE TEACHING AS ADAPTIVE EXPERTISE'

Catherine Scott and Steve Dinham

University of New England, Australia

‘CREATIVE TEACHING AS ADAPTIVE EXPERTISE’

Catherine Scott and Steve Dinham

University of New England, Australia

Introduction: Defining Creativity

Creativity is a topic much discussed in education circles and also much prized as an attribute of the ‘products’ of education. It is also both difficult to define and easy to recognise. This paper explores creativity in teaching. It uses contemporary theories of expertise to analyse the views of teachers whose creativity has been recognised via an award for quality teaching compared with those who have not received such an award. It then explores the role of leadership in supporting and encouraging educational creativity and innovation.

In a radically individualist culture such as our own, where tradition is dismissed and even distrusted, novelty and innovation are, in contrast, prized and revered. A desire to understand and foster the human creativity that generates innovation has led to interest and research on the topic. Accepted definitions of creativity usually concentrate on the product of the creative endeavour, such that a truly innovative object, process or idea is one that is both genuinely original and apt for its intended purpose (Sternberg and Lubart, 1999). However, in our psychologising culture creative products are believed to be the output of creative people, that is, people who possess a supposed attribute called ‘creativity’. The belief in the reality of this construct has led to an industry devoted to studying creative people to learn the secrets of their success, and to finding ways to measure the supposed underlying attribute.

This introduction undoubtedly gives the impression that we are somewhat sceptical when it comes to the existence of a ‘thing’ called creativity and this is indeed the case. While there is no doubt that certain people seem to have the knack of producing interesting and novel solutions to problems, or are just generally more productive somehow, we doubt that this is attributable to a ‘thing’ in their heads called ‘creativity’. Rather we would see the recognition of something as ‘creative’ as the result of the fortunate confluence of a number of person and situation variables. The person variables, we suspect, have more to do with a preference for solving problems in particular ways than with the possession of certain amounts of some mental trait. The situation variables include working in an organisation where innovation is supported, encouraged and allowed to happen. We discuss both aspects in this paper.

Artisan and adaptive expertise

Popular cultural views of creativity portray the production of novel, useful and/or beautiful things as the result of native genius, generally unschooled or at least in conflict with the ‘establishment’ of its day. However, the general consensus among theorists is that creativity depends firstly on the mastery of a body of knowledge and/or skills (Weisberg 1999). Certainly, despite popular misconceptions, Wolfgang Mozart may not have been the revered genius he became without the assistance of

Leopold Mozart, his father, who tutored him in music from earliest infancy, nor Picasso a legendary artist without his artist father who likewise taught him to draw as a 9 year old child. In all other areas of human travail true creativity also comes after long practice and the acquisition of expertise in the relevant knowledge and skills.

Expertise, however, does not guarantee creative or novel products or performances. Studies of its development have led to the proposal that expertise comes in two main types: 'artisan' expertise and 'virtuoso' or 'adaptive' expertise (Hatano and Ignaki, 1986; Miller, 1978; Wineburg, 1991, 1998; Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt, 1997). It is the latter that is associated with creativity.

Artisan and adaptive experts have in common extensive knowledge and skills in their area and the capacity, where necessary, to skilfully apply 'recipes' and formulae to solve problems in their domain. They differ, however, on their approach to problem solving and their attitude to expertise, especially their own. Artisan experts in the words of Bransford et al. (1999, p. 46) 'approach new problems as opportunities to use their existing expertise to do familiar tasks more efficiently'. In comparison adaptive experts do not necessarily accept the problem as stated but often treat it as point of departure and a means to expand and improve their own skills and knowledge.

The latter observation flags the importance of differing views of expertise between artisans and virtuosos. Artisan experts commonly regard expertise as entailing knowing everything that is necessary and thus having all the answers. Success thus resides in using efficiently what one already knows. Adaptive experts, however, view their expertise as a 'work in progress' and realise that their current knowledge represents only a small part of what it is possible to know. Given this insight, they are happy to search out new information and to seek assistance from others. They have, in other words, no investment in appearing to be the expert (Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt, 1997). Another way of styling this difference is to see adaptive experts as more 'meta-cognitive', as in more aware of their own knowledge stores and gaps therein.

To test the usefulness of the concept of adaptive expertise for understanding creativity in teaching we e-interviewed five winners of an NSW Minister for Education and Training/ Australian College of Educators Quality Teaching Award (QTA) who had been specifically noted in their citations to be 'creative'. We also e-interviewed a group of teachers who were recruited via education email discussion lists, one of whom turned out to have been recently nominated for a national teaching award. We included his responses with those of the QTA winners. We asked our interviewees their views on teacher expertise and put to them the hypothetical question: what would you do if your new teaching assignment included a subject in which student results have always been mediocre and which students do not much like?

The NSW Quality Teaching Awards

Background

In July 2000 at an ACE international conference, the then NSW Minister for Education and Training, John Aquilina, announced that he would make funding available to the NSW Chapter of ACE 'to recognise and applaud the best teachers in our schools and learn from them'.

The Chapter's challenge was to devise a rigorous, transparent and authentic process to identify outstanding teachers in NSW from government and non-government sectors, from early childhood through to university teaching and to research their practice.

The Chapter established a Steering Committee of College members across the various sectors with responsibility for the development of the Quality Teaching Awards (see Dinham, 2002, for further background)

Policies and Procedures

The broad phases in the Quality Teaching Awards are nomination, consideration of referees' reports, portfolio assessment, and site visits.

In each sector and for each candidate, the focus was to be on teaching. A recognised teaching qualification was not required, although only two of the 57 QTA winners in 2001 lacked a formal teaching qualification. There was also the 'term of reference' to research and report on outstanding teaching.¹

Criteria were based upon the *Standards of Professional Practice for Accomplished Teaching in Australia* (Brock, 2000) and were deployed in all stages of the QTA process. A professional learning portfolio built around the criteria was integral to the process. Portfolios were assessed by a panel of experts from each sector and successful candidates were then visited at their workplaces where their teaching was observed and they and other nominated persons were interviewed about their teaching.

Results

Responses to the e-interviews were interrogated for relevant themes. They are presented here by question.

What is an expert teacher?

Differences were found between the responses of award winning and non-award winning teachers that were as predicted. Non-award winners tended to give answers that were 'formulae' for successful teaching, which often used the 'buzz words' or 'buzz' concepts encountered in the course of teacher preparation and in-service:

An expert teacher is able to manage a classroom in a way that allows each individual student to learn. They are able to meet the needs of the low, average and high achieving students. Their goal is for the students to be motivated internally rather than externally. They cause their students to want to learn. Many strategies are up their sleeve so they can teach all of their students in a way that they learn best. **Tertiary teacher, teacher education, non award winner.**

¹ The QTA were presented for the first time on November 15th 2002. Research has continued with this group and subsequent recipients.

Assuming the expert teacher in question is someone who teaches in a classroom, knows thoroughly what s/he is teaching, and is knowledgeable of educational approaches (but not necessarily uses them all), this colleague is also skilful in creating different learning environments and adjusting/combining them as necessary based on leadership models; group dynamics and organizational theories; and insight into the human condition. Lastly, the expert teacher develops and sustains a relationship with students; a respectful and collegial relationship that transcends “familiarity breeds contempt.” **Secondary teacher, mathematics, non-award winner.**

What SHOULD a teacher be.. I imagine we could all list general qualities:
1) knowledgeable in field (not necessary to be expert - and in fact probably not if a teacher)
2) knowledgeable in learning theory
3) knowledgeable in development of the appropriate age they are teaching
4) has high standards of conduct and enforces rules of courtesy, and honesty
5) has good communication skills (writing, speaking etc.) **Tertiary teacher, teacher educator, non- award winner.**

I don't think this expert teacher needs to be a very articulate and fluent speaker but must be one able to communicate clearly and make others understand. S/he must also be more than a great facilitator and motivator; there must be subject matter knowledge to facilitate efficient learning. Facilitators should be just called what they are and not teachers. I can't imagine an “expert teacher” who knows little about his/her subject. **Tertiary teacher, teacher educator, non-award winner.**

The belief in the expert as ‘the one with all the answers’ even caused some to cast doubt on the possibility of teaching expertise. If one can never know all the answers, then one can never be an expert:

When you develop expertise it is within a narrow area, or ‘domain’. Hence it makes little sense to refer to expertise in broad areas such as music, financial management, or teaching, as no one person can ever master the entire range of knowledge and skills encompassed by such broad vocational areas. **Tertiary teacher, educational psychology, non-award winner.**

Award winners, in common with the non-award winners, mentioned important knowledge and skills that expert teachers must possess. In contrast, however, award winners also explicitly mentioned the necessity to ‘keep learning’. Knowing a great deal was not enough: the expert, according to these accounts, must be ‘never satisfied’:

An ‘expert’ teacher is one who has a strong knowledge of their subject matter and who is totally dedicated to their students; someone who is able to plan ahead, identify problems and deliver collaboratively devised solutions; someone who seeks improvement continuously; someone who is a classroom practitioner and a fine communicator about the things that matter

most to their peers and can model this practice. A competent teacher ‘treads water’ and holds their own but is not inspirational. Often they have little desire for betterment, and ‘care levels’ about students vary. **Secondary teacher, English and drama, award winner.**

The wording of this question is tricky because ‘expert’ seems to imply a level of knowledge rather than competence. I would be more comfortable with the notion of a ‘gifted’ teacher as opposed to an expert teacher. It is the ‘gifted’ teacher who has an emotional bond with the students; is empathic; is creative in responding to individual differences and understanding that not all learners learn in the same way or experience learning in the same way; who sees others’ failure to learn as a challenge to come up with new and different ways of presenting knowledge and skills or of making them accessible. ... Most of my students get pleasure and encouragement and learning from their interactions with me; I love my teaching and (most of) my students and they generally respond very positively to me. I have successfully taught a wide range of subjects in a wide range of modes. I am still experimenting to come up with more effective modes of teaching and assessment. **Tertiary teacher, History and Politics, award winner.**

The expert teacher is able to form appropriate relationships with the students in the class so that there is trust, a willingness to take risks in the learning and sense of safety to make mistakes and learn from them ...

Others consider me an expert although I continue to be aware of the ways I should improve my teaching. Yes, in spite of that, I do consider myself an expert. **Secondary teacher, Mathematics, award winner.**

The lack of necessity to be always the one ‘in the know’ also allowed award winners the freedom to ask others for inspiration, guidance and advice:

I consider myself to be an expert in certain areas e.g., leadership and team leadership. I consider I am passionate about the things I do and can always do better. I am willing to listen to other experts and respect the knowledge, skills and understandings that they hold. This openness is the key. **Secondary teacher, English and drama, award winner.**

My imagination – encouraged from and indulged in childhood; my family background – emotions were important; we were always encouraged to consider the other person’s perspective; my interest in people; my current primary relationship, which has deeply enhanced my understanding of individual differences. **Tertiary teacher, History and politics, award winner.**

The people from whom teachers seek guidance does not exclude students and in actuality always includes students:

The major influences on my creativity as a teacher? Student feedback - what works and what doesn't. **Tertiary teacher, engineering, award winner.**

Working with teenagers. I have been infected with their enthusiasm, honesty, rebellion against the norm and their generosity in learning and sharing their knowledge. **Secondary teacher, Mathematics, award winner**

There should also be information about why students have hated a unit. My approach would be to see if I can get some of the constituents in who most hated the unit and involve them somehow in the process of revitalising the unit. Nothing like people at the source for useful feedback. **Tertiary teacher, English literature, award winner.**

How would you handle a difficult teaching assignment?

Teachers' responses to the question of how they would handle or had handled a difficult teaching assignment, defined as taking over a subject that was unpopular and/or in which the students achievement was mediocre, illustrated the principles of adaptive expertise, or its absence, in practice. Non-award winning teachers' suggestions consisted of offering formulae rather than the problem exploration and redefinition typical of virtuosos:

If I was put into this situation I would not settle with mediocre results and would do what I could to make the class more enjoyable. I would find different ways of presenting the material and make it more applicable to the students' lives. Unfortunately I have not really had this type of teaching assignment so I can't speak from experience. **Secondary teacher, psychology, non-award winner**

The willingness to 'take risks', seek advice and look for new definitions of the problem rather than to routinely apply of a formula were typical of the award winning teacher's strategies for teaching the difficult subject or group of students. One respondent also described difficult assignments as a key and welcomed way to keep one's motivation high:

The good thing about these sorts of poison challices is that it is hard to do worse, and indeed, you can take the desperate need for change that such portfolios generate and use them as part of your motivational tools. **Tertiary teacher, English literature, award winner**

Creativity was needed with our Aboriginal students who were under-represented and disenfranchised. The parent committee was almost non-existent. Using parent leaders, student leaders and art/ cultural ideas, greater identification as an Aboriginal has occurred across our school and parent involvement has increased in school activities. Students attend more frequently and have greater self confidence. Students are happier and see meaning in school life. Students are painting, dancing, visiting sites of cultural significance and embracing each other. Pride in who they are has resulted. **Secondary teacher, History and drama, award winner**

Instrumentation class. Students love to build things rather than sitting in classrooms for entire courses. I saw this as a great learning tool and key source of motivation. I redesigned the instrumentation class so that students now build and test a simple instrument (for example an anemometer etc). They measure and characterise the performance of their instrument in terms of the classroom theory. Assessment is based on a written report on their instrument and a *viva voce*. **Tertiary teacher, engineering, award winner.**

My Judo sensei once told me that there is no such thing as a boring lesson, only boring teachers. ... I have made that a principle of my teaching style. I recently had just such an experience. The subject matter was Aseptic Technique for adult students enrolled in a career school setting. Most of my teaching colleagues have hesitated to accept this course assignment on the

basis that “it is like watching paint dry” or that “you can cover everything in the first three days.” The students also hate this course as it has a reputation for being rather boring and esoteric. The grade averages coming out of the course usually range between 73-77 percent for the final grade. When I was assigned to the course I was specifically asked to “spruce it up” and “make it more dynamic.” While this course has a lot of theoretical/didactic knowledge, there are skills that need to be developed and practiced as well.

The first thing I did was re-design the course with every third day focused on the skills and drills associated with the skills. Second, I created new PowerPoint slide shows that covered the didactic material. I also designed group projects rather than individual projects, forcing a lot more interaction among students. As is my usual practice, I provided a course outline that listed all that would be expected (with the usual caveat that the outline is subject to change based on the needs of the class). I would love to teach the course a couple more times just to refine the process some more, but the end result is that I am now tasked with training other faculty on the course presentation.

In a more direct response to your question, I think it is a matter of re-thinking the approach AFTER assessing the needs of the program and the students. **Tertiary teacher, health education, award winner.**

These responses also illustrate the adaptive expert’s not taking a problem ‘as given’ but treating it as a launching point from which to redefine issues, explore options and test solutions.

Discussion

As predicted the award-winning teachers displayed a qualitatively different approach to teaching to the non-award winners, in other words, they did not simply know more - and the non-award winners were by no means lacking in knowledge and understanding of teaching. The award winners were characterised by openness to new knowledge, indeed a thirst for it and a willingness to seek useful information from appropriate sources, without fear of losing face for ‘not knowing it all’. They were aware of their own expertise but also aware of its limits, and inclined to see each new ‘problem situation’ as a chance to widen their repertoire of skills. They were also aware that this constant search for improvement distinguished them from their less creative colleagues who in comparison were happy to continue to do things in familiar ways.

The result of their openness and keenness for new and better ways of doing things was the ‘quality product’ that led to their nomination for teaching awards. Others thus also recognised their exceptionality, and this often led to their colleagues and supervisors ‘asking me to take on yet another project, teaching assignment, or administrative role ...’. These challenges were usually welcomed as yet more ‘learning opportunities’, although one award nominee confided that he had recently surprised his supervisor by ‘learning to say “no”’.

The Ecology Of Creative Teaching: Leadership And Innovation

As we have indicated, in our individualist culture creativity is seen as an attribute of individuals and we have demonstrated that creative teaching depends, in part, on the possession of certain attitudes, knowledge and skills by individual teachers. However, the sort of openness and risk-taking described by our adaptive experts has a better chance of flourishing in certain situations, while in others these may be thwarted or prevented entirely.

Leadership and Innovation in Schooling²

If teachers and school leaders desire improvement, one route is to do the standard, accepted things as effectively as possible, something that many teachers and school leaders do superbly. Another way is to seek new solutions and creative approaches to existing challenges and to anticipate new challenges and canvass their solution in novel ways. This latter approach can be broadly described as innovation and a product of ‘adaptive expertise’.

A recent major review of teaching and teacher education in Australia found leadership to be particularly important in creating positive, innovative and productive learning cultures in schools (Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2003: xxiv).

Although the central thrust of the Review was on ‘strengthening science, mathematics and technology education’ the Review Committee³ noted that ‘all teachers across all subjects, and all our students should become partners in a learning society that underpins innovation and a high standard of living’ (2003: xv).

The Review found some of the ‘key factors in bringing about school improvement’ to be:

- Outstanding leadership, from formally designated staff, notably the school principal, and from the teaching staff and students;
- A clear vision and sense of purpose together with the capability to manage and orchestrate institutional change;
- A commitment by the whole school community, including parents, to this vision and to sustain it in all facets of school life;
- Highly competent teachers dedicated to achieving excellent learning outcomes for all students and to maintaining the highest standards of professionalism and professional learning; and
- Strong system and employer-led strategic planning, resourcing and support (2003: xxiv).

In respect of leadership, the Review found that:

In order to energise schooling for innovation, a very high quality of educational leadership is required. Competent leaders who have a strong, clear vision, are determined and have a capacity to inspire and move things

² This section is drawn from Dinham, S. (2004). ‘The Role Of Leadership In Producing Outstanding Education Outcomes In Junior Secondary Education’, BERA Annual Conference, UMIST, Manchester, 15th – 18th September, 2004.

³ Dinham was a member of the Review Committee.

forward will be in great demand. They need freedom and authority to steer, manage and orchestrate what are very often large, complex organisations (2003: xxv).

Another study has also highlighted the importance of leadership in creating a climate and culture where creativity and innovation can flourish.

AESOP – An Exceptional Schooling Outcomes Project – is an Australian Research Council funded project being jointly undertaken by staff from the University of Western Sydney, the University of New England and the industry partner, the New South Wales Department of Education and Training, the provider of public education in that state. It aims to explore the factors producing outstanding education outcomes in Years 7-10 [junior secondary] in a sample of sites in New South Wales (NSW) government secondary schools.

The study sites where ‘outstanding’ educational outcomes were believed to be occurring in Years 7-10 were selected using a variety of data sources including performance in standardised tests, various value added measures and nominations with evidence from various stakeholders. This process was underpinned and assisted by the rubric of the ‘Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for [Australian] Schooling in the Twenty-First Century’ (MCEETYA, 1999), central to which are the principles: that schools should:

- 1) ‘develop fully the talents of all students’,
- 2) attain ‘high standards of knowledge, skills and understanding through a comprehensive and balanced curriculum’, and
- 3) be ‘socially just’.

Sites were of two types: subject departments or faculties responsible for teaching certain subjects in Years 7-10, and teams or groupings responsible for cross-school programs in Years 7-10. Sites were selected to be somewhat representative, i.e., an appropriate mix of urban/rural, high/low socio-economic status, high/low non-English speaking background and a range of different subject areas and types of cross-school programs. Some schools selected had more than one site, e.g., Mathematics and student welfare. Over 50 sites across NSW were visited by teams, typically of four researchers, for a week.

In the case of both subject departments and teams responsible for cross-school programs, leadership was found to be a key factor in the achievement of outstanding educational outcomes. Often this leadership was exercised by the principal, but additional key personnel included heads of department (Head Teachers) and other teachers playing leading roles in faculties and programs. In many cases, the outcomes under study were found to be attributable to the appointment of a key person, although the ‘seeds for success’ may have been present or nascent prior to this. In other cases, antecedents for current success were attributable to a series of leaders, or groups of people, influential over time, with success building to the current level.

A preliminary analysis of data has revealed certain attributes and practices of these leaders that have resulted in innovation in their schools. These are briefly outlined below (see Dinham, 2004 for elaboration). An important point to be noted is that

these attributes do not constitute a ‘recipe’ – i.e., ingredients or inputs - for creativity or innovation, but are the products of a complex interplay between factors such as the history and development of the individual school, the personal qualities of the leader, and how challenges, problems and situations are perceived and addressed. They are as much the product of thinking and a particular mental approach to problem solving as they are of acting in certain ways.⁴

Leadership for Creativity, Innovation and Success: Factors Responsible for Outstanding Outcomes (Preliminary)

1. External Awareness and Engagement – these leaders actively seek out and nurture productive external relationships. They have an open and positive attitude towards change.
2. A Bias Towards Innovation and Action – these leaders seek novel solutions and are prepared to invest in new solutions. They support and empower others.
3. Personal Qualities and Relationships – these leaders exercise moral leadership and are able to relate well and empathise with all stakeholders.
4. Vision, Expectations and a Climate of Success – these leaders create a climate where all can experience success. They treat others professionally, expecting a high standard of professionalism in return. They balance the big and small picture.
5. Teacher Learning, Responsibility and Trust – these leaders are prepared to invest time and money in the professional learning of teachers. They entrust and empower teachers to be creative.
6. Student Support, Common Purpose and Collaboration – these leaders see student welfare as central and as every teachers’ responsibility. Student welfare is focussed on academic and social outcomes and clearly understood and consistently applied policies underpin this.
7. Students, Learning and Teaching Are the Prime Foci – these leaders keep student learning and quality teaching foremost in the school. Everything revolves around the facilitation of student learning and achievement.

As noted, the reader might be excused for thinking that the above series of qualities or actions are idealistic or prescriptive. There is a danger with such lists in that the context producing them is not sufficiently recognised and they can be regarded as ‘quick fixes’ or recipes for success easily transferred to other contexts. The fact that some of the leaders and their teams had spent years reaching the present level of achievement refutes that view.

Further, the attributes, actions or qualities need to be considered as both product (output) and process (input) variables, in that they contribute to further change and improvement. In many of the outstanding sites, it was clear that further improvement was taking place in the context of an ‘upward cycle’ of success.

⁴ The ideas expressed in this section are those of Steve Dinham but they have been greatly influenced by the writings and ideas of the other investigators of the AESOP project: Geoff Barnes, Paul Brock, Bill Green, David Laird, John Pegg, Wayne Sawyer and Robert Stevens.

Despite the present lack of full analysis of data, it can be confirmed that these qualities and approaches were highly evident and prevalent in the outstanding sites visited as part of the *AESOP* project. Together, under the influence of school leaders, they have been seen to produce positive and productive school environments. While they were very adept at doing the standards things well, these leaders also frequently ‘broke new ground’. Their openness to new ideas and novel solutions, new external productive partnerships and their fostering of those around them to try new approaches distinguished them from other leaders and led to considerable success and improvement in their schools, which were often in decline prior to their appointment.

A quote from a QTA recipient illustrates and encapsulates the above. When asked what facilitated creativity, the Award winner responded:

The continual professional development of being in a good, open, honest faculty where people shared their resources, their love of teaching and learning and their reflections on their own failures and need for improvement.
Award winner, secondary mathematics.

Conclusion

While individuals are regarded as possessors of the valuable trait of creativity, which leads to innovative and useful products and processes, the openness to new learning and to productive risk taking we found in individual award winners was mirrored in the value systems of the schools similarly recognised as exceptional. It would appear that, while an individual teacher can embody the beliefs and practices that give rise to innovative teaching, so can organisations. This is especially so of those schools blessed with leaders who support and encourage the values of professional learning, openness and trust. These values can be ‘caught’ by others teaching in such environments and the attributes of adaptive expertise/creativity made accessible to all members of staff. As an example one informant from an exceptional school stressed the importance of ‘peer modelling’ for whole school improvement and for changing for the better the professional practice of all its teachers.

Just as the right environment can encourage and foster creativity and innovation by deduction the wrong atmosphere can stymie it. Informants confided their experiences of working in situations not supportive of or conducive to creative solutions. Where leaders were overly given to ‘doing it by the book’, jealous of their own power and prestige and/or timid and lacking in vision people in the organisation who displayed the attributes of the ‘adaptive’ expert were more likely to be seen as trouble makers than as valuable team members. It was observed that the leaders of schools producing exceptional outcomes used the saying of ‘yes’ to recognise, support and empower others, while leaders in poorly performing and ‘average’ schools use ‘no’ as a means of controlling staff, students and the community.

What remains uncertain is the extent to which the attributes that lead to creativity and innovation can be taught or learnt outside the types of environments where they are a genuine and integral part of the value system. There is a depressing tendency for new knowledge and insights to be rapidly reduced to the sorts of formulae and slogans that are the main stay of at best artisan expertise, at worst merely competent levels of performance: the reduction of the adaptive expert’s restless search for new learning has for instance, been reduced to the slogans associated with ‘life long learning’ and

taking an original stance on a problem is ‘lateral thinking’ or ‘thinking outside the box’. There is no sign that being able to talk in these ways leads anyone to genuinely embody the characteristics they, in fact, parody, especially where the support to develop professionally is lacking.

References

- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). (eds.) *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, And School.*, Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning and Committee on Learning Research and Educational Practice, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council, Washington DC.
- Brock, P. (2000). *Standards of professional practice for accomplished teaching in Australian classrooms.* The Australian College of Education, Deakin West, ACT.
- Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt (1997). *The Jasper Project: Lessons in Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, and Professional Development.* Mahwah, NJ, Erlbaum.
- Dinham, S. (2004). ‘The Role Of Leadership In Producing Outstanding Education Outcomes In Junior Secondary Education’, BERA Annual Conference, UMIST, Manchester, 15th – 18th September, 2004.
- Dinham, S. (2002). ‘NSW Quality Teaching Awards – Research, Rigour and Transparency’, *Unicorn*, 28(1), pp. 5-9.
- Hatano, G, and K. Ignaki. (1986). ‘Two courses of expertise’, In *Child Development and Education in Japan*, Stevenson, H., Azuma, H., and Hakuta, K., (eds.). New York, W.H. Freeman.
- Miller, R.B. (1978). ‘The information system designer’, in *The Analysis of Practical Skills*, Singleton, W.T., (ed.), Baltimore, MD, University Park Press.
- Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs. (1999). *The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-First Century.* MCEETYA, Canberra.
- Review of Teaching and Teacher Education. (2003). *Australia’s Teachers: Australia’s Future Advancing Innovation, Science, Technology and Mathematics Main Report.* DEST, Canberra.
- Sternberg, R & Lubart, T. (1999). ‘The concept of creativity: Prospects and paradigms’ in *Handbook of creativity*, Sternberg, R. (ed.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Weisberg, R. W. (1999). ‘Creativity and knowledge: A challenge’, in *Handbook of creativity*, Sternberg, R. (ed.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Wineburg, S.S. (1991). 'Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence', *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(1), pp. :73-87.

Wineburg, S.S. (1998). 'Reading Abraham Lincoln: An expert-expert study in the interpretation of historical texts', *Cognitive Science*, 22: pp. 319-346.

Contact Details

Dr Catherine Scott scott2@pobox.une.edu.au

Professor Steve Dinham sdinham@pobox.une.edu.au

School of Education
University of New England
Armidale NSW
Australia 2351