Whatever Happened to Apprenticeship?

Apprenticeship Learning and Metacognitive Knowledge in the Mass University

By Stine Krøijer, Department of Anthropology, UCPH

ABSTRACT

The apprenticeship model has been prevalent in the teaching and supervision of students in anthropology at the University at large. Apprenticeship is characterized by relations built over an extended period of time, guided learning and engagement in a subject matter. The model is undergoing dramatic change in the contemporary mass university characterized by a high number of students and, more recently, a political pressure for shorter study times. This report discusses the role of apprenticeship learning in University education, and discusses how it can be adapted to current conditions. Zooming in on two MA courses in project design and advanced research methods, the value of 'apprenticeship learning' is evaluated in light of students' development of methodological expertise and metacognitive knowledge (knowledge of what they know and how they learn). The report ventures to assert that this is important for student's ability to account for their capabilities when they pursue jobs outside the University.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The focus of the report is on the link between apprenticeship learning and the development of metacognitive knowledge. Particularly on how curriculum design, teaching activities and supervision employing an adapted version of the apprenticeship model traditionally employed in university teaching can enhance students' metacognitive knowledge. When talking about metacognitive knowledge, I am referring to a student's thinking about his or her own thinking (Prince and Felder 2006: 125-26). The concept is often used in context of self-regulated learning, that is, students' management of how they go about learning (Cassidy 2011), but here, the concept is simply taken to mean students' awareness and reflection upon what they know, their strengths and weaknesses, and what methodologies they master. I will venture to assert that awareness of one's own knowledge is extremely important when students have to translate between the world of the University and that of academic labor market outside Universities.

The findings and arguments of this report are based on my participation in the curriculum design and teaching of two courses in advanced research methods at the University of Copenhagen. The first course described here is a newly designed 7th semester course in 'Advanced Research Methods' part of a new interdisciplinary master degree in Global Development, which is characterized by admitting students of diverse disciplinary backgrounds. The second course examined is 'Research Design and Fieldwork Methods' given to 8th semester students at the Department of Anthropology. This course has existed continuously since the mid-1990s as part of students' preparations to conduct independent field- and thesis work. The course was redesigned in 2015 to meet the challenges presented by the study progress reform, in light of insights gained during the accreditation process, and in response to student evaluations. In both cases, the process of curriculum design took place in dialogue with colleagues and co-teachers, as well as with the two heads of studies, but my findings and recommendations here are mainly based on my own teaching practice. In addition, I have had ongoing, more informal, conversations and interviews with anthropology students participating in the 'Research Design and Fieldwork Methods' and conducted a two-hour oral evaluation of the course on the topics addressed here. In context of the 2015 'Advanced Research Methods' course, I conducted short interviews with five students before course, and moreover they were - as part of the exam - asked to reflect upon what they had learned from the course. This provided valuable insights into student's own rendering of their knowledge.

In the following, the report will first provide some background on the tradition of apprenticeship learning in the University, with a particular emphasis on the role of this model in anthropology. Second, the report describes the curriculum design of the two courses in turn, the teaching methodology and how the development of metacognitive knowledge is addressed or built into the two courses. Finally, the report will compare the two. Perhaps not surprisingly, I found that the cohort of students with an interdisciplinary background in the Global Development master

programme were better able to account for their knowledge, but less skilled in undertaking qualitative research, while the opposite seems to be true for anthropology students. The report comes up with recommendations on how to adapt the two courses, holding on to a the positive elements of apprenticeship learning in the teaching of advanced methodology in a context of economic constraints.

BACKGROUND

How one develops from novice to a virtuoso master under the guidance of a skilled expert varies across cultures and among different skilled communities (Downey et al. 2015; Grassini 2007). Universities in Europe were historically organized in a guild-like system where associations of teachers and students engaged in a relationship of apprenticeship learning. Universities such as Bologna and Paris were formed from preexisting monastic schools operating in relative autonomy – or as a place apart – from the practical concerns of the surrounding society (Colish 1997; Oakeshott 1989; Williams 1989).

Apprenticeship was and is referring to the process of developing expertise though socialization and guided learning: It usually implies engagement in processes of 'learning by doing' overseen by a more experienced person within the field. In practice, the learning by doing or embodied learning (Downey et al 2015) is a composite of what Lave (2011) refers to as observation, coaching and practice. The apprentice observes the master executing a given process, and then the apprentice runs through the same process while receiving help and guidance from the master. Once the skill has been grasped the master reduces his or her participation, only providing occasional feedback. The learner obtains virtuosity in the performance of the task – a kind of practical wisdom or phronesis, that is, 'knowledge that sensible to its application in specific settings' (Flyvbjerg et al 2012:1, 2006).

The discipline of anthropology have historically been based on apprenticeship in several interlocking ways: First, participant observation while conducting fieldwork often entails a form of apprenticeship that results in 'embodied ways of knowing' about the research subjects' roles and duties (Downey et al 2015; Lave 2011), which should, then, become extrapolated in later writings. As part of this process, students learn to reflect upon what they see, what they have learned, and (ideally) on the deeper epistemological question of how one can know.

Second, anthropology students are taught to see anthropology as a craft that implies a readiness to engage in 'learning by doing', hereunder by mimicking academic ancestors and committing one's own mistakes during ethnographic fieldwork. In anthropology departments, and especially in British social anthropology, apprenticeship is described as part of the academic tradition. Historically, this implied a close relationship between faculty and students, master and apprentice,

and sometimes even a strong sense of belonging to a theoretical or methodological 'school' (see Evens and Handelman 2006; Fortes 1978; Gell 2006). Alfred Gell wrote:

> My undergraduate view of anthropology was simple and dualistic. Leví-strauss was God, Leach was his vicar on earth, and Meyer Fortes, I am ashamed to say, was the functionalist Satan, whom we Structuralists spurned and derided (Gell 2006: 4).

Productive theoretical and methodological friction played out at seminars, and students' engagement in these debates was considered part of the academic formation. The relationship between student and faculty did not only play out during classes or at the University, but also during fieldwork. Contrary to the dominant story in anthropology about fieldwork being a lonely endeavor, Meyer Fortes wrote:

> Malinowski dominated our apprenticeship, he was not the only influence, of course (…) Most important of all, however, was the friendship that grew up for me with Seligman and Evans-Prichard. With them there was constant discussion of the actual data of ongoing field research in Africa (Fortes 1978: 6).

Even though students were sometimes sent off to the field on their own, they were in different ways guided by senior anthropologists or developed close academic relationships with their peers. Several anthropology departments had field schools in Africa or students conducted fieldwork in areas adjacent to the field sites of their teachers. The close dialogue and reflection as well as the shared interest in a given field was point of departure for mutual learning.While this has also been a practice in Copenhagen, it has been partly abandoned, producing a situation where the conduct of fieldwork is sometimes experienced as an lonely, insurmountable obstacle (Bundgaard and Rubow forthcoming).

As a learning strategy, seeing anthropology – and especially qualitative fieldwork methods – as a craft, and learning as the guided learning of apprenticeship has its strengths and weaknesses. The guided learning and the practical wisdom build up through several method courses, exercises and short term fieldworks culminating in the students' own thesis fieldwork, still lead to a high level of expertise when it comes to qualitative research methods. Contrary to dominant trend of making University education more school-like, I believe that more apprenticeship like guided learning is called for. The kind of practical wisdom developed via apprenticeship is often described as superior to other forms of knowledge, because it entails the ability to apply knowledge creatively across different contexts and cases (Flyvbjerg et al 2012). What is left out, and needs to be addressed more consistently, is the link, or the lack thereof, between apprenticeship learning and the metacognitive skills needed when students have to venture into the academic labour market outside Universities. Maybe apprenticeship learning does not provide students with particularly strong ability to account for their own knowledge in a precise way after they have ended their studies.

The conditions for apprenticeship and guided learning have undergone dramatic changes at today's mass universities: classes are bigger, students' relationship to supervisors grows more distant, they seldom accompany experienced anthropologists to the field, and they are obliged to finish their studies in shorter time. Reviews and public debate about University teaching often focus on 'how many hours' of class room teaching is delivered (see Caldwell 2011) without considering if classroom teaching is in fact the best way to learn certain skills. In this rapport, I ponder about to what extent it is possible to do apprenticeship learning in the classroom, and if it can be done in ways that strike a good balance between embodied learning and strengthening students metacognitive knowledge.

In the Department of Anthropology up to 60-80 students go on fieldwork every year the ratio of students pursuing an academic career is shrinking, and instead students pursue job opportunities outside academia (Bundgaard and Rubow forthcoming). The report 'Omsat Antropologi: en undersøgelse af det antropologiske arbejdsmarked i Danmark' (Hansen and Jöhncke 2013) points to how anthropology candidates find it difficult to account for what they do and for the competences that the education provides. Telling a potential employer what an anthropologist does and his or her potential contributions to a workplace calls for metacognitive skills of translation - namely the ability to reflect upon one's own knowledge as well as that of others in order to translate between them.

Even though various methodological handbooks have been issued that supposedly translate between the tradition of long-term fieldwork involving full immersion and a more practical toolbox-oriented approach to carrying out research (see for example Konopinski 2014; O'Reilly 2014), the anthropological fieldwork practice is still said to be surrounded by 'an air of mysticism'. Books like Konopinski's, which we used for teaching in the research design course in the spring of 2016, recognizes that shorter and more focused master fieldwork is carried out today, but still talks about it as a strenuous rite de passage. In the department of anthropology, this has led to the implementation of a system of e-learning for ongoing supervision during fieldwork, but also more segmentation of the students thesis work. Contrary to Bundgaard and Rubow (forthcoming), however, I don't think this so-called mysticism is only associated with the practices surrounding ethnographic fieldwork, or that mysticism is necessarily bad for that matter, but that it is as much linked to the preference for apprenticeship learning, which has been the preferred approach when teaching methodology.

Instead of taking this as an argument for doing away with embodied & apprenticeship learning, this report sets out to explore if, how and to what extent 'apprenticeship in the classroom' can be practiced: are there ways for students to acquire the practical and experiential knowledge in the classroom that were formerly learned through a close and ongoing relation between faculty and students? And is it possible, reversely, to combine embodied 'learning by doing' with the strengthening of student's metacognitive knowledge in such a way that they might explain to others what they are truly good at?

APPLYING A CASE-BASED APPROACH IN 'ADVANCED RESEARCH METHODS'

The following draws on my participation in the design of the methodology course titled 'Advanced Research Methods'. The course is part of a new interdisciplinary MA programme in Global Development, started in 2014. I have been part of planning and teach the course for two consecutive years together with two colleagues from the Department of Economic and the Department of Geography.

Originally, in the accreditation of the education, the curriculum design outlined three consecutive modules: one in quantitative methods (survey methodology), one in GIS mapping, and one in qualitative methods (interview technique and participant observation). The intended learning outcomes focus on the ability to plan and perform research employing the mentioned methods, an ability to select between relevant methods and perform an analysis of the data, and to critically evaluate the choice of methods in scholarly work (see attached course description, appendix 1). In the preparation of the course, I convinced my co-teachers of trying to undertake a joint case study, applying a sequential mixed methods approach (Ivankova et al. 2006) to a 'real life' problem in the Copenhagen area.

The pedagogical rationale behind this was twofold: First, if students should be able to work in an interdisciplinary environment and to critically engage with the choice of methods in such context, we should facilitate that they were able to do so – instead of leaving it to them to think of ways of combining the modules. Second, it is my experience that learning methods at an advanced level is best done in context, i.e. by studying a real life problem and encountering real life methodological challenges. I suggested to work on a collaborative case study throughout the semester, forming student peer-groups, which were put together to secure a mix of prior qualifications. In my view, it is difficult to teach methods in any deep way inside the classroom, both the choice and application of qualitative methods are best learned in context. Moreover, case studies produce a kind of context dependent knowledge, which is necessary for developing from a beginner to a more virtuoso expert (Flyvbjerg 2006: 221). A case-based approach to learning is said to 'develop skills in discernment and reflection through the experiential approach' (Krogh et al 2015) and particularly appropriate to address interdisciplinary problem complexes. As students who are enrolled in this obligatory course come from different disciplinary backgrounds, and with very different prior knowledge of the methods taught, it was decided that students should conduct the study in groups put together to secure a mix of prior qualifications. Everyone should, then, in different stages of the case study be able to benefit from peer-learning. The course has 60-65 students, which were divided into 12-13 peer-groups.

In accordance with the logic of apprenticeship learning, students are first given small tasks with limited responsibility, in order to continue with the employment of tasks of increasing complexity. This logic was reflected both in the teaching activities within the course and across courses: In Advanced Research Methods students were first asked to interview one another before proceeding on to qualitative interviews with 'the man on the street'. This first experience in the classroom was used to create reflection on what constitute good questions in qualitative interviewing, i.e. how one can get access to the experience of the interviewee though different techniques, and on this background students could proceed to the development of interview guides in groups. In the semester following the Advanced Research Methods course, students follow a field school course in Tanzania, which give them the opportunity to conduct a study in the context of a developing country on a topic of their own choosing - with all the methodological and ethical challenges that implies. In short, the learning process has been designed as a process of increasing complexity and independence (cf. Lave and Wenger 1991).

Taking a case based approach to learning also implies the role of the teacher changes from the role as lecturer to one as guide and facilitator (Krogh et al 2015:205-6). It also implies a transformation of the lecture format still dominant in most universities (Christensen et al 1987). In this particular course the role of the teacher is to take the student though the process of data generation and analysis, helping the students to get real practical experience on how to conduct the process of research while providing formative feedback as they go along. In addition to this, the teacher and the teaching activities seek to generate reflection on the validity and reliability of the methods applied, in order to create a reflective awareness - in alignment with the intended learning outcome of the course.

In the class room, the assessment is learner-centered and formative. On a practical level this means providing feedback on note taking technique, interview technique, interview guides and transcribed interviews, which are submitted by the students via Absalon at different moments during the course. The exam consists in a group report presenting the findings from the case study, offering a qualitative and quantitative analysis hereof. The report receive feedback from teacher in the process of writing, and the course hence offers the students a chance to build competences before they are assessed from a more summative perspective (Sambell et al 2013: 6). After this, students have to submit an individual 3-page proposal for an alternative research design as well as a reflection on on their own learning from the course. The first element was insightful in order to judge their ability to transpose their context-dependent knowledge from one case to another (a new research design). This second element of the exam provided a valuable insight into students' self-regulatory and cognitive processes (cf. Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick 2007: 201-203), as well as concrete input for the improvement of course design and teaching activities.

From the interviews before course start in 2015, it was notable that many students were focused on learning technical skills, primarily the software programmes. From the reflections on their learning process, however, it was salient that many students had mainly focused on the topic of

the case study, i.e. on being able to produce findings related to this during the semester, while the acquisition of a deeper methodological knowledge or having had epistemological reflections received far less attention. This was unintended, but the generation of findings to some extent came to override the intended learning outcomes. This could probably be corrected for by adapting the exam (making the presentation and reflection upon method a explicit criteria when evaluating the report, for example). However, posing the question about their learning as part of the exam provided the students and us insights about their metacognitive skills and knowledge.

At any rate, the student engagement in the case based research provided possibilities of self-regulated learning and opens the door for more sophisticated 'ways of knowing' about methodology, but the approach also implies a number of challenges and possible flaws when applied in this particular course:

While the case based approach was well aligned to the intended learning outcomes of the course (Biggs and Tang 2011), the scope of the work was too large – running through the process of research design, generation of qualitative, quantitative and GIS data, conducting analysis of the different data sets and writing up the report was simply too time constrained, even though the course relied on in-between-classes activities and tasks, such as conducting the survey, interviewing and taking field notes. It was difficult to get students to step out of the role as receivers of knowledge (cf. Krogh et al 2015: 206) and the time pressure constrained the process of data analysis, making the teachers, us, take more (too much) control of the process.

When applying a case based approach in learning activities, the careful selection of the case to be studied is obviously very important. During the second year of the Advanced Research Method course (2015) the topic of case study was not very adequate for the learning of neither GIS nor participant observation. The case – focusing on voters perception of social media campaigning during the Danish Parliamentary elections that had taken place approximately two months ahead of the semester start. As a consequence, a spatial analysis using GIS and participant observation (online as well as offline) was largely meaningless. The most positive to be said about this selection of the case is that it offered students amble ground for coming up with suggestions for alternative and better research designs during their final exam.

The students were, as mentioned, coming from an array of disciplinary backgrounds. Generally speaking, they displayed a sound awareness of the strength and weaknesses of the different methods. According to the students themselves, the work in interdisciplinary groups 'enhanced their ability to address the topic of interest', enabled them 'to evaluate the choice of methodological tools' and to 'integrate the analysis of results', as students put it in their reflective essays. In the classes they required a lot of 'scaffolding' and explanation of ground rules and procedures. Students were able to articulate what they had learned from conducting the case study, but far from all reached virtuosity in the application of the methods in practice. At a practical level, the explanation was that a division of labour emerged within the groups, which

entailed that students performed the tasks that they were best at already in order to save time and produce the best possible report on the case. In this sense, students' self-regulatory practices produced an adverse effect - not allowing them to learn new methodological skills in any deep way.

Obviously, reaching virtuosity in qualitative interviewing and other methods take time. Seen in relation to the field school during the following semester, and the independent thesis work the following year, the course provides the fundamental skills and competences.

In this light, some changes in course design and teaching activities are called for:

- Limit the scope of the work by postponing the teaching of spatial analysis and GIS to the following semester; this should give more time to guide students through the process of analysis in accordance with an apprenticeship and case study approach to learning and to have more collective moments of reflections on methodology in class (already decided).
- Regulation of student behavior to ensure that all students gain familiarity and some expertise with the employment of the different methods, for example by making it a course requirement that each group member should submit field notes, a transcribed interview, and participate in realization of survey interviews.
- Undertake a more careful case study design ensuring that it gives opportunity to a meaningful employment of all the methods that student must master to fulfill the ILOs.
- A better correspondence between learning goals and exam form. Make some adjustments to the pass/fail exam, so students are required to demonstrate that they master the methods through the product (the report) and show that they can produce collective reflections on the selection and applicability of methods in light of their knowledge project.
- Attunement of learning goals between the advanced research methods course and the following field course in Tanzania to ensure progression in learning.

RESEARCH DESIGN: APPRENTICESHIP IN THE CLASSROOM

During 2015, the curriculum for the master programme in anthropology was reformed, hereunder the curriculum of the course in research design and fieldwork methods. I participated in this work. The new curriculum enters into force by September 2016, but in in anticipation it was decided to test-drive the new field course in the Spring of 2015. In the following I will describe my experience with trying to implement an apprenticeship approach to learning in the teaching of the course.

Students had during several years expressed dissatisfaction with the course being fragmented – it was split into inspirational workshops, method course and synopsis workshops taught by different teachers - but also that the course's location on the 7th semester did not give students sufficient time to prepare their fieldwork. As a consequence, many students while passing the synopsis

exam, decided to postpone their fieldwork, producing prolonged study times. In times of 'study progress reform' their decision to do so, potentially has grave economic consequences for the department. The coming years will show if the redesign of the curriculum of the master programme succeeds in creating more progress.

The desired effect is envisaged to become obtainable through class-based teaching organized in such way that the same teacher follows a group of 25-30 students though the semester, providing step-by-step guidance on the crafting of research design and fieldwork. In the following semester – where students are away on fieldwork – online mentoring has been made available to students (Bundgaard and Rubow forthcoming). The redesign of the curriculum hence draws on an apprenticeship model of teaching - without exactly returning to the times described by Fortes (1978) and others.

Some of the finer nuances of how these changes are implemented are interesting, if one is trying to carve out the possibilities of apprenticeship learning in a university characterized both by a greater number of students and a legal status as 'self-governing institution', inevitably leading to constant optimization efforts aimed at cutting back the study time and costs of students (see Wright 2014, 2015). In the following, I will describe the experience with doing 'apprenticeship in the class room', while the reader should keep in mind that this experiment is giving rise to deliberations concerning the reduction or elimination of 'normal' thesis supervision during the research and fieldwork planning phase.

The purpose of the course is twofold: a) to prepare students to carry out three months of ethnographic fieldwork; b) to help them develop the skills necessary for writing a convincing and realistic project proposal. The intended learning outcomes of the course focus on students' ability to write a linguistically clear and academically well-argued project design that demonstrates that they are capable of planning extensive and feasible anthropological fieldwork on the basis of a problem of their choosing, that they are able to select and relate their project to relevant regional and thematic literature, can delineate a research problem in relation to the local social and historical context, evaluate the relevance of different anthropological methodologies, and create analytical coherence between the problem addressed, the methodology, relevant theoretical perspectives as well as practical ethical aspects of the planned project.

During the spring semester of 2016 the approximately 60 students were divided into three classes having the same experienced fieldworker as teacher during the entire course in order to provide close guidance on the research design. This structure comes close to that used in the department twenty years ago, and the criteria for a good research proposal (synopsis) are largely the same. In fact, students were introduced to criteria from 1999 written by a professor and former teacher of the course.

As a consequence of the master programme curriculum reform, the course has been moved from the 7th to the 8th semester, preceded by two inspirational workshops during the 7th semester. Ideally, students should have decided on the thesis topic and fieldwork site before the course begins, and almost all handed in a proposal. Several later ran into problems concerning access to their desired field site, but at least the early decision made it possible to re-plan in time. The course consists in two weekly seminar classes, hereunder 6 synopsis workshops distributed throughout the semester, where students receive feedback on written assignments (sections of the research design). Students were generally highly motivated to participate in the course, 18 students handed in all their 6 assignments on time, and were eager to give and receive feedback and participate in class discussions. All 20 students passed the exam and were ready to go on fieldwork and as such the model lived up to objective of producing progress (though this can obviously not be judged from this small sample or before they have finalized their thesis projects).

My heuristic model of 'apprenticeship in the classroom' consisted in three elements: 1) Showing and using my own experiences, as well as drawing on those of others, to give students the possibility to observe and mirror themselves in more experienced fieldworkers; 2) teaching the crafting of research design though the joint analysis of exemplary practice and by mentoring and providing feedback on students' draft texts; 3) Engaging in joint experiments with methods, followed up by discussions of their applicability and versioning in different contexts.

The use of my own research design, field notes and field experiences was appreciated by students, which particularly came out during the oral evaluation of the course. As mentioned, students in the course participated well, but on one occasion they opposed the handing in of a written sample of their own field notes arguing that they had none. In the situation, I tried to convince them by arguing that one should start taking notes while negotiating access to one's field site. But during the following seminar class it was in fact their reading of my notes from an event in the field that finally convinced them. Most anthropologists tend to keep their field notes to themselves, which mean that they do not give other researchers or students access to laboratory of qualitative data. Sharing my notes gave rise to a quite long Q&A session about how they were taken, what was perceptions and sensations were included, how they were written up, and what possible analytical points that were reflected or foreshadowed in the ethnographic description etc.; a discussion which was they later returned to in their discussion of their own notes. In sum, the sharing of examples often led to quite nuanced conversations – on methodology, ethics and writing styles – which together with peer group exchange of experiences and written texts, gave students the possibility to mirror their own practices in those of others. This kind of lateral comparison, mirroring one's own professional practice with that of others without passing through the explication of standard rules or procedures, is one of the fundamentals of apprenticeship, I believe.

In the workshops, I took on the role more as mentor providing feedback on the crafting of the research design, particularly how to present the project idea and relevance of the project, how to

formulate a good problem statements and phrase the research questions, how to carve out of the projects contribution to the state of the art within a given field etc. With a group of 20 students, it is possible to become so familiar with their ideas and plans that the teacher can provide such ongoing sparring. However, when going beyond the crafting of a research design, the employment of an apprenticeship model in the classroom also displays its own limitation: It is not to the same extent nor always possible to provide content-oriented advise, for example on the choice of literature or on the definition a study's contribution to a field or topic, if this field is unfamiliar to the teacher. This seems to me to be one of the major differences between the classic apprenticeship model in anthropology and the apprenticeship in the classroom outlined here. In this sense, a division of work with the thesis advisor, who must contribute with the regional and/or thematic expertise, is still needed. Moreover, thesis supervisors play an important role in accompanying students through to the completion of their thesis and hence in their completion as professionals.

The teaching of methods was less focused on developing basic skills, and more on deepening and broadening knowledge and generating virtuosity in the application of methods. This was done during seminars by comparing and discussing concrete practices, or by developing proposals and debate how methods could be employed and adapted during fieldwork on particular topics presented by students. Teaching often developed as common processes of realization and reflection. Breaking the supervisor-student dyad (Dysthe et al. 2006) by doing 'apprenticeship in the classroom' have at least three positive elements: it is time saving in terms of teaching the more generic elements of crafting a thesis, it is positive for students to get used to multi-voiced supervision and feedback (which is something you have to navigate in work life both inside and outside academia), and it should be possible to facilitate theoretical and methodological debates, which are relevant to all students.

Not surprisingly, the anthropology students have a high level of virtuosity in qualitative methods, and are able to this apply knowledge creatively across different contexts and cases. The apprenticeship model, used in anthropology among other for learning methods, does however also entail some weaknesses. While the students are good at evaluating their own progress, reflect on and improve their practice, and transfer knowledge from one context to another, they are far less skilled at articulating what they are good at. During this course, I have experimented with little exercises such as: 'pitch your research topic to a possible donor', 'give an elevator speech on your qualifications' or 'explain the relevance of this to someone in your family' in addition to the more general debates over the societal relevance of their thesis projects. Moreover, I have tried to flag how methods can be off used in workplace contexts, but more should be done.

Even though students have been very happy about the course, and all submitted their final exam, it has been decided to make a series of changes next year due to budget constraints. In 2016-17, the master degree in anthropology will have an extraordinary high intake of new students, but the research design course will only count on two classes of some 45-55 students each. Moreover, it

has been decided to cut down from 2x2 to 1x3 lessons a week; something which will require rethinking the course of study again as well as some of the teaching activities. It has also been proposed, but not decided, to cut down (or completely drop) thesis supervision during the 8th semester where the students are planning their field and thesis work.

Ideas for improvement:

- The teaching of metacognitive skills has often been held within study skills sessions during the bachelor programme, but it should be integrated with the study of the content matter also in the master programme. The development a little idea catalogue for teaching activities that strengthening students' metacognitive knowledge, ways of articulating what they have learned and ability to explain what they are good at, could be a hand on solution.
- To facilitate that students are more aware of their skills and competence and able to articulate these to an audience outside the discipline could also be integrated into thesis supervision. An often overlooked element of thesis supervision has to do with the individual formation of the student as a professional (or their employability, if you will). Supervision, and the long term relation developed in an apprenticeship model, is not only important for learning a particular disciplinary craft or for gaining expertise within a subject matter, but also for shaping and making the student aware of their unique professional profile and expertise.
- When rethinking the course again, it could be an option to replace 4 out of 6 workshops with peer-supervision sessions in-between classes. Students find that it has worked very well with the periodic assignments (submission of drafts), which according to them 'has divided the work into parts', they have experienced a sense of 'being taken by the hand' and felt that they were led to work on the research design in a productive and ongoing manner. This should be maintained when the course is revised. Likewise the early decision on research topic and site gave time to re-plan when ideas were not viable thereby avoiding the postponement of fieldwork.
- If reduction of teaching or supervision needs to be made, lessons could be suspended during two weeks (about one third into the semester) for students to elaborate a thorough literature review. It is not possible to provide an thorough supervision on 40 research designs even with an 'apprenticeship in the classroom' model. Thesis supervision should be maintained at about the current level.

CONCLUSION

In this report I have tried to take the temperature of a rather murky subject namely apprenticeship learning in methodology teaching at the University of Copenhagen. Overall, the conclusion is that one should think of more, not less, apprenticeship learning, but also that this needs to take on new forms. Here I have briefly outlined two such models, namely a case-based model implemented with some 65 students and an 'apprenticeship in the classroom' model tested

with a group of 20 students. As outlined above both models have strengths and weaknesses when implemented in practice with two very diverse groups of students. It is also clear from the two examples described here that apprenticeship learning is far from flawless, and that a strong emphasis on socialization and guided learning need to be monitored with regard to student motivation, self-regulatory practices and their development of metacognitive knowledge. On the other side, guided learning - if taken seriously - is not simply an instrumental 'quick fix' to secure student progress, but an important element in developing into full professionals within their field.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Biggs, J. and C. Tang. 2009. Applying constructive alignment to outcomes-based teaching and learning.

Bundgaard, H and C. Rubow. Forthcoming. From rite of passage to a mentored educational activity: Fieldwork for master's students of anthropology.

Caldwell, G. 2011. Whatever happened to Apprenticeship Learning? *The Clinical Teacher*, vol. 8: 272–275.

Cassidy, S. 2011. Self-regulated learning in higher education: identifying key component processes. *Studies in Higher Education,* vol. 36(8): 989-1000

Christensen, C. R and A.J. Hansen (eds.) (1987) *Teaching and the Case Method*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Colish, M.L. 1997. Medieval Foundations of the Western Intellectual Tradition 400-1400. New Haven: yale University Press.

Downey, G., M. Dalidowicz and P.H. Mason. 2015. Apprenticeship as method: embodied learning in ethnographic practice. *Qualitative Research* vol. 15(2): 183-200.

Dysthe, O., A. Samara and K. Westrheim. 2006. Multivoiced supervision of Master's students: a case study of alternative supervision practices in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education* Vol. 31 (3): 299–318.

Evans, T.M.S. and D. Handelman. 2016. Introduction: The Ethnographic Praxis of the Theory of Practice, pp.1-11 In: T.M.S Evens and D. Handelman (eds.), The Manchester School: Practice and Ethnographic Praxis on Anthropology. New York: Berghahn Books.

Flyvbjerg, B. 2006. Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry* vol. 12(2):219-245.

Flyvbjerg, B., T Landman and S. Schram (eds). 2012. Real Social Science: Applied Phronesis. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Fortes, Meyer. 1978. An Anthropologist's Apprenticeship. *Annual Review of Anthropology* vol 7:1-30.

Gell, Alfred. 2006. The Art of Anthropology: Essays and Diagrams. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Grassini, C (eds). 2007. Skilled Visions: Between Apprenticeship and Standards. Oxford and new York: Berghahn Books.

Hansen, A-L Lysholm and S. Jöhncke. 2013. *Omsat antropologi: En undersøgelse af det antropologiske arbejdsmarked i Danmark*. Copenhagen: Antropologisk Analyse, Department of Anthropology, University of Copenhagen.

Ivankova, N. V., J. W. Creswell and S. L. Stick. 2006. Using Mixed-Methods Sequential Explanatory Design: From Theory to Practice, *Field Methods* 18(1): 3-20.

Konopinski, N. 2014. Doing Anthropological Research: A Practical Guide. London and new York: Routledge.

Krogh, L. D. Stentoft, J Emmersen and P. Musaus. 2015. Case-based learning. In: University Teaching and Learning. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.

Lave, J. 2011. Apprenticeship in Critical Ethnographic Practice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lave, J. 1988. Cognition in Practice: Mind, mathematics, and culture in everyday life. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lave J. and Wenger E. 1991. Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Oakeshott, M. The Idea of a University. In. T. Fuller (ed.), The Voice of Liberal Learning: Michael Oaskeshott on Education. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

O' Reilly; K. 2012. Introduction: Ethnography as Practice. Pp 1-27 In: Ethnographic Methods (second edition). London and New York: Routledge.

Nicol, D. and D. Macfarlane-Dick. 2006. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice, *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2): 199-218.

Prince, M.J. and R.M.Felder. 2006. Inductive Teaching and Learning Methods: Definitions, Comparisons, and research Bases. *Journal of Engineering Education*, April: 123-138.

Sambell, K. L McDowell and C. Montgomery. 2013. Assessment for Higher Education. New York: Routledge.

Williams, K. 1989. The Gift of an Interval: Michael Oakeshott's Idea of a University Education. *British Journal of Educational Studies* vol. 37(4): 384-397.

Wright, Susan 2014. Humboldt" Humbug!: contemporary mobilizations of "Humboldt" as a discourse to support the corporatization and marketization of universities and to disparage alternatives, pp 143-163 In: The Humboldtian tradition : origins and legacies. Thomas Karlsohn, Peter Josephson , Johan Ostling (eds). Leiden: Brills.

Wright, Susan. 2015. Autonomy and control: Danish university reform in the context of modern governance (Revised and updated), In: Learning under neoliberalism : ethnographies of governance in higher education. Boone W. Shear, Susan Brin Hyatt, Wright Susan. New York: Berghahn Books.