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Abstract
This article explores the synergy between cognitive apprenticeship and transactional analysis, specifically in relation to teaching, training, and supervision. The learning science of cognitive apprenticeship offers a relational approach through its use of the metaphor of master and novice, which is consistent with transactional analysis theory and practice. The author discusses cognitive apprenticeship as a pedagogical approach that has been central in transactional analysis training, supervision, fields of application, and practice from the beginning.

Master Po: Close your eyes. What do you see?
Young Caine: I hear the water, I hear the birds.
Master Po: Do you hear your own heartbeat?
Young Caine: No.
Master Po: Do you hear the grasshopper which is at your feet?
Young Caine: Old man, how is it that you hear these things.
Master Po: Young man, how is it that you do not?
(Spielman, Friedlander, & Thorpe, 1972)

Pedagogy
Pedagogy is both the science and the art of education. It is also a teaching method that encompasses the principles and methods of instruction. The pedagogy of any modality is the way in which teaching occurs, the approach to teaching and learning, the way content is delivered, and what students learn as a result of the process. It is worth noting that in some fields there is a distinction between pedagogy and andragogy. Knowles (1980) defined andragogy as “the art and science of helping adults learn” (p. 11).

Let us begin by asking, “What is the pedagogy of transactional analysis?” We know that it involves a common methodology that is used worldwide by transactional analysis trainers, trainees, supervisors, and supervisees. This methodology combines didactic, experiential, and theoretical delivery modes in supervisory, group, and individual learning settings. Teaching and learning in transactional analysis aligns with a shared philosophy based on the ideas that all people are OK, that everyone has the capacity...
to think, that people can decide their own teaching and learning destiny, and that these decisions can be changed as learning continues.

Considering the ongoing development of transactional analysis as a theory and practice, we as a community of learners and practitioners continue to add to our knowledge. Scardamalia and Bereiter (2006) referred to this process as knowledge building and wrote that “there are substantial similarities between deep learning and the processes by which knowledge advances in the disciplines” (p. 97). The construct of a knowledge-building pedagogy is considered instrumental to the evolution of pedagogy, which includes trainers’ innovations, students’ accomplishments, and new technologies.

Until recently, the main ways of teaching and learning transactional analysis have been fairly consistent. Over time, more contemporary delivery modes for learning have been actively explored, especially in relation to the global movement toward blended learning methods that include online learning.

There are many opportunities for knowledge building between transactional analysis theory, training, supervision, and teaching methods and learning design. For example, knowledge of learning design draws on various disciplines to answer these questions (Koper, 2005):

- What support do people need in order to learn?
- How can we assess and communicate the results of the learning process?
- How can we make learning and support as effective, efficient, attractive, and accessible as possible for everyone involved in the process? (p. 2)

In terms of these questions, we might ask whether pedagogy and learning design belong only in the classroom, in teaching and learning environments, or in supervision arenas. My view is that they also have a place in professional work with individuals, for example, when we consider that such work often involves an educational quality and that clients are often open to learning. In addition, learning occurs on the job through professional development, by considering our mistakes and successes, and by observing seniors and experts. Cassoni (2007) discussed parallel process in supervision in terms of linking theory with practice and “as a concept that connects the pedagogical and therapeutic functions of supervision” (p. 138).

Cognitive apprenticeship is one of many pedagogical approaches and learning sciences, and it is frequently used in teaching and supervising transactional analysis trainees at all levels. I suggest that it is also evident in our work as colleagues and peers as we interact within the context of our learning community.

**Cognitive Apprenticeship**

Cognitive apprentice is a learning science that studies teaching and learning.

The goal of the learning sciences is to better understand the cognitive and social processes that result in the most effective learning, and to use this knowledge to redesign classrooms and other learning environments so that people learn more deeply and effectively. (Sawyer 2006, p. xi)

Sawyer (2006) described it “[as] an interdisciplinary science: it brings together researchers in psychology, education, computer science, and anthropology, among others, and the collaboration among these disciplines has resulted in new ideas, new methodologies, and new ways of thinking about learning” (p. 3).

In thinking about the learning science of cognitive apprenticeship and its interface with transactional analysis training methods, I have linked collaborative learning and cognitive apprenticeship. In analyzing collaborative discourse and emphasizing peer collaboration, learning science draws on over 20 years of educational research that has consistently demonstrated that collaboration helps students learn. Sawyer also suggested that cooperative training groups result in greater learning than competitive or individualistically structured learning environments.

Cognitive apprenticeship is a theory of the processes involved when an expert (the master) teaches and demonstrates skills to an apprentice (a novice). “Cognitive apprenticeship is designed to bring cognitive processes into the open, where students can observe, enact and practice them” (Collins, 2006, p. 48). Collins further defined cognitive apprenticeship as follows: “The essential way people get better at
doing things is by thinking about what they are doing beforehand, by trying to do what they have planned, and by reflecting back on how well what they did came out” (p. 58).

Most teaching and learning is based on apprenticeship. From the time we were children we learned how to speak, do, be, accomplish daily tasks, develop skills, and perform a multitude of behaviors from the adults in our lives and what our communities show us. Through unconscious processes and, in some cases, explicit processes, we also learn individual and family scripts, which could also be viewed as a family cognitive apprenticeship.

As adults we continue to learn through various forms of apprenticeship: We learn our language from our families, as an employee we learn job skills on site, and many professions teach by having senior figures working side by side with junior practitioners. In transactional analysis training and supervision, this approach is central.

Collins (2006) outlined the two major differences between cognitive apprenticeship and traditional apprenticeship:

1. Traditional apprenticeship was usually set in the workplace, which limited what it could teach (i.e., it could only teach what was pertinent to a particular workplace). Cognitive apprenticeship differs in that the tasks and problems are chosen to illustrate the effect and power of certain techniques and methods. This provides the student with practice in applying them in diverse settings. As time goes by, the complexity is increased so that the skills can be integrated into practice and sequenced to “reflect the changing demands of learning” (p. 48).

2. Traditional apprenticeship emphasizes teaching skills in the context of their use, whereas cognitive apprenticeship emphasizes generalizing knowledge so that it can be used in many different settings and “articulat[ing] the common principles, so that students learn how to apply their skills in varied contexts” (p. 49).

Abbott (2004), who has written extensively about cognitive apprenticeship for many years, described how the master and novice in action involves a fine balance between the master orchestrating the experience for the novice and supporting the student in performing the task himself or herself so that learning can be integrated into practice.

Dennen (2004) defined cognitive apprenticeship as “the use of an apprenticeship model to support learning in the cognitive domain” (p. 813) and that the cognitive apprenticeship techniques of modeling, coaching, scaffolding, reflecting, and exploring are all “methods of teaching and learning that draw on social constructivist learning theory” (p. 814).

Principles for Designing Cognitive Apprenticeship Environments

Collins (2006) suggested that cognitive apprenticeship focuses on four dimensions that characterize any learning environment: content, method, sequencing, and sociology. He referred to these dimensions as the principles for designing cognitive apprenticeships environments. It is these principles that demonstrate the intersection between transactional analysis training and supervision and cognitive apprenticeship. They are generally found throughout transactional analysis training and learning, and they offer a design framework and approach. Van Beekum (2007) explained that an approach “refers to a philosophy of human experience in combination with a methodology of how to think about the issues presented by the client, that is, how to reflect on them, assess them, see them in context, and (maybe) decide what to do about them” (p. 146). These definitions of approach and method interface with the cognitive apprenticeship approach (Collins, 2006), which also includes method as a way of considering training design and learning philosophy.

Content: The Types of Knowledge Required for Expertise. Content involves using domain knowledge, which includes the specific concepts, facts, and procedures of a particular field. Heuristic strategies are the applicable techniques necessary for accomplishing tasks generally. These are often termed tricks of the trade (Collins, 2006, p. 49) and are generally effective techniques for accomplishing tasks. Control strategies are evident in the techniques and approaches used to solve problems, find solutions, accomplish tasks, and carry out practice. Control strategies, otherwise known as metacognitive strategies, are the controlling technique applied
in the learning process. Collins described these
as having “monitoring, diagnostic, and remedial
components: decisions about how to proceed
in a task generally depend on an assessment of
one’s current state relative to one’s goals, on an
analysis of current difficulties and on the strate-
gies available for dealing with difficulties” (p.
49). Learning strategies, the final component of
the content principles for cognitive apprentice-
ship, are strategies for learning domain knowl-
edge, heuristic strategies, and control strate-
gies. This is the knowledge about how to learn
new concepts, facts, procedures, and practice
and then to extend and reconfigure this knowl-
edge into more complex situations, sequences,
and practice.

*Method: Ways to Promote the Development of Expertise.* This involves the following ways of
promoting the development of expertise:
- Modeling: The teacher performs a task while
  students observe.
- Coaching: The teacher observes and facilita-
tes while students perform a task.
- Scaffolding: The teacher provides support
to help students perform a task.
- Articulation: The teacher encourages stu-
dents to verbalize their knowledge.
- Reflection: The teacher enables students to
  contrast their work with that of others.
- Exploration: The teacher invites students
to pose and solve their own problems.

*Sequencing: Keys to Ordering Learning Activities.* This involves increased complexity as
meaningful tasks gradually increase in diffi-
culty. Diversity also increases as practice is
carried out in a variety of situations so that broad
applications are emphasized. Global-to-local
skills focus on conceptualizing the whole task
before executing the parts in practice.

*Sociology: Social Characteristics of Learning Environments.* This involves “situated learn-
ing” (Collins, 2006, p. 52) in which students
learn in the context of working on realistic
tasks. It means having a community of practice
and communication about different ways to
accomplish meaningful tasks. Thus, students
are intrinsically motivated to set personal goals,
seek skills and solutions, and cooperate with
others to accomplish their goals. Collins re-
ferrred to situated learning as the “creation of a
learning environment in which the participants
actively communicate about and engage in the
skills involved in expertise” (p. 52).

It is both the co-creation, contact, contract,
and use of real-life experiences throughout
learning and having transactional analysis as
a framework for our personal and professional
experiences and practice that Spector (2000)
would call the “experience principle” (p. 3),
wherein understanding begins in and is based
on human experience. Further congruence be-
tween transactional analysis and cognitive
apprenticeship was highlighted by Goodyear
(2000) when he distinguished between knowl-
edge and skill (as outlined in Table 1) as a way
of avoiding adopting “exaggerated positions”
(p. 3) and failing to recall that the starting and
ending point should be human experience. By
this Goodyear meant that the “context is rel-
vant for learning and the construction of learn-
ing” (p. 3) so that “explicit consideration when
planning instruction” is essential for ensuring
that the experience principle is upheld rather
than an implicit view that one approach suits
all. Therefore, to avoid adopting the exaggera-
ted positions of one approach suits all is to
factor context and integration into practice that
is relevant and pertinent to the student.

Further congruence between transactional
analysis and cognitive apprenticeship is sug-
gested by Goodyear’s (2000) questioning of the
distinction between knowledge and skill as
outlined in Table 1. This is a way to avoid both
adopting exaggerated positions and forgetting
that the starting and ending point needs to be
the human experience. Essentially, Goodyear
suggested that by only providing knowledge
there is no guarantee or assurance that skill
development will occur.

**The Intersection of Transactional Analysis and Cognitive Apprenticeship**

In this section I will explore some transaction-
al analysis concepts that demonstrate the
intersection between transactional analysis and
cognitive apprenticeship. The authors and works
cited here are by no means exhaustive but rather
show the usefulness of cognitive apprentice-
ship ideas within transactional analysis training
and supervision.
Table 1
Knowledge Versus Skill (Goodyear, 2000, p. 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Knowing how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic knowledge</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative knowledge</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Practical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit (articulate)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Tacit knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discursive consciousness</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Practical consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historically, cognitive apprenticeship has been at the heart of training in transactional analysis from the beginning. In his patient-staff conferences, Eric Berne took the revolutionary step of including patients in case review meetings with other health professionals. This was cognitive apprenticeship for the health professionals as they watched and learned from Berne’s work, and, at some level, it was also that for patients whose cases were discussed. Berne’s weekly San Francisco seminars also reflected a cognitive apprenticeship model in that participants were there to learn from and observe him and his methods as well as to have him observe theirs.

As described by Cassoni (2007), Berne encouraged therapists/practitioners to engage actively in the process and to allow themselves both to observe and be observed. This constituted the relational model as proposed by Berne because it “enhances from the beginning the presence of both the therapist (practitioner) and the patient (client) in the here and now” (p. 131).

Berne developed the concept of “executive power” (Stewart & Joines, 1987, p. 48) to describe how one ego state holds the power as energy shifts among them. Referencing the cognitive apprenticeship metaphor of master and novice, in supervisor/trainer and supervisee/trainee relationships, supervisors may observe or even direct their own and the supervisee’s/trainee’s executive power using the cognitive apprentice methods of modeling, coaching, scaffolding, articulating, reflecting, and exploring practice and learning.

There is also synergy between cognitive apprenticeship and Schmid’s (2008) principles of transactional analysis, which include:

- Focusing on real people in real life situations
- Acknowledging and understanding multiple background levels
- Accepting the necessary function of intuition in creating reality
- Acting from a position of “I’m OK, You’re OK”
- Being dedicated to how people find meaning in life
- Encountering others on an equal level
- Taking each other’s autonomy and wisdom seriously
- Using concepts and procedures that can be understood and related to by everyone involved
- Keeping concepts as simple as possible yet profound on a deeper level
- Confronting each other about differences in perception and culture
- Building pluralistic and nonimperialistic associations (p. 18)

I would add to this list:

- Accepting equal responsibility for learning

When Stewart and Joines (1987) wrote about Berne’s theory of cure, they postulated that “script cure can be behavioral, affective or cognitive, or the combination of the three. In other words, someone who moves out of script can do so by acting, feeling and thinking in new ways” (p. 269). Within a cognitive apprenticeship approach, this begins the relationship between master and novice with the supervisor/
trainer recognizing his or her role as instrumen
tal and facilitative of the trainee/supervisee and
his or her own continued learning. Stewart and
Joines also wrote that “no matter how you de
fine ‘script cure,’ it is seldom a once-for-all event.
Much more often, cure is a matter of progress
ively learning to exercise new choices” (p. 269).
Linking the transactional analysis concept of
cure with cognitive apprenticeship demonstrates
that observing and learning from masters can
be the catalyst for rededication at many levels.

Barrow (2011) linked cure and the concept
of physis from clinical into organizational and
educational contexts when he wrote that “Berne’s
preoccupation, though, was script cure: making
people better, freeing clients from scripts, and
preferably as soon as possible. The farmer—and
by extension, the educator—is primarily
interested in growth” (p. 308).

Newton (2006) explained that “long before
we arrive at our script, we take part in stories
and believe ourselves to be in them” (p. 186).
These stories come from people older than we
are. Newton also discussed Kolb’s (1984) learning cycle, which is comprised of reflecting,
conceptualizing, and experimenting. This
was adapted by Napper and Newton (2000) and
called the “experiential learning cycle,” which
consisted of doing, looking, thinking, and changing
styles. They postulated “that our behaviour
is changed as a result of reflecting on and draw
ing conclusions about the experience” (p. 189).
Likewise, the work and roles of supervisor/trainer
and supervisee/trainee include reflection and
drawing conclusions.

Van Beekum & Krijgsman (2000) postulated
that contact and autonomy both need to occur
when we are in contact with others: “Real autono
my may indicate that we can fully experience
ourselves as we move between contact with
ourselves and contact with another” (p. 56).

Avoiding symbiosis in coaching, supervision,
or mentoring relationships was highlighted by
Hay (2007) and epitomizes the master and nov
ice construct:

We all unconsciously seek to attain some
version of child-like bliss, when parent fig
ures took care of us and we had no need to
deal with any of the difficulties of being in
the world. . . . The supervision process is

a great way to spend more and more time
not being symbiotic. As we become increas
ingly self-aware through reflection and
challenge, we spend more time in the here
and now. (p. 52)

Hargaden and Sills (2008) suggested that rela
tional transactional analysis is a way of working
that prioritizes the relationship between two
people as the central vehicle for insight and
change. This means that through the connection
they create together, the change occurs (p. 10).
Hargaden and Sills described this as a “bidirec
tional approach—therapy is a two-way street”
(p. 9). Furthermore, relational transactional
analysis involves engaging with unconscious
processes, which can be a potent and instru
mental approach when working with organiza
tions, individuals, and groups. Here the master
novice idea can be used to think about the rela
tionship and the bidirectional approach.

Summers and Tudor (2000) articulated the
principles of cocreative transactional analysis, including:

- “We”-ness of Adult-to-Adult relating plus
relating from all ego states, which precipi
tates “cotransferential” (p. 24) processes
- Shared responsibility of interdependence,
cooperation, and mutuality
- Present-centered development in the here
and now

Cognitive apprenticeship within transactional
analysis teaching and learning, supervising and
supervision involves a cocreative relationship
and environment, a we-ness of shared responsi
bility, and mutuality for learning. While the co
creative model emphasizes a level playing field
in Adult-to-Adult relating, often this needs to
be modeled through observing and experienc
ing in the supervisor/trainee relationship the
we-ness that allows the trainee’s confidence to
emerge and for his or her to experience the eff
ectiveness of this way of working.

Aligning Cognitive Apprenticeship with
Transactional Analysis Teaching Methods

Table 2 offers examples of applying the teach
ing and learning of supervision with transacti
onal analysis methodology and context to Good
year’s (2000, p. 3) concepts and distinction be
tween knowledge and skill.
The following describes the alignment of principles for designing cognitive apprenticeship environments with transactional analysis training and supervision teaching methods and procedures. The design principles are those articulated by Collins (2006) and described earlier in this article: content, method, sequencing, and sociology.

**Content.** The canon of Berne’s theories and concepts underpins all teaching of theory in transactional analysis. Interwoven with this foundation are later developments of transactional analysis, including various schools and approaches. Therefore, the domain knowledge of transactional analysis includes theory, concepts, history, and current and future developments.

Control or metacognitive strategies are methods of controlling the process of the task along with assessment, monitoring, and remedial components. This relates to trainees’ levels of experience and training. Senior trainees are more involved in having their supervision supervised whereas new and beginning trainees are more likely to seek supervision of their work with clients. Assessment of trainees is measured by evaluating the integration and knowledge of theory, practice, and self-awareness.

Learning strategies for learning domain knowledge as well as heuristic and control strategies involve the methods of didactic instruction, group process, experiential work, supervision, being observed, receiving feedback, gaining self-awareness, and applying theory to practice. Underpinning these strategies is the master-novice model of watching and learning from the trainer-supervisor, peers, and other trainees.

**Method.** This is particularly relevant to traditional ways of promoting and developing expertise. Each of these components of method is
based on the trainer/supervisor acting as the master for the novice trainee/supervisee.

- Modeling: The trainer/supervisor does live supervision of trainees and supervision of supervision within training and supervision groups or leads group process or teaches theory.
- Coaching: The trainer/supervisor observes the trainee doing supervision and/or teaching theory or concepts and provides support.
- Scaffolding: The trainer/supervisor provides support for the trainee to do the work and may ask the following types of questions to clarify and determine the kinds of support the trainee wants: What is our contract? What do you want from me? How do you want to organize the room so it helps you to complete the work? What do you want from your peers?
- Articulating: This involves the trainer/supervisor encouraging trainees to verbalize their knowledge and thinking. After the supervision is over, the trainer/supervisor will ask the trainee questions to allow the trainees’ thinking and awareness to emerge.
- Reflecting: The trainer/supervisor enables trainees to discuss their performance and knowledge and to make comparisons and links with practice.
- Exploring: The trainer/supervisor invites trainees to address their own learning needs and gaps.

 sequencEing relates to the order of learning activities such that increasing complexity and diversity are integrated. As trainees progress through transactional analysis training, the expectation is that training tasks, assessments, and practice will gradually become more challenging (e.g., knowledge of theory, application of theory to practice, self-awareness, practice maturity, and performance). Trainees will also be expected to apply their knowledge and skills in settings other than their primary training group (e.g., other training groups, observation by other trainers/supervisors, workshops, their own practice development, supervision of work with clients, etc.). Another aspect of sequencing is to be able to move from global to local skills, which involves conceptualizing the whole task before commencing the work. In a transactional analysis framework, the principles and philosophies of how people change is global and the work becomes how this is applied locally in one’s practice. A treatment plan, a change management project plan, and a plan for delivering and/or facilitating the learning of theory also involve moving from global to local. Within all of these, the global view allows for planning, thinking, and sequencing of the work. Sequencing also involves the development of skills along with ranges of complexity for the new learner through to the expert and within this, managing the timing, context, and use of applying increased skills and competency as appropriate within professional settings and situations.

Sociology refers to the characteristics of learning environments and begins with situated learning, in which trainees learn in the context of working on realistic tasks. For example, supervision focuses on actual supervision issues bought forward by the supervisee or real case studies that are considered in relation to theory and concepts that can be applied to increase understanding of both the case and the theory. A community of practice is a learning environment in which participants can actively communicate about and engage in the skills involved in expertise. Transactional analysis training communities of practice emulate this through their training days/weekends, workshops, and conferences. A community of practice is designed to foster the sharing of experiences and theoretical discussions about how to interpret theory and apply concepts. Essentially, a community of practice invokes feelings of ownership. Collins (2006) described a community of practice in this way: “Such a community leads to a sense of ownership, characterized by personal investment and mutual dependency” (p. 52). The mutual recognition of training and certification among transactional analysis groups and organizations supports a system that depends on excellence, consistency, and collaboration to ensure rigor, quality, and standards in transactional analysis training. This involves a high level of personal investment from all key stakeholders and depends on the training and certification groups and processes to be ever vigilant in maintaining quality international training frameworks and qualifications.
Sociology also refers to intrinsic motivation, which leads individual trainees to set personal goals in the service of developing the skills, solutions, and qualifications they seek. Intrinsic goals are related to learning that interests and inspires trainees to achieve their learning outcomes as opposed to extrinsic reasons for getting good marks (e.g., to please the trainer). Transactional analysis trainees contract to complete the training requirements with an institute or individual trainer. Finally, within sociology is cooperation, which involves collaborative learning based on working together with other trainees, trainers, and supervisors to accomplish learning goals.

In summarizing the alignment of cognitive apprenticeship with transactional analysis teaching methods, I cite Tyranigel (2011), who described his transactional analysis learning experiences and how while much was gained from the theories that were taught, the most memorable learning came through his experience of the people themselves. He wrote, “I hardly recall any specific interventions, but I am still touched by the meaningful encounters” (p. 19). I resonate with this and can recall how my strongest learning moments were about the trainer or supervisor.

**Training Leadership and the Master**

In keeping with the master-novice metaphor, trainers and supervisors in transactional analysis are the leaders of training programs. The following transactional analysis concepts relate to leadership theory and share a certain synergy with the cognitive apprenticeship notion of the master role.

Berne (1963, p. 106) described three kinds of leadership in organizations: effective, responsible, and psychological. These roles can be invested in one person or held by different individuals in various combinations. Competence and performance in the effective and responsible leadership roles can be observed. However, the psychological leader is an individual perception within a person’s own thinking, private structure, and frame of reference and represents someone who often holds a special place for that person for a variety of real and imaginary reasons and is often not explicitly articulated to others. Training in leadership is intrinsic to trainees’ learning and is experienced through their observations, feelings, and support of their learning goals and achievements.

For leadership and manager roles within organizations, Mountain and Davidson (2011) used the term “integrative leadership” (p. 167) to emphasize that leaders need to reflect the goals and values of their organizations. Thus, there is a demand to model the behaviors and attitudes the organization wants people to emulate and enact. Integrative leadership involves being congruent and authentic and to “walk the walk” that employees are expected to follow. This can also be applied to leadership in training, where trainees are encouraged or expected to follow the trainer’s example. This role modeling is evident in the standards required of transactional analysis trainers and supervisors, who are expected to reflect the values of transactional analysis and the training institutes and organizations to which they belong.

Van Poelje (2004) suggested that learning occurs in real-life situations “from key learning events, despite ingrained success formulas or scripts” (p. 225). She discussed research designed to test the theory and practice of learning leadership largely through on-the-job experience. The research outcomes suggested that not all managers are excellent learners but that excellent learners are often top managers. From this research, the seven key learning events that managers named most often were:

1. **Mission impossible:** tasks, projects, time pressures that seemed impossible
2. **Setbacks:** unexpected, unplanned, mistakes, failures
3. **Role models:** positive and negative, each had an important effect on learning leadership
4. **Conflicting norms and values:** personal values conflicting with business interests
5. **Dealing with subordinates:** managing teams and individuals (being the master)
6. **Dealing with the political arena:** internal and external politics
7. **Personal experiences:** key life events, such as death, birth, marriage, divorce

In leadership programs that have grown out of this research, as well as efforts to develop...
leaders within organizations, a critical component is that “all participants receive a management mentor and a project coach” (van Poelje, 2004, p. 227), an observation that is consistent with a cognitive apprenticeship model.

Krauz (1986) postulated that “leadership is not an entity, but a way of relating to others” (p. 85). She wrote, “Defining leadership in terms of power use expresses the intimate connection between the two concepts, which are different aspects of the same phenomenon” (p. 85). It is at this intersection that the roles of trainer and supervisor are central to how one relates, leads, and uses power with trainees and supervisees.

**The Master and Novice Within**

I am sure most of us would agree that early on, parents, elders, teachers, coaches, siblings, cousins, community, neighbors, and even pets shaped and were influential in our apprenticeship in life. For me, this continues today with the addition of my children, my other relationships, and now my 5-year-old grandson. He, I would add, keeps me in a constant novice state because every day he teaches and influences me about the most important things in my life: time, being in contact, being playful, and listening.

In my transactional analysis roles as supervisee, trainee, supervisor, trainer, leader, and organizational consultant, I contemplate the master and novice within myself often. From which position do I learn the most? I find that both are equally important and that the depth of my learning in either role depends on the context, the environment, and how I am being and feeling at the moment.

For a university e-lesson I delivered about cognitive apprenticeship, I developed a survey that posed the question, “Who learns the most: the master or the novice?” The results were almost evenly divided, with about 50 percent for each role. In their comments, one general theme was that people found in their education as adults an increased self-awareness about opportunities to learn from others, be they teachers, students, or peers.

I am constantly learning from supervisees about new aspects of myself and my practice. Recently, I really wanted one of my supervisees to set goals for achieving training milestones, and I noticed that this feeling on my part created tension, confusion, and a sort of stalemate in our relationship. This learning situation provided me with a deeper understanding of my own driver behavior and the impact it was having on my supervisee. It was from being challenged to accept this trainee setting his own pace that I could encourage him to take ownership of his own goals. This lesson was a learning gift for me, one that offered insight that I could grow from and integrate into practice.

There have been times when I have experienced that my learning as trainer-supervisor has far outweighed that of my supervisees/trainees. How trainees respond to my teaching of theory and my learning exercises constantly informs how I develop my curriculum and delivery methods.

When I began obtaining supervision on my work, I often wanted to please, not question, try hard, be fully prepared, and be on time. Now, some years on, I am still on time and prepared, and I notice that I am more confident and trusting of myself in terms of the cases and issues I bring to supervision. I am also more trusting of the supervision process along with the insight and learning that emerges.

Over the last year or two, as I have become more challenging, in a respectful way, regarding what I want from supervision, I have sometimes wondered if the supervisor could be learning more from me. In a recent session, I wanted to know why I had not been told about all the articles the supervisor had written. The response was, “Well, they are all listed and available on the website.” There are many directions that interaction could have gone. However, staying with the master and novice metaphor, it was, for me, the first time I had experienced myself so directly challenging the “master.” I felt comfortable with my outburst and wanted to recommend to the supervisor that all trainees and supervisors be made aware of the articles. I remember feeling that the distance between being a new supervisee and being one who was more experienced had widened substantially for me.

**In Summary**

Cognitive apprenticeship as a learning science and pedagogical approach offers an educational
theory, concept, and design framework for the teaching method of transactional analysis training.

Collins (2006) highlighted the extensive research that has been done over the last 15 years to incorporate the principles of cognitive apprenticeship in the design of learning environments. I believe that this research serves our global transactional analysis learning community well by validating the robustness of our training and supervision techniques and practice. Cognitive apprenticeship models and design methods offer transactional analysis a framework in which to place existing teaching and training methods and can also be useful for planning and designing. Our community of practice has excellent learning sciences in place, of which cognitive apprenticeship is one. It is worth embracing this model to support the ongoing excellence of transactional analysis training methods and procedures as we seek to embrace the global movement toward blended learning delivery, including online and face-to-face education.

The essence of the cognitive apprenticeship approach is for each of us to ask whether I, as a leader, trainer, and supervisor, am a practitioner whom trainees would wish to practice and be like and with whom they would want to share their learning journey.

As trainers and supervisors we are role models. If we want to educate people in transactional analysis, to offer ways of personal and professional development, to encourage trainees to take action we think will serve them, their clients, and society well, then we cannot teach or train them what to do. Rather, we must capture their imagination and attention, show them who we are, and show them our practice so that they may be encouraged to think, feel, and apply theory to practice in similar ways.

When I think back on my own transactional analysis training journey, the greatest inspiration came from the masters, elders, trainers, supervisors, and other trainees in our community of practice whom I aspired to be like, whose ways I wanted to incorporate into my own work. It is from this process and experience that I have begun to emerge in my own right by working on and integrating these learnings and experiences into my practice. This is an ongoing, often challenging, and exciting journey.

At a transactional analysis conference this year, I had the privilege of being part of a lunchtime conversation during which someone asked of a senior Teaching and Supervising Transactional Analyst (senior in age and with many years as a TSTA) about being an introvert or an extrovert and how she managed this in her life. Her answer was, “I am part of an ongoing personal development group where I go to keep learning about myself.” I was in awe of this response, and since then I have continued to feel inspired by her commitment to ongoing personal learning. I want to continue to have the energy and enthusiasm to be like that too.

Master Poe: At times the task you face may seem overwhelming. And you may feel unequal to what is required.

Young Caine: Master, I observe others, and they seem to know the way.

Master Poe: Do you?

Young Caine: I am puzzled and unsure. I move one way, and then another. To no purpose.

Master Poe: And therefore, grieve.

Young Caine: Yes, master.

Master Poe: The sage has said, “Others are contented, I alone am drifting. Not knowing where I am. I am different. I am nourished by the great mother. In an uncertain hour, the wise man acknowledges uncertainty.”

(Karpf, Karpf, & Daniels, 1975)
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