TEACHING A GRADUATE PROSEMINAR: AN EXPERIENTIAL APPROACH

MAUREEN E. KELLEHER
Northeastern University

Experiential education techniques are used more and more frequently at the undergraduate curriculum level although they are rarely employed in graduate courses. This paper describes a graduate proseminar that uses an experiential approach. Two key components distinguish this approach from that of more traditional professionalization courses: students learn by doing and topics covered in the course grow organically from the needs of each cohort of students. The ultimate goal of the proseminar is to engage students in their own professional development, to facilitate construction of group and individual experiential goals, and to provide the framework and support needed to meet these goals.

Within sociology there is a growing trend toward helping students prepare for and respond to the needs of society outside the narrow confines of the classroom. In undergraduate programs, this trend has advanced under various banners: "learning by doing," "experiential learning," "humanist sociology," "applied sociology," and "holistic education" (see DeMartini 1983; Friedrichs 1987; Gondolf 1980; Takata and Leiting 1978). Whether experiential learning occurs within the framework of a course, in an external assignment, or in an internship (see ASA 1990), it overcomes the "sanitizing" of the typical educational experience (Coleman 1982, p. 19) by meshing reflection with action (Green 1990). Chaichian's (1989) course on urban political economy, Greenberg's (1989) course on juvenile delinquency, DeMartini's (1983) applied sociological concerns, and Grzelkowski's (1986) community action learning model are only a few of the many efforts being made to enhance the "reflection and action" paradigm.

Experiential learning seems to have particular relevancy to graduate education, especially at the doctoral level. At this stage, students undertake their transition to professionalism. Some students aim toward a traditional academic career, others toward an applied career. The important point for purposes of this discussion is that in either case traditional graduate learning occurs within the confines of the classroom and the library. An experiential focus would increase the opportunity for graduate students to "learn by doing"—and would provide a forum for reflection about the process. This "learning by doing" approach offers the opportunity to develop professional skills such as interdisciplinary sensitivity, communication, and problem solving as well as a more general adaptation to a sociological perspective (Boris and Adanek 1981).

FACILITATING EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

Northeastern University's Department of Sociology and Anthropology introduced a master's program in 1966 and added a PhD program two years later. As the program shifted toward granting PhDs, we had fewer part-time and master's-only students. Recently we have averaged between three and four PhD graduates a year. Currently there are 70 "active" students in the graduate program, 51 of whom are pursuing a doctoral degree.

Four years ago I took over the required graduate proseminar. At that time the course had been on the books for approximately six years; it had been designed as a forum for information about the graduate program with the intention of building a sense of belonging to the ongoing sociological life of the department. PhD candidates were required to take the course for three quarters during one academic year.

The proseminar had fallen on difficult times: students avoided enrolling and attended only sporadically. Likewise, faculty members viewed teaching the course as a burden. I regarded the task as an opportunity, however. Given the precarious status of the course, I was in a position to re-envision both its goals and its methods, and I decided to introduce various components that I believed

would help to revitalize the course and make it more meaningful. I had often incorporated experiential opportunities into my undergraduate courses and thought this approach might help to rejuvenate the proseminar.

My challenge, then, as I set out to reconceive the proseminar, was how to incorporate the benefits of experientially based learning into a graduate program. Too often, graduate programs designed to promote specific skills become so restrictive that students have little time and opportunity for reflection (Schon 1987). The challenge was to allow the freedom and the opportunity for reflective, experiential learning to occur within a structural framework that would guide the students' efforts.

The course that I created was based on two key components:

1. Approximately two-thirds of the course is experiential: students *learn by doing* as opposed to being told what to do.
2. Most of the syllabus is emergent although certain "core" topics are addressed. That is, the topics covered grow *organically* from the needs of the group of students in that particular proseminar.

This experiential approach addresses a primary need of professional education. The process of becoming a professional clearly demands the mastery of a specific, specialized body of knowledge (DiPrete 1987; Friedson 1970; Hughes 1965; Johnson 1972). In graduate programs, those needs are met by the content area courses. Professionalism, however, also entails becoming integrated into the values and authority of a larger occupational community (Lachman and Aranya 1986; Morrow and Goetz 1988). The experiential process of the proseminar begins that integration process by familiarizing participants with the larger sociological community—the debates, resources, opportunities, and limitations of professional life.

Such an approach also makes demands on the faculty members who oversee the process. In experiential learning, the faculty role shifts dramatically. Faculty members no longer are the source of all knowledge and learning. In fact, it is not the sole responsibility of the faculty to ensure that learning occurs. Instead faculty members act as facilitators, offering guidance and providing feedback, encouraging students to develop relationships with other faculty members as a way of meeting their specific individual needs and concerns and ultimately becoming overseers of a process of professional growth and development. Although this new role provides the faculty with professional challenge and opportunity for growth, it also makes heavy demands on the individual faculty members' personal energy and involvement. In other words, it is not a role that should be assumed without a careful personal weighing of the costs and benefits.

FRAMING AN EXPERIENTIAL APPROACH

The basic goal of the doctoral proseminar, then, as it is presented currently, is to begin the process of integrating students into the larger professional community. This step is viewed as critical for our graduates, most of whom go on to academic positions. A smaller but significant number take either full-time research or applied positions after graduation. Although the proseminar explicitly addresses both traditional and nontraditional career trajectories (applied/clinical, for example), the course revolves around the idea of integration into a professional sociological community.

Currently all PhD candidates are required to participate in the proseminar in sequence: fall, winter, and spring quarters. Alternative patterns have not been successful. The course meets 15 times over three quarters, is worth three credit hours, and offers only a grade of satisfactory or unsatisfactory (for a discussion of another model of this type of course see Eitzen 1988).

Students are required to participate in a group and an individual project of their own choice. Group projects vary greatly and differ from year to year. Examples include attending professional meetings, presenting group papers, and organizing departmental or university wide events such as speakers and international programs. Last year our department's graduate program was evaluated externally, and we also hired an outside chair. Proseminar students were the most visible cohort in the graduate program to be involved in both activities. In addition, these group projects often are open to other graduate students in the program if they have the appropriate skills and interest.

Individual projects tend to center around preparing and/or presenting papers for professional meetings, grant applications, and departmental presentations (the last is often the

choice of international graduate students, who make their presentations at our yearly international dinner). Occasionally, one student takes responsibility for organizing a group activity and meets the requirement in that way.

Students are graded satisfactory or unsatisfactory because the pedagogical assumption is that critical self-assessment is more important than a traditional faculty assessment in the structure of such a course. Some students engage in a variety of group activities and one or two individual activities during the year; a few participate only in the minimum number of required activities. Within the framework of the experiential approach, the latter situation should not be unexpected. The unexpected outcome is that several of the previously more marginally involved students have returned the following year to participate in some group projects or have engaged in individual activities that they state were incubated in the proseminar.

CORE TOPICS

Currently no standard format exists for the year-long course although certain issues and topics usually are covered during the three terms (see appendix for a sample topic outline). During the first quarter, we cover the core topics of the course:

- Life as a graduate student;
- Professional ethics;
- The state of graduate education; and
- Various sociological concerns and debates currently being addressed by the profession.

The topics presented during this early stage are relatively random; in other programs other core topics might be more relevant. Nonetheless, these subjects seem to encompass, in a broad way, the major concerns facing students as they prepare to enter the profession. All of the topics, particularly the last, offer the opportunity for a great deal of flexibility in discussion.

Whatever the specific topics, this core stage is designed to do two things. First, it presents a wide range of topics and issues (although briefly) in the hope that several might generate enough interest to merit additional attention during the rest of the school year. Second, it allows a period in which the students and the faculty can develop into a community.

In the first two hour session, I present a general orientation to Northeastern's requirements in the PhD program and answer students' specific questions about the process of meeting various program requirements. During this discussion, I also set the stage for the experiential component of the course. The proseminar, I tell the students, is in essence your own course; issues raised and projects undertaken during the year will come directly from you. Often a student from a previous proseminar joins the class for the first meeting and explains some of the activities that his or her group undertook.

In the second session, we address professional ethical issues. As a basis for our discussion, students read a packet of material that includes work by sociologists who have written about issues of professional ethics (Becker [1966], among others); the coverage of the human subjects controversy of the 1970s and its implications (this topic includes articles from *Footnotes* and material that tracks a dissertation topic through the approval process); statements on professional ethics from various sociological organizations; and the document "Sexual Harassment Policy and Grievance Procedure" produced by Northeastern University (1990). This last item is often the most awkward to discuss, but I believe this topic is essential to professional ethics overall. In the third session, we discuss the state of graduate education in sociology. Over the last few years, I have compiled a packet of material that provides a brief overview of issues specific to the graduate student agenda. At different times this packet has included examples of department orientation material from various campuses nationally, ranging from official university publications to "survival guides" generated by graduate students themselves (I have found the University of California system to be a particularly rich source of these less formal views of graduate student life); selections from *Teaching Sociology: The Quest for Excellence* by Campbell, Blalock, and McGee (1985); selections from two special issues of *The American Sociologist*: "Graduate Education in Sociology" (McCartney 1987) and "Racial Diversity in Becoming a Sociologist" (Stanfield and Woldemikael 1988) (this latter issue has special significance for departments like mine, which include a number of international stu-

dents); Bettina J. Huber's (1985) *Employment Patterns in Sociology: Recent Trends and Future Prospects*; and a pithy, provocative exchange in *Teaching Sociology* which includes Egan's (1989) "Graduate School and the Self: A Theoretical View of Some Negative Effects of Professional Socialization" and the responses to her article by Piliavin (1989), Goodman (1989), and Aldous (1989).

In the fourth session, we look specifically at the various professional organizations that can help to integrate students into the sociological community: the American Sociological Association, the Society for the Study of Social Problems, Sociologists for Women in Society, the Massachusetts Sociological Association, the Eastern Sociological Society, as well as "specialty" organizations such as those for visual sociology and applied sociology. I also include a discussion of nonsociological organizations that might be of interest depending on substantive concerns, such as the American Evaluation Association and the Society for Research in Child Development. During this session I collect as many examples of journals as possible to expose students to a broad range of sociological voices.

BEYOND THE NORTHEASTERN CHALLENGE: THE EXPERIENTIAL COMPONENT

The final meeting of the first quarter marks the key transitional phase of the course. I use this time to reorient students' perspectives beyond individual concerns. The remainder of the course will provide them with the opportunity to take a "professional step"—to integrate their more specific concerns into the broader sociological community. That transition, however, is not quite as abrupt as it might appear at first. A key requirement—established on the first day of the first quarter—is that all students must join the American Sociological Association. Many students join other recommended groups, including the Society for the Study of Social Problems, Sociologists for Women in Society and the Sociological Practice Association. I urge them to read ASA *Footnotes* in order to gain a sense of the debates, problems, energy, and frustrations that exist in one segment of the profession, and to pay special attention to the items about funding, calls for papers, and meetings.

Students also are required to make a commitment to participate in both a group and an individual project during the proseminar year. During this session I review the activities in which students have participated during previous proseminars and also help the current students to generate new projects. In both individual and group projects, students can affiliate with other ongoing faculty projects or with activities independent of the department or university. During this meeting, they also choose topics to be covered for the rest of the school year, apart from group and individual projects.

EMERGENT TOPICS

As a result of the discussion of core topics during the first quarter and the needs and interests of the proseminar students, a number of topics and activities emerge during the remaining two-thirds of the course. For instance, a general discussion in the proseminar led us to consider and then to investigate graduate programs at other universities. That discussion in turn evolved into a group project in which the members of the proseminar proposed a regional conference on the current state of graduate education. In another instance, discussion of life as a graduate student focused on the concerns of our large group of international graduate students. That discussion led to yet another group project: the organization of an international students' dinner.

Although the topics change each year, they can be characterized by several general themes.

FUNDING

The very first project of the proseminar group was a proposal for an ASA "Problems in the Discipline" grant titled "Beyond the Crisis: The Current Condition of Sociology." The proposal, described briefly above, was intended for a regional conference of the nine PhD-granting universities in New England. Our motives for this grant application were twofold: 1) we were interested in finding out whether a variation of our proseminar existed on any other regional campus, and 2) a group experience in grant writing seemed to be a worthy pursuit.

Because of the grant deadlines, students met several times outside the proseminar to complete the application. Each student involved (not all students participate in all of the projects) had a particular task, such as library research, developing a budget, and forming a liaison with the ASA Washington office. Although the ASA did not fund this proposal, the students received their first grant-writing experience in the supportive environment of a seminar. At the same time, the topic of the grant forced students to address professional concerns beyond their own immediate experiences.

Interest in funding remains consistently high. Last year several students were interested in dissertation and postdoctoral funding, and they hope to submit applications that may be critiqued by proseminar participants before submission. Several years ago students invited a senior graduate student to talk about his successful pursuit of dissertation funding.

TEACHING

Our department requires PhD students to take part in an individual teaching tutorial, a fairly demanding project on which students work with an instructor of their choice. Whereas the tutorial concentrates on the nuts and bolts of teaching, in the proseminar we address larger issues concerning how to think about teaching as part of our professional agenda.

In 1988 our department was the location for an ASA Teaching Resources Project, an ASA workshop titled "The Teaching of the Sociology of Family Violence." Three members of the proseminar helped to facilitate the workshop by developing bibliographic material to be distributed at the conference and providing staff support during the conference itself (e.g., transportation services, registration, and arranging for meals, tour guides, and drinking companions).

In 1989 I was engaged in another ASA Teaching Services Project, a workshop titled "The Content and Quality of Graduate Education in Sociology," and I presented at the annual meetings. Once again, a proseminar participant chose this topic as an individual project and initiated research on national data in this area.

Students are encouraged strongly to become familiar with the ASA Teaching Resources Project and to use the resources available through that program. I also encourage them to attend an ASA teaching workshop as participants. One student received a student scholarship; others have expressed interest, and it is quite likely that more will take advantage of this teacher-training opportunity.

DEPARTMENT-FOCUSED ACTIVITIES

To be integrated into a professional community, students must think about their role as citizens of a particular department or unit. To that end, students participated in several department-oriented activities. One of the earliest was a survey of fellow students regarding their expectations for a proseminar course. This activity was undertaken in the first year, when the framework for the course still was being developed.

Recently our department underwent a review of its graduate program. Students (primarily from the proseminar) met with our faculty before the report was submitted, met with reviewers during the evaluation process, and began to attend graduate committee meetings; their interest and investment in the program had reached a new level.

PRESENTATIONS

Proseminar students have been involved regularly in presentations at the spring meetings of the Massachusetts Sociological Association. Although these local meetings provide some students with a first step in making professional presentations, students continue to participate at these meetings long after they have left the proseminar.

LEARNING BY DOING

As noted earlier, the final two-thirds of the course emphasizes learning by doing. All of the emergent topics discussed above require direct involvement by the students—either as individuals or in groups—in professional activities, such as grant writing, organizing and operating ASA teaching seminars, surveying students, helping to review programs, and making research presentations.

Three additional activities have become part of the group's responsibility over the past several years: attending professional meetings, the international student dinner, and hosting a guest speaker. Although these "regulars" may

change in the future, they seem to give students a sense of pleasure and continuity.

Attendance at an annual professional meeting. For three of the past four years, students have attended meetings of the Eastern Sociological Society. The purpose of attending these meetings is twofold. First, many of the students are attending their first set of meetings; I encourage them to consider the possibility of presenting at the Easterns at a later date. Second, we all agree to attend one session together and to meet afterward to discuss issues of content (did we *learn* anything during the session?) and style (what presentation techniques seemed particularly effective?). A group meal often is planned around the event; this event allows students and faculty members to socialize in a setting not dominated by our departmental hierarchy.

In addition, students have begun regularly to attend the spring and fall meetings of the Massachusetts Sociological Association. Many have made their first professional presentations at these meetings (thus fulfilling the individual goal requirement) and have found at least part of the audience to be "presenter-friendly" because of the large number of Northeastern students who now attend the meetings. Students also have found that the state-level meetings are a good place to network and to seek part-time or temporary positions.

Students hope in the near future to attend the national meetings as a group. This activity is a logical next step for students who regularly attend state- and regional-level meetings.

In all cases the students have borne the expense of attendance, but that expense has been held to a minimum. Carpooling or using a university-owned van has kept transportation expenses low. Shared housing and special student rates also have kept down students' housing costs.

The international student dinner. Three years ago it became clear that the graduate students' difficulty in communicating formally and informally was due in part to the broad mixture of students. This mixture included not only the traditional contrasts of male/female and part-time/full-time, but also international/American. As in many departments, the number of international students in our program has grown dramatically. The international student dinner has become one way in which the graduate proseminar has attempted to benefit from this new component.

Each year the dinner is organized by one or more international proseminar participants. They not only choose the date and generate the publicity for the dinner but also develop a program. This program includes presentations by three or four international students about their training in sociology and their professional expectations. As the presentations have become more sophisticated, we have explored the possibility of either assembling a panel for a meeting or writing a group paper about the graduate international student experience.

The guest speaker. Each year we also sponsor a presentation by a sociologist from outside the Northeastern community. The proseminar group either generates a list of names or decides on a topic and contacts the appropriate scholars. Our guests have included Steve Buff of the ASA Professional Development Project, who explained his work with the private and the public sector, and John Grady of Wheaton College, a strong proponent of visual sociology, who brought his photo essays and clips from his recent films.

Last year Murray Webster, director of the Sociology Division of the National Science Foundation, presented opportunities for dissertation and postdoctoral funding through NSF and helped to explain both the application process and some of the potentially fundable topics for present and future research.

Although the obvious goal of the speakers' series is to provide the opportunity to hear a particular speaker on a particular topic, the educational significance spills over into the area of professional development. One student usually takes responsibility for the arrangements, from the preliminary contacts to the evening of the actual presentation; at that time he or she acts as host to the event. Attendees at these talks have included other graduate students, faculty members, and representatives from the university administration.

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Readers of this article may wonder to what degree the experiences described here are unique to the Northeastern community and to what degree they are transferable to other programs. The answer is somewhat complex. The very nature of a self-created course suggests uniqueness; indeed, any attempt to duplicate an experiential proseminar must avoid merely

reproducing the details presented in this article. The imposition of a specific content would stifle the participants' ability to discover their own needs and to generate their own activities in response. Thus, the organic nature of the proseminar would be lost.

At the same time, I would like to suggest several broad guidelines that have grown from my own experience, which my colleagues could consider if they wish to fashion such a proseminar in their own programs.

1. I would urge master's and doctoral proseminars to be separated rather than combined. The needs and concerns of the two groups of students are distinct and need to be treated accordingly.
2. Facilitating this course for the first time is the most difficult task. For this reason I suggest that the instructor offer the course two years in a row: by the second year, the course will begin to assume a shape that reflects some of your students' and department's needs. In my department, the proseminar counts as one course in my regular teaching course load.
3. Whatever time is available for the course (e.g., two semesters, three quarters), you must strike a balance between providing some orientation to the professional world of sociology and allowing time for students to pursue their own interests as individuals and in groups. The balance that I have maintained—about one-third of the course for orientation and two-thirds for student projects—seems to have worked well. That balance may differ from program to program, depending on the typical background and the degree of professionalization already achieved by participants. The designer of the program must give careful thought to this matter.
4. Keep the group together during the entire year. As students strike out both individually and in groups on various projects, they might tend to view meetings of the entire proseminar as unnecessary, even cumbersome. In my opinion, that would be a mistake. The proseminar provides the beginnings of a professional community; students and faculty members have a constant need to share ideas, concerns, problems, dilemmas, successes. Granted, these meetings occasionally will be more burdensome than profitable. In that regard, the proseminar community differs little from other communities and groups of which we are a part. Even so, this opportunity to reflect on experiences is a critical part of the learning process.
5. In grading students, try to avoid overdifferentiating performance. At Northeastern I have the option of using a satisfactory/unsatisfactory system, and I recommend that option if it is available to you. Buswell et al. (1982) suggested that the criteria for evaluating students' performance in an experiential setting should be geared toward self-assessment: how well students have mastered the process of self-learning, whether they have developed positive attitudes toward learning and have accepted responsibility, whether their interpersonal skills have improved along with their self-concept. For the most part, my role as a "grader" is to make sure each student has met the basic requirements of the course. Beyond that point, students will assess themselves according to these criteria; such an assessment is shaped by frequent feedback from faculty members and fellow participants.
6. Evaluate the program. Simple questionnaires are useful but not adequate in evaluating the success of the proseminar. In my proseminar, the participants vetoed the use of formal mechanisms. Yet there are other ways to evaluate the effectiveness of a program. For example, you can track patterns of graduate students' participation in professional meetings. Are they attending these meetings in greater numbers? Are they presenting papers? The same principle applies to professional organizations and other professional activities and conferences. Are the professional networks in which students are involving themselves resulting in job placements or at least helping that process? Are students participating in board responsibilities in organizations? Has their applied work resulted in requests for additional assistance on projects? Do students apply for funding? All of these patterns have emerged at Northeastern.

   Also look for shifting patterns of behavior that might indicate a growing sense of integration into the professional life of your department and the broader community of sociologists. Finally, pay close attention to patterns of participation in the seminar itself. Are students refusing or delaying en-

rollment in the seminar? Are they looking for ways to circumvent the requirement?

7. Understand that the proseminar group might become the obvious graduate resource group in your department. Your chair is likely to ask whether the group can undertake certain activities. As the course becomes better-known, faculty members in your own program may turn to the group as a source of talent and energy. Although nobody should feel uncomfortable about refusing such requests, they can lead to opportunities and community building.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The experiential model for teaching a doctoral proseminar has created the opportunity for students to become involved in a variety of professional-level activities in a supportive setting. Although a significant amount of time is spent in discussing potential group and individual projects and attempting to carry them through, we also discuss more traditional concerns in the group, especially during the first quarter. I believe that the projects model has taken a requirement that historically was unexciting and not particularly valuable and has changed it into something that is lively and more clearly goal-oriented. We know we have had an impact on student life because graduate students not in the proseminar have joined us in a variety of projects and always attempt to make a group showing for the annual meetings.

Of course, trade-offs exist when a course is handled in this manner. On the plus side, we have increased students' interest in the proseminar and have heightened the importance of the proseminar as part of the graduate student experience. On the minus side, working with an "emerging agenda" is sometimes confusing and always demanding for all participants. Also, I am sure that at some points (especially when either no ideas or too many ideas are floating about), at least some students long for the "good old days" when they needed only to show up in order to meet the degree requirement.

An experiential model requires more effort on everyone's part. My role has evolved to be primarily that of facilitator. There is no right way to organize such a course; as this proseminar emerges, definite gaps are revealed. Yet the idea of engaging students in their own professional development and facilitating their construction of group and individual goals and means appears to be an appropriate aim for the curriculum.

I began this discussion of the proseminar by introducing two key components of professionalism: the acquisition of a specific, specialized body of knowledge and the integration into a larger community of fellow professionals. A number of scholars of the professions have suggested further that the successful socialization of professionals melds those two strains. Ultimately, professionals are characterized by their ability to combine the content material they have mastered with the values and attitudes they have acquired from their profession in order to diagnose and solve problems (Moore 1970; Schein 1973). This process, which Schon (1983) calls "reflection in action," involves the intuitive use of judgment and skill. Students will gain this ability only through experience. For that reason, the experiential proseminar becomes an indispensable part of their professionalization process.

REFERENCES

Aldous, Joan. 1989. "'Graduate School and the Self': A Response to Egan." *Teaching Sociology* 17:215-17.

American Sociological Association (ASA). 1990. *Internship Handbook.* Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

_____. *Code of Ethics.* Washington, DC: American Sociological Association (booklet).

_____. *PhD Certification Program.* Washington, DC: American Sociological Association (handout).

"ASA Testimony before Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects." 1977. Pp. 5 and 9 in *Footnotes*, August. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

ASA Graduate Program Survey: A Description of Selected Aspects. 1987. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association (handout).

Becker, Howard. 1967. "Whose Side Are We On?" *Social Problems* 14:239-247.

_____. 1986. *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berger, Joseph. 1989. "Sociology's Long Decade in the Wilderness." *The Sunday New York Times*, May 28, p. E6, col. 1-3.

Buswell, Mark, Gary Fornander, Lois Fornander, Pete Hokanson, Nancy R. Kellogg, and Leroy Smith. 1982. "The Senior Seminar in Experiential Education," Youth Participation and Experiential Education, edited by Daniel Conrad and Diane Hedin. New York: Haworth Press.

Campbell, Frederick L., Herbert Blalock, and Reece McGee. 1985. *Teaching Sociology: The Quest for Excellence.* Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Chaichian, Mohammad, William Ewens, Ginger Macheski, and Nancy Backus. 1986. "Getting People Started: Teaching Assistant Workshop for Sociology

Graduate Students at Michigan State University." *Teaching Sociology* 14:168-75.

Chaichian, Mohammad. 1989. "Urban Political Economy and Experiential Learning: Designing the Course 'Sociology of Dubuque.'" *Teaching Sociology* 17:56-63.

Coleman, James. 1982. *High School Achievement: Public, Catholic and Private Schools Compared.* New York: Basic Books.

Collins, Randall. 1986. "Is 1980s Sociology in the Doldrums?" *American Journal of Sociology* 91:136-55.

DeMartini, Joseph R. 1983. "Sociology, Applied Work, and Experiential Learning." *Teaching Sociology* 11:17-31.

Diprete, Thomas. 1987. "The Professionalization of Administration and Equal Employment Opportunity in the U.S. Federal Government." *American Journal of Sociology* 93:119-40.

Egan, Janet Malencheck. 1989. "Graduate School and the Self: A Theoretical View of Some Negative Effects of Professional Socialization." *Teaching Sociology* 17:200-207.

Eitzen, D. Stanley. 1988. "The Introduction of Graduate Students to the Profession of Sociology." *Teaching Sociology* 16:279-83.

Friedrichs, David O. 1987. "Bringing Ourselves Back In: The Reflexive Dimension in Teaching a Humanist Sociology." *Teaching Sociology* 15:1-6.

Friedson, Eliot. 1970. *Professional Dominance: The Social Structure of Medical Care.* New York: Atherton.

Goodman, Norman. 1989. "Graduate School and the Self: Negative Resocialization or Positive Developmental Socialization and For Whom?" *Teaching Sociology* 17:211-14.

Gondolf, Edward W. 1980. "Learning In the Community: An Undergraduate Training Program." *Teaching Sociology* 7:127-140.

Green, Charles S. 1990. "Liberal Learning versus Experiential Learning: False Polarities." Pp. 1-14 in *The Internship Handbook: Development and Administration of Internship Programs in Sociology*, edited by Richard Salem and Barbara Altman. Washington, DC: ASA Teaching Resources Center.

Greenberg, Norman 1989. "An Experiential Learning Approach to the Teaching of Criminology, Juvenile Delinquency, and Social Deviance." *Teaching Sociology* 17:330-36.

Grzelkowski, Kathleen. 1986. "Merging the Theoretical and the Practical: A Community Action Learning Model." *Teaching Sociology* 14:110-18.

Huber, Bettina J. 1984. *Career Possibilities for Sociology Graduates.* Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

_____. 1985. *Employment Patterns in Sociology: Recent Trends and Future Prospects.* Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

_____. *Council Takes Action on Multifaceted Initiative on Certification and Licensure.* Washington, DC: American Sociological Association (handout).

Hughes, Everett C. 1965. "Professionals." Pp. 1-14 in *The Professions in America*, edited by Kenneth S. Lynn. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Johnson, T. 1972. *Professions and Power.* London: Macmillan.

Lachman, R. and N. Aranya. 1986. "Evaluation of Alternative Models of Commitment and Job Attitudes of Professionals." *Journal of Occupational Behavior* 7:227-43.

Malec, Michael. 1984. "Seminar on Teaching Sociology." Pp. 3-11 in *Preparing Graduate Students to Teach: Syllabi and Related Materials from Graduate Courses On the Teaching of Sociology*, edited by Thomas L. Van Valey. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

McCartney. James L., ed. 1987. "Graduate Education in Sociology." Special issue in *The American Sociologist.* 18:1.

_____. ed. 1989-90. "Closing the Sociology Department at Washington University." Special section in *The American Sociologist.* Vol. 20:(4).

Moore, Wibert. 1970. *The Professions.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Morrow, Paula C. and Joel F. Goetz. 1988. "Professionalism as a Form of Work Commitment." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 32:92-111.

Northeastern University. 1988. *Handbook for Teachers*, edited by Lauren Pivnick. Boston: Northeastern University.

_____. 1990. *Sexual Harassment Policy and Grievance Procedure.* Boston: Northeastern University (booklet).

Piliavin, Jane Allyn. 1989. "'When in Doubt, Ask the Subject': A Response to Egan." *Teaching Sociology.* 17:208-10.

Salem, Richard and Barbara Altman. 1990. *The Internship Handbook: Development and Administration of Internship Programs.* Washington, DC: ASA Teaching Resources Center and Professional Development Program.

Schein, Edgar H. 1973. *Professional Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schon, Donald A. 1983. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action.* New York: Basic Books.

_____. 1987. *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sociological Practice Association. 1987. *Ethical Standards of Sociological Practitioners* (booklet).

Stanfield, John H. and Tekle Woldemikael, eds. 1988. "Racial Diversity in Becoming a Sociologist." Special issue of *The American Sociologist.* 19:4.

Takata, Susan R. and Wanda Leiting. 1987. "Learning by Doing: The Teaching of Sociological Research Methods," *Teaching Sociology* 15:144-50.

Van Valey, Thomas L. 1984. *Preparing Graduate Students to Teach: Syllabi and Related Materials from Graduate Courses on the Teaching of Sociology.* Washington, DC: American Sociological Association Teaching Resources Center.

APPENDIX

SAMPLE COURSE OUTLINE

WEEK 1: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PROSEMINAR

- Course Requirement: MUST JOIN ASA.
- Discussion of life as a graduate student at Northeastern University; introduction to faculty and their areas of specialization.

WEEK 2: PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

- Assignment:
- Northeastern University (1990), "Sexual Harassment Policy and Grievance Procedure".
- ASA "Code of Ethics".

- Sociological Practice Association (1987), "Ethical Standards of Sociological Practitioners".
- Howard Becker (1966), "Whose Side Are We On?"
- "ASA Testimony before Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects" (*Footnotes*, August 1977).

WEEK 3: THE STATE OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

- Assignment:
- "Graduate Education in Sociology." Special issue of *The American Sociologist*, 1987, Vol. 18:(4).
- "Racial Diversity in Becoming a Sociologist." Special issue of *The American Sociologist*, 1988, Vol. 19:(4).
- "ASA Graduate Program Survey: A Description of Selected Aspects" (1987).
- Kelleher and Klonglan, ASA Teaching Workshop, "The Content and Quality of Graduate Education in Sociology" (ASA annual meetings, August 1989).
- Janet Malencheck Egan (1989), "Graduate School and the Self: A Theoretical View of Some Negative Effects of Professional Socialization".
- Jane Allyn Piliavin (1989), "'When in Doubt, Ask the Subject': A Response to Egan".
- Norman Goodman (1989), "Graduate School and the Self: Negative Resocialization or Positive Developmental Socialization and for Whom?"
- Joan Aldous (1989), "'Graduate School and the Self': A Response to Egan".

WEEK 4: PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS AND DEBATES

- Assignment:
- Randall Collins (1986), "Is 1980s Sociology in the Doldrums?"
- Bettina J. Huber, "Council Takes Action on Multifaceted Initiative on Certification and Licensure" (ASA handout).
- "PhD Certification Program" (ASA handout).
- Bettina J. Huber (1984), "Career Possibilities for Sociology Graduates" (ASA publication).
- "Closing the Sociology Department at Washington University." Special issue of *The American Sociologist*, 1989-90, Vol. 20:(4).
- Joseph Berger (1989), "Sociology's Long Decade in the Wilderness".

WEEK 5: BEYOND THE NORTHEASTERN CHALLENGE: EXPERIENTIAL SOCIOLOGY

- Planning of individual and group projects for the remainder of the course.

WEEK 6: TEACHING ISSUES

- Discussion of types of teaching opportunities: teaching assistantships, basic and university college teaching, Alternative Freshman Year Program; discussion of ASA Teaching Services Program and *Teaching Sociology*.
- Assignment:
- Northeastern University (1988), *Handbook for Teachers*.
- Mohammad Chaichian, William Ewens, Ginger Macheski and Nancy Backus (1986), "Getting People Started: Teaching Assistant Workshop for Sociology Graduate Students at Michigan State University".
- Frederick L. Campbell, Hubert Blalock, and Reece McGee (1985), *Teaching Sociology: The Quest for Excellence*.
- Michael Malec (1984), syllabus for "Seminar on Teaching Sociology".
- Thomas L. Van Valey (1984), *Preparing Graduate Students to Teach: Syllabi and Related Materials from Graduate Courses on the Teaching of Sociology*. ASA Teaching Resources Center.

WEEK 7: DEPARTMENTAL HURDLES FOR A PhD

- Discussion of qualilfying exams, portfolios, teaching tutorial, language requirement, dissertation proposal, and dissertation.

WEEK 8: DEPARTMENTAL HURDLES (CONTINUED)

WEEK 9: SPEAKER

WEEK 10: MEETINGS

- Attendance at the Massachusetts Sociological Association meetings or Eastern Sociological Association meetings.

WEEK 11: DARING TO WRITE

- Assignment:
- Howard Becker (1986), *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article*.

WEEK 12: DARING TO WRITE (CONTINUED)

- Review examples of good writing; discussions of own work—students and faculty bring examples.

WEEK 13: INTERNATIONAL GRADUATE STUDENT DINNER

WEEK 14: FUNDING AND EMPLOYMENT

- Dissertation fellowships and postdoctoral funding sources; review of selections from the ASA *Employment Bulletin*; discussion of applied career options.

WEEK 15: COURSE WIND-UP

- Discussion of future individual goals and target dates for completing hurdles (self-assessment)—ties in with annual graduate student review by faculty. Report on individual and group projects.

Note: This outline includes readings and topics covered over a series of years. The course in any individual year might be very different, depending on particular concerns of the student group and on the individual and group projects that we decide to undertake. Students are never presented with a complete course outline; such a syllabus would essentially destroy the experiential potential. Instead I give a course outline that lists only the first four meetings of the course. At the fifth meeting we develop the syllabus for the rest of the year.

Maureen E. Kelleher is Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Northeastern University. She has been involved in various ASA teaching resources projects, including several workshops. Recent publications focus on child welfare issues, including child abuse and the reinstitutionalization of children.