PROJECT MUSE®

Local Cosmopolitans and Cosmopolitan Locals: New Models of Professionals in the Academy

Rhoades, Gary.
Kiyama, Judy Marquez.
McCormick, Rudy.
Quiroz, Marisol.

The Review of Higher Education, Volume 31, Number 2, Winter 2008,
pp. 209-235 (Article)

Published by The Johns Hopkins University Press
DOI: 10.1353/rhe.2007.0079

➔ For additional information about this article
<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/rhe/summary/v031/31.2rhoades.html>

The Review of Higher Education

Winter 2008, Volume 31, No. 2, pp. 209–235

Copyright © 2007 Association for the Study of Higher Education

All Rights Reserved (ISSN 0162-5748)

Local Cosmopolitans and Cosmopolitan Locals: New Models of Professionals in the Academy

*Gary Rhoades, Judy Marquez Kiyama, Rudy McCormick,
and Marisol Quiroz*

“I’ve decided I’m a local cosmopolitan,” the Latina doctoral student in Gary’s office said, in response to a question about how mobile she could be in pursuing her career. Judy had expressed an interest in being a professor, but she was committed to staying in the southwestern community in which she had grown up.¹ After getting a master’s degree with the program some years ago, Judy had left for two years to work in a student affairs position at Fairleigh Dickinson University, while her husband completed a master’s degree in educational psychology at Montclair State University. She and her husband had returned to Tucson, and Judy was now in the higher education

GARY RHOADES is Professor and Director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Arizona, Tucson. JUDY MARQUEZ KIYAMA is a doctoral student in the same study. RUDY MCCORMICK is Associate Director of Early Academic Outreach at the University of Arizona. MARISOL QUIROZ is a doctoral student at the University of Arizona’s Center for the Study of Higher Education. Address queries to Gary Rhoades, College of Education, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721; telephone: (520) 621–0947; fax (520) 621–1785; email: grhoades@email.arizona.edu.

¹The names we use are our own, so there is no “human subjects” problem as we have “given informed consent.” We use the name of our institution because context matters, but such usage does not compromise the privacy of any human subjects other than ourselves.

doctoral program. If she wanted to be a professor, she would have to leave. The closest university was 100 miles away, and research universities rarely hire their own students for entry-level, tenure-track positions. Judy knew this but said, "I love this city. My family is here. My husband's family is here. And we want to have our family here." Given current patterns of academic careers, Judy's reluctance to leave may prevent her from being a professor.

"I'm a local cosmopolitan, too," echoed Marisol, a fellow Latina graduate student. "But I plan to stay in the student affairs profession." She and Judy were meeting with Gary in his office to discuss an article they were writing.

"So you want to stay in town as well?" Gary asked. He could guess at the answer, for she, too, had grown up in the local community and wanted to stay. Marisol had done her bachelor's and master's work at the University of Arizona (UA) and was also now in the higher education doctoral program, in student affairs. She nodded.

"That will reduce your opportunities for moving up," Gary indicated, "because in student affairs, too, the fastest path to moving up is moving away."

Both Judy and Marisol understood the implications of their commitments to the local community, which go beyond wanting to live in their hometowns. Both are bright students. Both are pursuing their personal commitments and professional plans in a way that is common to many students in higher education programs. So what is important about their stories and our article? We see the importance of our paper in speaking to the significance of higher education curriculum in clarifying aspects of professional culture. It also speaks to the importance of institutional context, in the choices students confront. Most importantly for us, it speaks about and problematizes a dimension of professional culture that is classed and raced (and gendered) but that we take for granted, ignoring its implications, not just for the demographics and stratification of professions in academe, but also for the relatively detached relationship that it sets up between professionals and local communities. Addressing this issue provides us with a fuller understanding of who gains access to and what communities are served by the types of universities that house most higher education programs. That is our contribution. Even if our analysis *could* have been written by many others in these programs, to our knowledge it has not been done.

By way of thinking about higher education curriculum, Gary was delighted with Judy and Marisol's language; clear evidence of teaching effects is nice, especially when it's the effects of one's own teaching. His course, "Organization and Administration in Higher Education," has as its first reading Gouldner's (1957) classic article, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Towards an Analysis of Latent Social Roles." It is a half century old. But he has found over the years that it resonates with students, capturing much of the reality

they encounter in their workplaces and careers about employees' commitment to their local organization, to their national profession and career, or to some combination of the two.

What did Judy and Marisol mean by saying they were local cosmopolitans? They were adapting and modifying the idea of "local," applying it not mainly to the university but to the residential community to which they were loyal and to groups in the community (e.g., nuclear and extended family, underrepresented student populations) to which they felt dedicated. More than that, in self-identifying in terms of the concepts of locals and cosmopolitans, they were also making a connection between those concepts and the dominant model of professional.

That model is discussed in the program's "Introduction to Higher Education" class, which has a section on the rise of the academic profession. One of the readings is Jencks and Riesman's (1968) *The Academic Revolution*. It offers a clear statement of norms that structure the academic profession. A central norm is that of mobility in a national market. To be an academic means to be oriented to national norms and reference groups more than to local ones. That is central to the shift from a parochially oriented system of liberal arts colleges to a nationally oriented system of research universities. Such norms are also central to stratification among institutions—devaluing institutions that are oriented and recruit locally—and within professions—privileging those who circulate nationally over those who stay locally. And they help us understand the distance between research universities and their local communities.

Judy and Marisol were challenging that dichotomy between being locals versus being connected to the national norms of a profession. So, too, was one of Gary's former students; indeed, Gary's thoughts on this topic were first triggered some years ago by a hallway exchange with a Latino master's student named Rudy the semester he was graduating. Assuming that Rudy was on the job market, Gary had asked where he hoped to land. Rudy had given Gary a puzzled look.

"You're on the market aren't you?" Gary asked. "Where do you hope to get a job?" Gary's premise was that, with his new degree, Rudy would leave his current position, which was running a program for first-generation, Latino students in the south side neighborhood in which he had grown up—that he would move up by moving away.

But Rudy operated from a different premise. "Why would I leave?" he replied. "I like what I'm doing. All my friends are here. My family is here." Like Judy and Marisol, Rudy's commitment was to family and friends, and to serving the students of the community from which he came, more than to the university.

Judy, Marisol, and Rudy offer alternative models of a professional. They are writing different scripts about what it means to be a professional. But

given the prevailing model, there are costs to their choices—to their career possibilities, to their professions, and to the relations between academe and local communities. We are not suggesting that only lower-income Latinos face such challenges or make such choices; a commitment to family and community characterizes many working class, ethnic, and rural groups. Nor are we suggesting that lower-income Latinos cannot succeed in academic professions if local candidates are not hired. Obviously in our field there are mobile Latino faculty. Just as obviously, the number is limited, even in education, let alone in the profession more broadly. (In 2003, only 4.7% of full-time instructional staff in education—and 3.5% in all fields—were Hispanic, compared to 3.3% and 2.6% 10 years earlier. In public research universities in 2003 only 1.8 and 1.1% of all male and female full-time instructional staff were Latino. Similarly, in 2003, nationally only 4.6% of support professionals were Hispanic, compared to 3% in 1993.²) Our point is to question assumptions embedded in the dominant model of being a professional, with an eye not just to representation but also to conceptualizing and enacting the professional role in relation to serving local communities. What groups are (dis)advantaged by norms that express the cultures of particular social classes and ethnicities? Such (dis)advantage has to do not only with who gets into the profession but also with whose interests that profession serves.

In the introductory class, in the same week as Jencks and Riesman, students read an article about the rise of social science professionals in U.S. academe. Slaughter and Silva's (1989) historical study asks, What social classes did professionalizing academics align with in the late 19th century, and what political economic structures did they serve in seeking legitimacy and control over their professional domain? Though they deal with academe a century ago, their question remains relevant, for academe and also for a range of support professions.

In the present article, with three of his current and former students as co-authors, Gary discusses how students have helped him rethink the dominant model. They have provided him with insight into what social groups are served by that model and what groups are badly served by it. And they are helping him see the value of a different model of professionalism. In doing so, they are bringing Gary back to insights that Alvin Gouldner offered a half century ago but informed by the realities of their experience today.

The following section addresses the literature, elaborating Gouldner's, and Slaughter and Silva's work, considering literature on faculty, drawing on Baez's (2000) work on critical agency, and relating it to Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital. Subsequently, we discuss the key norm about faculty mobil-

²Data are from the National Center for Education Statistics (2005) and 1996 Digests: Tables 231, 232, and 224 in 2005, and 226, 225, and 217 in 1996 (NCES, 1996, 2005).

ity and support professionals. In the next section, we provide narratives of the educational and professional choices that Judy, Marisol, and Rudy have made, foregrounding the import of local community for them.

LOCALS, COSMOPOLITANS, SERVING POWER, CRITICAL AGENCY, AND PROFESSIONAL NORMS

Alvin Gouldner's (1957) article on cosmopolitans and locals is in part about the internal politics of organizations, which are shaped by latent role types.³ The ideas come from Gouldner's earlier book on bureaucracy (1954) and are related to what became a central focus in organizational studies—the different orientations of “bureaucrats” and “professionals,” with the former being more loyal to the particular organization and the latter being more connected to a national network and set of norms beyond the employing organization. It is clear which type is the more admired one. Gouldner extended these ideas in a study of teaching and administrative faculty at a liberal arts college. In a data-based typology, he contrasted locals (more loyal to the employing organization, reference group is within the organization, and less oriented to specialized skills such as research), with cosmopolitans (less loyal to the organization, reference group is outside the organization in professional groups, and more oriented to research). Again, it is clear which type is preferred.

Over the years, Gary's students have readily identified locals and cosmopolitans in their workplaces. Notwithstanding Judy, Marisol, and Rudy, most are out-of-state students who work part-time in the university or the community college and whose time in those positions starts and ends with graduate study, after which they move on. As graduate students reading academic literature and attending professional conferences, students talk about the difficulties of introducing new ideas into their offices. Such efforts often meet with resistance from “locals” who regard students as newcomers and short-termers who neither understand nor are committed to the local organization.

Some of Gary's students see that, between Gouldner's extreme cosmopolitans and extreme locals, are “intermediates,” who are defined by some characteristics of both groups. Yet Judy, Marisol, and Rudy go beyond that category by adapting the concepts to their own local and cosmopolitan commitments. Their local loyalty is less to the employing organization than to

³Gouldner's (1958) work explicitly identified empirically validated types of latent roles that structure organizational behavior, as a way of framing tension between organizations' need for loyalty and their need for expertise. He contrasted this model with some ideal types of bureaucracy that do not address such latent roles; at the same time, Gouldner posed his categories as pure types that patterned behavior across types of organizations.

community-focused and community-based professional practice—indeed, to changing the academy. Furthermore, Gouldner's locals were not classified in terms of their links to or networks in the community surrounding "Coop College."⁴

The idea of locals and cosmopolitans connects to norms about professionals. As Jencks and Riesman (1968) suggest, the rise of a meritocratic, academic profession was connected to the rise of nationally oriented universities and the increased significance of the federal government after War II as a funding source for research. Jencks and Riesman quite explicitly relate their ideas to the relationship between higher education institutions and their local communities and/or constituencies. The premise throughout is that national institutions are of a higher quality than local ones, which are defined as "parochial." This assumption is particularly evident in their pejorative portrayals of "negro" colleges and community colleges. To be parochial is to be narrow-minded—constrained by local, particularistic commitments that undermine the pursuit of excellence according to universalistic, meritocratic standards. Quality is defined by and equated with mobility in a national marketplace of and competition for the best, cosmopolitan faculty.

However, another perspective is that the rise of the university college and of a national model of the academic profession was associated with academe's alignment with particular social groups. Slaughter and Silva (1989) detail how professionalizing social scientists were connected in their ideas and orientation to the rising industrial class and the emergent national policy of establishing American empire globally. Other alignments were possible. Some social scientists were aligned with local and regional businessmen and elites. And there was an opportunity, with the rise of unions and populist farmer groups, for social scientists to align with the working classes. But the professionalizing professors' choice lay instead in "serving power" (Silva & Slaughter, 1984).

The orientation of a profession not only has implications for whom it serves, but also for how it is socially stratified, for who gets in and where. Historically, women faculty have been concentrated in community colleges and in less selective four-year colleges (Finkelstein, 1984). More recently, they are more likely to be hired in part-time positions and are more likely

⁴Only two of Gouldner's (1958) questionnaire items addressed links to the local community. Significantly, both suggest negative connotations about locals. One is a hiring scenario that describes a candidate as having been born in the state, being a competent teacher, being "extremely interested in the [local] community as a place . . . to settle," but "some people fear that he is not so professionally competent as [the other candidate]" (p. 472). The second is a reference to a local racial incident: "It is more important to remember that we live in a town with people who believe in segregation than to think only of abstract ideals" (p. 473). Local community links do not figure in the 1958 typology of types of cosmos and locals.

than men not to be on the tenure track (Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998; Perna, 2001). In public institutions, similar patterns hold for minorities.⁵

That is partly our interest, then, in offering alternatives to the prevailing model of the professional in the academy. Much literature focuses on diversifying the faculty ranks; virtually none focuses on support professions. Much of it concentrates on obstacles confronting new entrants to the profession—on their experiences in a foreign and hostile place, as in Sackrey and Ryan's working class "strangers in paradise" (1984). Whether the focus is on women (Glazer-Raymo, 1999) or on persons of color (Padilla & Chavez, 1995; Turner & Myers, 2000; Washington & Harvey, 1989), studies chronicle the challenges embedded in a system that is structured in the interests of the dominant group.

As valuable as such work is, there is an irony to many of the recommendations that come out of it. Much of the literature is critical, detailing discrimination. Yet much of the advice it provides is functionalist in suggesting that new faculty members should fit within existing incentive structures. Given an academy that does not reward community service (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995), the advice to new professors, especially to women and those of color, is to not get drawn into such activity (Johnsrud & Des Jarlais, 1994; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996) for it distracts from time that could be spent doing research and developing professional networks. The advice is more about how to "make it" than how to remake it.

Yet we are interested in not just who gets in, but what they do once they get there. So we draw on Baez (2000) for an example of alternative models of professionals. Baez's article is part of the "Organization and Administration" class syllabus. In the same week as Gouldner's article, the week's readings are titled, "Beyond 'the Organization': Personal and Professional Networks," signifying a focus beyond the boundaries of formal roles (as in Gouldner's latent roles) and of the organization, to (in Baez's case), networks in the local community.

In his study of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty of color, Baez (2000) conceptualizes service not as a problem but as an opportunity for critical agency that contests basic academic structures. Baez supports such contesting at the individual level (p. 382), suggesting that his "argument takes a 'local' perspective to social change" (p. 388):

By choosing to engage in race-related service despite understanding the risks of doing so, the faculty members were exercising an agency that appeared to

⁵According to NCES (2005, Table 231), community colleges have the highest percentages of African American, Hispanic, and Native American faculty (6.3, 5.3, and 1.9%). Comprehensives have higher percentages (5.7, 3.7, and 1.8%) than doctoral-granting institutions (4.1, 2.9, and 1.6%) and research universities (3.8, 2.9, and 1.2%). For Asian Americans, the pattern is reversed. Private institutions do not follow the pattern of the publics.

contest the predominant definitions of faculty work. . . . [T]hey felt also that their work forced their colleagues to rethink (if not accept) its importance in creating social change. [S]ome . . . tied race-related service to their scholarship of teaching, thus presenting themselves to their colleagues and students not as detached researchers and teachers but as “scholar activists,” deeply engaged in initiating social change. (p. 388)

For Baez, local, risky critical agency is needed to recalibrate the overriding emphasis on cosmopolitan aspects of academic work, in ways that link to social change and justice.

The agency of these faculty also reintroduces the value of the personal(istic). For many of the faculty Baez found that race-related service was a source of connection that was psychologically important for them. In linking their work to involvement in social communities and change, these faculty were also challenging and recalibrating, in Jencks and Riesman’s terms, the purely universalistic professional as detached, objective expert.

The personal dimension as well as that of critical agency is central to Judy, Marisol, and Rudy’s adaptation of “local,” of the community engaged, and of the social-justice-oriented professional. Yet such a recalibration involves balancing and negotiating between the academic world and local and cultural ties. And the literature describes this feat as a major obstacle—in fact, as an impossible balancing act, with students having to choose a new place and leave their old place to succeed educationally and professionally. Whether in their linguistic capital (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Ogbu 1978), and/or in their cultural, social, and symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1984, 1988), academics must distance themselves from other groups. That is part of their distinction as academics, as professionals.

Thus, Judy, Marisol, and Rudy’s conceptualization of their professional roles is a challenge, not only to prevailing norms, but also conceptually to Bourdieu and to social scientists’ characterizations of professionals, and of the choices and consequences for members of non-dominant groups seeking and gaining entry to them. Can such people succeed professionally and then serve and give back to their communities, or do they end up working in unintended ways that maintain the distinction between academe and the community? In gaining various forms of capital and distinction, do they develop and maintain, even if unintentionally, inherent antagonisms relative to the home community? Or are there unrecognized and undertheorized possibilities for them to achieve a balance?

What are some examples of the norms of the professions, and the tension between them and a commitment to a local community that play out in professional lives? In the curriculum of the University of Arizona’s Center for the Study of Higher Education, we address these issues with respect to the academic profession and also to the non-faculty, support professions—the

so-called managerial professions in the academy (Rhoades, 1998; Rhoades & Sporn, 2002). We explore in class how such professions, like student affairs, often take on features of the academic profession, including beliefs about careers and mobility that are embedded in received wisdom and in the reward systems of these professions. We do so because, although the vast bulk of the literature is devoted to faculty, most of our students in higher education programs, even in most highly ranked programs, go into support professions and administration.

A central norm in the academic profession in the United States (in contrast to many other countries) is the importance of mobility. For example, the received wisdom is that it is better to do one's graduate education at a different institution than where one was an undergraduate. Doing so broadens one's horizons; not doing so narrows and constrains one's experiences and opportunities. Part of this ideology is that professional norms and considerations should trump personal commitments, reflecting a normative schema of universalistic considerations, not particularistic ones guiding professional choices and practices. The mobility norm is even stronger when it comes to hiring entry-level faculty. For the most part, academic units at research universities, the presumed meritocratic peak of our system, do not hire their own graduates. The depth of the norm is clear in our pejorative characterization of its violation as "inbreeding." The implication is that such a procedure is unhealthy for the department and candidate. The department benefits most from a (inter)national search that generates a high quality pool. As in student recruitment, the presumption is that the wider the net is cast, the better the pool. To select locally is to reduce and weaken the pool, and to create a situation where personalistic considerations may affect professional decisions/relations.⁶

There is little consideration of what is lost by not selecting locally. Apart from losing high-quality people who are unwilling to leave their communities, we see three losses: (a) a sense of social responsibility and depth of commitment to parts of the local community; (b) a sense of respect for and understanding of the community's resources and cultural assets that could be tapped into (see Gonzalez, Moll, & Amanti, 2005, on "funds of knowledge"); and (c) a connection to the community that facilitates working with it.

The norm of mobility is also built into academic reward systems such as salaries. The path to getting a big raise is threatening to leave and/or getting

⁶In the United States, we apply that logic to entry-level hires, but not to tenure and promotion, in contrast to many European countries. In the United States, an assistant professor can go up in his or her institution for tenure, and from associate to full professor; but in continental European systems with a chair model of organization, the tradition has been that full professor (chair) positions are filled after a national competition and candidates must be outside the institution.

a letter of offer from another university. New faculty recruits may get paid more than faculty with years of service, leading to salary compression and other non-merit-based inequities. Student affairs, in which many higher education students' careers are embedded, follows a similar pattern. One path of professionalization for student affairs followed the faculty model (Hirt, 1992). And student affairs professionals' careers are facilitated by mobility.

The norm of mobility is entrenched in conceptions of the ideal student experience, which is a key feature of student affairs' ideology. The ideas of "going away" to college and of living on campus are valorized in the academic literature (and upper middle-class culture) as important for separating from parents, developing independence, and broadening social networks. It is important for students to move away to grow up.

Yet ideas about mobility are culture-bound conceptions. They reflect the culture of upper middle-class Anglos but run contrary to rural, working-class, and various ethnic cultures, which value connection to place, family, and community. And they represent a one-sided view about the benefits of mobility that overlook other dimensions of being "cosmopolitan." If locals are seen as stuck in one place, never benefiting from new experiences, can not cosmopolitans be viewed as being unanchored, drifting from one place to another and investing less in any one place than in their career—with the perverse effect of promoting salary mechanisms that reward people for leaving instead of for investing in an organization? And if locals are cast as parochial and narrow-minded, cannot cosmopolitans be characterized as carpetbagging opportunists who have little understanding of or appreciation for the local organization and community's culture? How does all of this play out in regard to the kinds of choices that Judy, Marisol, and Rudy make in their professional lives? We turn now to that question, offering narratives of these students' educational and professional choices.

THREE CASES FOR A DIFFERENT MODEL

In an article that seeks to offer new models of the professional, we also provide a model of presentation at variance with that of scholarly articles. (On this style, see Marshall and Barritt, 1990.) Some may interpret the short narratives that follow as anecdotal rather than as (in that gendered descriptor) "hard" data. But there are other ways of thinking about narratives. One features the significance of "sociological imagination" (Mills, 1959). Another is Boyer's (1990) "scholarship of teaching."

There are strong traditions in sociology of connecting the realities of individual, private lives to matters of broader public import, such as social stratification. In his classic *The Sociological Imagination*, C. Wright Mills (1959) wrote of the central significance of connecting the inner life and

personal situation to the social structure and institutions of the period, to the public issues surrounding the institutional arrangements of the day:

The sociological imagination enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society. . . . No social study that does not come back to the problems of biography, of history, and of their intersections within a society has completed its intellectual journey. (p. 6)

So, too, some of the most significant work in the symbolic interactionist tradition is based on short narratives (e.g., see Goffman, 1959). Similarly, a founder of the sociology of professions explored the social psychology of professional work through short narratives (Hughes, 1958). And a classic study of the academic labor market (Caplow & McGee, 1958) is based on stories of recruitment.

Our approach is also in line with Boyer's (1990) "scholarship of teaching." The idea is partly to give more value to instruction by valuing studies of it. Further, the concept suggests that a scholarly approach to instruction involves learning from students: "[T]eaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well. Through reading, through classroom discussion, and surely through comments and questions posed by students, professors themselves will be pushed in creative new directions" (Boyer, 1990, p. 24). We make public the private conversations that surround teaching and advising in a way that we hope informs the profession.

The ideas of this article are grounded partly in Gary's 21 years of teaching and advising as a faculty member in the University of Arizona's Center for the Study of Higher Education, but they were particularly triggered by his co-authors. In the course of that experience, he has observed patterns in the contingencies and strategies expressed in students' educational and professional choices. One example lies in the discourse of students' articulation of their career goals. Many of them are first generation, come from lower-income background, and are students of color. In contrast to so many of their upper-middle-class, Anglo peers, the discourse has to do with "giving back to" and serving their communities. These communities are socially constructed in different ways, but they generally are grounded in some conception of place and locale.

Given that, a word about the place of the University of Arizona makes sense, by way of setting the context for and acknowledging the limitations of our stories. Perhaps most importantly, it is a research university. It is likely that the norms and model we discuss in this paper are most evident in these settings and are perhaps less in evidence in institutions (such as community colleges) in which faculty and managerial professionals are not necessarily expected to participate in national professional associations. It is

also important to note that the University of Arizona is not a very selective public research university in student recruitment. Until recently, it selected the top 50% of the high school graduating class. Although Judy, Marisol, and Rudy were all, as their stories will reveal, strong students, it may be that in highly selective universities, we would be less likely to find “local” students. The large representation of Latinos in Tucson is also important to our case. But perhaps what makes the cosmopolitan/local distinction most salient is the center’s curriculum.

The ideas in the article are also grounded in Judy, Marisol, and Rudy’s lives and in the concepts they have learned in the higher education program that have given them a language with which to frame and understand the professional norms expressed in their lives. The concepts can be seen in their educational choices about where to pursue their education, and in the professional choices they are making about their futures.

We offer short narratives about those choices. Our hope is that, through the experiences of these current/former students, the larger issues we are addressing will be made more concrete. There are commonalities in the stories, but there are also significant variations on a theme that speak to the value of offering several narratives. We present them in first person, occasionally injecting our observations (in *italics*) about the connection between their stories and the norms and stratification of professions.

Judy’s Choices

I like to tell people that I am from such a small mining town that if you blink while driving through it, you’ll miss it. It’s not quite that small, but close to it. Mammoth, Arizona, where I grew up, is one of many copper mining towns in Arizona that was affected when copper mines began shutting down in the late 1990s. Both my parents worked for the copper mines. My dad for over 30 years was an electrician in the ASARCO Copper Mines. My mom stayed home with my brother, sister, and me until I was in eighth grade, and from then on did secretarial work for BHP Copper Mines.

The context of the copper mining industry and company town is important. As students progressed through school in our small community, there were strong messages about working in the mines, about the summer jobs that could lead to full-time positions after graduation, and about the good money you could make after graduating from high school. There was no strong message about attending college. Many of my classmates never considered college and began working in the mines immediately after high school.

I received a much different message from my parents. Although neither of them graduated from a four-year institution, it was always an expectation that my brother, sister, and I would attend college. While I was in high school, my mom finished her associate’s degree from our local community

college. At the time, I didn't understand the importance of this, but the experience of attending the community college provided my mom with the opportunity to meet new people, feel proud about her education, travel to national conferences (something she *never* had done before without my dad) and help her to understand some of the navigation strategies necessary to succeed in college.

[Judy articulates the value of educational and geographical mobility for personal growth.] In high school I was both the nerd and the captain of the cheerleading/dance team. I'm beginning to understand that this only happens in small towns! Both of my social roles provided me with networking and scholarship opportunities for college. Graduating at the top of my class, I had financial aid that would cover all of my college costs.

It's so interesting for me now to read college application advice for high school students that they should apply to eight or ten schools. I had seriously applied to one—the University of Arizona. I also submitted an application to Colorado College, more on a whim than anything else. Although I had no idea what a liberal arts college really was and although my parents were frustrated by having to pay the cost of the application fee, I wanted to prove to myself that I could be accepted at a smaller, private school. My parents were comfortable with me attending the UA because it was close to home and because I had an older cousin there with whom I would be living. So Colorado College (or any other school) never was a realistic consideration. *[Thus, the small-town, working-class, Latino cultural norm about mobility and family structured Judy's choice.]*

Initially, I thought that I wanted to go to medical school but quickly realized that the sciences were not for me. I loved learning about the dynamics of social interactions, child and student development, and moved into family studies, graduating with a B.S. in four years. Someone I knew who had completed the higher education program at the UA recommended that I apply. Again I only applied to two places—the UA and Arizona State University. I did not know enough to research different graduate schools, to look for practical versus theoretical programs, or to look into what the research faculty were doing.

Part of what initially interested me in pursuing a graduate degree in higher education was my involvement in the New Start Summer Program. As an incoming freshman, I went through this six-week transition program. It included a college-level class, living in a residence hall, and daily orientation workshops. It helped ease my transition into the UA. Two years later I applied to be a peer advisor for the program and, in that role, led the daily orientation workshops. This introduced me to the field of student affairs. I loved working with students, especially underrepresented, ethnically diverse ones. During my master's program, I worked there as a graduate assistant.

Halfway through my master's program, my husband was accepted to a master's program at Montclair State University in New Jersey. This was the kind of opportunity he was hoping for, in that the clinical and school psychology program was specifically designed to teach students how to work with Spanish-speaking clients. Despite the distance, I completed my program while working in New Jersey in student affairs and became the first in my immediate and extended family to earn a master's degree.

In New Jersey I worked at a small, private institution, Fairleigh Dickinson University. The experience was eye-opening. I learned how a small, private institution operates, and I came into contact with a level of diversity that I was not accustomed to in Tucson, including very different populations of Latinos than I was familiar with. The experience prepared and taught me in ways that I could not have received without leaving the comfort of the UA. *[Here Judy again articulates the values of mobility, of gaining experience that could not be gained at home. Yet she returned.]*

After my husband's graduation, we decided we were ready to move home to begin our Ph.D. programs and eventually begin a family of our own. Both of us have large, extended families, and we knew that we wanted to be close to our families again. Yet now my professional aspirations are developing in unexpected ways. I have realized how much I enjoy doing research and writing. Two of my professors have involved me in various research projects, and I am writing articles with them. This experience has opened my eyes to the academic side of higher education; and at this point, I am seriously considering the faculty route. This is where my personal dilemma comes into play.

After working for three years with a student leadership program at the UA, I have returned to multicultural affairs—to the program that helped me succeed as a student. As an assistant director with Undergraduate Initiatives, I provide resources and programs to increase the retention of underrepresented students. I have come full circle and can now give back to the community, the people, and the programs that helped me. I work with students in the same position that I was when entering college. My husband and I are close to our families, have great professional opportunities, and are working with the populations we love. However, I know that if I want to be successful in the faculty world of higher education, I need to be willing to leave Tucson and probably Arizona. This is something that my husband and I talk about often and still have not come to a decision about. Whatever we decide, I know that we will end up in a place that allow us to continue to work with the underrepresented populations that we care so much about.

I am fortunate to be able to incorporate the community into my research. My hope is that doing so will lead to long-lasting change in the community, to increased access and broadened opportunities for members of the community. It is here that I struggle with balancing my roles as someone from

those communities and someone who has gained new cultural and social capital as a result of higher education. This struggle is primarily internal as I am learning how to negotiate and incorporate the two cultures in which I move. It has never been a struggle imposed by or communicated from my home community. It has never felt like I am selling out. In fact, it's been quite the contrary. Being the first in my extended family to achieve this level of education has resulted in a great sense of familial pride. Being from such a small mining town has also resulted in a great sense of pride from the community and school, and has afforded me the opportunity to utilize my research strengths in my former school district. While my parents may not always understand the work I'm doing, they are always eager to listen and learn. Taking the advice of a close friend and colleague (also a Latina and first in her family to pursue a doctorate) I created a timeline of important exams, defenses, dates, and requirements, with a description of each. This has allowed me to incorporate my family into the process. Ultimately, they and my community serve as great sources of strength and support. *[Judy's commitment to community is structuring her opportunities. Yet she is also restructuring her profession. For she is coming to the belief that, wherever she is, she will give back to her community, either as a "local (who is) cosmopolitan" who stays in or returns to her home community, or as a "cosmopolitan (who is) local" who moves from her home community but becomes grounded in the community in which she settles. Either way, she is enacting an alternative to the prevailing model of a professional.]*

Marisol's Choices

It was always a no-brainer for me. From the minute I was old enough to remember, I knew where I was going to college. *[It's important that there was never a question of whether she would go to college.]* I was born and raised in Tucson. I knew I was always going to be a Wildcat, and so did everyone else in my family. That was the path that all of my cousins chose. Both my mother and father's side of the family are proud Tucsonans, and part of being a proud Tucsonan means being proud of the University of Arizona, whether or not you are/were a student. *[The affective dimension of place is striking. A pride of place and loyalty attaches to the local university.]*

My dad was the only one from his family to graduate from college, the U of A: none of my aunts and uncles on my mom's side attended college. But all of them wanted their children to go to college, and going to college meant going to the U of A. My sisters and I are the youngest of the "cousin cohort," and my parents learned from the choices their sisters and brothers made about the education they wanted for their daughters to prepare us for college. *[The power of the extended family here is culturally important.]*

My family is Catholic, and we have a very strong belief system. Our parish is St. Ambrose, which also has a K-8 schooling system. Although

my parents attended public schools, they wanted their daughters to go to parochial school. My mother thought it was very important that we had religion throughout our schooling. Also, my parents were impressed with the discipline and structure that they saw in the schooling system that they thought was lacking in the public schools. All of my cousins attended parochial school as well, and my parents were impressed by what they heard from my aunts and uncles. My family is not by any means well-to-do. My aunts and uncles, and my mother and father sacrificed many things so their children could attend private schools. When I tell people that I attended a parochial school, they assume that I come from a wealthy family. But reflecting on my past now, I realize that, along with my family, the other families that sent students to St. Ambrose were often just like mine. They were working- or middle-class Hispanic, Catholic families. They saw education as an investment and spent their money on that rather than on clothes, cars, or summer vacations. When speaking with friends now who attended public schools, I see that some actually had more money than my family, but they chose to spend it differently.

My parents decided to continue the private school track in secondary school. I knew from the time that my sisters and I entered elementary school that they wanted us to attend Salpointe Catholic High School. At the time, it was *the* college preparatory school, and that was the goal for us. My dad worked two jobs for as long as I can remember, working weekends many times just so that we could have this opportunity. My mother worked full-time as well, so they could save the necessary money.

For my family, going to college was just the next step after high school, just like going to high school was the next step after graduating eighth grade. There was no question. I knew that my parents had this goal for me, and I took this very seriously. I excelled in school always and worked diligently to be the best that I could be. Although I was accepted to University High School, the public college preparatory school, my parents and I both knew that I was going to Salpointe. Being accepted to University High was a huge deal for me, though, because I knew that college was just that much more real for me. *[Like Judy, Marisol's choices were structured by culture, and her attitudes about her ability were strengthened by being admitted to a school she would choose not to attend.]*

Once in high school, my main goal was to excel so that I could get scholarships for college. Had I had it my way, I would have bypassed high school and gone straight to college. By that age, I was able to understand and appreciate the sacrifices that both of my parents made for me, and I was determined not to let them down. I wanted to pay for my college education and repay them for all of their hard work. By junior year, I was receiving many college pamphlets from places all over the country. My SAT scores were high and I had a 4.0 GPA. It was exciting to get the pamphlets, but I

rarely opened them. *[Again, although her choices were constrained, and her application behavior was limited, Marisol's habitus about education was being strengthened by being recruited.]* I knew where I was going. I could not wait to begin my college career at the U of A. This was the only school I wanted to attend and the only school that I applied to.

Upon entering college I was like a fat rat in a cheese factory. College was everything that I thought it would be. All of my hard work paid off. I received a full tuition waiver for my time at the U of A as long as I maintained a certain GPA. I lived at home. My parents would not be able to pay for me to live outside of my house, and I would not even dream of asking them to. I was relieved that they were now off the hook and that I could take care of my own education. Although many viewed living at home as rare, it is the norm for many Hispanic families. I would stay at home and concentrate on my education. I do not think that I would have been able to succeed in college without the support system of my family. My parents were just as interested in my college education as they were in my K-12 schooling, if not more, because I was the first one in my immediate family to enter college; and finally, all of our collective hard work paid off. My dad was eager to hear me talk about things that he had also experienced in college, and my mom was so proud to have one of her daughters doing something that she had never had the opportunity to do herself. *[From the dominant perspective, not being able to live on campus is a limitation; yet Marisol constructs it as normal, essential, and enriching.]*

Even though I followed a different path than many of my friends from elementary and middle school, I never felt that I was not supported by them and my family. In fact, it was their support and encouragement that really motivated me to continue and pursue my graduate degrees in higher education. Since I grew up knowing my friends' families, it is not uncommon for me to run into them and the first question that they all ask me is, "How is school going?" They are excited for me; and when there are times I am tempted to maybe take a break, it is these encounters that I draw on to continue, because I know that I have a strong network of people who care. Everyone knows what my educational goals are, and I look forward to the day that I can finally tell them, "I AM FINISHED!!!" Rather than feeling alienated from friends and family by my success, I feel that I owe them so much for their encouragement. Some have told me that they are motivated to possibly continue with their own education because they see that it is possible.

Starting my freshman year, I began working with the Early Academic Outreach Department of the U of A, promoting college to middle-school students who reminded me of myself when I was their age. In this job, I finally realized what my career goals were. Although I was always an excellent student, I never knew what career to pursue. People had the usual sugges-

tions: med school, law school, engineering. None of these interested me. I was a little nervous. Everyone had high expectations of me, but I did not know what I wanted to do . . . until second semester freshman year. I realized that the time I enjoyed the most was the time I spent working with the students. I saw a little bit of me in each of them, except that some of them did not have the good fortune to have such strong family support. If I could work with programs that provided this support as my career, I would be fulfilled. My only question was, did a field like this even exist? As I began to learn more about the university, I came to realize that student affairs was that field, and I did everything I could to become involved in its programs. During the summer after my freshman and sophomore years I worked for New Start, a summer bridge program for first-generation, minority, and lower-SES students. Throughout my undergraduate years I worked for Early Academic Outreach. And I majored in family studies.

For graduate school, I wanted to enter higher education. Again, there was no choice but the U of A for me. Besides, it was one of the best in the nation, and its faculty were committed to working with the community to increase access. I felt that the program was tailor-made for me. I had the best of both worlds: learning the theory behind the work and then applying it daily in my professional field. *[Although Marisol stays "local" she constructs the decision as a meritocratic, academically informed one.]*

During my graduate career, it became increasingly clear to me that in order to "move up" in student services I would have to "move out." One of my co-workers at the Athletic Department asked me what my future plans were. When I told him that I eventually wanted to be a director of a student services office, he told me, "Sometimes you have to leave in order to come back." My stomach turned when I heard this.

Leaving Tucson is the last thing I want to do. Although my discipline values those who have outside experiences, it should be equally important to value the work of those who have made a commitment to better their community and those who live in it. One of the express goals of the university over the past few years has been to increase the rate of attendance of underrepresented students from the local community. If a university is going to become local-friendly in recruiting students from underrepresented groups, the effort would benefit from having professionals who are local to the community. There is a mixed message. How much does the institution truly value the local people that it is supposedly trying to serve if it will not work to keep those people working for it? *[Marisol is a local who is cosmopolitan in her involvement in her profession. She is committed to and active in both, to the end of seeking to enhance educational opportunities in her community by challenging and changing the norms of her profession.]*

Rudy's Choices

During my senior year of high school, I was faced with a possibility that no one in my family had ever been faced with. I was the first in my family to have the opportunity to attend a college or university. Later, I would hear of students whose parents had told them from as far back as they could remember that they would go to college. To be honest, this message was never really conveyed to me by my parents, even though I had been academically successful and was approaching high school graduation. It was not that I had bad parents; they had shown their support of me in every other way. Instead, it probably had more to do with their lack of information or cultural capital about going to college. My father only completed seventh grade and my mother completed the equivalent of ninth grade in Mexico. It is difficult to promise a child something that you are unsure of how to attain. Also, the money my family made from my mom cleaning houses in a nearby retirement community and my father's work in roof repair was barely enough to keep food on the table and meet our daily needs. *[Rudy's background raises an interesting point about what connections and geographical mobility are valorized in the dominant model. His mother is a Mexican immigrant. He has bi-national networks. But given the dominant model's focus on professional networks, its embedded social class structure, Rudy's connections would not qualify as cosmopolitan.]*

I asked some of my friends who had graduated from my high school about their path to and experience with the university. I saw how difficult it was for them, the time they had to spend studying. I wondered if I was ready for a university education. Perhaps I should start off at a community college, or maybe it would be wise to go right into the workforce. I also wondered how I would be able to pay for college. My parents could not pay and my job paid \$4.35 an hour—reflecting a ten-cent raise that I was very proud of at the time. But it would not be enough to afford a university. You would think that a student who ranked 13 in a class of over 300 would not have such concerns. But these are the questions I struggled with as I considered attending a university.

While my parents might not have been able to promise and provide me the finer material things in life, they provided the most important thing that I could ask for—their support and love. I also had other support as well. I was fortunate to have a high school math teacher, named Paul Dye, who challenged and inspired me to fulfill my potential as a person and a student. I also had a high school counselor, Diane Lasky, who continually asked me to think about the possibility of going to a college or university. Mrs. Lasky also introduced me to Nichieli Bejarano, a University of Arizona student recruiter who came out to my high school and empowered me by providing me with the important college knowledge needed to apply for university admission and federal financial aid.

I applied only to the University of Arizona. It was close to home. I had responsibilities within my family. I wanted to serve as a role model to my younger brother and to do that I felt that I had to be close to him. I also could not afford the cost of living away from home at one of the other state universities, much less going to school out of state. I quickly found that I had been admitted to the university. Nichieli shared with me her successes and struggles, provided advice, and encouraged me to attend a summer bridge program that was offered by the University. Ms. Lasky had helped me to complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and had pointed me in the direction of other scholarships that I qualified for. The university provided me with a tuition waiver and grants, due to my high level of financial need. Fortunately, the scholarships, waivers, and that \$4.35 an hour job would be enough to cover the cost of education at the University of Arizona. *[Like Marisol, Rudy constructs his choice to live at home not as a constraint, but in terms of responsibility to his parents and his brother.]*

Prior to my first day of the New Start Summer Program, I called my *nina* (godmother) and asked her what the cross streets were for the university. I had lived in Tucson all my life. Although I had been to the university for the student carnival and on field trips to the planetarium, on those occasions I never realized that I was on the UA campus. The six weeks that I spent in the summer program introduced me to the rigor of a university-level course, the resources available to students, and a social network consisting of the staff and incoming and current students.

Throughout my first year of college my major was engineering. While I was getting A's and B's in those classes, I really found myself interested in psychology, where I felt that I would have more opportunity to interact with people in a manner that would allow me to serve others. I made the change at the end of my freshmen year and never regretted the decision. I also went back to work as a student employee for the New Start Summer Program and for other programs that worked to increase the recruitment and retention of historically underserved populations. I spent five years completing bachelor degrees in psychology and family studies. *[Like Judy and Marisol, Rudy was an able student who had been encouraged to select a major that would lead to a high-paying profession. But he switched, as they did, to family studies (which, at UA, has a counseling emphasis), and like them constructed that choice as a path to serving people.]*

It was in my fifth and final year of college that I began to consider graduate school. I knew that I wanted to work helping people. I just had yet to define the group of people that I wanted to work with. A graduate student in our office introduced me to the field of higher education. I was not aware that there was a field that addressed student retention. I remember receiving an information packet from the Center for the Study of Higher Education and knowing that this was the graduate program for me.

Again, I could have applied to out-of-state schools. However, my financial situation had not changed much. My family and my future wife's family all lived in Tucson. Others encouraged me to gain a different perspective by attending an out-of-state graduate program. However, I felt that there was a benefit to staying in Tucson, as I knew and understood first-hand the needs of local students in regard to college access. I applied to one program—the U of A's Center for the Study of Higher Education. *[Like Marisol, Rudy's reasons for staying in Tucson are professional, not just personal, but his choice reflects a new model of the professional as someone who can better serve a community by knowing it.]*

Graduate school proved to be challenging. For three long years, I read and read and read, and I came to better understand the field of higher education. While in graduate school I applied for and earned the position of Coordinator for the New Start Summer Program. I immersed myself in local and state schools, sending a strong message to students regarding the feasibility of a college education and sharing how similar college knowledge and this summer program experience had made the difference for me and could make a similar difference for them.

As I approached graduation, Dr. Rhoades asked where I might be applying for employment. The answer was easy. I would remain in Tucson at the University of Arizona. My family was here. I was familiar with the community. I was working for a program that I had benefited from. Tucson had no earthquakes and no tornadoes. Tucson is where I belonged. I understood the benefit of a different life experience, but the benefits that I would gain from staying within my community outweighed breaking away from that community. *[Rudy constructs his choice to stay in terms of the benefits that come with understanding and belonging to the community, and of reciprocity—giving back to a program that had served him.]*

After working for the New Start Summer Program and for Multicultural Programs and Services for six and a half years, I took my current position with the U of A's Early Academic Outreach office. I oversee parent outreach programs aimed at providing parents with information about the college preparation process early on. As part of this work, I facilitate workshops for the UA's College Academy for Parents, a partnership with the Sunnyside Unified School District, the district from which I graduated. The program teaches parents about college preparation, introduces them to faculty who explain the value of the core academic subject areas required for college admission, and invites families to visit the UA campus. The goal is to provide parents with information that will help them encourage and support their children's college aspirations. I believe the program can have a generational impact. With parents who are both first-generation college graduates, my five-year-old son and three-year-old daughter are hearing messages about going to college; they are already familiar with the UA campus. For each

child that we help achieve a university education, we increase the chances that the next generation that sprouts from that child will also go to college. This is important work that must be done in many places across this country. But if you ask me where I will be in the future, you should know that I will be here within the family and community that I have come to know and that I now have the opportunity and responsibility to serve. [*Like Judy and Marisol, Rudy's choice is constructed from a position of strength and a sense of social responsibility; and his professional role is framed in terms of social justice and change.*]

DISCUSSION

The narratives of Judy, Marisol, and Rudy affirm their education, using concepts they have been taught to frame their educational and professional choices. Curriculum matters. A professional education curriculum can address matters of professional culture and its connection to the social class structure of society. The Center of Higher Education's curriculum has been constructed with the goals of (a) exploring and critiquing structures that define higher education and shape its role in reproducing social inequality, and (b) challenging and changing that regime of structures, policies, and practices. Such a curriculum can help students, many of whom are first-generation (or the first in their families to get advanced degrees), with the cultural capital of professions in academe. It can also problematize that capital and those professions in ways that empower students to make meaning of their positions and choices, and to challenge and change professions and the academy in the process. In our view, curriculum in higher education programs is only partly about preparing future managerial professionals and professors in the tools of their crafts, and it is not simply about increasing representational diversity in the academy. It is more about challenging and changing the work and social role of those professions and the academy. The University of Arizona has been a good setting for this, with its relatively open access character in a low-income state, and its location in the "periphery," in the borderlands.

The narratives can also teach us with their modification of and challenges to the concepts in distinctive models of professionalism that better fit students' culture and lives. The stories and adaptations will likely vary from one underrepresented group to another. Our stories of Mexican Americans in the Southwest are not the same as stories of Puerto Ricans, Native Americans, African Americans, rural and/or working-class Anglos, or immigrants. But we can learn from them about how to incorporate commitment and service to (and knowledge of) local community and orientation to social change into our model of professional. Not all Latinos (or students from other underrepresented groups) make "local" choices like Judy, Marisol, and Rudy.

But Latinos (especially Mexican Americans) are more likely than others to apply to fewer colleges, to attend locally oriented, community colleges, and to live at home while attending college (Hurtado, Inkelas, Briggs, & Rhee, 1997; Perna, 2000). Rather than seeing this as problematic, as a deficit, we could, like these students, construct it as a benefit—as a fruitful path that can enhance the development of socially responsible professionals committed to social service and societal change. In this regard, the schooled can school the teachers.

The stories may also help us rethink academic literature about mobility and status attainment. Judy, Marisol, and Rudy offer us a very different take on the consequences of upward social mobility; there is no sense that they feel estranged from their home community, or fail to belong to either the professional or home worlds they navigate in the way that scholars working out of Bourdieu and Ogbu's concepts suggest. Quite the contrary. So movement between these communities may be freer for some than others, and future research should explore this possibility.

Similarly, our stories should deepen our analysis of status attainment. The prevailing view would suggest that Judy, Marisol, and Rudy were tracked into the UA and a lower-status field of higher education, rather than realizing their potential in more prestigious universities and higher paying fields and professions. Indeed, their pattern of moving into family studies and counseling as undergraduates is interesting. But to stop there would be to do violence to a more complete view that accords them agency in their choices, and that recognizes value in those choices, for them and society. The choices were made not out of resignation or weakness, but out of an active, deep sense of responsibility and commitment to family and to enhancing communities, and realizing personal fulfillment through those choices. That is why we have drawn on Baez's idea of critical, race-based agency. If we construct Judy, Marisol, and Rudy only as being shortchanged as individuals in their opportunities for upward mobility, we shortchange not only their lives, but also our own opportunity to change our professions and revise the structures of inequality that our constructions of professional work perpetuate. We would also cut ourselves off from the possibility of learning that such change is possible through local critical agency.

As a professional community, then, rather than simply socializing such students into current professional norms, to enable them to "succeed," maybe we can learn from them to broaden our definition of professional success and to thereby change academic and managerial professions not just demographically, but in their work and connection to community. To be sure, Judy, Marisol, and Rudy's opportunities have been limited by the social and material conditions of their families, which is why Gary feels so strongly that we should rethink our conceptions of professions that systematically disadvantage people whose backgrounds and cultures prioritize place and the

collective over mobility and the individual.⁷ But just as surely we are limited by our current model that detaches professors and managerial professionals from the locales in which they work and the communities they are said to benefit, particularly in the more prestigious universities that most emphasize the value of mobility and that house many higher education programs. Rather than serving the public good from an objective, distanced position, above the client, the narratives articulate an embedded, socially responsible, involved professional, who is connected to place, community, and the people they serve in ways that enhance that service. Place is a consideration not of prestige, but of personal, social commitment, focused not only on serving individual clients but on changing structures of opportunity.

In suggesting alternative professional norms, we do not seek to discredit the value of existing norms. Nor do we argue for their discontinuance. We are not calling for an inbred, pink-eyed set of academic and managerial professionals. Indeed, some of our stories point to the value of geographical mobility in taking professional positions, as with the experience of Judy's New Jersey exposure to student affairs. And some of our stories support the value of cosmopolitan dimensions of professionalism. So we are not proposing only a "local track" for minority groups into such faculty and managerial professions as student affairs (Marisol and Rudy's field) urging them to choose the local and dismiss the cosmopolitan. That could delimit and constrain opportunity for applicants from underrepresented groups, particularly in cities lacking significant minority populations. (We should underscore the fact, however, that even a 3% Latino local population is higher than the representation of Latino faculty nationally in public research universities.)

What we *are* calling attention to is the value of alternative norms that we believe will serve the professions well, not simply in diversifying them, but also in enhancing their ability to connect with and serve various underserved populations and communities. We are suggesting including alternative paths (not a "no mobility" model), and not just paths into the academy, to increase representational numbers, but also of paths back from the faculty and managerial professions into the local community. We are calling for a more balanced interpretation of the multiple characteristics and loyalties of professionals. For in our view, the prevailing model is out of balance. It

⁷Not all stories are happy ones. The importance of community and place have figured prominently in the choice of other, also very bright, Latino students to return home before finishing their program and not complete their degrees. When Gary asked one student why he was moving back—that he was not geographically that far away—the student explained that he didn't have the money to make repeated trips to his family and "I have a nephew I haven't even seen, man. It's time to go home." His choice was not just based on missing home; it was a matter of fulfilling his family responsibilities.

juxtaposes the value of some types of mobility (upper-middle-class, professional) as cosmopolitan against that of others (e.g., low-income immigrants) and of connectedness to lay, local communities. The extent to which we are out of balance is reflected in our conflation of narrow service to the profession with a broader professional ethic of service to society.

Judy, Marisol, and Rudy's stories open up the possibility, expressed in Judy and Marisol's self-identification as "local cosmopolitans," of more balanced combinations of local and cosmopolitan characteristics and values that can encourage commitment and connection to local communities, and that enrich the professions and extend their benefits and influences beyond current boundaries. They return us to the moral of Gouldner's work—that the most consequential players in organizations are "intermediates" who combine elements of cosmopolitan sensibilities with local sensitivities. Even as they move in the abstract, universal worlds of cosmopolitans, they are grounded in concrete realities of local communities, and in a sense of social responsibility to serve them by changing the academy. That is what we aspire to for our students, and ourselves.

We close with a postscript. As of this writing, Judy and her husband are thinking they may leave Tucson, to enable her to pursue a career as a professor. Does this mean that Judy has been socialized into the dominant model? Hardly. Wherever she goes, like Marisol and Rudy, she will connect to underserved populations in the communities of the university in which she works. She will enact the role of professional as a "cosmopolitan (who is) local," working, through critical, race-based agency, at remaking the academy.

REFERENCES

- Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education*, 39(3), 363–91.
- Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). *Homo academicus*. Cambridge, Eng.: Polity Press & Basil Blackwell.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Caplow T., & McGee, R. (1958). *The academic marketplace*. New York: Basic Books.
- Finkelstein, M. J. (1984). *The American academic profession: A synthesis of social scientific inquiry since World War II*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

- Finkelstein, M. J., Seal, R., & Schuster, J. H. (1998). *The new academic generation: A profession in transformation*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Glazer-Raymo, J. (1999). *Shattering the myths: Women in academe*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1954). *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2(3), 281–306.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1958). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles—II. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2(4), 444–81.
- Hirt, J. (1992). *Professionalism, power, and prestige: Ideology and practice in student affairs*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arizona.
- Hughes, E. C. (1958). *Men and their work*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Hurtado, S., Inkelas, K. K., Briggs, C., & Rhee, B. S. (1997). Differences among college access and choice among racial/ethnic groups. *Research in Higher Education*, 38, 43–75.
- Jencks, C., & Riesman, D. (1968). *The academic revolution*. New York: Doubleday.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Des Jarlais, C. D. (1994). Barriers to tenure for women and minorities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 17(4), 335–353.
- Marshall, M. J., & Barritt, L. S. (1990). Choices made, worlds created: The rhetoric of AERJ. *American Educational Research Journal*, 27(4), 589–609.
- Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- NCES. (1996). *Digest of education statistics, 1996*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- NCES. (2005). *Digest of education statistics, 2005*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Ogbu, J. (1978). *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-national perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- Padilla, R., & Chavez, R.C. (1995). *The leaning ivory tower: Latino professors in American universities*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Perna, L. (2000). Differences in the decision to attend college among African Americans, Hispanics, and Whites. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(2), 117–141.
- Perna, L. (2001). The relationship between family responsibilities and employment status among college and university faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(5), 584–611.
- Rhoades, G. (1998). Reviewing and rethinking administrative costs. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 13, pp. 111–147). New York: Agathon Press.

- Rhoades, G., & Sporn, B. (2002). New models of management and shifting modes and costs of production: Europe and the U.S. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8, 3–28.
- Sackrey, C., & Ryan, J. (1984). *Strangers in paradise: Working class academics*. Boston: South End Press.
- Silva, E. T., & Slaughter, S. (1984). *Serving power: The making of a social science expert, 1865–1924*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Silva, E. T. (1989). Prometheus bound: The limits of social science professionalization in the progressive period. *Theory and Society*, 9, 781–819.
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany: State University of New York Press/Washington, DC: The George Washington University.
- Turner, C. S. V., & Myers, S. L. (2000). *Faculty of color in academe: Bittersweet success*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Washington, V., & Harvey, W. B. (1989). *Affirmative rhetoric, negative action: African-American and Hispanic faculty at predominantly white universities*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.