NAOMI REED & AMY BROWN

IN EVERY WAY I'M HUSTLIN':
THE POST-GRADUATE SCHOOL INTERSECTIONAL EXPERIENCES OF ACTIVIST-ORIENTED ADJUNCT AND INDEPENDENT SCHOLARS

How do we measure academic success, and what does it mean to produce knowledge? In academia, many advisors deem publishing, obtaining research grants, and holding committee positions the most relevant and productive activities for junior scholars. Indeed, all of these ventures are important and beneficial, but not every Ph.D. enjoys immediate access to these opportunities. As adjuncts, postdoctoral fellows, lecturers, or independent scholars, we often acquire experience through a different family of academic pursuits. As we demonstrate below, scholars in these non-tenure track and often part-time positions sometimes teach students who deal daily with issues of poverty, immigration, racism, or gun violence. As we teach students of color and lower-income students, some of whom struggle with low self-esteem in the classroom, we create curricular environments that break down the mainstream discriminatory discourses that disregard many of these student populations. At times, we face trauma or violence with our students. While these issues could occur in Research-1 (R-1) spaces, they are more typical in some of the classrooms we encounter as adjuncts. We also move through privileged and protected elite academic spaces as part-time laborers, all the time, trying to reach the point where the scholarly community that trained us validates us.

This real life, on the ground 'hustle' often allows us to actualize some of the politics we write about. We see ourselves as activist educational anthropology scholars, and aim to have our research manifest in classrooms as emancipatory education reform. We recognize that our experiences as adjunct scholars in community colleges in conjunction with our experiences in R-1 academic spaces enable us to see through multiple lenses, strengthen our pedagogical skills, and further refine and actualize our political agendas. As malleability is essential to the ethnographic toolkit, we feel that scholars in social science who teach in a variety of spaces and create knowledge based in these experiences have invaluable perspectives that need to be highlighted, affirmed, and encouraged in the academy. If we aim to have our scholarship impact the world politically and socially, we push the scholarly community to redefine what counts as "cultural capital" in the academy. We argue that this kind of participation should be affirmed, rather than diminished by our discipline. We also aim to make the intersectional 'hustle' we describe below an experience that academic search committees might validate, as opposed to disparage. We demonstrate how social scientists that occupy a unique hybrid subjectivity—as adjuncts or instructors in certain marginal spaces and as writers, researchers, and students in traditional R-1 academia—engage in a particular hustle that is sometimes evidentiary of valuable, yet unrecognized approaches to teaching and research.

Methods

As we explicate our experiences in this space, we share our stories through autoethnographic narrative. Autoethnography is a form of writing that involves a political commitment to an epistemology that connects the self with others, a social world, and places that social world into a larger context (Denzin, 2006). It recognizes that meaning is always co-constructed. At the same time, it is possible to make an ontological commitment to learning more about a "real world" that exists beyond co-constructed truths (Maxwell, 2013), and consider alternatives. Autoethnography recognizes that the researcher is never separate from the knowledge that he or she produces (Glesne, 2011; Haraway, 1988; Peshkin, 1988), and centralizes the analytic experience of the researcher as a form of knowledge production.

As humans, we give structure to our experience through narrative; the stories we tell about our experiences help us to give coherence to seemingly contradictory and contentious social practices (Razfar, 2012; Riessman, 1993). Through connecting story to social structure, narrative analysis recognizes that the stories we tell often reflect upon deeper stories (Bell, 2002), helping us to get at information that we may not consciously know, to reflect on everyday problems and to make tacit cultural assumptions explicit (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Razfar, 2012). Through autoethnographic narrative, we expose and challenge the troubling realities of the academic labor market's simultaneous dependence on, and disregard for part time laborers.

In and Out of the Ivory Tower: Amy's Story

 It was a normal Thursday night until we heard the gunshots - eight of them. Seated near the front door of the school, I locked eyes through the glass with the man who ran towards the building, tearing off his clothes like he had been hit. He wasn't running alone - he held hands with a young boy, whom I later found out was his five-year-old nephew. He tried to open the building's door to avoid the bullets, but Mr. Keating, the security guard, blocked his way. Young - maybe in his early 20s - and Latino, the man looked like he could have been one of our students, but I had never seen him before. I watched as Keating pulled the child in through a crack in the door. Students and professors came out of classrooms, crowding the hallway, confused and frightened. From further down the hallway, I heard the thud of books being thrown to the floor. They were Kelsey's - the girlfriend of the man who had almost been killed. Hearing what had happened, she ran toward the front door of the school screaming, trying to get outside. Lourdes, the mother of the little boy (and the sister of the man who the shooters were aiming at), also ran towards the door. Mr. Keating and another staff member held them back. Despite the fact that she did her best to fight Keating's grip and get out of the building, Kelsey eventually gave up and succumbed to staying inside. Her partner was outside unharmed and the shooters seemed to have disappeared.

As we waited for the police to arrive, staff urged students and professors to go back into classrooms. I sat with Kelsey and some of her friends, and we tried to calm her down as we waited. It was already 9:00 pm when the shooting began. Normally classes ran until 9:30, but on that night, everyone knew that classes were over. After the police left, Mr. Keating walked students and staff to their cars or to the city bus stop. Kelsey and Lourdes seemed shaken, but most of the students seemed relatively calm.

Smiling, several checked in on me to make sure that I was ok. "This happens in our neighborhood all the time, Amy, it's no big thing - you cool?" they asked.

"Yeah", I responded, a little baffled. Whether I was cool should have been the least of everyone's worries. Emotionally, I was fine — and glad that no one had been hurt - but thoughts raced through my head as I drove home.

I worked two nights a week for $750 a month at this job, which was housed in an alternative high school building in northeast Philadelphia. It was one of four part time jobs I was working that semester. I had finished a Ph.D. in anthropology from a top tier university two years earlier. While on the job market and working on my book manuscript, I served as an adjunct professor at two universities in Philadelphia,

teaching both graduate and undergraduate classes, and was also doing some executive education for a business school housed in another university.

At the job in Northeast Philadelphia, I was a *Learning Coach*. Alumni of the high school took classes towards their associates' degrees from adjunct professors who taught night classes in the high school building. These students had struggled to graduate from high school, and had often returned after dropping out, having children, or facing other challenges that prevented them from succeeding in traditional public schools. As a Learning Coach, I was responsible for checking in with and tutoring a cohort of 15 students on a weekly basis (and sometimes more) to make sure that students felt supported in their classes and that they learned the skills they would need to succeed in college, especially because many of them wanted to transfer to four-year institutions after graduation.

I had spent the morning in a very different environment, the conference center at the business school, observing and advising business executives from around the world on their team dynamic as they participated in a simulation (sim, for short). In teams of eight, executives created a fake company, chose roles, manufactured, and marketed a virtual product. I took notes on executives as they participated in the sim, and afterwards, led discussions that focused on strategy and teambuilding. Individual tuition for this particular ten-day long executive education program was $10,000, and the conference center was one of the most elite spaces in which I had ever worked. For the ten days of work, I earned $4,000. Mealtimes boasted five star dining, executives slept in plush guestrooms, and there was a cocktail lounge and a fitness center accessible to guests as well. One fascinating aspect of the conference center was that theoretically, one never had to leave the building. Guests were in the middle of Philadelphia, but with name badges around their necks, could stay in a space that was completely insulated, protected and removed. Indeed, many of the executives did not leave - the morning times before classes were spent in the fitness center, while evenings were spent networking in the lounge.

While the night school and the conference center where I spent the morning are parts of the same city, the differences between the two speak to what Ed Soja (1989) refers to as the 'spatiality' of cities - that is, the idea that space is socially produced and interpreted. Spatial realities signify power relationships (Crampton & Elden, 2007; De Certeau, 1994; Harvey, 2001; Lefebvre, 1991). As a part time laborer in academia, I gained the ability to move between, and teach in the context of, different spatialities, and to have firsthand experience with the differing abilities of social groups to travel and gain the privilege of mobility - or protection (Massey, 1995). In the morning, my name badge and credentials led me to experience an iteration of Mike Davis's gated city (2006), and in the afternoon, the same credentials, along with my previous work experience as a public high school teacher in New York City, led me to experience a very different sort of urban space. In one, bodies were protected from having to accept or experience economic neglect, social hardship or the immediateness of death firsthand. In the other, bodies were accustomed to living with these realities and at times, had to physically defend against them. I was reminded not only of the ways that social relationships continually produce space (Lefebvre, 1991), but also of the ways that the production of space is inextricably linked with the exercise of economic power (Harvey, 1973) as well as the construction and re-articulation of race, gender, nation and sexuality (Deutsche, 1991; Massey, 1991; Morgan, 2000; Omi & Winant, 1994).

The contrast between the spaces of the business school and the night school demonstrate a politic of capital and investment that operates in tandem with the construction of race and racial meaning. These race and class politics construct college students and staff, business executives, and me, the part time worker who moved between those spaces, hierarchically – bodies that are traditionally read as valuable to the economy at large seem to garner more protection. The moment where Brown and Black students checked in to see whether I, a White female staff member, was ok, was clearly a racial one, epistemologically supported by a collective protection of Whiteness (DeLeon 2012). Additionally, at the business school, safety and peace were maintained as integral parts of the simulation experience, whereas at the night school, a threat to the safety and peace of staff and students was normalized. The police came and the following week, the program continued as usual. This would probably not have been the story had the campus - whether it were college or high school – been predominantly White. Such relegation to

normalcy would certainly not have been the story had the shooting taken place at the entrance to the business school.

One of my mentors, after looking at a curriculum vitae (cv) and cover letter in which I stated in the opening paragraph that I was working at four institutions, advised me to delete any evidence of three out of four jobs. "It will look better", he said, "if you market yourself as a full-time scholar in the most prestigious institution you work." Other mentors whom I asked agreed with his advice on the presentation of self on the market. As I navigate between academic spaces, teaching undergraduates working towards associates' and bachelor's degrees, teaching graduate students, and working with business executives in variously privileged institutional spaces, I am aware that I am developing my consciousness as a politically engaged intellectual who moves toward praxis in my scholarship and my teaching as a direct result of both my graduate training, and of having to navigate these spaces. I am also aware that search committees in departments of anthropology and schools of education may not recognize the value and potential of the unique knowledge production that occurs in having to teach and research while crossing these sorts of intellectual and social borders. My mentor's advice pushes me to an awareness of the myriad ways in which academia, and the academic job market, help to reproduce an economy of urban space in which the jobs with the most clout and capital are those that serve to insulate and protect current inequities. Institutions and jobs of prestige have an investment in protecting this economy as we know it, and oftentimes, the intellectuals whom they choose to invest in are expected to perform an identity in which we too, protect the status quo.

Adjunct Activism in a Community College: Naomi's Story

Prior to my doctoral studies in social anthropology, I was a graduate student in applied mathematics. In addition to never quite figuring out how to connect my mathematics training to my sociopolitical interests, my social consciousness was greatly heightened by the experience of being the only Black female graduate student in a department of White and foreign men who had no real interest in social issues. I decided that I had to make a change. When I made the transition from mathematics to anthropology I thought I was leaving a space where my politics and my concerns for society were being ignored. More specifically, I saw anthropology as a way to directly impact the world in a way that I could not recognize in mathematics.

During my graduate studies, I began to teach math at a local community college in order to support myself during the summers. It was during these summers that I recognized my participation in something that directly addressed my political and social interests. As an anthropologist and critical Whiteness studies scholar, I had become accustomed to studying race in elite White spaces, as I researched an upper-class White high school for my dissertation fieldwork. I had reached a point in my graduate studies where I was exhausted with the overflow of Black and Brown bodies in the ethnographic canon and I wanted to shift the gaze towards White bodies.

Although studying racism and racial epistemology in elite White spaces created a vast amount of data, bridging these experiences with my intended emancipatory efforts was difficult to say the least. Most of the students, teachers, and parents in my field site were not interested in hearing my critical perspective of their racial epistemology. The community college offered me an immediate alternative avenue in which to satiate my activist goals. I am not abandoning the hope of creating emancipatory efforts in elite spaces, but currently marginal spaces are more accessible and responsive to progressive change.

Many of my students at the community college were lower income persons of color, and were often intimidated by math because they had been told by a teacher or two along the way that they could not "do" math. These students were very different from the predominantly White and middle-class students whom I observed in my field site and the students that I instructed as a teaching assistant in the anthropology department at the University of Texas. The students at the community college seemed to be less entitled to their own education. More specifically, many of them were very insecure about my perception of them and often let that insecurity impact their engagement with the course. They were

hesitant to speak during lecture or to work examples in class. Students at UT often approached the classroom with ownership and had certain expectations of me. I began to see the emancipatory potential in teaching at a community college and encouraging nontraditional students to take ownership of their education and to reject racist, classist, and sexist narratives that hindered their ambition and overall entitlement to a good education.

One particular student brought this realization to the fore for me. It was the first day of the eight-week summer session for college algebra. I hurried to my classroom even though I was ten minutes early because I wanted to write all of the activities for the day on the board. I was certain I would be there before any students arrived, but as I walked in I noticed an older Latina student sitting in the middle of the room, looking through the textbook. I asked her, "Are you here for college algebra?" She looked up and quietly in a heavy Spanish accent said, "Yes. Is it OK that I am here early?" I told her, "of course" and began writing the day's events on the board. She arrived to every class meeting early, reading through the text before each lecture. I was certain that when it came time for the first test she would ace it because she was such an attentive student, but when I graded her test paper I was disappointed. She made a 61% on the test. I could not understand how she had scored so poorly. I looked over her test again and realized there were four problems that she did not attempt at all. The test was only ten problems long. I realized that when she at least tried to work the problems she did well, but because she left four problems completely blank, I could not give her partial credit.

The next day I decided to talk to her about it, as I anticipated that she would be upset about her grade. When she saw her grade she lowered her head and quietly asked me, "Are you going to drop the lowest grade?" I told her yes, but that I wanted to talk to her about this test. I explained that she should try to write something for each problem and not leave anything blank in the future. She listened to me and said, "Well, in Mexico they do not grade the other work, it is just multiple choice, and I did not want to embarrass myself by writing something wrong, so I wrote nothing." She then apologized to me and walked back to her desk. She seemed more concerned with my perceived judgment of her than anything else.

Her demeanor was quite different from what I was used to from the undergraduate students at the University of Texas. Typically, they blamed a poor performance on some lack of instructional support from me. They were rarely concerned about embarrassing themselves and always offered answers to questions with confident emphatic intonation. I know of course that people in general are more confident in the social sciences than in mathematics, but the older Latina student's response to me seemed to be about more than just that. I recognized that she not only needed to learn college algebra, but she also needed to become aware of her rights as a student, rights that perhaps she could not recognize as an immigrant of color in the United States.

After speaking with her, I made it a point to begin that day's lecture with a brief conversation about some of the common myths about math. I told the students that they had perhaps heard some of the stereotypes such as, women cannot do math, or that students of color are not good at math and science. They nodded their heads indicating that they were carrying these thoughts with them into the classroom. I told them that as a Black woman mathematician and anthropologist, I could not believe those things and that I expected all of them to be mathematicians in this course. I encouraged them to ask questions and to politely interrupt my lecture if they did not understand something. I explained to them that there are no "smart" students and "dumb" students. I told them that there are "students who have information" and "students who do not have information." I asked that those of them that understood the material to explain it to their peers, and those of them that did not understand the information to ask for help from their peers.

It seems like a simple suggestion, but emphatically presenting these ideas to the students and forcing them out of these notions of elitism with respect to intellect opened the door for all of them to feel comfortable enough to at least try to succeed. Of course some of them still struggled greatly, but I did notice a change in the older Latina student's approach. She began to ask questions during lecture, she wrote all of her work on the tests, even if what she wrote was completely incorrect. She would write notes on her test papers, presenting alternative approaches to solving problems. She began to demonstrate a clear level of

entitlement for her role as a student in the class. She even reworked a problem that I worked in lecture one day and handed it in to me indicating where I had made an error. She began helping her peers when they struggled with class examples and she regularly asked for help.

As the summer progressed, she became more confident and ultimately earned an A in the class. She told me at the end of the course one day, "Thank you. I was really able to learn from you." I told her, "No, thank you for being such a wonderful student." I interpreted that comment to refer not just to my ability to explain factoring or conic sections well, but also as a comment recognizing my commitment to making education emancipatory and accessible to all students. I left that summer feeling like I had not only raised one student's consciousness, but had also used the community college space to make very real social and political change.

Part Time Labor in Academia

Despite the fact that graduate students in R-1institutions continue to be groomed for tenure-track jobs in other R-1s, numerous scholars mark the steady growth of non-tenure-track faculty across colleges and universities in the United States (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa & Leslie, 1993). This current trend redefines the nature of academic work (Pekkola, 2013), inspiring conversations about the meaning of being "on the market" as a graduate student or newly minted Ph.D. One markets oneself to the most prestigious (full-time, tenure-track) academic jobs as a valued resource, but it is increasingly likely that one's labor and scholarship will be devalued in a part-time academic job. Halcrow and Olson (2008), Berger and Ricci (2011) and Jubas (2012) have categorized part-time academic workers as cheap laborers who are exploited victims of an increasingly problematic and neoliberal market.

Pekkola (2013) outlines the unique effects of proletarianization on part time academic workers who are still expected to maintain high levels of training and skills despite an increasing workload. Indeed, Ihssen and Kaurin (2011) write that adjunct and part-time faculty struggle with existing in a state of permanent liminality without the benefits of a foreseeable end to that transitional status. Often, these liminal faculty members, in the hope of acquiring a more permanent job, struggle to "shine" in the eyes of the scholarly community, never guaranteed a reward for their efforts.

While radical scholars have complicated and argued against the pervasive and dominant myth of meritocracy in the United States (Akom, 2008; Anyon, 1997; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Giroux, 1983; MacLeod, 2008), this myth continues to survive and thrive in academia. Just as the belief that any individual who works hard and assimilates to middle-class values and norms will be rewarded with upward mobility (Allen 2001 cited in Akom 2008), the myth that if one works hard and sufficiently markets oneself as an academic, one will be recognized and rewarded by an institution, survives. The myth of meritocracy as an effective system that allows upward mobility in the United States (MacLeod, 2008) promotes the belief that it is one's own fault if one does not succeed in being validated in academic spaces as a young scholar. As we struggled to actualize our graduate training and our politics through our praxis, we experienced the feeling that we needed to hustle harder – no matter how hard we tried, we were not doing quite enough to succeed on the market.

Work, Labor, Action and Capital in the Academy

Academicians are typically expected to take on research, pedagogical, and administrative activities either simultaneously or at some point throughout their careers. In some departments, faculty are even expected to be involved in some sort of local community engagement at least within the university, if not also in the neighboring community or town. Pekkola (2013) argues that academic work can be theorized in a number of ways, all of which fall under what Hannah Arendt (1958) categorizes as "labor, . . .work, . . [or] action" (p. 4). Arendt's conceptualization of labor, according to Pekkola, is defined as the work in which someone engages in order to survive. Work is defined as a more human behavior in that it is the choices and behaviors in which one engages to make improvements to the human condition. Action is defined as

always political and to be the on-the-ground behaviors of the individual. Our stories expand upon this paradigm and show that being an adjunct, independent scholar, or participating in some type of high school or secondary education employment is an intersectional experience of labor, work, and action. We argue that the ways in which being an adjunct combines these three types of pursuits is in fact as authentically anthropological, as academically rigorous, and perhaps more politically effective than R-1 academic work.

Adjunct scholars are often employed to take on a teaching load or a course or two that are in need of an instructor; teaching and pedagogical activities make up most of the adjunct experience. Many scholars hope to serve temporarily and transitionally in adjunct positions while they pursue/await full-time positions in either a teacher university or an R-1 institution. For this reason, these scholars typically continue their research activities such as data collection, publishing papers, presenting at conferences, or publishing monographs. Institutions do not require this of adjunct scholars, but to maintain one's identity and relevance within traditional academia, an academic must take on these activities in addition to his or her teaching responsibilities. Finally, adjuncts are sometimes in social environments that inadvertently require participation within the community or within an intimate social space with their students.

As we demonstrate above, adjunct scholars may work in elite spaces, but may also work in other spaces where they encounter urban violence, mentor vulnerable and disadvantaged immigrant and Black or Brown students or work in mentoring programs. We assert that these pedagogical experiences can be seen as "survival"-based or "labor" activities, done to support oneself. Continuing one's research can be seen as "work" because scholars often work on their research projects in order to better society or to at least contribute to society in some manner. Engaging with disadvantaged students in community colleges or mentoring programs can be seen as "action," because being in these environments can potentially propel the scholar into a politically influential position.

Situating oneself as a laborer, worker, or actor requires that a scholar acquire, produce, and reproduce certain kinds of "social" and "cultural" capital (Bourdieu, 1977, 1986). We theorize the ways in which adjunct scholars position or represent themselves within each of these realms through the lens of capital in an attempt to argue that the choices we are forced to make within this very unique hybrid space either afford us laudability and academic prestige, diminish professional academic growth, or do neither.

According to Bourdieu (1977, 1986), the ability to achieve and maintain upward mobility has to do with one's ability to access and manipulate various forms of dominant social and cultural capital. Agents use and manipulate forms of capital, thereby reshaping and rearticulating "culture" and social structures. Bourdieu explains that cultural capital is comprised of characteristics such as education, language, style, discourse, or acquired cultural material that enhances one's possibilities for social mobility in life in nonfinancial ways. To secure one's financial or economic situation, one also acquires social capital: beneficial or preferential treatment between individuals and groups. Both social and cultural capital are relevant within academia as scholars must not only secure grants, or tenure, or book contracts, but also they must acquire certain theoretical discourse, publish in certain journals, present at certain conferences and construct their curriculum vitae in a certain manner. Adjunct scholars often find themselves laboring in institutions that may not return the necessary social or cultural capital to have upward mobility with the academy. They then must take on other activities that might afford them traditionally beneficial or "dominant" capital (Akom, 2008; Carter, 2003).

More recently, scholars have pushed Bourdieu's theories further. Prudence Carter (2003) questions Bourdieu's assumption regarding the supremacy of "dominant" forms of cultural capital, demonstrating that Black youth deftly navigate between "dominant" and "non-dominant" forms of cultural capital as they move between school and home contexts. She explains that "non-dominant" cultural capital is often employed by marginalized individuals in order to establish membership within their community. While Carter refers specifically to Black urban youth, here we employ this concept of "non-dominant" cultural capital to demonstrate how adjunct scholars acquire and employ certain types of cultural capital in ways that R-1 academics may not have the opportunity to acquire or employ inside of these particular spaces, such as community colleges or secondary education programs.

Many adjunct scholars have "on the ground" experiences moving between elite spaces and less prestigious spaces where they ameliorate urban violence or work towards improving the esteem of Black and Brown community college students. They gain the experience of "action"-oriented moments that force the realization of the political goals that their more traditional academic efforts have not created. For example, many educational anthropology scholars are invested in solving concerns of equity, curriculum reform, the school to prison pipeline, and other critical educational issues. Some adjunct scholars engage these politically activist goals. In the case of the activist anthropology program at the University of Texas scholars are expected to engage with a social movement, a political organization, or some other political institution, giving an adjunct scholar the chance to acquire non-dominant type cultural capital and utilize it in an academic program where it is respected as dominant capital.

More specifically, according to the *Austin School Manifesto* (Gordon, 2007), tenured or tenure-track activist scholars in this program "believe that teaching and the production of insurgent knowledge is itself one form of 'resistance'; however, [they] struggle to push [their] work past discourse to praxis. [They] seek social transformation through both aspects of [their] work" (p. 93). Even though these non-dominant forms of cultural capital create upward mobility in these marginal spaces, adjunct or independent scholars having access to these protected arenas is rare. Consequently, as the adjunct scholar attempts to represent him or herself as marketable for traditional academia, he or she is often faced with the fact that these action-based experiences are not read as beneficial, prestigious, or even relevant scholarly experiences. As is often the case with marginalized communities, adjunct scholars often need to be able to acquire and utilize both dominant and non-dominant capital in order to labor, work, and act—to survive, better humanity, and to be an activist, respectively.

Conclusions: Bringing the Hustle to the Academy

Embedded in the questions we ask here are deeper questions about what counts as knowledge and activism in academia. The definitions of these terms are always intertwined with power. Hale (2006) posits that cultural critique takes an approach to research and writing in which political alignment is manifested through the content of the knowledge produced (Clifford, 1988; Clifford & Marcus, 1986; Marcus, 1998). He differentiates between cultural critique and activist research, where a relationship is established with an organized group of people in struggle and where research methods lead to a privileged scholarly understanding for scholars and communities. While both activist anthropology and cultural critique are explicitly politically engaged, Hale posits that cultural critique should not be a resting place for activist anthropology. While cultural critique always retains its commitment to the institutional space from which it comes, activist anthropology maintains, both theoretically and methodologically, dual political commitments - to an institution, but first to the community and organized struggle in which it is situated.

Visweswaran (2011) takes Hale's (2006) ideas back to the academy, arguing persuasively against the institutionalization and professionalization of "activism" there. She posits that there is a need to blend activism and research because a "gap" has been forced "between a community in 'need' of research and the university in need of activism" (Visweswaran, 2011, p. 74). Visweswaran also points out that this process of blending activism with scholarship is fragile and can sometimes inadvertently create an absorption of activists' efforts into the professionalized paradigm of the institution. More specifically, when scholars attempt activism in the R-1 university environment, sometimes their 'hustle' becomes entirely about creating an experience that is recognizable for tenure evaluations, grant proposals, or other senior faculty. The political freedom that can be ascertained outside of the R-1 institution is often lost, thus potentially warping the activist project. If traditional R-1 institutions lauded and valued the experiences that many adjunct scholars acquire, then perhaps that is one way to close this gap between research and activism and maintain a different – and very much needed – kind of activism.

Further, Pierre (2008) discusses Black subjectivity as a site of activist engagement, arguing the ways in which some Black academics in particular are potentially engaged in the ideological and embodied

struggle to define identity and construct community. She argues: "to me, what seems important for exploring the relationship between activism and research is that we recognize activism as an integrated process, as a combination of positionality/experience and politics" (p. 132). As part time academic laborers, what does it mean to recognize the importance and value around one's unique positionality in the context of the devaluing of one's time and intellectual labor? We argue that it may be both possible and necessary to view the positionality and experience of the part time academic laborer as a site of activist engagement and marginalized subjectivity, and therefore as cultural capital.

If in fact R-1 institutions recognized the more politically flexible realities of adjunct and independent scholars, then perhaps the cultural capital that all scholars seek might shift. More researchers and academicians might aspire to occupy spaces where they are not simply accountable to an institution, but also accountable to a community, a social movement, or a political agenda. If adjunct experiences or independent scholarly experiences in community colleges and mentoring programs were encouraged by the academy, then not only might scholars be able to move beyond work and realize more action, but also adjunct scholars might be able to market themselves and their truly valuable experiences within the academy. As graduate students, adjunct or independent scholars aspire to tenure-track positions in the academy, the academy might also aspire to embrace the very successful praxis that results from the intersectional experiences of the part time worker's hustle.

References

Akom, A. A. (2008). Ameritocracy and Infra-racial Racism: Racializing Social and Cultural Reproduction Theory in the Twenty-First Century. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 11*(3), 205-230.

Allen, R. L. (2001). The Globalization of White Supremacy: Toward a Critical Discourse on the Racialization of the World. *Educational Theory, 51*(4), 467-485.

Anyon, J. (1997). *Ghetto Schooling: A Political Economy of Urban Educational Reform*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baldwin, R., & Chronister, J. (2001). *Teaching without Tenure: Policies and Practices for a New Era*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bell, J. (2002). Narrative Inquiry: More Than Just Telling Stories. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(2), 207-213.

Berger, E., & Ricci, C. (2011). Exploited by Universities: Part-Time Workers as Victims. *Workplace, 18*, 1-9.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). New York Greenwood Press.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books.

Carter, P. (2003). "Black" Cultural Capital, Status Positioning and Schooling Conflicts for Low-Income African-American Youth. *Social Problems, 50*(1), 136-155.

Clifford, J. (1988). *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. (1986). *Writing Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Crampton, J., & Elden, S. (Eds.). (2007). *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davis, M. (2006). *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles* (2nd ed.). New York: Verso.

De Certeau, M. (1994). *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

DeLeon, A. (2012). "A Perverse Kind of Sense": Urban Spaces, Ghetto Places and the Discourse of School Shootings. *Urban Review, 44*(1), 152-169.

Denzin, N. (2006). Analytic Autoethnography, or Déjà Vu All Over Again. *Journal of Contemporary Autoethnography, 35*(4), 419-428.

Deutsche, R. (1991). Boys Town. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 9*, 5-30.

Gappa, J., & Leslie, D. (1993). *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part Timers in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and Resistance: A Pedagogy for the Opposition*. Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction* Boston, MA: Pearson.

Gordon, E. T. (2007). The Austin School Manifesto: An Approach to the Black or African Diaspora. *Cultural Dynamics, 19*(1), 93-97.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *The Prison Notebooks* (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, Trans.). New York: International Publishers.

Halcrow, C., & Olson, M. (2008). Adjunct Faculty: Valued Resource or Cheap Labor? *Focus on Colleges, Universities and Schools, 2*(1).

Hale, C. (2006). Activist Research v. Cultural Critique: Indigenous Land Rights and the Contradictions of Politically Engaged Anthropology. *Cultural Anthropology, 21*(1), 96-120.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies, 14*(3), 575-599.

Harvey, D. (1973). *Social Justice and the City*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Univerisity Press.

Harvey, D. (2001). *Spaces of Capital: Toward a Critical Geography*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ihssen, B., & Kaurin, P. (2011). And Justice for All: Obligation and the Employ of Contingent Faculty. *Workplace, 18*, 25-35.

Jubas, K. (2012). On Being a New Academic in the New Academy: Impacts of Neoliberalism on Work and Life of a Junior Faculty Member. *Workplace, 21*, 25-35.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space* (D. Smith, Trans.). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

MacLeod, J. (2008). *Ain't No Makin' It: Aspirations and Attainment in a Low-Income Neighborhood*. (3rd ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Marcus, G. (1998). *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Massey, D. B. (1991). Flexible Sexism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 9*, 31-57.

Massey, D. B. (1995). *Spatial Divisions of Labor: Social Structures and the Geography of Production* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.

Morgan, J. (2000). Critical Pedagogy: The Spaces that Make the Difference. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 8*(3), 273-289.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.

Pekkola, E. (2013). Academic Work Revised: From Dichotomies to a Typology. *Workplace, 22*, 1-12.

Peshkin, A. (1988). In Search of Subjectivity - One's Own. *Educational Researcher, 17*(7), 17-21.

Pierre, J. (2008). Activist Groundings or Groundings for Activism? The Study of Racialization as a Site of Political Engagement. In C. Hale (Ed.), *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics and Methods of Activist Scholarship* (pp. 115-135). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Razfar, A. (2012). Narrating Beliefs: A Language Ideologies Approach to Teacher Beliefs. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 43*(1).

Riessman, C. (1993). *Narrative Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Soja, E. (1989). *Post Modern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. New York: Verso.

Visweswaran, K. (2011). Conclusion: Fragile Facts On Scholarship and Activism. *Cultural Dynamics, 23*(1).