"THERE'S A HUMAN BEING HERE": A DOCTORAL CLASS USES DUOETHNOGRAPHY TO EXPLORE INVISIBILITY, HYPERVISIBILITY, AND INTERSECTIONALITY

Annemarie Vaccaro*	University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI, USA	avaccaro@uri.edu
Chiquita Baylor	Salve Regina University, Newport, RI, USA	chiquita.baylor@salve.edu
Desiree Forsythe	University of Rhode Island, Kingston RI, USA	desi_2158@uri.edu
Karin Capobianco	LICSW, Rhode Island College, Providence, RI, USA	kcapobianco@ric.edu
Jana Knibb	Community College of Rhode Island, Warwick, RI, USA	jknibb@ccri.edu
John Olerio	University of Rhode Island, Kingston RI, USA	jolerio@uri.edu

*Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Aim/Purpose	This paper contributes to the scholarly literature on intersectionality and social injustice (invisibility, hypervisibility) in higher education and serves as a model for enacting doctoral education where research, theory, and practice converge.
Background	Invisibility and hypervisibility have long been documented as social injustices, but very little literature has documented how doctoral students (who are also university employees) make meaning of intersecting privileges and oppressions within post-secondary hierarchies.
Methodology	This study used a 10-week Duoethnography with co-researchers who were simultaneously doctoral students, staff, instructors, and administrators in higher education settings.
Contribution	This paper offers a unique glimpse into *currere*—the phenomenon of theory and practice converging—to offer an intensive interrogation of life as curriculum for five doctoral students and a professor.

Findings	This paper illuminates rich meaning-making narratives of six higher educators as they grappled with invisibility and hypervisibility in the context of their intersecting social identities as well as their varied locations within post-secondary hierarchies/power structures.
Recommendations for Practitioners	Duoethnography can be an effective strategy for social justice praxis in doctoral programs as well as other higher education departments, divisions, or student organizations.
Recommendations for Researchers	Researchers can use Duoethnography to explore a plethora of social justice issues in doctoral education and across staff, faculty, and Ph.D. student experiences within the power structures of post-secondary education.
Future Research	Future research can more deeply explore social injustices and the intersections of not only social identities, but also social locations of doctoral students who are simultaneously employees and students in a university hierarchy.
Keywords	doctoral education, duoethnography, invisibility, hypervisibility, intersectionality

INTRODUCTION

As part of a doctoral course about social justice in higher education, five students and one faculty member engaged in a ten-week duoethnographic project where they grappled with a plethora of social justice topics—including intersectionality, invisibility, and hypervisibility. As a methodology, duoethnography (Breault, 2016; Norris & Sawyer, 2012) affords the opportunity for "both researchers and readers to critique the relationship between personal and larger cultural narratives" (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 17). This manuscript provides a unique and detailed perspective about the way invisibility, hypervisibility, and intersectionality shaped the experiences and meaning-making of six higher educators, five of whom were doctoral students.

In 2011, Museus and Griffin called for higher education scholars to use intersectional paradigms to consider how "the confluence of one's multiple marginalized and privileged identities is an interaction that creates a unique experience" (p. 8). The varied, intersecting privileged and marginalized identities of each co-author contributed to their perspectives and experiences with professional invisibility and hypervisibility and added rich evidence for individual and collective meaning-making in the duoethnographic process. Our duoethnographic project (Breault, 2016; Norris & Sawyer, 2012) adds to the growing body of literature about invisibility, hypervisibility, and intersectionality for doctoral students (Haynes et al., 2016; Truong et al., 2016) who hold complex intersecting social identities as well as social locations in the power structure of post-secondary educational settings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Duoethnographers are discouraged from starting a study with a review of the existing literature (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). Instead, through a rigorous survey of it, the literature acts as an interactive voice throughout the research process (Breault, 2016). Norris and Sawyer (2012) suggest that during a duoethnography, literature be collected as is deemed necessary. As topics of invisibility and hypervisibility emerged, and as our duoethnographic conversations began to revolve more around intersectionality, we involved those bodies of literature in conversation with our duoethnographic narrative (Breault, 2016; Norris & Sawyer, 2012). In this section, we offer a very brief overview of the relevant literature on these topics. It is important to note that extensive and in-depth literature reviews are not typical for duoethnographic papers.

INTERSECTIONALITY

The term intersectionality is commonly used in academe; however, researchers define and apply it in a variety of ways (Collins & Bilge, 2016; Museus & Griffin, 2011; Shields, 2008). Early intersectional writings were composed by Black women who described the simultaneity of racial, gender, and class oppressions (c.f., Combahee River Collective, 1977/1995; Crenshaw, 1989, 1991). Intersectional scholars call upon readers to recognize social structures, power, and privilege (Collins & Bilge, 2016). Collins (1991) noted that women of color experienced a matrix of domination due to their intersecting race and gender identities. More recently, scholars have noted that everyone lives within the context of the matrix of oppression due to the totality of our identities and that the structures of race, class, and gender "create disadvantages for women of color" but also "provide unacknowledged benefits for those who are at the top of these hierarchies" (Zinn & Dill, 1996, p. 327).

Shields (2008) explained how intersecting social identities (e.g., ability, race, gender, class, sexuality) are "organizing features of social relations, [that] mutually constitute, reinforce, and naturalize one another" (p. 302). As such, seminal and contemporary intersectional scholars offer insight into the interconnection among concepts like invisibility, hypervisibility, and intersectionality. For instance, hooks (1981, p. 7) foregrounded notions of intersectionality and invisibility when she said, "No other group in America has so had their identity socialized out of existence as have black women. We are rarely recognized as a group separate and distinct from black men, or as a present part of the larger group 'women.'" In her writing about black feminist thought, Collins (1998, 2000) described a matrix of domination faced by black women which included alternating invisibility and hypervisibility. She explained how prior to the 1980s, black women were "virtually invisible" and yet, increased visibility of women of color has brought "increased surveillance" (Collins, 1998, p. 52). A decade later, Purdie-Vaughns and Eibach (2008) hypothesized that people holding two or more subordinate identities often experience intersectional invisibility which is "the general failure to fully recognize people with intersecting identities as members of their constituent groups" (p. 381). More recent intersectional writers (Museus & Griffin, 2011) noted that the confluence of minoritized and privileged social identities lead to incredibly complex intersectional realities for higher educators based upon varying access to social power.

INVISIBILITY & HYPERVISIBILITY

In this section, we draw upon a growing body of literature that illuminates invisibility and hypervisibility. Invisibility can be defined as "being treated as if one is not visible, and being dismissed, devalued, ignored, and delegitimized by others because of one's race" (Torres-Harding et al., 2012, p. 155-156) or due to membership in a social identity group with limited representation (Stewart, 2018-19). Ironically, while those holding marginalized identities often experience feeling voiceless and invisible, they often also experience feeling highly scrutinized or hypervisible. Hypervisibility is the "condition of being subject to heightened scrutiny, observations, and policing due to one's limited representation" (Stewart, 2018-19). Ryland (2013) further described hypervisibility as "scrutiny based on perceived difference, often (mis) recognized as deviance" (p. 222). Being treated as invisible or hypervisible are forms of discrimination and can manifest in different ways for marginalized social identity groups and for individuals holding different intersecting social identities.

The notion of invisibility as a microaggression has been documented in the psychology and higher education literature. In focus groups with eight Asian American students and two professionals, Sue et al. (2009) documented the "invalidation of interethnic differences and invisibility" as a form of microaggression (p. 98). Participants felt invisible when colleagues suggested that Asians were not people of color and did not experience racial discrimination and when conversations about racism focused solely on Black and Latinx people (Sue et al. 2009). Nadal (2010) noted how invisibility manifests when women are "overlooked" or when men are given "preferential treatment" (p. 166). In two separate experimental studies, Sesko and Biernat (2010) found that black women experienced invisibility because they go "unnoticed and unheard" (p. 357). In a different study, Franklin and Boyd-Franklin (2000) described how African Americans experienced a psychological invisibility syndrome

as a result of repeated and persistent racial exclusion. Two years later, Torres-Harding et al. (2012) included invisibility as a category on their Racial Microaggressions Scale (RMAS).

Numerous studies have illuminated how invisibility manifests for minoritized populations in higher education (Abes & Wallace, 2018; Cartwright et al., 2009; Constantine et al. 2008; Mena & Vaccaro, 2017; Michael-Makri, 2010; Miles, 2012; Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010). In a study of students of color in graduate-level counseling programs, Michael-Makri (2010) found the highest average microaggression scores related to experiences of having one's ideas minimized or ignored and being overlooked for services. In a study of college students with physical disabilities, Abes and Wallace (2018) explained how intersectionality complicated experiences of invisibility in their college participants who "experienced intersectional erasure [because they] were invisible in society at large and among other disabled people" (p. 551).

Constantine et al. (2008) found 12 Black faculty experienced alternating invisibility and marginalization/hyper-visibility. Ten of the participants described invisibility as not being noticed by colleagues and the devaluation of scholarship on race and gender topics. Participants felt hypervisible "when their expertise [usually about race] was needed or when they were asked to help recruit an applicant of color for an available position" (Constantine et al., 2008, p. 351). Hypervisibility often resulted in faculty feeling like the spokesperson for their race. In another qualitative study with twelve African American faculty, Cartwright et al. (2009) found more than half the participants experienced feelings of hypervisibility alternating with invisibility. In a different study, Sanchez-Hucles and Davis (2010) noted how women of color in higher education are hypervisible when university administrators want them to address multicultural issues, but invisible when it comes to receiving professional support. Black women, in particular, have reported being unheard in conversations and situations where their voices should be equal contributors to the conversation and go unnoticed even after they have earned their seat at the table (Mena & Vaccaro, 2017; Miles, 2012).

A few studies have specifically looked at racism in doctoral education. Truong et al. (2016) documented four manifestations of racism experienced by doctoral students, including one powerful quote about the ways students of color can be treated as if they are invisible in a classroom. In a different study, Haynes et al. (2016) used the invisibility syndrome as a tool to conduct a critical race analysis of the ways racist master narratives shaped the entire educational trajectory of Black women doctoral students.

In sum, invisibility and hypervisibility often act simultaneously to disadvantage and create barriers and burdens for members of marginalized groups in higher education (Settles et, 2019; Tuitt & Carter, 2008), by denying them authority, legitimacy, voice, and recognition (Lander & Santoro, 2017; Settles et al., 2019) and exposing them to discrimination based on their marginalized identities (Tuitt & Carter, 2008). Invisibility and hypervisibility are all inherently connected to identity, intersectionality, power, and hierarchy (Collins, 1998, 2000; Collins & Bilge, 2016; Settles et al., 2019; Shields, 2008; Simpson & Lewis, 2005). In this study, we used the concepts of invisibility and hypervisibility to explore the experiences of being denied authority, legitimacy, voice, and recognition in the higher education spaces that we inhabit as higher educators and doctoral students with varied intersecting social and professional identities.

METHODOLOGY

Duoethnography is a method in which *currere* (Pinar, 1975), theory, and practice converge (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). Currere (Pinar, 1975) is a process of intensively interrogating one's experiences in life generally and education in particular (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). Duoethnographers use currere to better understand the collective experience of a shared phenomenon (Sawyer & Norris, 2013). Norris and Sawyer (2012) argued that the uniqueness and power of duoethnography comes from "the listening of the relevant stories of the other" (p. 28). Importantly, duoethnography was selected for our project because it is a methodology that harbors a robust commitment to social justice and allowed for close alignment with the goals of our social justice in higher education course. As recognized by Sawyer and Norris (2013):

> When framed by principles of social justice, duoethnography is both a reflection of social justice and a method to advance it. The concept of social justice is premised on the recognition of the urgent need to examine power and privilege and improve societal and environmental conditions. (p. 6)

To this end, we assert duoethnography assisted us in deeply exploring our multiple intersecting social identities, power-laden locations in university hierarchies, and our experiences with invisibility/hyper-visibility while simultaneously affirming our understanding of, and commitment to, social justice in higher education.

METHODS

CO-RESEARCHERS

The authors of this article are five doctoral students enrolled part-time in a Ph.D. program in education and a faculty member in the program. Even though the co-researchers are listed as authors on this manuscript, we have chosen to use pseudonyms in the findings section to protect our institutions and individuals who may be referenced in our quotations. Five of the researchers identify as cisgender women and one identifies as a cisgender man. Three of the researchers are People of Color and three are White. One of the researchers identifies as queer and five identify as heterosexual. The six individuals range in age from 30 to 48, hold varying religious views, and identify as lower-middle class to upper-middle class. Differences between duoethnographers are both expected and encouraged (Norris & Sawyer, 2012), and we believe our project was strengthened by the diverse intersecting social identities and respective perspectives of each co-researcher. See Table 1 for co-researcher demographics.

The Ph.D. program is designed for professionals who work full-time and is co-sponsored by two public universities located in the northeastern United States. At the time of the study, the five students were in various stages of the first three years of coursework required by the doctoral program and chose to enroll in the instructor's social justice in higher education course as an elective. During the first meeting of the class, the instructor posed the idea of engaging in a duoethnographic project for the 10-week course. Each of the students was invited to participate in a Duoethnography or complete an alternate set of assignments. Duoethnography is a methodology that attracts participants who enjoy the process of thinking and conversing about their own lives and the lives of others (Breault, 2016). As such, all the students expressed interest in participating in the project as co-researchers.

While some may assert that the name of the methodology, duoethnography, suggests a maximum of two participants, we subscribe to Breault's (2016) suggestion that the number of participants in a duoethnography is only limited by their ability to maintain intimacy, trust, and commitment to the methodology. In addition to being enrolled in the same Ph.D. program, all five of the student co-authors, as well as the instructor, are also full-time employees at various institutions of higher education. Three of the co-researchers have primarily instructional or faculty roles at three different campuses including a state flagship institution, a state comprehensive institution, and a community college. The other three participants were employed at one public flagship and one small private post-secondary institution as higher education administrators. Duoethnography brings together complex beings situated within their own complex social networks (Breault, 2016). The social networks of the co-researchers are both varied and intertwined as they are peers in a doctoral program co-sponsored by two institutions but are also employed across four post-secondary institutions situated within the same state.

Table 1. Co-Researchers Demographics

Pseudonym	Race and/or Ethnic Identity	Gender	Campus Roles
Virginia	Black	Cisgender Woman	Doctoral Student, University Staff Member
Maria	Black/AfroLatina	Cisgender Woman	Doctoral Student, Community college Faculty Member
Tiffany	White	Cisgender Woman	Doctoral Student, University Staff Member
Caroline	Asian	Cisgender Woman	Doctoral Student, University Faculty Member
Jude	White	Cisgender Man	Doctoral Student, University Staff Member
Mary	White	Cisgender Woman	Doctoral Course Instructor, University Faculty Member

DATA COLLECTION

GROUP CONVERSATIONS

The main form of duoethnographic data collection involved group conversations about social justice in the context of higher education. Over the ten-week project, co-researchers engaged in seven in-depth conversations, each centered on a particular aspect of social justice. All conversations were audio recorded and thereafter transcribed. The instructor was the primary arbiter of the topics of discussion. This practice is in keeping with Breault's (2016) suggestion that it is beneficial to duoethnographers to decide beforehand on key topics that will likely be of importance to the phenomenon of inquiry. The seven conversations focused on social justice in the context of (i) our own backgrounds and interesting identities, (ii) educator/teacher issues, (iii) issues facing employees within the organizational structures of higher education institutions, (iv) issues encountered by doctoral students, (v) issues in faculty and staff interactions, (vi) challenges in conducting higher education research, and (vii) what it means to be an ally. Time was reserved at the end of each conversation for co-researchers to generate additional prompts for conversation. During these 60-90 minute conversations, the instructor, when needed, served as a moderator to ensure focus stayed trained on the phenomenon of making meaning of social justice and to hone in on specific points of particular interest that required further discussion. Breault (2016) noted that early adopters of duoethnography are particularly susceptible to the problem of parallel talk, which refers to instances in which the participants share independent stories of experiences that pertain to similar issues rather than engage in an interactive, shared probing of those issues. Having an experienced moderator ensure the discussions consisted of conversation, rather than monologues, was an essential check against the problem of parallel talk.

Trustworthiness takes on a unique form when researchers are also participants (Jones, 2009). Jones (2009) suggests that researchers serving as participants should engage in ongoing member checking. Therefore, to increase trustworthiness, each co-researcher member checked the weekly transcript of the group conversation for accuracy within a few days of the conversation. As was the case with our

project, review of transcripts of dialogical inquiry can serve as a separate component of data analysis, exploration, and generation (Drechsler Sharp et al., 2012).

INDIVIDUAL MEMOING

The immediate review of transcripts was coupled with weekly memoing by each co-researcher about personal reflections and meaning-making pertaining to the transcribed conversations. The memos served as individual post-reflections on the process and context of the weekly recording. The memos were shared electronically within three days of each recording session. Co-researchers read and reflected on all memos and, thus, they served as an additional form of data collection. Memoing is not a typical facet of duoethnography. Yet, according to Norris and Sawyer (2012), duoethnographers model a state of perpetual inquiry. As such, we believe our practice of memoing to be consistent with the spirit of the methodology. Moreover, the memoing process, and the resultant memos, which were shared among the co-researchers, increased intimacy and trust among the participants. Breault (2016) argues that duoethnography relies on familiarity and trust between researchers. Prior to the start of this project, not all of the co-researchers had familiar, personal relationships with each other. We assert that by establishing a process that required each co-researcher to toggle between group inquiry and visible personal reflection (via memoing), we accelerated the development of collective trust and intimacy. During one of our recorded sessions, a co-researcher noted, "Part of the power in this class was reading your memos every week." Additionally, the memoing process contributed to robust data collection that allowed for thick description, which makes the findings of a duoethnographic inquiry more trustworthy (Norris & Sawyer, 2012).

INTEGRATING THE LITERATURE

In accordance with duoethnographic methods, we reviewed and revisited literature during the collection and analyses phases of the research project. All co-researchers agreed on selected readings on a weekly basis to compliment the chosen discussion topic. An effort was made to have minoritized voices represented in the literature so that, as Norris and Sawyer (2012) suggest, these voices are regarded as additional partners in the conversation. In addition to the weekly readings, the co-researchers identified additional, relevant literature on invisibility, hypervisibility, and intersectionality in higher education as this paper evolved.

DATA ANALYSIS

After all discussions were transcribed and all memos complete, the co-researchers each explored the transcriptions and memos. Through our analytic process, we identified key emergent concepts of invisibility and hypervisibility in the transcripts and our rich, reflective, and candid duoethnographic narratives. Duoethnographic analysis, unlike other forms of qualitative research, does not include the chunking of data into categories in order to construct a metanarrative. Conversely, duoethnographic findings are presented as an engaging narrative. The narrative is intended to prompt readers to alternate between the diverse perspectives of co-researchers and their own perspectives on the topic. As a result, readers become co-participants and active witnesses in an extended dialogue like the one presented in this manuscript (Norris & Sawyer, 2012; Sawyer & Norris, 2013). We invite readers to engage as a co-participant with us in the following dialogue about our meaning making regarding invisibility, hypervisibility, and intersectionality.

FINDINGS

Duoethnographers encourage readers to develop their own perspectives on the topic by presenting a rich narrative of the co-researcher's meaning making, quotes, and diverse perspectives (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). This style encourages the readers to become co-participants, in which they push beyond the mere absorption of findings to develop their own understanding and take part as active witnesses as the dialogue unfolds. During this duoethnography, the co-researchers engaged in discussion about how invisibility and hypervisibility manifests and affects each person differently based on their

hidden and visible intersecting identities. The duoethnographic process gave space for each of the co-researchers to explore how they have experienced and been impacted by these social justice concepts. We also garnered a glimpse into each other's lives and experiences, creating a deeper understanding and appreciation for one another and for the complexity of intersectionality, invisibility, and hypervisibility.

All co-researchers could identify areas where they were impacted by hypervisibility and invisibility (or lack thereof), and many of these encounters differed based on the co-researchers diverse social identities (e.g., racial, gender, sexual, class, and ability) as well as their professional status within power-laden university hierarchies.

Virginia: I always thought that if I worked harder and I got a seat at this table that I would be able to stop all of these things [incidents on campus] from happening. … I was at orientation and a mother came … and she had an issue. And so the orientation leader said, "Let's go talk to Virginia", but instead of her coming to shake my hand, which is clearly the "Virginia" out of the two of us at the table, she goes in to reach out to shake the white male student's hand. I thought that now because I've moved up and I have a seat at a table … that I wouldn't be experiencing invisibility … I am a Black woman who is a director of student activities, you know I exist, … there's no invisibility there. But still, in that moment, she managed to make me feel invisible in a seat and at a place where I shouldn't feel invisible. And I only envision as I move up to be vice president, dean of students or whatever that is that gets me at an even higher seat at the table, how visible that will make me? Or will they [privileged administrators/students/parents] still make me invisible?

Maria: Virginia's experience of invisibility was also wrapped up in hypervisibility. Hypervisibility is what made the white mother go very much out of her way (Really? This guy looks like a Virginia to you?) to maintain the authority white supremacy and patriarchy bestowed to white men, in the face of the black woman. Virginia was not invisible to this woman. … I always see invisibility as a two-edged sword. So, there's invisibility and there's hypervisibility, right? I feel like in order to make someone invisible and to make them different, you have to first identify them as different. "You don't belong here, or what are you doing here?"… They just sort of act like they can't see you. (As women of color or women generally) people will bump into you, you'd be at the supermarket. Just this idea of personal space. Students do it to me. Sometimes I just freeze, to make them realize like, you're in my way or like, hi, there's a human being here…

Tiffany: I think the area I struggle with most is not being treated as an aspiring scholar whose entire line of work focuses on issues of race, sexism, class, and other minoritized identities. When I am called into these conversations, it's as a friend, a wife, a family member… perhaps because of my age/gender [i.e., young, white woman], people are not interested in anything more than my casual opinion, especially when my knowledge base is directly confrontational to their beliefs. I would like to be taken seriously. My husband, during our debate, told me he was looking to talk to his wife, not to a scholar and therefore wasn't interested in what I was saying. How do I take off my 'scholar' hat and put on my 'everyday person' hat? Why is it that when I wear a specific hat (or viewed through my intersecting social identities—young woman) I am forced into invisibility?

Caroline: When discussing diversity, equity, and social justice, I feel that as an Asian woman, I am simultaneously looked at to answer questions and overlooked as "not a minority." My struggles and oppression as a woman of color have been dismissed and deemed not as "severe" as others from different minority groups. There was one article (Nguyen, 2016)… written by an Asian author and she really … spelled out a lot about invisibility and how she as an Asian woman felt invisible and was overlooked and not called a minority and things like that. And that really resonated with me as an Asian woman because it really put into words things I've always felt but didn't really have the words for. … It may have given me a feeling of vindication. Like it is a real thing, it's not just me being sensitive or over-sensitive or whatnot.

Tiffany: … in computer science …the majority is white and Asian and like you're missing (whole groups of people). So, every time I give like any sort of diversity talk, I … rail against that because

you're missing like whole groups of people in there as you bucket (Asian)... But I guess we bucket everything. That's as humans. We do that. Yeah.

Jude: Normally when I end up coming upon things, (I think) oh, I can relate to this. (This time) it's on the flip side. There was a time where they were trying to merge the College of Continuing Education and the School of Education and I was [a graduate student] just there to take notes on my laptop... it was a super contentious meeting, neither of the sides want(ed) to get merged. (It was) thought if you put them in the room, they would agree with it and they didn't. And someone was like, "Well Jude, what do you think?" I just popped up from my computer like, "I'm sorry, what? My opinion?" … So yeah, I don't feel it as being invisible…[but the older woman dean who was supposed to be facilitating the meeting certainly was treated as if she was invisible when the participant asked for (and privileged) my opinion instead of addressing her.]

Virginia: I do find it interesting that you just said as a grad student, they gave you a seat at the table when most people wouldn't have a seat. Like, there were people who were steps under your boss that didn't have seat at that table. And as a white male, you were easily provided a seat at the table where you didn't have to fight for it. You didn't have to, you were just there taking notes and you got an opinion.

Jude: Yeah. I've had a charmed career path, for sure. I am very thankful for it. And I do acknowledge it.

Mary: I am constantly wrestling with hypervisibility and invisibility as it relates to my social and professional identities. Who gets rewarded and patted on the back for doing social justice work? Too often white people, and often white women like me. I get recognized often for being social justice activists on campus. And I know that recognition comes from my privileged intersecting identities as a white woman and my power-laden role as a professor on campus. Those experiences of privileged hypervisibility happen simultaneously with my experiences of being dismissed [invisible] when I am one of the few women in a room of men administrators or when colleagues send LGBTQ students to me for advice or counseling [making me feel hypervisible].

The duoethnographic conversation, presented above, mirrors much of the literature on alternating invisibility and hypervisibility for minoritized social identity groups in higher education (Abes & Wallace, 2018; Cartwright et al., 2009; Constantine et al. 2008; Mena & Vaccaro, 2017; Michael-Makri, 2010; Miles, 2012; Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010). In line with the method, this literature became part of our conversation (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). Virginia and Maria described instances where they experienced personal and professional erasure (Collins, 1998, 2000; hooks, 1981; Sesko & Biernat, 2010; Torres-Harding et al., 2012) as women who identified as Black and Caribbean and Afro-Latina respectively. Caroline was in conversation with literature describing how invisibility is experienced by Asians who are often not seen as people of color (Nguyen, 2016; Sue et al., 2009). Jude, Mary, and Tiffany experienced privileges as white university employees, yet intersectional realities of gender (Nadal, 2010) and sexuality complicated those experiences. As such, during our duoethnographic conversations, we consistently revisited the work of Museus and Griffin (2011) who pointed out the need to recognize the complexity of intersecting privileged and oppressed social identities in higher education. Our duoethnographic conversation, however, pushed beyond this literature to illuminate the complex ways our varied doctoral student, staff, and faculty roles within university hierarchy also informed our experiences and meaning-making processes.

Norris and Sawyer (2012) note that duoethnographers "reconceptualize their perceptions of themselves and their cultural worlds" (p. 11). During our duoethnographic process, we used currere (Pinar, 1975) to reflect upon our individual and collective experiences, and in turn, deepen our awareness of intersectionality, invisibility, and hypervisibility. Our collective meaning-making inspired our growth and had positive ramifications on our work as educators. As our duoethnographic praxis progressed, we further reflected on how we could use these collective social justice perspectives to positively impact those around us—including our colleagues, students, and family members. Duoethnography is a method that advances social justice. In the following section, readers can join our conversation about how we made meaning of the formal and informal venues by which we inspired (or

hoped to inspire) learning about invisibility, hypervisibility, and intersectionality with each other and in our professional and personal spheres of influence.

Tiffany: I think I definitely learned, too. Just having y'all's perspective in not allowing students to reroute. To skip over you as people... If they (privileged parents, colleagues, students) had a problem and they come to me (instead of you or another colleague from a marginalized background)…. I never really gave that much thought. Because in some ways I thought that I was being helpful-- "Well I'm taking this (problematic student) away to where you don't have to deal with them." But, (I never thought) that's totally undercutting all of you as professionals. One of the things that I can take away is being a better person in this space. It's like, "Oh God, that makes a lot of sense to not do something like that" (i.e., use my privilege and disempower you as a colleague).

Virginia: I often view myself as this educator to my students, because who else is a Black female working on an extremely predominantly White institution to help them understand those experiences? In a way that is pushing already, by my presence being there, pushing (against) the stereotype that Black women are ignorant. Well, no, because here I am. I'm a Director and I am also in a Ph.D. program. So, I'm already breaking your stereotypes. I'm already pushing through glass ceilings.

Jude: My personal experiences of feeling invisible while on campus are limited to a handful of times early in my career... Some people took a lot of interest in a new person working an entry-level job in the Provost's Office, committed my name to memory, and always engaged in small talk. Others would avoid eye contact at all costs so as to prevent having to make an introduction. I was always cognizant of this and have always tried to think about how it felt to be completely ignored by some university leaders and warmly greeted by others when trying to develop my own style of leadership.

Maria: The first (powerful learning experience for me) was the idea of invisibility in higher ed spaces, and how it was experienced by all of us at the table in a variety of ways, with some of the experiences being similar. The discomfort that Caroline and Tiffany have expressed several times about not wanting to remain invisible in the face of injustice was very thought provoking to me. I thought about the root of this discomfort in a question, "Who gets to speak up for injustice? How? Why?" This led me to think about the most insidious forms of invisibility, those of white supremacy, ableism, heterosexism, homophobia, ageism, classism, male dominance, neurotypicality, cis-genderedness, etcetera, etcetera. … These forms of invisibility thrive because they remain unquestioned, or discredit those who question them. … I think that making these injustices visible is at least half of the process of enacting social justice, and is what gives us the authority to call them out.

Caroline: (In the class), I think some people talked about—I think Tiffany specifically had said that she had never considered the dichotomy that I live. And so that was helpful to me to hear that what I was saying came through because sometimes I feel that I'm over-explaining or I'm under-explaining. Or, I'm not doing a good enough job explaining (what invisibility and hypervisibility feel like) so the fact that it came through to me felt good.

Mary: At the beginning of the semester, I was not sure if, or how, we would accomplish the duoethnographic goal of furthering social justice through praxis. And I appreciate how thoughtful (you approached the process). You gave feedback to each other with compassion and grace. And I was impressed by how often in your memos you talked to each other… The way that you were constantly uplifting each other, and challenging with compassion and grace, is just such great role modeling for how we should do this work. (Moving forward with your duoethnographic praxis) each of you have to figure out how you're going to do that on your own. You're going to have conversations with colleagues. You're going to keep reading. We're going to keep writing together. That is the heart of duoethnographic praxis. So, thank you for coming on this journey with me.

Key tenets of duoethnography include engaging in reflection, meaning-making, and dialogue with the goal of enacting social justice (Norris & Saywer, 2012; Sawyer & Norris, 2013). In this findings section, our duoethnographic narrative highlighted our individual and collective currere (Pinar, 1975) related to social justice, generally, and invisibility, hypervisibility, and intersectionality, in particular. Using duoethnographic praxis, we reflected on our personal and professional enactments of social

justice regarding intersectional invisibility and hypervisibility via formal (teaching, supervision, administrative decisions) and informal (conversations, interpersonal challenges) means.

DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

While the intent of any duoethnography is not to impose conclusions upon readers (Norris & Sawyer, 2012), we do feel compelled to provide closing remarks regarding our process and findings. We hope that our paper serves as an impetus for faculty, staff, and students in higher education to explore the use of duoethnography within their spheres of influence. Duoethnography was an ideal method for exploring invisibility, hypervisibility, and intersectionality in higher education because it does not examine a phenomenon from a single point of view, but rather presents the experiences of multiple individuals (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). Moreover, as Norris and Sawyer (2012) point out, duoethnography allows readers the space to enter into conversation, as opposed to simply following along a single narrative. As such, it could be an effective strategy for social justice praxis in a variety of post-secondary settings such as classrooms, departments, divisions, or student organizations.

Duoethnographers deeply examine their lived experiences in order to "assist themselves and others in better understanding the phenomenon under investigation" (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 13), which in this case was invisibility and hypervisibility in higher education. Through our discussions, the matrix of oppression (Collins, 1989; Zinn & Dill, 1996) and intersectionality became evident in the unique experiences each of us encountered as doctoral students, faculty, and staff members in four different institutions of higher education. Virginia's status as a mid-level higher education administrator was deliberately unrecognized (by a White mom) and she was thus made invisible in a space where she supposedly wields a lot of authority. Maria frequently needs to stop interactions with White people until they recognize that they are treating her as if she is invisible when they encroach on her personal space. Tiffany's expertise is often deliberately subjugated (by campus colleagues and even her husband) in order for others to find fulfillment in certain conversations. Caroline, as an Asian woman, is frequently dismissed altogether as a woman of color. Jude, who arguably holds the most privilege based on his appearance combined with his economic status, is often welcomed into campus spaces that others are routinely shut out. However, even Jude has occasionally experienced invisibility in his career because of his age and position in the university hierarchy. Our duoethnographic narrative, highlighting these rich and unique experiences with intersectionality, invisibility and hypervisibility show how salient and interconnected (Byrd et al., 2019) these phenomena are for higher educational professionals with varying roles in the university hierarchy.

Breault (2016) suggests that duoethnographic conversation can be both informational and transformational. This was certainly the case when Tiffany, in reflecting on Maria's experiences in the classroom, came to understand that by responding to the complaints of students who bypass instructors of color—an act she had previously believed to be in service to faculty—she was actually undermining her colleagues in the classroom and contributing to their invisibility and delegitimization of their authority within the institution. Just as invisibility can be experienced differently, it can also be processed differently by people with different identities. That was the case with this duoethnographic project.

The duoethnographic focus on collective and individual meaning-making (Breault, 2016; Norris & Sawyer, 2012) afforded us a research space where we could hold varying perspectives true simultaneously. This dual reality is apparent in the juxtaposition of Virginia and Jude's lived realities. The conversation and literature regarding invisibility left Virginia wondering aloud just how high in a campus hierarchy she would need to climb in order to have her authority recognized by all stakeholders. She is determined to withstand oppressive individual (e.g., parent) and institutional cultures and processes that lead to her invisibility on campus. She challenges her own invisibility (and that of her colleagues) to set an example for students who look like her. Jude, meanwhile, as a White man having dealt only with fleeting instances of invisibility as a professional, was not plagued by such questions about his future career path or saddled with a compulsion to carry any burden other than his own. In his reflections he was liberated from self-doubt and able to focus on how he can avoid making others feel

invisible as he ascends to leadership roles. Virginia feels pressure to succeed in higher education because she fears that if she fails, she may not be blazing a trail for Black women who come after her. Jude is unencumbered by such pressures of shared identity and can focus on his own success, with an intent on using any power eventually gained by promotion to deinstitutionalize invisibility. The juxtaposition of how these two aspiring administrators in higher education made meaning of invisibility and hypervisibility illuminates how strikingly different day-to-day work conditions and power dynamics can be on a college campus for employees of differing intersecting social and professional identities. Mary's experiences of being both invisible and hypervisible because of her race, gender, sexuality, and faculty status further illuminates the complexity of intersectionality.

A couple recommendations emerged from our duoethnographic conversations. One hallmark of duoethnography is currere—defined as "an act of self-interrogation in which one reclaims one's self from one's self as one unpacks and repacks the meanings that one holds" (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 13). As part of this reflective process, educators must be aware of their own privileges regarding social identity, education, wealth, and positionality within the organizational structures of higher education. Educators must also reflect on how their privileges and implicit biases may affect others generally and lead to invisibility or hypervisibility in particular. As part of the dialogue process, curerre is done in conjunction with co-researchers (Norris & Sawyer, 2012). "Duoethnographers recognize that the frames that they hold are inadequate and [conversations with co-researchers] can assist in a re-conceptualization of self" (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 24). As such, we encourage readers to engage in duoethnographic work with colleagues where they engage in self-reflection and hard conversations about invisibility, hypervisibility, and intersectionality in higher education. Growth is often an uncomfortable, non-linear process. Duoethnography is an incredible tool for growth that happens at the crossroads of challenge and support (Sanford, 1966). We encourage readers to be open to hard conversations, where their actions—even well intentioned—may be criticized. It is often hard to truly understand how our actions impact someone else. The duoethnographic process affords an ideal vehicle for robust conversations, challenges to one's worldview, and subsequent growth.

We also learned through the duoethnography process how important it is to honor variations in the ways co-researchers process and respond to new information. Active listening is as much a part of good conversation as any verbal form of participation. We all process new and uncomfortable information differently. As such, duoethnographers should assume that co-researchers might be participating in good faith and at their unique readiness level (Sanford, 1966), even if they remain quiet during some of the conversation.

Higher educators need to create space where colleagues and students do not experience invisibility or hypervisibility. For those of us involved in hiring and performance management practices, steps should be taken to deinstitutionalize invisibility and hypervisibility of those with minoritized identities. Whether it be in meetings, search committees, or in the classroom, creating space for everyone to thrive is an important step in making higher education more inclusive. For those of us who hold positions of power, it is important to listen to, and support, people who hold more precarious positions (i.e., tenured vs not, senior staff vs new hire)—as they are often the employees who are treated as if they are invisible. Educators must constantly take note of who is listened to more during meetings, who is hired or promoted, who is passed over, and who is left out of decision-making processes. Higher educators must also be cognizant of, and challenge, hypervisibility (tokenizing, expectations for mentoring/supporting minoritized students, etc.) on campus. Through these daily acts, educators can do their part in combating invisibility and hypervisibility in higher education.

CONCLUSION

Our study aligns with prior studies that documented invisibility and hypervisibility for university faculty, staff, and doctoral students from various minoritized social identity groups (Abes & Wallace, 2018; Cartwright et al., 2009; Constantine et al. 2008; Haynes et al., 2016; Mena & Vaccaro, 2017; Michael-Makri, 2010; Miles, 2012; Sanchez-Hucles & Davis, 2010; Truong et al., 2016). Our duoethnographic paper adds rich detail to this body of literature in the form of detailed narratives that draw

readers into conversations about invisibility, hypervisibility, and intersectionality. Importantly, our study highlights the ways invisibility and hypervisibility can differ for university employees based on a person's diverse social identities (e.g., racial, gender, sexual, class, and ability) as well as their professional status within the university hierarchy.

Duoethnography models a state of perpetual inquiry (Norris & Sawyer, 2012), and invisibility, hypervisibility, and intersectionality in higher education are certainly phenomena worthy of much more interrogation. Norris and Sawyer (2012) suggest that duoethnographies do not end with conclusions because they continue to be written by those who read them. More specifically, they contend that duoethnographers "present their readers with opportunities for reflective engagement" (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 11). As such, we encourage readers to continue conversations about intersectionality, invisibility, and hypervisibility in their spheres of influence in post-secondary education.

REFERENCES

Abes, E. S., & Wallace, M. M. (2018). "People see me, but they don't see me": An intersectional study of college students with physical disabilities. *Journal of College Student Development*, *59*(5), 545-562. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2018.0052

Breault, R. A. (2016). Emerging issues in duoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 29*(6), 777-794. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2016.1162866

Byrd, W. C., Brunn-Bevel, R. J., & Ovink, S. M. (Eds.). (2019). *Intersectionality and higher education: Identity and inequality on college campuses.* Rutgers University Press.

Cartwright, B. Y., Washington, R. D., & McConnell, L. R. (2009). Examining racial microaggressions in rehabilitation counselor education. *Rehabilitation Education*, *23*, 171-182. https://doi.org/10.1891/088970109805029996

Collins, P. H. (1991*). Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment.* Routledge.

Collins, P. H. (1998). *Fighting words: Black women and the search for justice.* U of Minnesota Press.

Collins, P. H. (2000). Gender, black feminism, and black political economy. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *568*(1), 41-53. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716200568001005

Collins, P. H. & Bilge, S. (2016). *Intersectionality.* Polity Press.

Combahee River Collective. (1995). Combahee River Collective statement. In B. Guy Sheftall (Ed.), *Words of fire: An anthology of African American feminist thought* (pp. 232–240). New Press. (Original work published 1977). https://doi.org/10.1093/acref/9780195301731.013.78642

Constantine, M. G., Smith, L., Redington, R. M., & Owens, D. (2008). Racial microaggressions against Black counseling and counseling psychology faculty: A central challenge in the multicultural counseling movement. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *86*(3), 348-355. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2008.tb00519.x

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum,* (1), 139–168. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429500480-5

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review 43(6), 1241-1299.* https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039

Drechsler Sharp, M., Riera, J. L., & Jones, S. R. (2012). Telling our stories: Using autoethnography to construct identities at the intersections. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 49*(3), 315–332. https://doi.org/10.1515/jsarp-2012-6338

Franklin, A. J., & Boyd-Franklin, N. (2000). Invisibility syndrome: A clinical model of the effects of racism on African-American males. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *70*(1), 33-41. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0087691

Haynes, C., Stewart, S., & Allen, E. (2016). Three paths, one struggle: Black women and girls battling invisibility in US classrooms. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *85*(3), 380-391. https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.85.3.0380

hooks, B. (1981). *Ain't I a woman? Black women and feminism*. Pluto Press.

Jones, S. R. (2009). Constructing identities at the intersections: An autoethnographic exploration of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development, 50*(3), 287-304. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.0.0070

Lander, V., & Santoro, N. (2017). Invisible and hypervisible academics: The experiences of Black and minority ethnic teacher educators. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *22*(8), 1008–1021. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2017.1332029

Mena, J. A., & Vaccaro, A. (2017). "I've Struggled, I've Battled": Invisibility microaggressions experienced by women of color at a predominantly White institution. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*, *10*(3), 301-318. https://doi.org/10.1080/19407882.2017.1347047

Michael-Makri, S. (2010). *Racial and ethnic minority graduate student experiences with racial microaggressions in CACREP-accredited programs*. (Publication Number ED514673). (Doctoral Dissertation, Texas A & M University. Available from ProQuest LLC.)

Miles, S. (2012). L*eft behind: The status of Black women in higher education administration* (UMI No. 3519353). (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University. Available from ProQuest LLC.)

Museus, S. D., & Griffin, K. A. (2011). Mapping the margins in higher education: On the promise of intersectionality frameworks in research and discourse. In K. A. Griffin & S. D. Museus (Eds.), *Special Issue: Using Mixed-Methods Approaches to Study Intersectionality in Higher Education. New Directions for Institutional Research, 2011*(151), 5–13). Jossey-Bass. https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.395

Nadal, K. (2010). Gender microaggressions: Implications for mental health. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *Feminism and women's rights worldwide* (Vol. 2, pp. 155–175). Praeger.

Nguyen, C. (2016). Asian American women faculty: Stereotypes and triumphs. In B. Taylor (Ed.), *Listening to the voices: Mutli- ethnic women in education* (pp 129-136). University of San Francisco.

Norris, J., & Sawyer, R. D. (Eds.). (2012). Toward a dialogic methodology. In D. Lund, R. D. Sawyer, & J. Norris (Eds.), *Developing qualitative inquiry. Duoethnography: Dialogic methods for social, health, and educational research* (pp. 9-39). Left Coast Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315430058

Pinar, W. (1975). Currere: Toward reconceptualization. In W. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (pp. 396-414). McCutchan.

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. P. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles*, *59*(5-6), 377-391. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9424-4

Ryland, M. (2013). Hypervisibility: How scrutiny and surveillance makes you watched, but not seen. [Tumblr blog]. https://beautyvsbeast.wordpress.com/2013/10/18/hypervisibility-how-scrutiny-and-surveillance-makes-you-watched-but-not-seen/

Sanchez-Hucles, J. V., & Davis, D. D. (2010). Women and women of color in leadership: Complexity, identity, and intersectionality. *American Psychologist*, *65*(3), 171. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017459

Sanford, N. (1966). *Self and society*. Atherton.

Sawyer, R. D., & Norris, J. (2013). *Duoethnography*. Oxford University Press.

Sesko, A. K., & Biernat, M. (2010). Prototypes of race and gender: The invisibility of Black women. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*, 356–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2009.10.016

Settles, I. H., Buchanan, N. T., & Dotson, K. (2019). Scrutinized but not recognized:(In)visibility and hypervisibility experiences of faculty of color. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *113*, 62-74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.06.003

Shields, S. A. (2008). Gender: An intersectionality perspective. *Sex Roles, 59*, 301-311.

Simpson, R., & Lewis, P. (2005). An investigation of silence and a scrutiny of transparency: Re-examining gender in organization literature through the concepts of voice and visibility. *Human Relations*, *58*(10), 1253-1275. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726705058940

Sue, D. W., Bucceri, J., Lin, A. I., Nadal, K. L., & Torino, G. C. (2009). Racial microaggressions and the Asian American experience. *Asian American Journal of Psychology*,*13*(1), 88–101. https://doi.org/10.1037/1948-1985.s.1.88

Stewart, D. L. (2018-19). Ideologies of absence: Anti-Blackness and inclusion rhetoric in student affairs practice. *Journal of Student Affairs*, *28*, 15-30.

Torres-Harding, S. T., Andrade, A. L., Jr., & Romero Diaz, C. E. (2012). The racial microaggressions scale (RMAS): A new scale to measure experiences of racial microaggressions in people of color. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *18*(2), 153-164. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027658

Truong, K. A., Museus, S. D., & McGuire, K. M. (2016). Vicarious racism: A qualitative analysis of experiences with secondhand racism in graduate education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *29*(2), 224-247. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2015.1023234

Tuitt, F. A., & Carter, D. J. (2008). Negotiating atmospheric threats and racial assaults in predominantly White educational institutions. *Social Policy*, *14*(2), 51-68.

Zinn, M. B., & Dill, B. T. (1996). Theorizing difference from multiracial feminism. *Feminist studies*, *22*(2), 321 331. https://doi.org/10.2307/3178416

BIOGRAPHIES

Dr. Annemarie Vaccaro is a Professor and Program Director for the College Student Personnel Master's Program at the University of Rhode Island. Her scholarship focuses on inclusion and social justice in higher education. She uses qualitative methods to explore the rich and complex experiences of students, faculty, and staff. She teaches graduate courses in qualitative methods and mentors graduate students through the qualitative research and writing process. Dr. Vaccaro has received a number of professional awards for her work including 2018 NASPA Pillar of the Profession Recognition; 2017 NASPA George D. Kuh Award for Outstanding Contribution to Literature; and 2010 ACHE Alex Charter's Research Award.

Chiquita Baylor is the Director of Student Engagement at Salve Regina University and a fourth-year doctoral student within the joint Education program offered by University of Rhode Island and Rhode Island College. She has worked in the field of student affairs for over 15 years. Chiquita is passionate about access to higher education for all students especially for marginalized populations and helping students grow and develop into engaged student leaders. Her work and research interests revolve around Black collegiate women activists and Black feminist leadership development in college.

Desiree Forsythe works for the Computer Science Department in the role of Education and Outreach coordinator and helps facilitate many of their diversity and inclusion efforts. She also teaches undergraduate CS courses that are focused on ethics and technology. Additionally, Desiree works as the Broadening Participation Specialist for Computer Science for Rhode Island (CS4RI), a state-wide computer science initiative to bring CS to K-12 students. Desiree is a third year PhD student in Education, with a research focus on social justice in higher education settings.

Karin L. Capobianco is a Masters level Social Worker who had worked in clinical day/residential schools for 15 years before joining the Social Work faculty at Rhode Island College as an Assistant Professor. She has taught courses in diversity, oppression and direct social work practice as well as served as a field education coordinator. Karin is a third-year doctoral student in the joint Education program offered by the University of Rhode Island and Rhode Island College. Her research interests are centered in the Social Work field education experience for students.

Jana Knibb is an Assistant Professor of Sociology in the Department of Social Sciences at the Community College of Rhode Island. She teaches courses in General Sociology, Race and Ethnic Relations and Sex, Sexuality and Gender. She is also an advisor with the Safe Zone ™ initiative at CCRI and facilitates trainings for faculty, staff, students regarding allyship for LGBTQ+ students at CCRI. Jana is a third-year doctoral student in Education in the RIC/URI Co-Doctoral Program, with a research focus on Disabled BIPOC student experiences in Higher Education.

John Olerio oversees Summer Sessions and the Winter J Term at the University of Rhode Island. He also teaches URI 101, a first-year seminar for URI undergraduates. John is a fifth-year student in the PhD in Education program cosponsored by the University of Rhode Island and Rhode Island College, with a research focus in undergraduate degree completion.