"Nested Interculturality": Dispositions and Practices for Navigating Tensions in Immersion Experiences

Netta Avineri

This chapter explores the model of "nested interculturality" (Avineri, 2015), and highlights the tensions experienced in cultural and linguistic immersion experiences. "Nested interculturality" is a collective of dispositions (enduring attitudes that guide behavior) and practices (behaviors and action that embody those dispositions) for ethical engagement in intercultural interactions. Here, I use the "nest" metaphor in two ways. The first way is to consider "nests" as any space where one feels both challenged and supported, a protected space for growth. If we consider a bird's nest we can highlight on the one hand the growth, cultivation, and protection that is provided and on the other hand precariousness, instability and risk.[1] Examples of "nests"

---

[1]In workshops and courses in which I introduce "nested interculturality" I first ask the students/ participants to share their associations with the word "nest", which invites them to consider both the positive and negative aspects of the term. I also show a short video in which a bird is sitting on branches and there is a second bird struggling underneath the branches. Though at first they

---

N. Avineri (✉)
Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey,
Monterey, CA, USA

could be cohorts, classrooms, families, organizations, regions, countries or other contexts. By foregrounding the dual nature of "nests", the "nested interculturality" model acknowledges the tensions of intercultural interactions. The second way that "nesting" is used is to highlight how participants in immersion experiences are frequently engaging in many layers of cultures (e.g., cohorts, classrooms, organizations, regions, countries) simultaneously. This notion of "nesting" dovetails with the onion model of culture (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005) and Dugan's (1996) nested theory of conflict by highlighting the multiple cultures and (sometimes) contestation involved in intercultural interactions across various contexts. There is an inherent balancing act involved in this "nesting" of multiple cultures, which can manifest in tensions that need to be intersubjectively negotiated in interaction. The "nested interculturality" model is ecological, dynamic, and relationally-oriented, highlighting both interdependence and symbiosis. This model is novel in that it acknowledges the complex and fraught nature of intercultural interactions, in contrast to many models of intercultural development that highlight the importance of objective, value-free judgments of cultural practices.

In this chapter, I discuss how educators balance the complex nature of these "nests" and foster students' knowledge, practices, and dispositions to navigate them. This approach connects with building communities of practice (Wenger, 2011), as well as more recent work in higher education on the notion of creating "brave spaces" (Arao & Clemens, 2013; Palfrey, 2017). "Brave spaces" has been proposed as an alternative to "safe spaces" by highlighting the risk and courage involved in exploring oneself and others in educational contexts. "Safe spaces" were originally conceptualized as contexts that are created for students so they can feel free to explore their identities, histories, and experiences without judgment. "Nested interculturality" draws upon these two frameworks to consider how safety and courage can simultaneously be promoted in immersion environments.

---

are not able to see the second bird, eventually they are able to. I then highlight how interculturality is about "seeing the second bird" (i.e., noticing and acknowledging what may be at first be invisible or marginalized, and thoughtfully engaging with it).

Through its focus on local contexts "nested interculturality" does not dictate "best practices" but instead "contextual practices" that are particular and unique. This approach connects with the notion of decolonizing teacher education (Martin, Pirbhai-Illich, & Pete, 2017) and critical ethnography (Reyes Cruz, 2008) through its efforts to widen the center to include those who may currently be on the periphery (i.e., "the second bird" described in footnote 1). It also relates to critical interculturality (Martin et al., 2017) by focusing on "addressing issues in systems and structures" across contexts. These critical frameworks dovetail with Mitchell's (2008) discussion of critical service-learning, which includes the traditional elements of a classroom component, community component, learning to serve, serving to learn, reflection, and the model complements these elements with three additional components: a social change orientation, working to redistribute power, and developing authentic relationships. Service-learning (as one example of an immersion experience) is frequently seen "as a vehicle for connecting students and institutions to their communities and the larger social good, while at the same time instilling in students the values of community and social responsibility" (Neururer & Rhoads, 1998, p. 321). Critical approaches to service-learning on the other hand acknowledge the power and privilege involved in service encounters while moving toward a social justice focus. Taking a critical approach to immersion experiences can highlight the fraught nature of intercultural interactions, and demonstrate the need for a range of pedagogical practices necessary to ensure students' ethical engagement with individuals and communities.

Lastly, "nested interculturality" approaches immersion experiences from an "antifoundational" perspective (Butin, 2010). Butin (2010) highlights that innovations in education (e.g., immersion experiences) could be considered from technical, cultural, political, and antifoundational perspectives. An antifoundational perspective highlights that simply because an innovation is proposed does not automatically mean that it is a good thing, connecting with both critical and decolonial perspectives. Therefore, one should constantly question what is effective and what is not in order to create ethical and responsible educational practices. This critical approach connects with processes of ongoing inquiry and action (Avineri, 2017) for social change. By highlighting

dispositions, practices, and tensions, "nested interculturality" contributes uniquely to the literature by adopting an "antifoundational" perspective to meaningful immersion experiences.

As noted above, nested interculturality foregrounds an ecological, dynamic, relational, and negotiated view of interculturality. This focus on the give-and-take of intercultural learning is in contrast to models that primarily highlight the individual's intercultural development (see Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2006, 2009; Dervin, 2011; Hall, 1976; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003; Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). In this way, the model highlights the importance of context, positionality, and collaborative meaning-making (Abes, Jones, & McEwen, 2007; Chavez, Guido-DiBrito, & Mallory, 2003) in cultivating a "disposition of between". This model acknowledges that interculturality (Hua, 2018) is best conceptualized as an ideology that is negotiated through interaction (Liddicoat, 2007), which means that assessing individuals' intercultural competence must simultaneously integrate a recognition of context as well as the histories, experiences, and identities of individuals in interaction with others. In addition, interculturality is "an oppositional practice" (Kramsch & Nolden, 1994). By considering not only what individuals and groups have in common but also those times and places in which contradictions and opposition occur, this model highlights the complexities of intercultural interactions. The oppositions involved in intercultural learning therefore foreground tensions, at macro (e.g., country, region), meso (e.g., organizational, institutional, structural), and micro (individual, interpersonal) levels (cf. Bronfenbrenner, 1977, 1979; Watling Neal & Neal, 2013). "Nested interculturality", through these various foci moves from an individual disposition to a critical and interactional practice. A competence-based approach primarily highlights what individuals are able to do in a unidirectional, developmental way. A "nested" approach instead embraces questioning one's habitual modes of thinking alongside the interrogation of individually-oriented models that themselves may be forms of privilege and the bases of colonial practice. This chapter's discussion of dispositions, tensions, and pedagogical practices will help to bring this approach to life.

As noted above, a "nested" approach to interculturality simultaneously highlights "nests" (dual spaces of cultivation and challenge), and "nesting" (layers of culture) during educational experiences. It is relevant here to discuss what some of these nests are, and how balancing among them may be explored. Since there are so many pieces being negotiated simultaneously, it is essential to discuss the balancing acts involved in meaningful intercultural engagement in these immersion experiences. The first nest to consider includes community members and community partners (e.g., non-profit organizations, social service agencies, and educational institutions), with one focus of negotiation being on students' projects and tasks. Another nest includes program administrators, faculty members, and support staff, who are focused on resources and support as well as balancing students' and partners' and institutions' preferences and needs through ongoing engagement. Students are another nest, with their own preferences, conceptualizations of service and professional orientations. In order to cultivate a nested interculturality among these various nests, it is essential to create spaces to explore tensions as well as approaches to balancing preferences and needs. These balancing acts can be focused on navigating interpersonal dynamics as well as choosing to prioritize institutional partnerships and/or individual preferences. Among participants in these different nests, there may be similar or distinct conceptions of scope of students' engagement, notions of time, and commitment to projects over time.

"Nested interculturality" connects with other trends in social justice education to create inclusive spaces for individuals, groups, and communities. These approaches highlight diversity (the range of ways that people are different), inclusion (allowing for full and equal participation), and equity (fairness), as well as acknowledging privilege, conceptualized as unearned advantage and conferred dominance (Johnson, 2001) and marginalization. Diverse ways of conceptualizing one's own and others' identities (Abes et al., 2007; Avineri, 2015; Chavez et al., 2003; Zimmerman, 1998) are also central, including positionalities (how one's identities, experiences, and history shape interactions with others), intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989), how different aspects of identities connect), and markedness (Bucholtz, 2001), the notion that some groups of people are perceived in different contexts as

Table 1 Nested interculturality: dispositions, tensions, and pedagogical practices

Dispositions	Critical empathy	Negotiating reality	Ethical engagement	Partnership orientation	Appreciative inquiry	Collaborative knowledge creation
Tensions	Individuals & partners	Participation, observation, & documentation	Positionality & objectivity	Humility & expertise	Inquiry & change	Impact
Pedagogical Practices	Critical reflection	Narrative reflection	Multimedia reflection	Language learning & Sociolinguistics	Collaborative explorations	Scenarios

normal/default ("unmarked") and others are perceived as different from the norm ("marked"). Being sensitive to these issues can provide a useful backdrop for fostering dispositions that are central to "nested interculturality", as outlined in the following section.

Educators in immersion experiences can engage in a range of pedagogical practices to foster participants' "nested interculturality". The roles of temporal nesting (interacting with cultures across various time scales) and spatial nesting (interacting with cultures across different spaces) are crucial to a deeper understanding of individuals' intercultural development over time and space. Therefore, this chapter provides detailed examples of pedagogical practices that can be used during immersion experiences to explore and address tensions that are part of intercultural interactions (see above Table 1).

Fostering Dispositions

There are a number of dispositions to highlight when discussing "nested interculturality" with students, faculty members, and staff involved in immersion experiences. A disposition is an enduring attitude that can shape practices (cf. Schussler & Knarr, 2013; Welch & Arreeepattamanil, 2016). These dispositions are a basis for an exploration of the more relational components of interculturality, and connect with other efforts in higher education more broadly.

The first disposition to foster is critical empathy (DeStigter, 1999; Nero, 2009; Palmer & Menard-Warwick, 2012), the notion that understanding others' perspectives is a central goal but also an impossible task. This emphasis suggests that one should accept the incommensurability of experience between individuals and cultures, highlighting both intellectual engagement and affective relationships. In intercultural learning spaces, educators frequently seek to foster students' empathic ability to see the world "through another's eyes" or "in another's shoes". This focus is intended to have students engage with perspectives other than their own, and imagine how the world might be seen by those who are different from them. This is an essential aspect of intercultural learning. However, there are limits to one's ability to truly understand what it is

like for another individual or member of a group to move through the world. In one case in a service-learning course I was teaching, one student said to another student "I get it" in relation to issues of race and experience. However, the notion of *critical* empathy highlights the limits of perspective-taking and foregrounds lived experiences as understood in individuals' own words. Therefore, a starting place for critical empathy may be to say "I don't get it". This could perhaps invite more conversation and discussion, fostering a more engaged approach to interculturality in these educational experiences. Additional approaches to fostering critical empathy are discussed in the Pedagogical Practices section below.

A second disposition that is central to "nested interculturality" is negotiating reality (Antal & Friedman, 2008; Arieli, Friedman, & Agabria, 2009; Friedman, 2014), an enduring attitude with which students can encounter new cultures by acknowledging how cultures are not monolithic or static. This approach involves reciprocal engagement among members of different cultures, such that they put in the difficult work of understanding and making sense of one another's perspectives and approaches. Negotiating reality may also be seen as a set of practices, since it involves ongoing engagement with individuals and groups as a mode to better understand other cultures as made up of individuals' lived experiences. Whereas other models of intercultural development may focus on objective, judgment-free approaches to understanding other cultures, negotiating reality acknowledges the ongoing commitment and give-and-take involved in making sense of another culture. It also recognizes the roles of discomfort and comfort in these interactions, as well as the fact that actions and reactions are shaped by values and ideologies. In addition to recognizing the role of negotiation in "nested interculturality", it is important to consider and question what constitutes reality (including lived experiences and materiality) (cf. Pennycook, 2017; McIntyre, 2018).

Both critical empathy and negotiating reality relate to the third disposition of ethical engagement with communities. In order to interact ethically with community members during immersion experiences, it is essential to become aware in advance of potential ethical issues and consider how they may be addressed throughout the experiences themselves. These day-to-day issues have been conceptualized by DeCosta

(2015) as "microethics". This includes a consideration of the guiding principles of respect for persons, yielding optimal benefits while minimizing harm, and justice (DeCosta, 2015) as well as the 4 R's of ethics (Avineri, 2017): reasons, roles, relationships, and responsibilities (pp. 64–65). Reasons are one's goals, aims, and objectives in engaging in inquiry and partnership; roles are the subject positions that various individuals may occupy; responsibilities are the tasks and duties involved in those various roles; and relationships are built through ongoing interactions. Discussing ethical approaches can include some discussion of both principle ethics (what shall I do?) and virtue ethics (who shall I be?). Exploring ethical engagement would also involve discussion of conflicts of interest, bias, and cultural and linguistic aspects of ethical notions themselves.

A partnership orientation is the fourth disposition; it dovetails with negotiating reality as it highlights the ongoing interpersonal, intercultural, and institutional work involved in experiential learning programs (see Bringle, Clayton, & Price, 2009; Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Holland, 2001; Jacoby & Associates, 2003; Torres, 2000). Sustainable partnerships include all stakeholders (including universities and community members) seeing themselves as part of a "partnership identity" or a "we" relationship (Janke, 2008). This would involve committed engagement, as opposed to more tentative or even aligned engagement (Dorado & Giles, 2004). Collaborations that focus on a "partnership" identity can provide opportunities for transformative partnerships, in contrast to those with a more transactional or exploitative nature (Clayton, Bringle, Senor, Huq, & Morrison, 2010; Jameson, Clayton, & Jaeger, 2010). Building transformative partnerships involves a complex balancing act of respecting community partner preferences, learner agency, and instructor's shaping of learning experiences, as well as choice, autonomy, agency, mutuality, reciprocity, quality, and benefit. It is important to explore with students, staff, and faculty members before, during, and after immersion experiences how interpersonal, intercultural, and institutional dynamics may impact the partnership-building process. In addition, immersion experience facilitators can emphasize the importance of both students' perspectives and experiences and the sometimes "unheard voices" (Stoecker, Tryon, & Hilgendorf, 2009)

of community partners as well as community members themselves. Discussions of partnership building therefore integrate an exploration of unequal power relationships at macro, meso, and micro levels. This acknowledgment of inequality and inequities therefore highlights the tensions involved in a "nested interculturality" approach.

Connected to critical empathy, negotiating reality, ethical engagement, and partnership orientation is the fifth disposition of appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider, Whitney, & Stavros, 2008), a theory of knowledge and collective action that focuses on appreciating, envisioning, dialoguing, and innovating. Appreciative inquiry is a disposition that is central to "nested interculturality" because it highlights the role of observation and understanding as a first step toward critical engagement with communities in immersion environments. The approach encourages students to cultivate a disposition of ethical observation. This approach is distinct from those that are problem- and solution-oriented, and allows for more in-depth inquiry from a collaborative standpoint. Frequently, students enter communities seeking to make a change or create solutions without first recognizing what is being done well in those contexts. Appreciative inquiry slows down the overall process and allows for a recognition of all that individuals and communities have to offer to intercultural collaborations.

Appreciative inquiry could be considered a first step toward a disposition of collaborative knowledge creation, best embodied by action research approaches (Bradbury-Huang, 2010; Dick, 2004; McNiff, 2013; Reason & Bradbury, 2013; Sagor, 2000; Stringer, 2008; Wicks & Reason, 2009). This "transformative orientation to knowledge creation" … "seek[s] to take knowledge production beyond the gate-keeping of professional knowledge makers" (Bradbury-Huang, 2010, p. 93). Whereas other research paradigms embody a hierarchy between the "researcher" and the "researched", a central goal of action research is to collaborate with communities to create knowledge together. Action research includes cycles of issue identification, data collection and analysis, reflection, and action. This form of inquiry involves collaborative, co-created projects, as opposed to pre-set agendas created by those who frequently already hold some power in the intercultural interactions. With action research, the goal is to flatten traditional hierarchies

between researchers and community members through ongoing engagement and co-constructed research agendas and products. Overall, these six dispositions underly the model of "nested interculturality", and can be fostered through pedagogical practices like those outlined later in this chapter.

Tensions

As discussed previously, "nested interculturality" integrates the dual nature of "nests" as well as the "nesting" involved in engagement with layers of culture. Therefore, it is essential to discuss the tensions that may arise in immersion experiences, and explore pedagogical practices to uncover and handle them. These tensions can be discussed among participants as well as program administrators before, during, and after immersion experiences.

The first is a tension between *individuals and partners*. This tension focuses on individuals' identities and preferences balanced with those of the partnership as a whole. The second tension is among *participation, observation, and documentation*. When students are encountering new cultures they may move along the participant-observation spectrum, which includes choices about when to engage, what to say, and how/if to document. Students can be trained in ethnographic methods, thereby allowing them to understand cultures and communities from longitudinal and in-depth perspectives (Avineri, 2017). They can then explore how to make the familiar strange and the strange familiar, while recognizing their own emic (insider) and/or etic (outsider) perspectives across diverse interactions.

A related tension is that between *positionality and objectivity*, which connects with anthropological concepts including emic (insider) and etic (outsider) perspectives. In addition, anthropologists' goals to make the familiar strange and the strange familiar relates with this tension between acknowledging one's own perspectives while also seeking to remain relatively objective and value-free when engaging with new cultures. As discussed above, nested interculturality acknowledges the various positionalities that individuals hold during intercultural

interactions. However, many models of intercultural development highlight the importance of objective, value-free judgments of new cultural practices. Therefore, at times there may be a tension between a somewhat objective "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) (deep and elaborate accounts of behaviors and contexts) and an acknowledgment of one's own identities, experiences, histories, and ideologies. A fourth tension is focused on *humility and expertise*. When is it relevant or preferable to highlight what one can contribute to a discussion and when is it best to engage in humble practices that instead allow space for others to highlight their perspectives and contributions? This is a rich area of exploration with students during immersion experiences, especially as it relates to issues of "competence". A fifth tension is between *inquiry and change*, with an inquiry orientation being focused more on what is happening within a given culture and deeply listening to the experiences of others. A change orientation instead may focus on action and what is next for a given community or cultural context. It is important to highlight the roles of negotiating reality and reciprocal engagement as one way to balance these two orientations in intercultural interactions. A sixth tension is focused on how *impact* is conceptualized by different individuals at local and global levels, including who, whom, what, where, when, why, and how that impact is manifesting. It is useful to explore with students, community members, and community partner organizations how these tensions can be negotiated and perhaps resolved through ongoing "nest" building, reflection, and collaboration.

Pedagogical Practices to Foster "Nested Interculturality"

In the section below, I describe pedagogical practices I have used to foster "nested interculturality" among students and other participants in various educational contexts, highlighting the range of nests to cultivate and balance in these endeavors. These educational spaces include a Master's level course called "Service-Learning: International & Domestic Community Partnerships", an undergraduate critical

service-learning course called "Hunger & Homelessness", an undergraduate critical service-learning and ESL course for international students called "Hunger & Homelessness in America's Salad Bowl" (more information about this course is included in Avineri & Perren, in press), and a Master's level course called "Language Education Practicum Capstone". They also come from collaborative action research projects both domestically and internationally that I have overseen with students, including those focused on the impact of immigration policies on K-8 students in California, women experiencing homelessness in California, community-based agriculture collaborations in Peru, and marine policies in the Bahamas. In addition, the activities that I describe below are taken from a number of immersive learning workshops I have provided to both undergraduate and graduate students engaged in local and global educational experiences (e.g., New Student Orientation, summer and year-long study abroad and experiential learning programs). I have also used some of these approaches and activities for educators' professional development sessions (e.g., conference presentations, high school educators' professional development sessions, university-level faculty and administrators forum). Overall, this section provides concrete pedagogical practices for fostering nested interculturality in a range of educational contexts, which can be adapted for short-term workshops as well as long-term engagement (e.g., semester-long courses, immersion experiences) for an in-depth exploration of the balancing acts and tensions involved.

Critical Reflection. In the teaching and trainings that I have offered, I seek to engage participants in ongoing critical reflection and critical reflexivity about the various tensions involved in immersion experiences. Reflection is "sensemaking about actions, the metacognitive work that one engages into process an activity before, during and/or after it happens" (Avineri, 2017, p. 112). One key distinction is between **R**eflection (structured reflection) and **r**eflection (ongoing, informal modes). Reflection allows students to experience, process, generalize, and apply (and share), as part of the experiential learning cycle (Kolb,

2015).[2] As Eyler and Giles (1996) note, meaningful reflection is continuous, connected, challenging and contextualized.

One critical reflection approach is pre-reflection (or preflection), during-reflection, and post-reflection (Avineri, 2017, p. 114). This connects with Murphy's typology (reflection-for-action, reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action), that allows for the range of possibilities across temporal and spatial contexts. For example, at a recent conference keynote speech I asked the participants to engage in "preflection", asking them some of the following questions: How do you define social justice?, Where does this definition come from?, Share or (draw) an example of service., What makes it service?, and Share an "intercultural" encounter you have had in the past week. How did it go? How do you know? This type of "schema activation" allows the participants to engage with the relevant topics in advance of the presentation itself, building a connection with their own perspectives, the material, and one another. I also frequently ask workshop participants as a pre-reflection prompt to consider "Who is in your nests?" (i.e., spaces/communities of cultivation and challenge), providing them with some examples (e.g., students, classrooms, institutions, faculty, staff, administrators, communities) and allowing them to explore how and why these spaces are meaningful for them. In other cases, students are asked to reflect on a previous intercultural interaction and discuss the tensions they encountered and how they handled them. I have also asked students to reflect upon their various identities, and how they may be relevant in their immersion experiences (see Avineri, 2015 for detailed discussion of these reflections). In preparation for engaging with new communities, students may engage in a "nest exploration" by conducting research, observing the community, and/or document what they notice. This provides them with hands-on approaches to issues including participation vs. observation vs. documentation (discussed in the Tensions section above) as well as inquiry and narrative.

Another approach to pre- and post-reflection is called FACE, in which students identify the facts, assumptions, challenges, and

---

[2]http://www.servicelearning.umn.edu/crimson/dependancies/multimedia/reflection1.pdf.

expectations they are aware of before entering a new community. The facts can be identified through online and other types of research, whereas the other three components generally come from individuals' own perspectives and experiences. These facts, assumptions, challenges, and expectations can then be revisited at the end of an experience, to see how they match up (or not) with perceptions and assumptions that were held before the experience itself. In trainings with educators, I have also asked them to consider which concepts resonated with them, which activities they could adapt to their own contexts, and what challenges they might face in implementing their ideas (and how they might handle those). Post-reflection prompts can allow individuals to apply concepts and ideas to their own contexts in fruitful ways.

The What—So What—Now What[3] framework provides participants with an opportunity to think through and describe what happened, determine why it is important to them/raised relevant issues and figure out next steps/what it means for the future. A related model is DEAL,[4] in which participants Describe (experience objectively, assess progress since last reflection), Examine (personal, communal, academic perspectives), Articulate Learning (what, how, why). For example, in the Hunger and Homelessness critical service-learning course that I teach, about halfway through the semester I ask the students to describe an encounter at their community partner site, connect it with course material, and consider what it means about their dispositions and practices moving forward. This focus on a particular event connects with critical incident reflections, in which individuals describe in detail something unexpected, critically analyze how they handled it, consider what they might do in future situations, and what this means about them as a practitioner (cf. Critical events in Bailey, 2007; Nunan and Choi, 2010; Tripp, 2012). Identifying and analyzing particular incidents can allow for details and specificity alongside generalizations of principles and attitudes.

---

[3]http://www.servicelearning.umn.edu/info/reflection.html.

[4]http://servicelearning.duke.edu/uploads/media_items/dealreflection-questions.original.pdf.

Narrative Reflection. A central component of building nests is narrative, which refers to storytelling and story listening. A focus on narrative (Avineri 2019; Bauman, 2004; Briggs, 1986; De Fina & Perrino, 2011; Falconi & Graber 2019; Zigon, 2008) highlights the roles of interaction, negotiation, and audience at individual, group, community, and cultural levels. In addition, narratives can allow for an exploration of both present-day and historical narratives. As discussed above, one of the key tensions to explore in nested interculturality is among participation, observation, and documentation. This tension can be fruitfully examined through the lens of narrative. I encourage my students to consider the following questions when exploring their own narratives and those of community members with whom they interact during immersion experiences:

- How do we **ask questions**?
- How are narratives **invited**?
- Who **tells** narratives?
- In what **languages**?
- To whom are the narratives **addressed**?
- Which narratives are **listened to**?
- Which narratives are **discounted**?
- How do we **share narratives** in ethical ways?

I also provoke them to consider the following question: Would you still want to travel to that country if you could not take a camera with you—a question of appropriation (Waheed, 2013). This provocative question helps them to consider how and why they may choose to document what they see during their experiences. When students encounter this question, they begin to recognize the assumptions and taken-for-granted aspects of their immersion experience. They begin to ask critical questions about ethics, and recognize their positionality in relation to those with whom they are engaging during these experiences. I have also used an article from the satirical newspaper *The Onion*, "6-Day Visit to Rural African Village Completely Changes Woman's Facebook Profile Picture". This can also encourage students to consider their motivations and intentions when documenting their experiences for different audiences. I have also worked with students to create

digital stories about their immersion experiences, to explore the "nests" they have been a part of. In some cases I have also shared those digital stories with students in subsequent semesters, to discuss issues of ethics, positionality, and audience in relation to creating stories about their experiences.

In addition, I encourage them to create narratives (including who, what, where, when, why, and how) with special attention paid to whom (meaning the various audiences that may be exposed to those narratives). A narrative lens can allow students and community members to explore their own perspectives while also allowing new nests to form through the sharing of those narratives. For example, I provide them with examples of "6 Word Stories" including "For sale. Baby shoes. Never worn.", "Painfully he changed 'is' to 'was', "and "One bowl of spaghetti. Two forks". I then ask them to consider what their first interpretation of these stories were, and then encourage them to imagine other possible interpretations for the stories based on different contexts, circumstances, and audiences. They then create a three "6 word stories" about the same intercultural experience, each design for a different audience (family member, friend, someone whom they just met). Activities like these can highlight issues of narrative and audience for the participants at any phase of their immersion experience.

Another narrative-focused activity that allows students to explore issues including critical empathy and positionality comes from the organization Narrative 4. In this activity, individuals share the story of their name with a partner (their choice—first name, middle name, last name). They can include as much or as little detail as they would like, frequently including information about their history, family, identity, and experience. Their partner listens to this story. Then, with another pair, the partner shares that story in the first person. This embodied activity provides students with the opportunity to realize what it might be like to truly be in "someone else's shoes". Students begin to realize how identities (e.g., age, race, class, background) are expressed publicly and how those may be perceived by others. They also may realize how difficult it can be to be responsible for faithfully tell someone else's story. These aspects of the activity are miniature versions of the ethical questions they are meant to grapple with throughout their immersion

experiences. This activity therefore highlights issues of critical empathy and the importance of deep engagement in ethical narrative sharing about and among communities.

Multimedia Reflection. Another set of approaches I use to demonstrate the role of nests in students' intercultural interactions includes critical reflection using multimedia materials. For example, I use the TED Talk "Don't ask where I'm from, Ask where I'm a local" to highlight issues of identity, history, perception, and markedness. This approach can open up fruitful discussions about students' experiences moving through different contexts over time. In the video, Taiye Selasi encourages viewers to identify 3 R's (rituals, relationships, and restrictions) in the contexts where they feel local. I also use the video "The Power of Outrospection" to encourage students to consider the roles of both individual self-examination as well as outward-facing engagement with community issues, highlighting in particular the disposition of critical empathy. While watching the video, they are focused on identifying something they agreed with and something they disagreed with as a way to critically engage with the material. The What-How-Why framework has students describe in detail before moving to interpret what they are seeing, which is connected with the Describe-Interpret-Evaluate (DIE) framework frequently used in intercultural education environments (more recently proposed as the Describe-Analyze-Evaluate [DAE] model in Nam & Condon, 2010). I encourage students to focus in the "What" section on nouns and verbs and in the "How" section on adjectives and adverbs. They then move to the "Why" phase, which may include hunches, intuitions, and educated guesses about what they see. This activity encourages them to "pause" before making assumptions about what they are seeing, which connects with the disposition of ethical observation discussed in relation to appreciative inquiry. I have modeled the activity using my own photos, and then ask students to engage in the activity with a partner's photo to practice and then find out if their interpretations are "correct" or not. When students are able to identify relatively quickly (or slowly) the "correct" interpretation, this can also highlight the commonalities (or differences) there may be in the group as a whole.

Language Learning and Sociolinguistics Approaches. In preparing educators and learners for in-depth immersion experiences, it is also essential to consider both general issues and specific approaches/topics. For example, for the "Hunger and Homelessness" course for international ESL students, instructors and student assistants participated in an in-depth training focused on the interconnected learning outcomes of service-learning, language learning, and intercultural learning. They learned about content-based instruction, working with learner populations, approaches to critical reflection, options for engaging in group discussion and dialogue, and topical areas (e.g., hunger and homelessness). There are a number of language learning activities that could be included for a focus on issues of diversity, equity, and identity. For example, students can learn about different themes (e.g., gender, age, region, religion, racism). They could engage in critical discourse analysis of textbooks, focusing on text, context, intention, and discourse features. For example, they could discuss the ways that grammatical exercises may reinforce gender stereotypes. Students can create their own exercises but with a range of contexts & examples. Students could be taught vocabulary in the target language that helps them talk about cultural diversity (e.g., equality, bias, ethnic group names) and intercultural issues. They could engage with authentic texts in the target culture (e.g., written documents, visuals like maps, photographs, cartoons). All of these may be approaches to connect language and intercultural learning in meaningful and critical ways.

In addition to these language learning activities, I have exposed students to key sociolinguistic concepts that may be relevant in building partnerships. These include more general concepts including communities of practice, situated identities, and epistemics/knowledges (see Avineri, 2015 for further discussion of these areas). We also discuss examples of pragmatics, recipient design, adjacency pairs, presuppositions, repair, and "codeswitching" as they relate to multilingual and intercultural communication during their immersion experiences. For example, in some classes, students write their first emails to their community partners, and I provide them with feedback based on concepts of recipient design, presuppositions, and epistemics/knowledges. Providing these conceptual frameworks can deepen students' thoughtful

engagement with one another, partner organizations, and community members.

Collaborative Explorations. A fifth set of pedagogical practices are collaborative explorations students can engage in before working with communities and community partners. Though all of the activities listed above could potentially be done with some amount of collaboration, those that follow require collaboration among student participants. For example, before beginning a group project with a community-based organization, students can discuss a group needs assessment,[5] which includes identifying group strengths and roles, existing resources/local knowledge, stakeholders/participants, outcomes, tools/procedures, other resources/sources, and timelines. Students taking the time to explicitly identify these aspects of their collective knowledge can preempt some tensions around humility and expertise, as described in the Tensions section above. Part of this approach includes the groups creating an agreement about how they want to communicate with one another and move forward with the project. After students engage in their community-based projects, they can present both the process and products. Then, students can write reflections about what they learned through one another's presentations, identifying connection points and differences. These collaborative explorations within and among student groups ("nests") can allow for more thoughtful engagement with one another and with community members and community organizations.

Scenarios. A last approach that I use frequently with my students is discussion of scenarios, which I have been collecting and adapting over the years. I primarily use these scenarios in a graduate-level course designed to train students in critical service-learning pedagogy, though I have used others in different educational contexts. I name these scenarios with one-word descriptions (e.g., the bus, the box, the brooms, the dream, the word, painting, the necklace) and share these stories with students. They have an opportunity first to consider individually how they might react if they were in these situations. They are encouraged

---

[5]This needs assessment tool is adapted from Peter Shaw's Curriculum Design needs assessment tool.

to consider the scenarios from the four perspectives provided in Butin's (2010) typology: technical (logistical), cultural (meaning-making), political (power and privilege), and antifoundational approaches. They also discuss in groups what they are sure about and unsure about in terms of how they might approach the situation and why.

"The bus" focuses on a student feeling uncomfortable traveling by bus to her service site because men said inappropriate comments to her while she was traveling. "The box" is about a student being asked to build boxes (which food would eventually go into) at their site. "The broom" is about an African American student being asked frequently to clean up at her site, and how this connected with her views of how she felt like a "maid" in that space. Another "broom" story is about a Japanese service-learner who broke a broom at his site, after which one of the site supervisors said that he was doing "karate stuff". "The dream" is about a white student discussing during an activity about the "American Dream" how his father worked hard and therefore deserves his success. "The word" is about a Practicum student whose ESL student used the word "segregate" to mean "separate" during a class activity. "The painting" is about a graduate student intern at a sports-focused site in Latin America who was asked to paint for her first few weeks at the site. I created the last scenario, about one student complimenting another student's North African necklace and then speaking in generalizations about North Africa. These scenarios are meant to have students critically engage with issues of identity, perception, privilege, and service, among other issues. By openly discussing their perspectives as a group, students have the opportunity to become aware of, crystallize, and share their perceptions as a mode to foster nested interculturality.

Conclusion: Nested Interculturality for Social Justice

Ultimately, "nested interculturality" is focused on dispositions and practices for equity and social justice through its recognition of the relational components and tensions in intercultural education (de Sousa, 2014;

see Gorski, 2008). In constrast to intercultural learning approaches that focus primarily on individuals and objective assessments of other cultures, "nested interculturality" recognizes the centrality of relations, institutions, structures, and systems in intercultural interactions. Highlighting tensions, dispositions, and practices moves from objective inquiry to critical engagement with social issues. Students are encouraged to encounter and make sense of issues they may at first be uncomfortable with. By highlighting issues of power, privilege, and markedness in these contexts, it may be possible to move toward social change and social justice. Bell (2007) conceptualizes social justice as a process and a goal that involves full and equal participation (mutually shaped to meet everyone's needs) of all groups in society. It also includes equitable distribution of resources as well as all members being physically and psychologically secure, self-determining and interdependent. She notes that in order to move toward social justice it is essential to acknowledge oppression (pervasive, restrictive, hierarchical, power, privilege, hegemony, identity, internalized, "isms") as well as the roles of consciousness, agency, and resistance. The roles of language and deep engagement with cultures is highlighted in Avineri, Graham, Johnson, Riner, and Rosa (2018). A focus on social justice involves "audience coalescence" (Avineri & Perley, 2018), a critically empathetic process of coming together for social change.

When students engage in in-depth reflection in different times and spaces, they are able to see the context-bound, dynamic, and fluid nature of both culture and interculturality. Whereas students may begin with a helping or fixing orientation during their immersion experiences, the goal is to see through engagement, interaction, and service how they are engaging in interactions by seeing individuals not as weak or broken but as whole (Remen, 1996). A focus on individuals' roles in addressing social inequalities at micro, meso, and macro levels allows for a more in-depth consideration of what is needed to shape spaces for social justice. "Nested interculturality" dispositions and practices can allow for critical interculturality and decolonization by acknowledging the complex, fraught, and layered nature of interactions. The focus here is on the process of building "nests" where both growth and challenge are fostered, as a means toward moving toward a more equitable and just world.

References

Abes, E. S., Jones, S. R., & McEwen, M. K. (2007). Reconceptualizing the model of multiple dimensions of identity: The role of meaning-making capacity in the construction of multiple identities. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(1), 1–22.

Antal, A. B., & Friedman, V. J. (2008). Learning to negotiate reality: A strategy for teaching intercultural competencies. *Journal of Management Education, 32*(3), 363–386.

Arao, B., & Clemens, K. (2013). From safe spaces to brave spaces: A new way to frame dialogue around diversity and social justice. In L. M. Landreman (Ed.), *The art of effective facilitation: Reflections from social justice educators* (pp. 135–150). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Arieli, D., Friedman, V. J., & Agbaria, K. (2009). The paradox of participation in action research. *Action Research, 7*(3), 263–290.

Avineri, N. (2015). Nested interculturality, multiple knowledges, and situated identities through service-learning in language education. In J. M. Perren & A. J. Wurr (Eds.), *Learning the language of global citizenship: Strengthening service-learning in TESOL*. Champaign, IL: Common Ground Publishers.

Avineri, N. (2017). *Research methods for language teaching: Inquiry, process, and synthesis*. London, UK: Palgrave.

Avineri, N. (2019). The 'heritage narratives' of yiddish metalinguistic community members. In E. Falconi & K. Graber (Eds.), *Storytelling and narrative practice: Ethnographic approaches to the tales we tell*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill Publishers.

Avineri, N., Graham, L. R., Johnson, E. J., Riner, R. C., & Rosa, J. (Eds.). (2018). *Language and social justice in practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Avineri, N., & Perley, B. C. (2018). Mascots, name calling, and racial slurs: Seeking social justice through audience coalescence. In N. Avineri, L. R. Graham, E. J. Johnson, R. C. Riner, & J. Rosa (Eds.), *Language and social justice in practice* (pp. 147–156). New York, NY: Routledge.

Avineri, N., & Perren, J. (in press). Language testing in service-learning: A critical approach to socially-situated language-in-use. In S.-A. Mirhosseini & P. DeCosta (Eds.), *The sociopolitics of English language testing*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.

Bailey, C. (2007). *A guide to qualitative field research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bauman, R. (2004). *A world of others' words: Cross-cultural perspectives on intertextuality*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bell, L. A. (2007). Theoretical frameworks for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook* (pp. 3–15). London and New York: Routledge.

Bradbury-Huang, H. (2010). What is good action research? Why the resurgent interest? *Action Research, 8*(1), 93–109.

Briggs, C. L. (1986). *Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interviewer in social science research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bringle, R. C., Clayton, P. H., & Price, M. (2009). Partnerships in service learning and civic engagement. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement, 1*(1), 1–20.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2002). Campus-community partnerships: The terms of engagement. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 503–516.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist, 32*(7), 513–531.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bucholtz, M. (2001). The whiteness of nerds: Substandard English and racial markedness. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 11*(1), 84–100.

Butin, D. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice: The future of community engagement in higher education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.

Chavez, A. F., Guido-DiBrito, F., & Mallory, S. L. (2003). Learning to value the "other": A framework of individual diversity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(4), 453–469.

Clayton, P. H., Bringle, R. G., Senor, B., Huq, J., & Morrison, M. (2010). Differentiating and assessing relationships in service-learning and civic engagement: Exploitative, transactional, or transformational. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 16*(2), 5–21.

Cooperrider, D. L., Whitney, D., & Stavros, J. M. (2008). *Appreciative inquiry handbook for leaders of change* (2nd ed.). Brunswick, OH: Crown Custom Publishing.

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, 1989,* 139.

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*(3), 241–266.

Deardorff, D. K. (Ed.). (2009). *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DeCosta, P. I. (Ed.). (2015). *Ethics in applied linguistics research: Language researcher narratives*. New York, NY: Routledge.

De Fina, A., & Perrino, S. (2011). Introduction: Interviews vs. 'natural' contexts: A false dilemma. *Language in Society, 40,* 1–11.

Dervin, F. (2011). A plea for change in research on intercultural discourses: A 'liquid' approach to the study of the acculturation of Chinese students. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 6*(1), 37–52.

de Sousa, Santos B. (2014). *Epistemologies of the south: Justice against epistemicide*. New York: Routledge.

DeStigter, T. (1999). Public displays of affection: Political community through critical empathy. *Research in the Teaching of English, 33*(3), 235–244.

Dick, B. (2004). Action research literature: Themes and trends. *Action Research, 2*(4), 425–444.

Dorado, S., & Giles, D. E., Jr. (2004). Service-learning partnerships: Paths of engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 11,* 25–37.

Dugan, M. A. (1996). A nested theory of conflict. *A Leadership Journal: Women in Leadership, 1,* 9–20.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. (1996). *A practitioner's guide to reflection in service learning*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University.

Falconi, E., & Graber, K. (Eds.). (2019). *Storytelling and narrative practice: Ethnographic approaches to the tales we tell*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill Publishers.

Friedman, V. (2014). Negotiating reality: Intercultural communication as constructing social space. In S. Poutiainen (Ed.), *Theoretical turbulence in intercultural communication studies* (pp. 9–25). Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Gorski, P. (2008). Good intentions are not enough: A decolonizing intercultural education. *Intercultural Education, 19*(6), 515–525.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.

Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*(4), 421–443.

Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Holland, B. A. (2001). A comprehensive model for assessing service-learning and community-university partnerships. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2001*(114), 51–60.

Hua, Z. (2018). *Exploring intercultural communication: Language in action* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.

Jacoby, B., & Associates (Eds.). (2003). *Building partnerships for service-learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jameson, J., Clayton, P., & Jaeger, A. (2010). Community engaged scholarship as mutually transformative partnerships. In L. M. Harter, J. Hamel-Lambert, & J. L. Millesen (Eds.), *Participatory partnerships for social action and research* (pp. 259–277). Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.

Janke, E. M. (2008). *Shared partnership identity between faculty and community partners* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations Publishing (Order No. 3336046).

Johnson, A. G. (2001). *Privilege, power, and difference*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Kolb, D. A. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.

Kramsch, C., & Nolden, T. (1994). Redefining literacy in a foreign language. *Die Unterrichtspraxis, 27*(1), 28–35.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). The ideology of interculturality in Japanese language-in-education policy. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *30*(2), 20.1–20.16.

Martin, F., Pirbhai-Illich, F., & Pete, S. (2017). Beyond culturally responsive pedagogy: Decolonizing teacher education. In F. Pirbhai-Illich, S. Pete, & F. Martin (Eds.), *Culturally responsive pedagogy* (pp. 235–255). Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

McIntyre, L. (2018). *Post-truth*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McNiff, J. (2013). *Action research: Principles and practice* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Mitchell, T. D. (2008). Traditional vs critical service-learning: Engaging the literature to differentiate two models. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *14*(2), 50–65.

Nam, K., & Condon, J. (2010). The DIE is cast: The continuing evolution of intercultural communication's favorite classroom exercise. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 34*(1), 81–87.

Nero, S. (2009). Inhabiting the other's world: Language and cultural immersion for US-based teachers in the Dominican Republic. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 22*(3), 175–194.

Neururer, J., & Rhoads, R. A. (1998). Alternative spring breaking: Learning through community service. *NASPA Journal, 35*(2), 100–118.

Nunan, D., & Choi, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Language and culture: Reflective narratives and the emergence of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Palfrey, J. (2017). *Safe spaces, brave spaces: Diversity and free expression in education*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Palmer, D. K., & Menard-Warwick, J. (2012). Short-term study abroad for Texas preservice teachers: On the road from empathy to critical awareness. *Multicultural Education, 19*(3), 17–26.

Pennycook, A. (2017). *Posthumanist applied linguistics*. London and New York: Routledge.

Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2013). *The SAGE handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Remen, R. (1996). *Helping, fixing or serving?* [PDF file]. Retrieved from https://www.uc.edu/content/dam/uc/honors/docs/communityengagement/HelpingFixingServing.pdf.

Reyes Cruz, M. (2008). What if I just cite Graciela? Working toward decolonizing knowledge through a critical ethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry, 14*(4), 651–658.

Sagor, R. (2000). *Guiding school improvement with action research*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Schussler, D. L., & Knarr, L. (2013). Building awareness of dispositions: Enhancing moral sensibilities in teaching. *Journal of Moral Education, 42*(1), 71–87.

Stoecker, R., Tryon, E. A., & Hilgendorf, A. (Eds.). (2009). *The unheard voices: Community organizations and service learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Stringer, E. T. (2008). *Action research in education*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Torres, J. (Ed.). (2000). *Benchmarks for campus/community partnerships*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Tripp, D. (2012). *Critical incidents in teaching: Developing professional judgement*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Waheed, N. (2013). *Salt*. New York, NY: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Watling Neal, J., & Neal, Z. P. (2013). Nested or networked? Future directions for ecological systems theory. *Social Development, 22*(4), 722–737.

Welch, A. G., & Areepattamannil, S. (Eds.). (2016). *Dispositions in teacher education: A global perspective*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Wenger, E. (2011). *Communities of practice: A brief introduction* [PDF document]. Retrieved From https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/11736/A%20brief%20introduction%20to%20CoP.pdf?sequence%E2%80%B0=%E2%80%B01.

Wicks, P. G., & Reason, P. (2009). Initiating action research: Challenges and paradoxes of opening communicative space. *Action Research, 7*(3), 243–262.

Zigon, J. (2008). *Morality: An anthropological perspective*. New York, NY: Berg.

Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). Identity, context and interaction. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in talk* (pp. 87–106). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.