

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Exploring Counternarratives to Linguistic Privileging and Invisibility: Community Translingualism as a Mechanism for Resourcefulness

Toni Dobinson  | Sally Lamping  | Stephanie Dryden  | Julian Chen  | Paul Mercieca  | Sonja Kuzich 

School of Education, Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia, Australia

Correspondence: Toni Dobinson (t.dobinson@curtin.edu.au)

Received: 31 May 2024 | **Revised:** 11 December 2024 | **Accepted:** 16 December 2024

Funding: The project was funded by monies received from Lottery West by the City of Canning and redistributed to us. Application number 420173903.

Keywords: community translingualism | critical participatory action research (CPAR) | linguistic invisibility | linguistic privileging | resourcefulness

ABSTRACT

There is significant pressure on translingual communities, who draw upon and blend all the linguistic and semiotic resources with which they have come into contact (i.e., language, material objects, the built environment) to navigate linguistically inaccessible infrastructures in their new setting. We examined the role language plays within one Local Government Area (LGA) in Western Australia via a larger Critical Participatory Action Research (CPAR) project; re-visiting the politics of resourcefulness and focusing on examples of linguistic privileging and linguistic invisibility. The overall study included an initial needs analysis survey which enabled critical conversations around identified problems. These were further unpacked through data collected via interviews/focus groups; shadowing community leaders and LGA/not-for-profit employees in their contexts. This offered opportunities to document how stakeholders navigated or resolved known problems. The data was analysed iteratively and thematically to inform and expand conversations around potential collaborative efforts. This article focuses on the analysis of interview and focus group data in one LGA which highlighted systematised linguistic privileging of individuals who speak certain forms of English, and the rendering of community languages as invisible by the system. In response communities created resourceful spaces where collaborative semiosis licensed collective meaning making through the community's full spatial and translingual resources, enabling access to resources, utilisation of community-generated skills, sharing of local knowledge and fostering of recognition for individuals as agents in civic life, countering the linguistic invisibility they experienced. For institutions, such as LGAs, to catch up with communities, they need to recognise and sustain community translingualism as an essential resource. Our article outlines a viable framework for dismantling linguistic privileging and invisibility in favour of sharing language responsibility with translingual communities.

1 | Introduction

Australia is home to 250 ancestries and 350 languages, with 5.5 million people using a language other than English in their daily lives (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2021). The West Australian city of Perth has a population of two million people and 38 local government areas (LGAs) in its metropolitan area

(Western Australia Local Government Association 2019). Despite being one of the most remote cities in the world (Gill 2015), Perth has attracted the largest overseas-born population of any state in Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2016) and this is rising steadily, with migrant populations in some areas doubling in size over the last 10 years. An inevitable outcome of such migration and the coming together of various

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2025 The Author(s). *Diversity & Inclusion Research* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

backgrounds, contexts, and lived experiences, is the emergence of environments where individuals and communities can draw upon and blend the linguistic and semiotic resources with which they have come into contact, creating communities which are translingual (Canagarajah 2013). Translingualism is present in the way that language users draw on all codes available to them as part of their everyday repertoires. Users integrate borderless systems, or even parts of systems rather than distinct languages, utilising their full linguistic, semiotic, and spatial resources (Canagarajah 2013), including material objects and the built environment to facilitate everyday communication (Lee 2022). The translingual turn sees boundaries between languages simply being ‘the result of ideological invention and sedimentation’ with these boundaries having limited capacity to guide everyday communication in the absence of semiotic and spatial repertoires (Lee and Dovchin 2019, p. 1). While translingualism can support more nuanced interactions among community members, and greater accessibility to community resources, this community reality contradicts institutional policies and practices that continue to maintain monolingual ideologies, silencing linguistic resources like translingual practices and, instead, reinforcing bounded linguistic repertoires that favour some linguistic practices over others (Rosa and Flores 2023). This results in two potential outcomes: linguistic privileging, that separates and hierarchises languages and linguistic varieties for the purposes of maintaining power; and linguistic invisibility, which obscures authentic language practices through the institutional enforcement of monolingualism. To bridge this gap, services at the local level need to accommodate the linguistic assets that communities offer (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2021), but in many cases in Western Australia, this has not occurred. Additionally, the onset of Covid underscored the pre-existing and untenable burden on translingual communities to access, interpret, and use vital information from monolingual, mono/bimodal and print-based resources to survive (Lamping et al. 2024; Seale et al. 2022).

This article focuses on focus group and interview transcripts to report on the language strand drawn from a larger 4-year Critical Participatory Action Research (CPAR) (Fine and Torre 2021; Sandwick et al. 2018) study that included translingual community leaders, not-for-profit service providers, LGA employees, and our research team. The research, which began at the start of Covid in 2020, formed the basis of a community-driven engagement framework, which became a mechanism for co-learning across stakeholders throughout the project. The work has transformed practice within one LGA by privileging the knowledge and experience of translingual communities previously excluded from initiatives and strategic plans that impact them directly. There are 6000 translingual community members now participating in, or benefitting from, community-led activation of approximately 250 small and larger-scale community-driven projects, events, or initiatives across the LGA. Systemic change has also included stronger representation from translingual community members in city council and the opening of a community-designed intercultural centre that now serves the entire community.

The CPAR approach enabled iterative and reflective cross-stakeholder discussion and action around language access, which was a central and reoccurring problem in the overall

study. Much of the success of the community-driven engagement framework became centred around how the LGA and service agencies could recognise language access and visibility as a critical component for working sustainably with migrant communities. To explore this further, the language strand of this study draws from research on community translanguaging (Kim, Dorner, and Song 2021) to answer the following research questions:

1. How does institutional linguistic privileging and invisibility affect translingual communities in one LGA in Western Australia?
2. How are these communities supporting and sustaining community translanguaging in this LGA?

By first presenting focus group/interview data that focus on how linguistic privileging and linguistic invisibility impacted translingual communities who sought to engage with LGAs and community providers during our project, we underscore the role linguistic privilege/invisibility play in ‘the material and enduring challenges that marginalised communities face in conceiving of, and engaging in, the kinds of activism and politics that are likely to facilitate transformative change’ (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013, p. 265). We counter those examples with ones from community run initiatives to examine the possibilities in contexts where community translanguaging was sustained and supported, activating community skill sets, knowledge building, and recognition, which are the interdependent attributes of community resourcefulness (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013). We argue that these examples demonstrate the critical role community translanguaging plays in combatting language privileging and invisibility and providing sustainable, community-led engagement. We present these as models for future work in this area.

2 | Theoretical Underpinnings

2.1 | Colonisation

Linguistic injustice is at the heart of the challenges translingual communities experience when dealing with LGAs and community providers in Western Australia. Residual notions of colonisation underpin this injustice. Whereas in the past, colonisation imposed English practices by force, in more recent times, it has been perpetuated through institutions upholding English as the primary instrument for navigating systems. Institutional policy and practice enforce the restriction and peripheralization of other languages, making dialogue outside of set forms of language impossible by only privileging those who follow imposed linguistic rules (Veronelli 2015). English dominance in these systems has been theorised as English linguistic imperialism, where ‘English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages’ (Phillipson 1992, p. 47). In other words, English is used as a key dimension in sustaining and reproducing disparities between the elites and the dominated. Competence in English becomes the way that unequal distribution of services and resources is maintained and legitimised (Skutnabb-Kangas 2015).

The spread of English is central to global injustice and can engender exclusion, discrimination, racism and disadvantage (Rosa and Flores 2023). *Linguistic privileging*, that deliberately separates and hierarchises languages for the purposes of power and control, is an ongoing outcome of colonisation. Colonial discourses of language sustain the mindset that language is an identifying trait of an individual's membership and loyalty to the culture and values of a particular nation-state (Canagarajah 2013). Not only do such mindsets encourage monolingualism as the default expectation, but they also privilege a normative 'standard' English variety as being truly representative of group membership. Any individual who wields language according to this privileged norm enjoys a social status unattainable to those who do not speak the dominant language or language varieties, and this status intersects with the background of the speaker, with the monolingual 'standard' typically being categorised as spoken by those who are white and middle or upper class (Kroskirty 2021). Thus, individuals whose linguistic repertoires show signs of language contact through their migratory backgrounds, and through other intersectional attributes such as their ethnicity, class, or Global South origins, are vulnerable to being viewed as having inadequate English ability due to their 'non-standard' linguistic repertoires, regardless of their level of English competence (Rosa 2016). The superior hierarchical positioning of English and English varieties vis-à-vis other languages and varieties, therefore, spills over into the positioning of standard, so-called 'native speaker' varieties as superior to others (Pronskikh 2018). As Gallagher-Geurtsen (2007) pointed out, standard 'native' English speakers' experiences of linguistic privilege are so normalised that the language and cultures of anyone not in this group, that is, the world's majority, are consigned to invisibility. This essentially hidden privilege protects power systems that maintain the status of standard English, leading to linguistic gatekeeping that positions monolingual standard language speakers as the norm, with any speakers using varieties deviating from the norm being viewed as problematic, and hence, othered.

Translingual communities can also suffer from *linguistic invisibility*. They have their authentic language practices rendered invisible by 'a monolingual habitus' (Bourdieu 1977) or a 'monolingual mindset' (Clyne 2005). Ironically, while Global South migrants and refugees who reside in local communities often receive unwanted attention from the receiving community because of visible differences (Udah and Singh 2018), they are rendered completely invisible in terms of their language. Here, we see the terms 'standard' and 'nonstandard' play out in structural inequities that perpetuate othering practices. Often grouped together under the culturally and linguistically diverse (CaLD) label to acknowledge the language contact and translingualism inherent in these groups, this label becomes vulnerable to institutional quantifying of these groups as non-(standard) English speakers, that ultimately categorises all nonwhite translingual people together for engagement and reporting purposes. This linguistic silencing is part of a post-colonising landscape (Moreton-Robinson 2003), forcing translingual communities to self-resource and take action through community engagement and organising, but with limited access to the resources that enable sustainability (Uekusa and Matthewman 2022).

2.2 | Community Engagement, Translingualism, and Resourcefulness

Community engagement that is grounded in deliberative democratic theory (Kohler-Koch and Quittkat 2013; Levac and Wiebe 2020) includes an allegiance to 'envisioning alternatives to the asymmetrical, colonial status quo, and in imagining more democratic, just, and inclusive relations that can be manifested through public engagement' (Levac and Wiebe 2020, p. 9). This definition of community engagement aligns with Fraser's (2000) discussions of parity of participation, where full participation in social interaction is made possible through institutionalised recognition and redistribution of resources. MacKinnon and Derickson (2013) write that resourcefulness can be fostered in communities and in institutions where resources are accessible, skills recognised, local/cultural knowledge shared and built, and recognition possible. This enables the parity of participation, rendering historically marginalised individuals as integral parts of the social and economic fabric of communities (Fraser 2000). In reality, the situation in many marginalised communities is very different. LGAs, schools, and other community organisations often allocate resources in a top-down fashion and perpetuate Global North notions of community engagement that silence grassroots and culturally and linguistically just ways of working. Because those in these marginalised communities have never been recognised by these institutions, they are rendered invisible, and, as a result, resources are distributed or made accessible without their voices (Fraser 2000). An outcome of this is that communities often find themselves cut off from culturally or linguistically accessible or appropriate resources and networks within the larger infrastructure of a local government or city, struggling to access information, resources, and social networks that are required to make a way in a new place.

As a result, communities begin to form group networks to survive; pooling and allocating community-generated resources to assist in times of crisis (Ebersöhn et al. 2018). While Ebersöhn et al. (2018) establish that such acts, known as *flocking*, are a testament to the extraordinary resilience of some communities, our research indicates that it is often a response to austerity and inability to access resources that enable full participation in social and civic life (Lamping et al. 2024). Flocking occurs when government responses do not adequately cater for the needs of the community, causing an over reliance on community responses to address significant needs (Uekusa and Matthewman 2022). One common form of this self-resourcing within communities involves the provision of ad-hoc language assistance to address systemic monolingualism around access to social services, education, local government, and healthcare (Flores et al. 2012). This practice creates a significant burden for community members, who must be relied on to interpret critical advice that includes information around health and well-being, crisis response, or educational policies and practice. This ad-hoc care provided by communities themselves often goes unnoticed by the agencies or local governments that have bypassed adjustments to language access and inclusive policies in favour of an over-reliance on this community-based resource (Flores et al. 2012). In this effort to self-resource, communities often sustain languages and cultures through translingualism.

In this article, we unpack *community translingualism* as a practice that explicitly counteracts linguistic norms such as

linguistic privileging and linguistic invisibility. As previously mentioned, translanguaging consists of individuals integrating borderless linguistic systems, calling upon their full linguistic, semiotic, and spatial resources to achieve successful communication (Canagarajah 2013). This theorisation of how language occurs in interaction has also been conceptualised as ‘translanguaging’ (García 2009), ‘metrolinguism’ (Otsuji and Pennycook 2010), and ‘polylingualism’ (Jørgensen 2008), all of which recognise the ethos of fluid language usage to ‘transcend the boundaries between named languages, language varieties, and language and other semiotic systems’ (Wei 2018, p. 9). These theories predominantly focus on how individuals engage in fluid language usage; however, a vital and less explored aspect of translanguaging theory is in how communities function to decentre individual competency as the central driver in translanguaging. Community translanguaging, that draws on ‘community translanguaging’, as theorised by Kim, Dorner and Song (2021), achieves this by highlighting the ways communities can integrate language, engaging with a diverse range of multimodal and translanguaging repertoires as a way of fostering resourcefulness (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013). This expansion of translanguaging shifts the focus to how communities generate repertoires in a superdiverse world.

The coming together of people’s life experiences and multimodal identities in new or changing spatial contexts generates robust and networked ecologies, enabling deeper expressiveness of experiences and knowledge that support a sense of community (Dryden et al. 2021). Spaces that allow for the full expression of language resources through promoting linguistic visibility and reducing language disparities can assist in the formation of translanguaging community networks and community repertoires (Kim, Dorner, and Song 2021). Not only can translanguaging in these spaces foster the acceptance of combined language resources (Liu and Fang 2020), it can also increase collective agency and activism through languaging (Dryden et al. 2021; Kim, Dorner, and Song 2021; Toohey 2019). Community translanguaging facilitates community resourcefulness by dismantling borders, enabling the sharing of resources, local knowledge, skills, networks, and transcultural navigation for recent arrivals (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013; Tsarenko et al. 2022). We argue that local governments, cities, and social service organisations have much to learn from these practices, which could enable recognition and redistribution for translanguaging communities (Fraser 2000).

This article explores the implications of how community translanguaging can be incorporated as part of co-designed institutional policy that removes top-down evaluations of ‘relevant’ linguistic resources for meaning making. This is significant, because while translanguaging and its iterations such as translanguaging have been extensively studied in educational institutions (see García et al. 2017; Kim, Dorner, and Song 2021; Liu and Fang 2020), it has been neglected in the research of how government bodies also systemically contribute to such linguistic issues. The ethical implications of these structural barriers of monolingualism raise implicit questions about who belongs in the community. Such examinations of translanguaging communities are an important step in establishing how institutions need to meet the linguistic needs of these communities, if they wish to avoid the legitimisation and reproduction of

discriminatory attitudes, practices, and unequal access (Skutnabb-Kangas 2015).

2.3 | Research Design

In early 2020, a large LGA in Perth, Western Australia contacted the research team through Welcoming Cities, an organisation that brings together Australian LGAs, cities, towns, and municipalities around inclusivity and civic participation relating to immigrant populations (Welcoming Cities 2019). In the initial weeks of this study, it was clear the LGA, translanguaging community leaders, and not-for-profit service providers had faced several challenges in communicating with each other during the initial Covid lockdowns. The LGA and not-for-profit providers believed many communities had been cut off from critical information around pandemic safety, housing, food and amenities, social services, employment, and education during this time (Lamping et al. 2024). The CPAR approach was used to explore these issues across stakeholder groups, embedding observation, critical dialogue, and reflective action throughout this project, as part of the ongoing CPAR cycle (Sandwick et al. 2018; Fine and Torre 2021).

2.4 | Our Positionality

All non-Indigenous Australians are migrants because the country was never ceded. As a research team, we comprise first generation migrants to Australia, originating from the United Kingdom, United States, and Taiwan, as well as one researcher who was born in Australia. While our expertise as a research group includes four applied linguists and two educational researchers with extensive backgrounds in sustainable community-driven co-learning, our largely Global North positionality cannot be ignored.

2.5 | Participants and Recruitment

The study included translanguaging community leaders, not-for-profit service providers, LGA employees, and our research team, consisting of a total of 136 participants across one particular LGA from 2020 to 2024. The team recruited community leaders from translanguaging backgrounds, who speak two or more named languages, represented the most populous communities in the LGA, and had a history of community leadership and collaboration. Additionally, individuals who worked or volunteered for English language programs and spoke English as their first language, along with people who had paid roles within the LGA and social service organisations were also recruited. See Table 1 for more information about the backgrounds of the six participants featured in this article.

2.6 | Data Collection and Analysis

As part of our larger study, we used an initial stakeholder-designed needs analysis survey, which included questions about community strengths and challenges during the initial

TABLE 1 | Participant backgrounds.

Name	Gender	Linguistic resources	Community role
Robert	Male	English	Not-for-profit service provider to community
Simar	Male	Punjabi, Urdu, English	Community leader
Zaw	Female	Burmese, English	Community leader
Sarah	Female	Arabic, English	Community leader
Aaban	Male	Hazaragi/Dari, English	Community leader
David	Male	English	English language program volunteer

**FIGURE 1** | Focus group discussions.

lockdowns, but also offered opportunities for respondents to make suggestions and identify reoccurring or pre-Covid challenges; this aligned with the observation portion of the CPAR cycle. This data was then used to inform the next phase (critical dialogue), which included four focus groups to engage stakeholders in discussions related to survey data as part of comprehensively mapping the challenges. Figure 1 shows a focus group.

To further explore these challenges and better understand strengths, we engaged with additional observation, establishing eight shadowing opportunities, where the research team visited participants (translingual community members, not-for-profit-service providers and volunteers, and LGA employees) in their settings to document examples of engagement that could be represented to all the stakeholders. The shadowing opportunities allowed us to create profiles of community engagement practices by collecting data through photographs, video/audio-recorded semi-structured interviews, and written field notes (Figures 2 and 3).

Data from the shadowing sessions was then used as part of the CPAR cycle, to inform further critical discussions, reflection, and action by drawing from lived examples of community initiatives that responded to identified challenges. Figure 4 shows an example of the mapping of reflective action across stakeholders.

**FIGURE 2** | Shadowing.

These three methods of data collection allowed us to engage in a CPAR cycle that enabled extended visits with stakeholders and knowledge sharing around challenges and opportunities (Lamping et al. 2024).

We analysed focus group/interview data thematically to establish challenges, strengths, and patterns of sustainable engagement across communities (Braun and Clarke 2012). We utilised a Miles and Huberman (1994) framework that goes through the phases of data reduction, data display, conclusion drawing and verification. Through thematic analysis we identified several refrains in the focus group and shadowing data related to the language strand, including language access, language status, and instances of community translingualism as a mechanism for facilitating resourcefulness. Using MacKinnon and Derickson's (2013) four components of resourcefulness—activation of skills/technical skills, accessible resources, local/cultural knowledge shared and built, and recognition made possible, we use this data to contrast the antiquated institutionalised practices of linguistic privileging with the dynamic reality of everyday Australia, where community translingualism is a mechanism for realising community resourcefulness.

Our study has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee (HRE2020-72827) in our institution. All participants reviewed an information statement about the project and gave informed consent to participate in the project,



FIGURE 3 | Shadowing.



FIGURE 4 | Reflective action.

including consent for the use of their image in photographs. For ethics consideration, all participant names have been replaced by pseudonyms to protect identity and confidentiality.

2.7 | Findings

While we had several data points for the overall study (survey, interviews/focus groups, field notes recorded while

shadowing on site), the scope of this article is analysis of the interview/focus group data obtained while shadowing participants on-site. A discussion of all the data points would far exceed the scope of this article. These data are presented below to underscore trends in the overall study. The findings are divided into those pertaining to the LGAs tendency towards linguistic privileging and lack of recognition of migrant's languages (linguistic invisibility) followed by the response by communities in terms of community translanguaging.

2.8 | Activation of Skills/Technical Skills

2.8.1 | Linguistic Privileging and Deskillling

Communities' capacity to organise and influence systemic change is largely dependent on their collective skills and technical abilities (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013). In our study, however, we found several examples of collective community skills and technical abilities that went unrecognised by the LGA and wider community because of linguistic privileging. There was evidence in community members' stories that both the LGA and associated community providers implicitly practised linguistic privileging and deskillling. An example of this was found in one excerpt of an interview with Zaw, a Burmese-Australian community member who also has a doctorate obtained in English and works as a senior academic at a local university (Extract 1). She describes meeting with members of the LGA to discuss ways of connecting more efficiently with translingual communities other than through their websites.

community member suggested the problem was not with the website, and its mode of communication, but with Zaw's command of English (Line 5). The community member continues the gatekeeping initiated by the LGA and perpetuates 'standards' for English, accusing Zaw of not being able to read in English and seemingly conflating 'non-nativeness' with poor English literacy and a lack of knowledge about communication strategies, inferiorising Zaw's linguistic repertoire. Zaw goes on to describe how this community member interrupted her continually as she tried to explain, and how she felt the individual was prejudiced towards her. She also makes a general suggestion that the LGA was perhaps not used to seeing Asian women speaking out ('Uh, I think why they are not used to ...with you know ...like the Asian woman ...like speaking out quite a lot...'). The interviewer quizzes Zaw further in Extract 2.

Extract 2

#	Discussant	Interview transcript
6	Interviewer	So do you think there's work to be done with the larger community in [LGA] on how to come together as a real community and value everyone's perspectives and opinions and language backgrounds?
7	Zaw	I think (pause)
8	Zaw	Not because of the the language ...I think it's something to do with the perception
9	Interviewer	That's exactly right. That's a really good point... Linguistic racism...

Extract 1

#	Discussant	Interview transcript
1	Zaw	Ah, I say, you know, having all the information on the website is not enough anymore
2	Interviewer	Alright
3	Zaw	Uh, ...like you know, people are not pooling the information anymore. Information provider needs to use some sort of like a push up communication channel to reach to the community member. That was my suggestion.
4	Interviewer	Hmmm
5	Zaw	Ah, someone was like, Oh, that's not the problem with the City. I remember that you can't read ...you can't read English and so you can't complain about the communication

In Line 1 Zaw tells how she questions the effectiveness of conveying information to communities through the LGA's website, an insight she has from many years working with communities and with university students in online learning contexts. She qualifies her observation and then suggests an alternative approach, 'a push up communication channel' (Line 3) that sends out communication through platforms such as WhatsApp or Direct Messaging. She recounts how at one meeting another translingual

The interviewer's question (Line 6) hints at the need for the larger community to be more inclusive and respectful of the minority community's views and language. After pausing to think, no doubt trying to choose her words carefully, to really pinpoint what is going on in the situation, Zaw proposes that the language is not the issue (Line 8, 'Not because of the language ...I think it's something to do with the perception'). Rather, the issue is the negative assumptions expressed by the meeting participant toward her because English is not her first

language, a phenomenon widely noted in the research (Hanzlíková and Skarnitzl 2017; Rosa and Flores 2023). Because Zaw has a doctorate and a comprehensive level of skills and knowledge about online communication platforms and community engagement, she feels that the community member is prejudiced towards the variety of English that she speaks or is simply making assumptions about her capacity to understand English because it is not her first language. This extract demonstrates the perception even by migrants themselves, that Zaw's migrant background means her English and knowledge are insufficient or lower status (Palmer 2011).

2.9 | Accessible Language Resources

2.9.1 | Linguistic Invisibility

Linguistic privilege is often upheld by institutional efforts to flatten or silence linguistic difference. MacKinnon and Derickson (2013) discuss access to material resources in their framework as a critical component to resourcefulness, articulating the strategic role material inequality and maldistribution plays in communities' capacities to thrive. In this article, we define language resources as comprised of the social networks that enable meaning-making across, and within, language groups and also the material resources that enable access to the dominant language. Extract 3 comes from Robert, an Australian-born manager of an English language program at an associated community provider institution. Robert discusses the impact access to interpreters as a resource had on his students' abilities to continue to learn during Covid, highlighting the way these community languages are overlooked, dismissed, and rendered invisible even in contexts designed to support these communities through language education. While this has been a longstanding issue with communities, Covid particularly exacerbated its impact.

Extract 3

In Line 2, Robert makes it clear in his response to the interviewer's question in Line 1 that a dichotomy exists according to the learners' linguistic repertoires. While some students managed to engage in the dominant discourse with the educational institution during Covid related lockdowns, those who did not have a sufficiently high level of English and were unable to use their own first language to successfully access community services due to the community provider not using interpreter services, were a concern. Such disregard for individuals who require language assistance to comprehend important information ties in with monolingual mindsets that position individuals with diverse language repertoires as lacking an Australian identity (Hatoss 2019), and therefore language or interpreting assistance barely even registers as a consideration. This places more stress on a community to self-resource this vital assistance. As Robert outlines, such thinking alienated the English language learners who needed the most help of all during the global pandemic.

This finding supports a view that monolingualism is central within Australian society fostering a lack of recognition for individuals who have a range of linguistic resources outside of English and making their languages invisible. This entrenched monolingualism that legitimises only English usage can promote the perception that it is not the responsibility of organisations to accommodate individuals' linguistic diversity, even when those individuals cannot interact effectively in the dominant visible language. This impedes these individuals' systemic access to material resources and can result in their social exclusion and disempowerment (Dobinson et al. 2024). The extract also demonstrates the role intersectionality plays in compounding injustice for those who require language assistance. MacKinnon and Derickson (2013) argue that unlike resilience, resourcefulness is material and relational and dependent upon access to the same resources afforded to the wealthiest communities. In our study, resourcefulness was dependent upon access to soft resources (time, social networks and capital) and hard resources (language materials, education, transportation), all of which were connected to linguistic, social, and economic status (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013). The gatekeeping of language and technical

#	Discussant	Interview transcript
1	Interviewer	And how would you say that a whole kind of issue of support and community kind of getting together has changed since COVID came or the same?
2	Robert	... we did manage to keep a fair proportion of them [migrants] engaged, but with our really low-level students we were, um, concerned, not just because we could not engage them with the study, but they, uh, that with COVID other parts of [community provider] are shut down and they do not have interpreters anyway which is one of my big issues
3	Interviewer	Mmmm... Hmmm...
4	Robert	So that they do not have any way for low level clients to engage with the services like the jobs and skill centre, for example, ... there is no interpreter, th-that was a concern because without- without, um, interpreters, um, and they cannot go face to face.

resources Robert describes is a longstanding issue in translingual communities, made more publicly visible by the pandemic. In our study, the pressure to self-resource language and technical training so that communities could access social services, distance education, and crisis support, was extreme during the pandemic, underscoring the ways these ad-hoc services often fill gaps where resources are unavailable or inaccessible (Uekusa and Matthewman 2022).

2.10 | Local and Cultural Knowledge

2.10.1 | Homogenising and Silencing Local Knowledge

Being able to bring together collective life experiences that can inform the transition of new arrivals and young community members is an essential form of knowledge building (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013). It is also a strong component of community translingualism, where communities' individual and shared experiences become a collective repertoire from which the community draws (Kim, Dorner, and Song 2021). Systemic language practices, however, often serve to homogenise translingual communities into one community, rendering the cultures and knowledges of individual communities invisible. This practice can limit communities' opportunities to effectively use their shared repertoires to facilitate access to additional resources.

Zaw drew attention to the impact homogenisation has on communities when she expressed frustration about one event organised by a community provider institution. She had specifically requested that she be placed as an interpreter with new-to-country Burmese speakers in a neighbouring LGA, due to her awareness of their language needs. However, this request was ignored, potentially due to ongoing issues with the LGA requiring community members to work on its behalf with communities that are only within its boundaries. This meant that Zaw was required to speak to new-to-country people in her own LGA but not Burmese speakers. In Extract 4, she describes being paired with a Sudanese community member who speaks very little English and attempting to use translingual techniques, 'Of course I can't speak Sudanese, and we cannot get the translation. So, we were drawing picture to be able to fill the form for her and for her family, right?'. She goes on to explain what happens and her feelings about it.

Extract 4

#	Discussant	Interview transcript
1	Zaw	I can't speak her language ...she can't speak my language and we can't speak...She can't speak English either
2	Interviewer	So what your saying is just because you're "culturally and linguistically diverse", they're putting everybody together
3	Zaw	Yeah
4	Zaw	Yeah very worrying. And another thing is like observing how they doing. I just feel like just only ticking the boxes exercise for the government agency.

The situation is exacerbated by Zaw's perception that this grouping was merely for convenience, not for the real benefit of the participants; just a 'ticking the boxes exercise for the government agency' (Line 4). There seems to have been no attempt on the part of the LGA to explain the rationale for the groupings to participants. Instead, all individuals who did not speak English as their first language were grouped together, regardless of their stories and experience. This linguistic invisibility demonstrates a lack of acknowledgement of linguistic diversity and a devaluing of languages other than English, to the extent that different language groups were paired and expected to communicate with few resources, placing everyone at the same level. It appears to run with an expectation that all individuals in Australia should be able to speak English and therefore no provisions need to be made for first languages. This is seen by Zaw as administrative box ticking and lacking recognition of what migrants can bring to communities. As Zaw adds, 'Yeah, it's not like how we could provide this. The best service as possible to the community...We even need to define the meaning of inclusiveness'. Lack of inclusivity in this instance not only prevented the individuals at the event from establishing meaningful connections, but it hindered their progress in navigating their new communities because it silenced local knowledge, leaving communities unable to inform and guide each other through their collective experiences (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013).

2.11 | Misrecognition and Status

2.11.1 | Subjugated Status

Recognition underpinned the entire language strand of this study, demonstrating that without language recognition, the other interrelated components of MacKinnon and Derickson's (2013) resourcefulness were impossible to enact. Language recognition in this context means full recognition of one's language(s), and language use, as equal to those who hold linguistic power in English speaking contexts. Through that recognition, communities have equal access to the resources that are required for full participation in society (Fraser 2000). In the context of our study, and Australia at large, recognition is the central driver for justice in pluralistic contexts; the institutionalised values which uphold 'native' English and render all non-nativised forms of English invisible also render

certain people invisible. Participants in the study described how linguistic privileging contributed to misrecognition and deskilling, locking them out of certain paid opportunities in organisations where they were filling significant gaps as volunteers (Lamping et al. 2024).

Deskilling stems from colonial forces which feed the tendency of those who inhabit the Global North, and speak

Robert, the manager of the English language program at a local community provider institution. He suggests that certain teachers in his institution tend to treat their adult English as an Additional Language/Dialect (EAL/D) learners like children, with language challenges being synonymous with cognitive challenges (Martínez 2018):

Extract 5

#	Discussant	Interview transcript
1	Interviewer	So do you notice any kind of difference of teacher or is it more or less the same attitude everywhere?
2	Robert	Um, I think it was a slight, well, I think, when- yeah. A slightly different one. I think... one of the ones that I'm, um, uh, I'm concerned about h-here in [community provider] is that, um, uh, that teachers have this mindset that, not all of them, I mean, just some that think they're children. You know, they treat them like children, rather than adults who can function perfectly well on their own language and culture, but they just don't have the English to- to convey their meanings, Um, so, I did a training course recently where, um, I'd- I ran on, um, visible thinking, um. We did the "See Think Wonder" activity, and one of the, you know, if you know that activity, yeah?
3	Interviewer	Uh-hmm, uh-hmm.
4	Robert	Um, where, um, one of the teachers, uh, we've got to the wonder stage where I was running it through the class to show the teachers, to show them how to do it, and they go, "What wonder? My students don't wonder." and I was like "What?"
5	Interviewer	[laughter]
6	Robert	I couldn't believe it. It was, uh... Yeah, so that- I mean that- that mindset we have to get away from as well. Th-that, you know, um, in fact, in the training course we're doing, you know, to them, we've got something in particular, to look at that one because I think they often have this idea of, they don't know the difference of adult teaching and teaching children.
7	Interviewer	Right. Or they see a, you know, lack of English as lack of consciousness.
8	Robert	Yeah.
9	Interviewer	Was that different in ELICOS or is it similar?
10	Robert	Oh there were some of that there still, there was some of that. Um, it wasn't quite as pronounced I think, because the ELICOS students came in generally stronger in English and our um, you know, from middle class backgrounds and they were, you know, they'd- they'd been in classrooms.

English as their first language, to infantilise those speaking English as their additional language, conflating perceived language competency with qualifications, experience, or knowledge (Spack 2006). This contributes to systemic values that perpetuate misrecognition. Rosa and Flores (2023) argue that this is a 'co-naturalisation' of race and linguistic discourses which serves to 'position particular populations as less than fully human and in need of perpetual containment and (re)mediation' (p. 105). Extract 5 is another excerpt from

In Line 1 the interviewer tries to ascertain if the teachers at Robert's provider institution all have similar attitudes to their students, to which Robert replies in Line 2 that attitudes vary but that there is definitely a prevalent mindset amongst those teachers on migrant programs. They believe they are teaching children who are not only unable to use English, the privileged language, but, by extension, therefore, have no command of language at all, rendering them languageless (Rosa 2016). Moreover, the

apparent lack of English is melded with a lack of intelligence, critical thinking and natural curiosity as suggested by Palmer (2011), with teachers proposing that EAL/D students cannot ‘wonder’ (Line 4). Robert confirms (Line 6) the teachers’ lack of capacity to distinguish between teaching children and teaching adults takes on a discriminatory overtone. In Line 10 Robert observes that it is the social status of the students, namely, their socio-economic backgrounds which prompts such treatment by teachers, underscoring the role intersectionality plays in misrecognition.

2.12 | Community Responses

2.12.1 | Recognising Community Language Repertoires Through Choir

While linguistic privileging and linguistic invisibility permeated the challenges translingual communities faced in this study, there was also evidence of this situation being redressed from the ground up, at least in terms of community translingualism. Local communities were forming initiatives and inviting local languages into activities such as community choirs. One such choir group specifically recruited EAL/D learners to sing in multiple languages as well as English in one volunteer community organisation. In Extract 6, David, an English-speaking New Zealand-born choir leader, now living in Australia for over 20 years, described the motivation for translingual community members to join their local choir, with language becoming a key part of the choir activities.

Extract 6

#	Discussant	Interview transcript
1	Interviewer	Is it challenging? Uhm, like, as-, we’re all-, I mean I was wondering about like, the language differences. So when you’re up there trying to teach them, uhm, different songs or harmonizing or whatever. Is it ever difficult because of the language barrier?
2	David	And so we deliberately mix up the-the songs that are[device noise] part English and -
3	Interviewer	Mmm...Hmm
4	David	-part world music because we want it to be fun
5	Interviewer	Yeah
6	David	So when we, uh, [device noise] started teaching, which was accidental, but, “Assalamu alaikum”..Uhm.. “peace be with you”
7	Interviewer	Mmm
8	David	And, uhm, and they were, uhm, correcting our pronunciation
9	David [later in the interview]	So giving them the opportunity the to sing [inaudible]. I would just think. “Well, hey I’ve got my own language”

In Lines 2 and 4, David explains how the choir mix languages together in the songs, engaging in intentional translingualism (García et al. 2017) to make it fun. This is an example of how a space and context of a choir can bring communities together to exchange and share a common repertoire (song) unified through their life experiences (Kim, Dorner, and Song 2021). Community translingualism emerged alongside the incorporation of world music, encouraging the choir to engage in translingualism (Line 6). Multimodality made the community languages more visible while retaining the dominant language (English) in some songs. It brought a cross section of communities together in a shared experience, giving previously marginalised community members an opportunity to shine and be confident enough to correct the choir master and other choir members on the pronunciation of their languages (Line 8 ‘And, uhm, and they were, uhm, correcting our pronunciation’). David’s stance that being able to use your own language is a basic human right (Line 9 ‘I would just think. “Well, hey I’ve got my own language”’) provides a case for recognition and redistribution, where a resource is made flexible to enable the exchange of community knowledge. Such situations allow for the utilisation of people’s skills, where members hold equal status and their linguistic resources are integrated and valued (Fraser 2000; MacKinnon and Derickson 2013).

2.12.2 | Community Efforts to Counter Linguistic Invisibility

Despite the perpetuation of language privileging and the rendering of community languages as invisible by the LGA, communities came together to counter this response by providing ad-hoc support. Simar, a local Punjabi community member, describes his work in Extract 7.

Extract 7

#	Discussant	Interview transcript
1	Interviewer	Can you tell me how <name of community organisation> got started?
2	Simar	I moved here in 2011 and right away my house got broken into. The day I moved in. I started a neighbourhood watch program which slowly grew and spread. We were a close-knit group. When there was a problem, we would just call each other. Then, WhatsApp? got started and we got a WhatsApp group for the neighbourhood watch. Everyone was able to communicate with each other on the group text. There were about 150 people in the WhatsApp? group. But it was only emergencies and requests for help. . . . Then, I started to think that there might be a way to use Facebook in a way to bring the community together outside of emergencies and those calls for help. So, I started the Facebook group <name of community organisation>. You have to live in the City of X to join it, but I let people in from neighbouring communities also. We started posting on there about meet and greets, local issues, general info, and bring a plate to share nights that could bring the community together. We have about 525 people in that group now.
3	Interviewer	So, did things change or did you face any new challenges during COVID isolation?
4	Simar	Not really a lot of changes. I used the Facebook page to share important information and we did have some issues with communicating with people in local languages. So, I asked <name of individual who works for the LGA> to get me some help with those translations and we were able to start posting information about the lockdown in several local languages. We have a large Punjabi population- a group of men who like to come to the park and sit together under the trees. I have a picture of them after we were able to put the information up in their language- they are all sitting together 1.5 meters apart. Still able to be together, but following the guidelines.

Simar describes a simple progression from WhatsApp to Facebook based on patterns he observed within the community. Because the infrastructure for community connection was already established before Covid, Simar indicates that while there were few changes, he was able to identify 'issues with communicating with people in local languages.' The Facebook group was used as a platform for what Kim and Song (2019) define as 'collaborative meaning-making,' drawing together social relationships and multiple meaning making resources to enable a 'communicative ecology' (p. 268). It became a resource that used community translanguaging to connect individuals through many forms of English and additional languages.

In these interactions, Simar could clearly see the issues individuals were having interpreting information about lockdowns without translated materials. He was able to use his contacts within the LGA to provide these translations, which he could then link on the community Facebook page. This is an example of how a free and common social networking platform like Facebook can de-stratify access to important materials, enabling resourcefulness through community translanguaging (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013). In this instance, communities identified a need and provided the translated materials for the City; the City then facilitated the distribution to networks outside of the Facebook page. This example of community translanguaging informed socially just cross-stakeholder action

in crisis and served to reconnect a group of Punjabi men who had previously come together to sit in the park. Posting the information on lockdowns in their language enabled them to reconvene while also following the Covid guidelines. This shows how language access to one resource in a community fosters resourcefulness in other connected ways, making way for these communities to continue to strengthen social and material connections (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013).

2.12.3 | Community Recognition of Skills and Knowledge

Community-based examples of skill and knowledge recognition were also plentiful in the study. Participants frequently discussed how they worked with community members to activate their skills and experiences by creating opportunities for community translanguaging. One such example was offered by Sarah, who arrived in Australia as a refugee after several years as a displaced person in Lebanon. As a torture survivor, she has found ways to heal and help her community recover by providing community education that draws from the skills and expertise she acquired before displacement. The ways she enables community translanguaging as a way of helping her community realise its resourcefulness in skills and expertise can be seen in Extract 8.

Extract 8

#	Discussant	Interview transcript
1	Interviewer	What would you like to see your community do in the next 5 years?
2	Sarah	My dream I wanna do, you know, café? Maybe and maybe 'cause so many just have men. You can make it one just for women and start working inside and maybe sewing also you can also if can women sewing you know, so we can share and this my dream and if I do this, I'm very happy.
3	Interviewer	Like a community apprentice program? So, would you be teaching people how to cook? How to organise a menu?
4	Sarah	I think so. This event I'm start now have a group who come I want teaching how to cook and people how to prepare the table.
5	Interviewer	Is this just for women?
6	Sarah	Oh no no, we have man also. Yeah it's mixed people from India, from Japan, Australian and different people. We want to start to do this in a restaurant because I do this in a restaurant and finished over there (reference to her home country).
7	Interviewer	So what language do you use when running the workshops?
8	Sarah	English. It's hands on and you know, I'm explained to some people in Arabic. Also is very good because we helping people talking and we see when I meet people the problems. One told me she worked 22 years in restaurant in her country and still until now no Certificate 1 study. Oh my God, this killed me. How many years she don't know how to . . . her husband goes to work. What can you do? You stay home just crying and no work? Community is good because if something inside you can share everything clearly.

In Extract 8, Sarah highlights the skills and experience activated in the contexts she facilitates, contexts where people from many language backgrounds come together across language groups to focus on an activity together, using their spatial, linguistic, and cultural repertoires to make meaning in a very local way (Pennycook 2010). By offering activities that draw from members' knowledge, skills, and interests, she takes the focus off language as the prerequisite for full participation in a community and, instead, recentres the human in this endeavour, activating their 'strategic agency' (Kim, Dorner, and Song 2021, p. 295). In Line 6, she indicates that the current cooking group she facilitates includes a range of language groups, which she brings together by sharing her own restaurant experience. In Line 8, she indicates that while the platform is English, she sometimes uses Arabic. Non-Arabic speakers are free to use their full repertoires to engage in the activities as well, providing another example of strategic community translanguaging. A wide range of participants' skills and knowledge are recognised in addition to their linguistic capacities, which are collectively resourced through her projects (Kim, Dorner, and Song 2021). She also reflects in Line 8 on the issues community members often face because of isolation and lack of opportunities to use their skills as ways into learning additional languages: 'One told me she worked 22 years in a restaurant in her country and still until now no Certificate 1 study.' This individual had a lifetime of restaurant experience but was isolated from employment and otherwise housebound because her qualifications and skillsets were not recognised.

While Sarah works to counteract these instances through establishing opportunities for community translanguaging, the broader devaluation of migrants' previous work experience is evident, especially for those acquiring their work experience in the Global South. As a result, these migrants

are deskilled and their expertise wasted (Leung 2017). For resourcefulness to flourish in these contexts, institutionalised devaluing and deskilling needs to be disrupted, but, as MacKinnon and Derickson (2013) argue, this is impossible if communities are not able to use their skills and knowledge in the wider context. Sarah's efforts are only one example of how this practice is counteracted by communities themselves, but access to power networks, and conditions that offer individuals like Sarah a role in decision making, continues to be limited.

2.12.4 | Activating Local Knowledge Through Community Translanguaging

The LGA's homogenisation of translanguaging communities strips these communities of an initial opportunity to dialogue and build knowledge that can then be shared and reduces their capacity to generate their own resources and networks to connect with others (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013). In contrast to the practices Zaw discusses in Extract 4, examples exist of community leaders drawing from local knowledge and providing contexts for knowledge building to occur through community translanguaging on numerous occasions. An example of community leaders drawing from local knowledge through community translanguaging is outlined by Aaban, a community leader for the Afghan-Hazara community in the LGA. Aaban describes the work he is doing, not only in his own cultural and linguistic community, but in multicultural and translanguaging communities generally (Extract 9). He stresses how important it is to have a bottom-up approach which includes all community members drawing from their resources to make meaning and build knowledge around shared challenges, emphasising the connections between language and cultural knowledge.

Extract 9

#	Discussant	Interview transcript
1	Interviewer	So what kinds of challenges do you face in the work you do in the community?
2	Aaban	...we have a language school for children. If they have not enrolled in English we also help them. Because some people who just come to Australia recently, we are helping them. Also, we want our children should be connected to the culture. Because Australia is a multicultural country. We teach them the language.
3	Interviewer (later in the interview)	[So] they're also establishing that professional network. So using people in strategic places to broaden the network to include additional people?
4	Aaban	So, we need to do more of better work when it comes to outreach with CaLD communities. And having diverse faces, especially in the mental health field. I work in a mental health field and support and there's a lack of diversity, lack of...I get members of the CaLD community saying, ok, I have to say but it's a white kind of Caucasian and we need to include other bilingual people. Just diverse faces...

Aaban emphasises the importance of supporting language development and maintenance, both in terms of supporting new migrants with the dominant privileged language of English and helping community members retain strong ties with first language, knowledge, and culture (Line 2). In Line 4 he emphasises the need to have better 'outreach' than currently exists, indicating that LGAs and associated community providers are not tackling the problems that exist in this space effectively. Representation by translingual community members ('diverse faces') is needed urgently to stem linguistic invisibility, especially in the mental health portfolios of these institutions. Aaban's work shows access to resources is not only connected to the ways communities are able to share local knowledge, but also dependent on how their skills and knowledge are recognised and used in the larger network. Skill recognition would increase the number of translingual individuals working in these fields and mirror the reality of pluralistic societies, offering opportunities for organisations like LGAs and social services to share more effectively in the care for communities.

3 | Discussion

Our study set out to address the research questions: 1. How does institutional linguistic privileging and invisibility affect translingual communities in one LGA in Western Australia? 2. How are these communities supporting and sustaining community translingualism in this LGA?

We can see from the findings that linguistic privileging and invisibility affect translingual community members in this particular LGA. Community members feel they are not being valued by the LGA for their skills, contributions, and knowledge even when they speak English proficiently and have advanced degrees of higher education. We found several

examples of collective community skills and technical abilities that went unrecognised by the LGA and wider community because of implicit and explicit, conscious or unconscious linguistic privileging (Davila 2011; Hall and Carlson 2016; Rosa and Flores 2017) and de-skilling based on the hierarchical positioning of English, as well as perceptions that people who speak English as an additional language are inferior to those who have it as their first language as Zaw told us 'Not because of the the language ...I think it's something to do with the perception' (Hanzliková and Skarnitzl 2017; Pronskikh 2018; Rosa 2016; Rosa and Flores 2023). In ways originally described by Lippi-Green (2012) in her work on language, ideology and discrimination, participants spoke of facing pre-conceived ideas about the way people in certain social categories perform linguistically (Deutschmann and Steinvall 2020) with these ideas extending beyond stereotyping of language to linking language with competence (Fiske, Cuddy, and Glick 2007) and intelligence (Shapiro 2014). Participants reported feeling inferior due to their perceptions that those speaking the privileged language viewed them as inferior due to their linguistic capacity in the dominant language. In some cases, this mindset had also been adopted by translingual migrants themselves as documented by other researchers (Chaparro 2019; García-Mateus 2020), showing the powers of colonialism and reflecting the fact that while Australia has become more multilingual its policies and institutions have become more assimilationist (Schalley et al. 2015).

In addition, participants felt their own community languages continue to be institutionally subjugated and rendered invisible (Dobinson et al. 2024) with their lived experiences very different to that of 'white', English speaking Australians in the same community. Robert told us how those migrants who did not have a sufficiently high level of English were unable to use their own first language to successfully access community services because of a lack of information in their first language. The

entrenched monolingual mindset in Australian communities alluded to by Clyne (2005) seems to be alive and well in the LGA we researched with evidence to suggest this permeates other LGAs and most Australian institutions (Liddicoat 2016). Participants spoke about being grouped together under the umbrella of 'diversity' due to their perceived inability to speak the dominant language rather than grouped by their own languages. This broadbrush approach instilled feelings of invisibility at both a linguistic and personal level with participants feeling their languages were de-valued. The expectation seemed to be that migrants would all speak in English and those who followed these imposed linguistic rules would be privileged as a result (Veronelli 2015). By homogenising and silencing local languages and knowledges migrant communities' capacity to generate their own resources and connect with others in their own language networks is diminished (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013). It is obvious that there is limited appreciation by the LGA and associated community providers of the need to support multifaceted engagement through comprehensive approaches that recognise and sustain linguistic diversity.

Despite individual and institutionalised efforts to silence and flatten their languages, knowledges and cultures, however, we found communities themselves showed remarkable agency in pulling together to support and sustain through community translanguaging. We observed two-way learning and a reversal of roles and power structures as communities came together through choir, not only introducing their own languages to the choir but teaching their languages to the monolingual choir leaders, overturning the linguistic silencing characteristic of a post-colonising landscape (Moreton-Robinson 2003). In response to lived experiences of feeling vulnerable and isolated, community members took the initiative to set up Facebook pages incorporating local languages to facilitate further outreach and strengthen social and material connections between community members (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013). They enlisted their spatial, linguistic, and cultural repertoires to communicate in their own local way (Pennycook 2010) and utilised these repertoires beyond their original functions of providing a sense of safety to shared activities such as cooking and sewing. While some literature has described migrant parents being concerned and doubtful about re-enforcing non-mainstream community languages in a context where English language ability decides academic prospects (Eisenclas and Schalley 2019), community members actively promoted their languages through community initiatives such as language classes.

In short, communities were seen to be shouldering the load for many initiatives in language maintenance and community translanguaging. While bottom-up culturally and linguistically inclusive ways of working are to be applauded, however, there is the danger of community members being exploited or overburdened while adding to, or creating, new resources which could be managed more comprehensively and inclusively through institutional change. Addressing this requires LGAs and community providers to evidence translanguaging as characteristic of Australian identity through institutional bending and resourcing that positions these community efforts as sustainable models for enabling full community participation.

4 | Conclusion: The Politics of Resourcefulness and Community Translingualism

Across this study, we found evidence of ongoing language privileging and the rendering of community languages as invisible within the LGA that we researched. These tensions also point to the existence of linguistic privileging and linguistic invisibility across institutions in the Western Australian context. However, we also uncovered initiatives developed at the ground level that bypassed dominant ideologies and, instead, established simple frameworks by which community members could be recognised and collaboratively exchange social, material, and linguistic resources (Kim, Dorner, and Song 2021).

While no singular research approach can flatten hierarchies in community-based research or reverse decades of misrecognition, we found CPAR to be a vehicle for moving toward institutional change through this research. In this instance, CPAR enabled careful community-based dialogue to take place and be shared across stakeholder groups, unlocking deep and ongoing tensions. While the scope of the article was confined to interview/focus group data obtained while shadowing participants on-site, the vignettes highlighted the ways communities negotiate institutional factors that diminish their languages, cultures, and knowledges to repair and redress harm.

Our research showed efforts toward recognition are being tackled most successfully by communities themselves, who are activating spaces around cities through community translanguaging and presenting alternative visions of the ways resourcefulness is fostered and realised (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013). Grassroots initiatives led by both translanguaging and monolingual English-speaking community members have lessened the impact of linguistic privileging and invisibility that can lead to isolation. Through their efforts to sustain community languages and simultaneously offer English support, while providing multimodal opportunities for individuals to access resources, share local knowledge, utilise their skills, and achieve levels of recognition that are not attainable in the wider monolingual context, community members have shown agency in this space. A potential outcome of this is that persistent community translanguaging in these communities may function as a force for the alteration of monolingual mindsets in the future (Dryden et al. 2021) and move us into the pluralistic 21st century. Nevertheless, institutional change required for translanguaging communities to be recognised and resourced appropriately has been slow and further research in this area could provide insights into how such issues could be explored and addressed on a larger scale.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the participants in this study who generously showed us their communities. The project was funded by monies received from Lottery West by the City of Canning and redistributed to us. Application number 420173903. Open access publishing facilitated by Curtin University, as part of the Wiley - Curtin University agreement via the Council of Australian University Librarians.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

- Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2016. "Country of Birth, State and Territory." <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/population/australias-population-country-birth/latest-release>.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2021. "2021 Census: Nearly Half of Australians Have a Parent Born Overseas." <https://www.abs.gov.au/media-centre/media-releases/2021-census-nearly-half-australians-have-parent-born-overseas>.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. "The Economics of Linguistic Exchanges." *Social Science Information* 16, no. 6: 645–668.
- Braun, V., and V. Clarke. 2012. "Thematic Analysis." In *APA Handbook of Research Methods in Psychology*, edited by H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, and K. J. Sher, 57–71. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Canagarajah, S. 2013. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Chaparro, S. E. 2019. "But Mom! I'm Not a Spanish Boy: Raciolinguistic Socialization in a Two-Way Immersion Bilingual Program." *Linguistics and Education* 50: 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2019.01.003>.
- Clyne, M. 2005. *Australia's Language Potential*. Australia: UNSW Press.
- Davila, B. T. 2011. "Enduring Patterns: Standard Language and Privileged Identities in the Writing Classroom." Doctoral diss., University of Michigan.
- Deutschmann, M., and A. Steinvall. 2020. "Combatting Linguistic Stereotyping and Prejudice by Evoking Stereotypes." *Open Linguistics* 6: 651–671.
- Dobinson, T., S. Dryden, S. Dovchin, Q. Gong, and P. Mercieca. 2024. "Translanguaging and 'English-Only' at University." *TESOL Quarterly* 58, no. 1: 307–333. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3232>.
- Dryden, S., A. Tankosić, and S. Dovchin. 2021. "Foreign Language Anxiety and Translanguaging as an Emotional Safe Space: English as a Foreign Language Migrant Learners in Australia." *System* 101: 102593. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102593>.
- Ebersöhn, L., T. Loots, R. Mampame, et al. 2018. "An Indigenous Psychology Perspective on Psychosocial Support in Southern Africa as Collective, Networking, and Pragmatic Support." *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 28, no. 5: 332–347.
- Eisenclas, S. A., and A. C. Schalley. 2019. "Reaching out to Migrant and Refugee Communities to Support Home Language Maintenance." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 22, no. 5: 564–575.
- Fine, M., and M. E. Torre. 2021. *Essentials of Critical Participatory Action Research*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Fiske, S. T., A. J. C. Cuddy, and P. Glick. 2007. "Universal Dimensions of Social Cognition: Warmth and Competence." *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 11, no. 2: 77–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.11.005>.
- Flores, G., M. Abreu, C. P. Barone, R. Bachur, and H. Lin. 2012. "Errors of Medical Interpretation and Their Potential Clinical Consequences: A Comparison of Professional Versus Ad Hoc Versus No Interpreters." *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 60, no. 5: 545–553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annemergmed.2012.01.025>.
- Fraser, N. 2000. "Rethinking Recognition." *New Left Review* 3, no. 3: 107–118.
- Gallagher-Geurtsen, T. 2007. "Linguistic Privilege: Why Educators Should be Concerned." *Multicultural Perspectives* 9, no. 1: 40–44.
- García, O. 2009. "Education, Multilingualism and Translanguaging in the 21st Century." In *Social Justice Through Multilingual Education*, edited by T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. K. Mohanty, M., and Panda, 140–158. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters.
- García, O., S. I. Johnson, K. Selzer, and G. Valdés. 2017. *The Translanguaging Classroom: Leveraging Student Bilingualism for Learning*. Philadelphia, P.A.: Caslon.
- García-Mateus, S. 2020. "Bilingual Student Perspectives About Language Expertise in a Gentrifying Two-Way Immersion Program." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 26, no. 1: 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1797627>.
- Gill, N. 2015. "Where Is the World's Most Remote City?" *The Guardian*.
- Hall, J. M., and K. Carlson. 2016. "Marginalization: a Revisitation With Integration of Scholarship on Globalization, Intersectionality, Privilege, Microaggressions, and Implicit Biases." *Advances in Nursing Science* 39, no. 3: 200–215.
- Hanzlíková, D., and R. Skarnitzl. 2017. "Credibility of Native and Non-Native Speakers of English Revisited: Do Non-Native Listeners Feel the Same?" *Research in Language* 15, no. 3: 285–298.
- Hatoss, A. 2019. "Unpacking Monolingual Ideologies: Voice of Young Sydneysiders." In *Multilingual Sydney*, edited by A. Chik, P. Benson, and R. Moloney, 66–78. London: Routledge.
- Jørgensen, J. N. 2008. "Polylingual Languageing Around and Among Children and Adolescents." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5, no. 3: 161–176.
- Kim, S., L. M. Dorner, and K. H. Song. 2021. "Conceptualizing Community Translanguaging Through a Family Literacy Project." *International Multilingual Research Journal* 15, no. 4: 293–316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2021.1889112>.
- Kim, S., and K. H. Song. 2019. "Designing a Community Translanguaging Space Within a Family Literacy Project." *Reading Teacher* 73, no. 3: 267–279.
- Kohler-Koch, B., and C. Quittkat. 2013. *De-Mystification of Participatory Democracy: EU-Governance and Civil Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kroskrity, P. V. 2021. "Covert Linguistic Racisms and the (Re-) Production of White Supremacy." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 31, no. 2: 180–193.
- Lamping, S., S. Dryden, T. Dobinson, J. Chen, P. Mercieca, and S. Kuzich. 2024. "Locked Out, but Not Disconnected: Multilingual Community Engagement in Australia." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 50: 3490–3509. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2024.2303068>.
- Lee, J. W. 2022. *Locating Translingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, J. W. and Dovchin, S., eds. 2019. *Translinguistics: Negotiating Innovation and Ordinariness*. London: Routledge.
- Leung, M. W. H. 2017. "Social Mobility via Academic Mobility: Reconfigurations in Class and Gender Identities Among Asian Scholars in the Global North." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 43, no. 16: 2704–2719.
- Levac, L., and S. M. Wiebe. 2020. "Conclusion: Reflections on Deliberative Democracy, Public Participation, and the Future of Policy Making." In *Creating Spaces of Engagement: Policy Justice and the Practical Craft of Deliberative Democracy*, edited by L. Levac and S. Wiebe, 375–459. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Liddicoat, A. J. 2016. "Language Planning in Universities: Teaching, Research and Administration." *Current Issues in Language Planning* 17, no. 3–4: 231–241.
- Lippi-Green, R. 2012. *English With an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*. London: Routledge.

- Liu, Y., and F. Fang. 2020. "Translanguaging Theory and Practice: How Stakeholders Perceive Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language." *RELC Journal* 53, no. 2: 391–399.
- MacKinnon, D., and K. D. Derickson. 2013. "From Resilience to Resourcefulness: A Critique of Resilience Policy and Activism." *Progress in Human Geography* 37, no. 2: 253–270. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132512454775>.
- Martínez, R. A. 2018. "Beyond the English Learner Label: Recognizing the Richness of Bi/Multilingual Students' Linguistic Repertoires." *Reading Teacher* 71, no. 5: 515–522.
- Miles, M. B., and A. M. Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Moreton-Robinson, A. 2003. "I Still Call Australia Home: Indigenous Belonging and Place in a Postcolonising Society." In *Uprootings/Re-groundings: Questions of home and migration*, edited by S. Ahmed, A. M. Fortier, M. Sheller, and C. Castaneda, 23–40. London: Routledge.
- Otsuji, E., and A. Pennycook. 2010. "Metrolingualism: Fixity, Fluidity and Language in Flux." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7, no. 3: 240–254.
- Palmer, D. 2011. "The Discourse of Transition: Teachers' Language Ideologies Within Transitional Bilingual Education Programs." *International Multilingual Research Journal* 5, no. 2: 103–122.
- Pennycook, A. 2010. *Language as a Local Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pronskikh, V. 2018. "Linguistic Privilege and Justice: What Can We Learn From Stem?" *Philosophical Papers* 47, no. 1: 71–92.
- Rosa, J., and N. Flores. 2017. "Unsettling Race and Language: Toward a Raciolinguistic Perspective." *Language in Society* 46, no. 5: 621–647. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000562>.
- Rosa, J., and N. Flores. 2023. "Rethinking Language Barriers & Social Justice From Raciolinguistic Perspective." *Daedalus* 152, no. 3: 99–114. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48739984>.
- Rosa, J. D. 2016. "Standardization, Racialization, Languagelessness: Raciolinguistic Ideologies Across Communicative Contexts." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 26, no. 2: 162–183.
- Sandwick, T., M. Fine, A. C. Greene, B. G. Stoudt, M. E. Torre, and L. Patel. 2018. "Promise and Provocation: Humble Reflections on Critical Participatory Action Research for Social Policy." *Urban Education* 53, no. 4: 473–502. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918763513>.
- Schalley, A. C., D. Guillemin, and S. A. Eisenclas. 2015. "Multilingualism and Assimilationism in Australia's Literacy-Related Educational Policies." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 12, no. 2: 162–177.
- Seale, H., B. Harris-Roxas, A. Heywood, et al. 2022. "The Role of Community Leaders and Other Information Intermediaries During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Insights From the Multicultural Sector in Australia." *Humanities & Social Sciences Communications* 9, no. 174: 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-022-01196-3>.
- Shapiro, S. 2014. "'Words That You Said Got Bigger': English language Learners' Lived Experiences of Deficit Discourse." *Research in the Teaching of English* 48, no. 4: 386–406.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 2015. "Linguicism." In *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1460>.
- Spack, R. 2006. "English Lessons." *TESOL Quarterly* 40, no. 3: 595–604.
- Toohey, K. 2019. "The Onto-Epistemologies of New Materialism: Implications for Applied Linguistics Pedagogies and Research." *Applied Linguistics* 40, no. 6: 937–956.
- Tsarenko, Y., A. G. B. Cruz, E. Snuggs, and D. Tojib. 2022. "Institutional Work by Migrant Women Leaders in Precarious Spaces of Volunteering in Melbourne." *Australia, Gender, Place & Culture* 29, no. 5: 693–714.
- Udah, H., and P. Singh. 2018. "'It Still Matters': The Role of Skin Colour in the Everyday Life and Realities of Black African Migrants and Refugees in Australia." *Australasian Review of African Studies* 39, no. 2: 19–47.
- Uekusa, S., and S. Matthewman. 2022. "The Limits of Resilience: A Discussion of Resilience From the Perspectives of Critical Disaster Studies." *Australasian Journal of Disaster and Trauma Studies* 26, no. 3: 117–130.
- Veronelli, G. A. 2015. "The Coloniality of Language: Race, Expressivity, Power, and the Darker Side of Modernity." *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women's and Gender Studies* 13, no. 1: 108–134.
- Welcoming Cities. 2019. "Diversity is Our Reality." Inclusion is a Choice. <https://welcomingcities.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/WelcomingCitiesBrochure.pdf>.
- Wei, L. 2018. "Translanguaging as a Practical Theory of Language." *Applied Linguistics* 39, no. 1: 9–30.
- Western Australia Local Government Association. 2019. "Local Government Area List (Perth Metro)." <https://www.wa.gov.au/system/files/2020-02/Local%20Government%20Area%20List.pdf>.