


Searching for a New Dessert Recipe: An Anti-Oppressive Approach to Research by Centering Language and Culture

Andrea A. N. MacLeod¹ ^a¹ *Communication Sciences & Disorders, University of Alberta*

Article Information

Keywords: anti-oppressive research, social justice, multilingual, multicultural, research methods

https://doi.org/10.48516/jcscd_2024vol2iss2.26

Submitted: October 18, 2023
EST

Accepted: October 23, 2024 EST

Published open access by
Adelphi University Libraries.

Abstract

Through this paper, I aim to articulate how I have recentered my research from post-positivism to constructionism epistemology. This recentering was driven by the need to better align my research on multilingualism with the priorities, concerns, and aspirations of the multilingual communities that I serve. I describe three key frameworks that inform my work: Community Based Participatory Research, Community Cultural Wealth, and Transformative Research Paradigm. I illustrate the application of these frameworks with examples from research conducted within my lab. An anti-oppressive approach to research is achieved by linking these frameworks and applying them to my research program.

As my community leader colleague Yvonne Chiu said, “*Language is not just a cognitive ability or skill: it is pivotal for the survival of our communities*” (Y. Chiu, *personal communication*, 2022). Her words deeply resonate with me and provide a *sluagh-ghairm*, a rallying cry, to guide my research program. I have sought to recenter my research on bilingual children’s communication development to capture their abilities and ensure that the socio-cultural role language plays within families and communities is at the forefront. In this paper, I will outline my experience moving from my post-positivist research training towards an anti-oppressive approach to research. I will begin by considering my positionality, as my experiences fed into questioning how I was doing research. I will then describe the frameworks that I have integrated in recentering my research. Finally, I will illustrate how this recentering has shifted my research practice within my lab, from co-developing research questions to knowledge mobilization.

Positionality matters

I come from Highland Scottish immigrants who settled in Canada in the late 18th Century onto unceded Algonquin lands in what is now Ontario, Canada. I grew up speaking English at home and mostly French outside the home, starting with daycare as an infant, then attending French school, and speaking primarily French with friends. I began contributing to bilingualism research 25 years ago as a research assistant working on a project

where my knowledge of two languages was seen as an asset, a novel experience within a monolingual English university setting within a French-speaking community. During that time, I discovered a love for research, particularly for research on the communication development of young children. As a bilingual in monolingual academic institutions, I had often experienced a devaluing of my language abilities and the “errors” I made in both my languages were frequently pointed out. Before this work as a research assistant, I had had few academic experiences where my bilingual abilities were seen as a strength. It would be years before I could step back and appreciate my translanguaging, from word choice to sentence structure to punctuation, as a strength. I was also a first-generation undergraduate student (i.e., neither of my parents attended university) and then a graduate student in Communication Sciences and Disorders. For me, the experience of being a first-generation university student meant that I was learning the institution’s rules, both stated and implicit. I had little space for stepping back and challenging held wisdom.

During my graduate studies, I learned that my research questions on bilinguals were best framed as a comparison to monolinguals, yet monolinguals did not require a comparison group. While valuing bilingualism on par with monolingualism is important, comparing bilinguals to monolinguals ignores bilingual language abilities specific to the bilingual experience. Within this context, I found it challenging to highlight that bilinguals

^a Correspondence to andrea.a.n.macleod@ualberta.ca

are not the sum of two monolinguals but that, as bilinguals, we hold knowledge about our languages *and* how to use our languages across settings. This comparison also did not provide space to acknowledge the systemic inequities, discrimination and racism that underlie language use in our communities, which makes some languages easier to transmit and sustain than others, and some languages more valued. As a bilingual, I knew these inequities were present and was able to advocate for the importance of situating my thesis research within a community of speakers (i.e., French-English communities in a bilingual community in Canada). However, within the research tradition I was learning to fit into, I felt there was little space to articulate why bilinguals need to be understood within the context in which the languages are being used. In other words, we only have half of the picture if we ignore the social and political context in which bilingual speakers live.

These roots and experiences informed the recentering of my research program within a social justice framework. With this recentering, I began to leave behind the post-positivist epistemology I had learned in my undergraduate and graduate studies. Post-positivist epistemology aims to develop an understanding of the world through research by objective observation, where the researcher's bias needs to be mitigated (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). I began stepping into a constructionism epistemology where knowledge is created through the research process, which involves researchers and participants, and the knowledge is shaped by the perspectives of those who create it, including social, cultural, and historical contexts (Braun & Clarke, 2022; Burr, 2015). I also began a move to understanding bilingual language use and development from a translanguaging lens. Translanguaging theory focuses on how bilingual and multilingual individuals use all their multimodal linguistic knowledge to make meaning and communicate (García, 2009; Vogel & García, 2017). An explicit goal of translanguaging theory is to question power structures that influence language learning and teaching (Wei & García, 2022), where the terms used to describe language practice are social constructions (Otheguy et al., 2015). Practically, my program of research centers and values children's language knowledge to empower children, families, and communities in supporting culturally and linguistically sustaining practices that contribute to resisting dominant ideologies. With this recentering, I have found alignment between my personal values and those that drive my research.

The Re-Centering

The re-centering led to a change in my research framework as I found that I needed new tools, new ways of

seeing the research landscape, and new ways of making sense of the data I and my community colleagues believed was important to engage with. If we take the analogy that research is like making a dessert, through my training, I learned a recipe for an apple pie that was well-known and appreciated¹. This recipe laid out the path to follow to make something that looks and tastes like apple pie – that is, a methodology to successfully conduct research. In addition, this recipe made an apple pie that could be made by others and appreciated – that is, the methodology was replicable and rigorous. As I moved to center social justice, not just as a possible outcome of a study but the reason for the research, it was clear that I could not just take this favourite recipe and sprinkle social justice into the filling or use it as the new topping. Instead, I needed to experiment and explore to find a new dessert recipe; I needed to find new research frameworks and methodologies. I worried that those who were used to apple pie might not appreciate the taste of this new dessert – I was concerned that my research would no longer be relevant. I wondered if I would need to find a new group of people to share this dessert with; in other words, I would need to find colleagues who value a different perspective. Through this paper, I will outline my recipe for this new dessert (i.e., an anti-oppressive research methodology) that I bring to my research with bilingual children and their families.

The need to re-center my research became increasingly urgent as I put the community at the center of my research rather than clinicians, educators, or other researchers. While the process was gradual at first, I could see a turning point when I put down my apple pie recipe and began searching for a new dessert. It was in 2015, the year that Canada welcomed a wave of refugees from Syria. Working with my colleagues, we sought to find ways that we could support these newcomers that were meaningful and sustainable. From the outset, our goal was not to identify children with communication disorders but rather to support all children's communication in all of their languages. In this way, our work aligned much more with the "prevention" mandate of the field of SLP than a focus on assessment and treatment. Our Multilingual Language Program was developed with student volunteers who were fluent in French and Arabic. We offered the program in community settings to support the development of the home language and introduce the language of school to preschool and young school-aged children (MacLeod et al., 2020). At first, this work was separate from my research program, and I struggled to find ways to align it with the post-positivist, quasi-experimental research methodology that I was working within. When I spoke about this work with colleagues, it elicited comments about whether it was "research" or

¹ As noted by a reviewer, even the notion of a recipe, a replicable formula, is specific to certain types of knowledge holders. Perhaps a future step is letting go of the idea of the recipe itself?

even “within the scope” of speech-language pathology. Our work felt marginalized, and not just figuratively: we presented this work at ASHA in 2018, a time when the refugee crisis in Syria was regularly in the news, in a room out on the edge of the conference site, late on Saturday afternoon, attended by fewer than 15 people. Despite external expressions of doubt, I was energized by this new direction – I began to feel an alignment between my values and the research I was doing. Thus, I continued to pursue this work and seek out other ways of researching. Along my path, I found three key ingredients that center on social justice: Community-Based Participatory Research (Israel, 2008), Community Cultural Wealth (Yosso, 2005), and Transformative Research Paradigm (Mertens, 2007).

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR)

The first key ingredient I found was Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR), an approach to participatory research informed by the social sciences and applied to the fields of health (Israel et al., 1998; Wallerstein, 2021). CBPR shifts away from the post-positivist ontology that is dominant in the health sciences to acknowledge the existence of different realities (Israel et al., 1998). As with other forms of participatory research, CBPR strives to be community-driven to improve the alignment between research and practice (Burke et al., 2013) and contribute to social justice (Wallerstein, 2021). Indeed, CBPR was informed by Freire (1970/2007) and research from researchers working alongside the communities to work toward social change (Wallerstein, 2021). CBPR lays out a way of working with marginalized communities to create a more equitable research process by reducing inequities identified by community partners (Israel, 2008; Israel et al., 1998). The levelling of power is done by valuing and amplifying the voices of the community partners *and* by the researchers positioning themselves as partners within the collaboration rather than overseers. Key characteristics of CBPR include its participatory nature, and thus, the community is included throughout the research process. Partners are empowered through mutual decision-making and knowledge mobilization. It is also characterized by equity in the collaborations; thus, we identify and value the strengths and knowledge that all collaborators bring. It also involves sustainability and building on the strengths of communities. Within CBPR, implementing an intervention (i.e., a change to the status quo) that is informed by the research team’s work is part of the research process. Finally, it requires a long-term commitment by all partners. This participatory approach values the perspectives of the community and thus aligns well with the second key ingredient, Community Cultural Wealth (Yosso, 2005)

Community Cultural Wealth

The second key ingredient, the framework of Community Cultural Wealth (CCW; Yosso, 2005), was first introduced to me by my community activist colleagues at

Multicultural Health Brokers Cooperative, Edmonton, Canada. As part of our mutual capacity building, they shared this framework that informed their work of resisting mainstream pressures that often viewed culture and language as barriers to assimilation and success. Instead, the CCW framework values language and culture as assets. Integrating this framework in my research is part of an authentic commitment to CBPR and to centering my partners in our research. I have also found it a powerful and energizing framework that has informed my work in research but also in teaching and service. CCW is a theoretical framework proposed by Yosso (2005) that centers the knowledge and experiences of marginalized individuals and communities. Community Cultural Wealth contrasts with Bourdieu’s conceptualization of Cultural Capital. Specifically, Bourdieu identified cultural capital as knowledge that is held and transmitted by those who hold power and is used to define and reproduce expectations in education (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). In this framing, the broader society considers children who are from marginalized communities as lacking capital when compared to children from the dominant community. Building on Critical Race Theory and Critical Pedagogy (e.g., Freire, 1970/2007), Yosso critiqued this deficit framing that has been applied to racialized communities. In the American context, Yosso (2005) has argued that this view positions white middle-class culture as the standard that is valued and to which other communities are compared. As a result, some communities are seen as culturally rich, while others are viewed as culturally poor as they lack the features of this dominant standard. Adding to this bias, young bilingual children are often grouped together as “second language learners” or “additional language learners.” This deficit framing is especially the case for minoritized languages, which are seen as less valuable and potentially harmful to a child’s academic achievement.

Instead of a deficit framing, Yosso (2005) places value on the community cultural wealth of marginalized communities. Specifically, she proposes six critical types of capital that families and communities build and transmit to children: *Linguistic Capital*, which includes intellectual and social skills attained through communicating in multiple languages; *Family Capital*, which encompasses the cultural knowledge supported and transmitted through family and carried forward as a sense of shared community, history and memory; *Social Capital*, which refers to one’s network of people and community resources; *Navigational Capital*, which refers to one’s ability to maneuver through social institutions, including institutions that were designed for the mainstream or majority community; *Aspirational Capital*, which refers to one’s ability to maintain ambitions and goals about the future; and *Resistance Capital*, which refers to one’s ability to actively challenge inequality. Building on this model, I have argued that language transmission contributes to strengthening and enhancing these other capitals (MacLeod & Demers, 2023b). Thus, as my community-based colleagues emphasize, it is important for families to feel

empowered to sustain their home language and resist pressures from mainstream society that lead to language loss. While I could see that CCW complemented CBPR methodology, I was still looking for a way to connect the two, which led me to the Transformational Research Paradigm.

Transformational Research Paradigm

When I began reading about the Transformational Research Paradigm (TRP Mertens, 2007), I felt this was the missing ingredient needed. The TRP aims to create a research space where inequality and injustice can be addressed. As Mertens (2010b) stated, *“The fundamental principles of the transformative axiological assumption are enhancement of social justice, furtherance of human rights, and respect for cultural norms.”* (p. 470) The TRP emerged from the work of marginalized individuals who sought to have their voices represented in research by working with partners to support social justice and human rights (Mertens, 2010a). This paradigm is situated within an ontological position that reality is socially constructed, so the social context that defines these realities is important to understand. To build this understanding, Merten (2007) argues that the researcher needs to work collaboratively with the participants in the study in a way that reduces power differential and forefronts their perspective. It is here that I see a strong alignment with participatory methods, such as CBPR. Within the TRP, the researcher is also called to value the strengths that exist within communities by respecting and honouring the dignity of community members. And it is here that I see a connection with the culturally affirming approach of CCW. In addition, the researcher must acknowledge that they are not a neutral observer and thus must carefully consider their biases and positionality. Working with the community, knowledge is thus co-developed to define the problem, understand how to do research in this context and guide the dissemination of results.

Integrating the Building Blocks

As mentioned above, the community is at the heart of CBPR, the CCW framework, and the TRP. When I ask myself, “Who am I doing research for?” I can answer without hesitation that my research aims to serve the communities, families, and children with whom I collaborate. As noted by Braun and Clarke (2022, p. 175), theoretical and methodological alignment is important and supports the rigour of the research one engages in. Thus, in pursuing my program of research, I am positioned within a contextualist epistemology, my research is informed by the theoretical framework of Community Cultural Wealth, I work within a Transformative Research paradigm, and I apply Community-Based Participatory Methodology. As described in the next section, these key ingredients serve to guide how I ask research questions, foster a positive lab, and work alongside community members. I will draw examples from the work we do in my research lab, beginning with how we apply CBPR, how CCW is integrated in

our team and our work with communities, and how TPR impacts how we conduct and disseminate our research.

Integrating Community-Based Participatory Research

A cornerstone of my research has become doing research about and through multilingual language groups. In these groups, we collaborate with community partners to co-lead multilingual language groups with a focus on their home languages (MacLeod et al., 2024). These community partners often support parents and children within their community, sometimes through regular group meetings. An important component of our partnership is acknowledging the time and expertise that these partners bring to the work. Together we outline the time commitment and availability, work with them to schedule meetings around their availability, and review the budget for financial compensation. Based on recommendations for ethical CBPR research (Flicker et al., 2007), we strive for equitable compensation through fair hourly rates and clear expectations for contributions to the collaboration.

Within this CBPR context, we co-lead sessions with groups of children who are three to six years old and who are exposed to a language other than English at home. We have focused on this age range as it is the time of the first major transition children experience in language exposure. During this time, children move from a home context where the minoritized language is used to a preschool or school context where the majority language dominates. In addition, through interviews with families, we have learned that the time before children start school is cherished by parents as a period for transmitting their language and culture. By focusing on these early years, we hope to support parents and children early to confidently use practices that are linguistically and culturally sustaining. We apply an inclusive approach and strive to adapt our program for all children, regardless of their developmental path. Our inclusive approach highlights the importance of optimal communication for all children in all their languages to ensure their participation in all spheres of their daily life. By including children who are neurodivergent, we aim to create a space to welcome families who may experience additional marginalization as newcomers with a neurodivergent child. Through these groups, we are supporting families and community members in language transmission, *and* the groups are a context for our research. In this way, our research embeds linguistically and culturally sustaining practices, builds capacity within communities, and aims to share these learnings with both academics and other experts serving these communities.

Integrating Community Cultural Wealth

We center CCW in our lab, we do this by valuing the knowledge we each bring from our communities. In 2019, I was reading with my children Aviaq Johnston’s (2017) book “What’s My Superpower?”, a story of a young

Inuit girl who celebrates the superpowers of her friends while searching for her superpower. In 2020, I brought this narrative to the Multilingual Families Lab to begin a discussion. As a group, we exchanged, shared, and brainstormed about the importance of centering our language abilities and providing space in our lab for who we were. Through these discussions, we developed a lab vision and motto and renewed the discussion in 2023 (Multilingual Families Lab, 2024). Our lab motto is “Our superpowers are our languages & cultures”. We continue to embody this motto by valuing the language and cultural knowledge that our team members bring. Within our lab, which is situated in a SLP department, I’ve observed university students shift from cautiously acknowledging that they know a language other than English to feeling empowered by their language and cultural knowledge. This shift has led to students openly sharing their cultural and language experiences within lab meetings, relating to articles from our journal clubs, and applying these in their research. For example, they use their language and cultural knowledge in identifying tasks and questions in the methodology, in reaching out to families and communities to participate in research, to inform the analysis of the data, and to communicate results back to the community members. In this context, I hope that students in my lab feel their multilingual identity is affirmed and valued.

In addition to bringing CCW to our research team, we integrate it through our CBPR with communities (MacLeod et al., 2020, 2024). We ensure that the framing of the multilingual language groups *is not* about helping to bridge a gap in knowledge or compensate for perceived defects and *is not* about helping parents learn to provide a higher quality of input to their children. Instead, we aim to help children and their families to support all their languages and feel empowered about the transmission and maintenance of their home language through culturally sustaining practices. Specifically, we learn what parents value in their child’s communication and work with them to enhance these abilities. We do that by creating a space for their home languages outside of their home, where their home languages and cultural practices are valued, perceived as an asset, and part of their identity. We incorporate translanguaging practices (García & Wei, 2014; Jasper, 2018), which view all the child’s languages as resources and valuable knowledge. Translanguaging frames children’s languages as a strength, as something to be proud of. We also acknowledge that language knowledge means speaking and understanding for some children, but for others, the knowledge may be reflected mostly in understanding the language. By including a broad range of multilingual abilities, we believe that language transmission and maintenance practices can reduce the chance of losing the minoritized language. Through these groups, we want children to communicate in all their languages and to feel proud of their language knowledge across their languages. We talk with parents and community members about different ways of communicating and using our

languages – that as bilinguals, we might use our languages together or side by side. When we shared the translanguaging perspective in a workshop, community members laughed with surprise when they learned that their ways of languaging had a name. They shared how empowering it was to learn about translanguaging – to see all their language knowledge as a strength rather than focusing on deficits in a specific language that often comes from a monolingual framing. We work with parents to find ways to enhance and highlight the strategies they use for language stimulation, transmission, and maintenance. We integrate culturally sustaining practices such as crafts, food, and music to amplify the links between language and culture.

Through our collaboration, we build reciprocity by contributing towards sustainable practices within the communities. A core practice is the co-development of multilingual language groups with community leaders. Since our community partners often support parent-child groups within their community, we have experienced a reciprocal process of learning and sharing. For example, we have worked closely with the community of Amharic and Tigrinya speakers from Ethiopia and Eritria, and Kurdish speakers from Syria. In these contexts, parents who are community leaders co-lead the groups to provide linguistically and culturally sustaining practices. For example, they contributed to the choice and the order of the themes we will use in the groups, and they informed the selection of books, songs, and activities. They also help to adjust our planning to accommodate faith celebrations and other community events. In the Ethiopian and Eritrean groups, our partners shared beautiful songs that included Amharic, Tigrinya, and English, which had everyone moving and singing; in the Syrian group, our partner had a powerful and poetic way of talking about language that was inspiring to us and families. With their input, we have included youth from the communities to support the groups and learn about the research process. Through these groups, young children not only met other children and families that spoke their language, but they also saw a youth who spoke their language. The youth also had the opportunity to see the value of their language knowledge in a research setting, an experience I had found valuable as an undergraduate student. Through collaboration, we share our session plans and resources with our partners so that they can integrate these ideas into future groups. We have also grown the sustainability of this work through workshops, such as one hosted in April 2023 and attended by 35 community leaders representing more than 15 communities and 23 languages. In this workshop, I shared about the work my lab had done with community collaborators; the community collaborators shared their experiences and what they had learned, and we opened the discussion to all participants to hear about their experiences supporting their community’s home language and culture. In our CBPR collaboration, we have found that through our collaborations that integrate reciprocity, we

can achieve sustainability not just as an outcome but as a core part of the process.

Integrating Transformative Research Paradigm

Aligned with TRP, our lab is aware of power dynamics and the importance of trust in our collaborations with communities. We keep this awareness front of mind in how we communicate with community leaders and members. Many of the communities we work with are newcomers to Canada, some with experiences as refugees. Within this context, community members are often finding their footing in a new country, family members may not be comfortable speaking English, and some families have experienced trauma. By working with communities, we can build trust and begin to learn about community members' aspirations and concerns. We actively consider power dynamics in communicating with community leaders and members. We take the time needed to build relationships, which may result in extended timelines in the initial phases of a project. However, we also find that this strong trust leads to moments where work is accelerated, including the recruitment of individual families and the dissemination of knowledge. Building trust and relationships includes ensuring that we make time to hear about what strengths are within the community and learn what questions they would like answered. As we move forward with a study, we include time to hear the community members' feedback and meaningfully incorporate this feedback into the study. This approach can be as simple as changing the wording in consent forms or as complex as changing the themes in our multilingual language groups and incorporating community members in our groups.

We also strive towards accessible research by reducing barriers to participating in research and ensuring that participant voices are heard. Since we have relationships with community members, we are able to learn the barriers to participating in research and how to make our research accessible. Accessibility can be created by including optimal times to begin recruitment and to plan interviews, changing the language(s) used in the research process, preferences for meeting online or in person, addressing transportation challenges, addressing concerns around the recording of the interviews, and meaningful compensation for taking part in the research process. For example, we have worked to reduce language barriers by making sure that community members reviewed research-related documents first. We exchanged around what could and could not be adjusted and considered alternative wording, then updated the documents with the research ethics board. We also adapted the consent forms to the language(s) used by the community through translation and interpretation. In some contexts, our community partners assisted us with recruiting families and contributed to the interpretation process. When engaging in the research, we strived to ensure that participants could use the language in which they were most comfortable throughout the research process. Thus, our multilingual team had opportunities to use their lan-

guages with the participants and we included youths and volunteers from the community who received an honorarium for their contribution. We worked with our community partners to ensure that the perspectives of families and communities were represented as we interpreted and prepared to disseminate the findings by reviewing summary statements together and integrating their feedback. Finally, for some communities, accessibility included accessing technology to take part in the research. This challenge was particularly clear during COVID-19, and we began to loan tablets to families with pre-paid internet access in order to facilitate their participation in the study.

Our research also contributes to resisting dominant, monolingual ideologies (MacLeod & Demers, 2023a). This resistance is woven throughout the research program. We do this by ensuring that we have a multilingual team that can support the participation of parents and children in the language they are most comfortable in. We amplify parent voices through participation as co-leaders of multilingual language groups. We support community members in affirming and enriching their practices through co-designing our multilingual language groups. We have also brought knowledge through continuing education opportunities within the speech-language pathology community and early childhood educators. In these settings, we advocated for moving away from terms that center English and a deficit model of multilingualism, such as "English language learner." We encourage professionals to use a more inclusive and positive framing, such as a "multilingual child who knows...". We also advocate for the importance of the home language beyond a cognitive ability to include its role in sustaining cultures and enriching bonds within families. Lastly, we built reciprocity by sharing knowledge and resources developed throughout the research process. We have shared these resources within our lab, with our community collaborators, and with our participating families.

Flexibility and Challenges

The key ingredients of CBPR, CCW and TRP support a strong yet flexible recipe for research. For example, I was able to adjust my research program to the COVID-19 pandemic. Through our connections with our community partners, we learned about their worries and needs and worked with them to adapt to the COVID-19 context. We learned that parents were overwhelmed, had few resources (e.g., time, money, toys), and were looking for ways to help their children learn and play. In response, we developed a series of activities that could be done at home, with material available at home with young children. These activities were written in simple English and were easily translated into the language of community members and shared with community organizers. When communities expressed worries about their children's learning, we collaborated with them and provided our program remotely with families and also in a hybrid model within a preschool classroom. Through these adaptations, we learned strategies to include par-

ents actively in the program, to reach families who are geographically dispersed, and to support classrooms remotely.

I have found applying an anti-oppressive framework within the field of communication sciences and disorders to be challenging. I experienced being hesitant to share a look into my research “kitchen”, being sidelined with concerns about scope (e.g., Is this research within the scope of communication sciences and disorders? Is this even research?), methodology (e.g., not recognizing methodological rigor outside a post-positivist epistemology), and research questions themselves (e.g., alignment of the questions with the community’s needs rather than with academic discourse). There are also challenges when it comes to measures of “productivity” in academia, where the fast pace of research and dissemination is valued (Ulmer, 2017). In my experience, CBPR is not “slow”. It requires the researcher to maintain a sustained pace throughout the collaboration in order to be responsive to community needs. The timing of the research is determined in large part by the community partners. The dissemination, or knowledge mobilization, occurs throughout the collaboration, not only at the end through more traditional forms of conference presentations and manuscripts. As a result, I’ve experienced the need to better describe and advocate for the importance of this approach and contributions that lay outside of those traditionally valued when presenting my research for annual evaluations or as part of grant proposals. I continue to reflect on how to engage in collaborations, how to ensure that social justice guides the recipe that we use, and how to value partnerships with colleagues who come with different perspectives. I don’t always get it right; I don’t always get my point across, but I certainly am always learning.

Coming from post-positivist training, I have struggled to find more equitable models within the field of SLP. Learning a new way to do my research, to make this new dessert, continues to take time and creativity. It has led me to read across disciplines and find resonance in the work of scholars in other fields, such as education, social work, and public health. I’ve cherished rich and rewarding collaborations that continue to enhance my understanding and research. I strongly believe that by sharing more about how we are doing our work, we can learn from each other and continue to build a body of research that decolonizes, that resists dominant discourses, and that supports families and communities in their aspirations.

.....

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest related to the content of this article.

Acknowledgments

Thank you to Yvonne Chiu and colleagues at Multicultural Health Brokers Cooperative who have welcomed me into the cooperative, been patient with my questions, and shared their perspectives with me. Thanks to Catrine Demers and Amy Glaspey for the conversations and feedback on earlier drafts. Thanks also to the anonymous reviewers for their questions and comments. And thanks to the Multilingual Families Lab team for sharing their positivity, curiosity, and multilingual superpowers.



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CCBY-SA-4.0). View this license’s legal deed at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0> and legal code at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode> for more information.

References

- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Sage Publications.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic Analysis: A practical guide*. Sage Publishing.
- Burke, J. G., Hess, S., Hoffmann, K., Guizzetti, L., Loy, E., Gielen, A., Bailey, M., Walnoha, A., Barbee, G., & Yonas, M. (2013). Translating community-based participatory research (CBPR) principles into practice: Building a research agenda to reduce intimate partner violence. *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 7(2), 115–122. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cpr.2013.0025>
- Burr, V. (2015). *Social constructionism* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Chiu, Y. (2022). [Personal communication].
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Flicker, S., Travers, R., Guta, A., McDonald, S., & Meagher, A. (2007). Ethical dilemmas in community-based participatory research: recommendations for institutional review boards. *Journal of Urban Health*, 84, 478–493. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11524-007-9165-7>
- Freire, P. (2007). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Continuum. (Original work published 1970)
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765>
- Israel, B. A. (2008). Critical Issues in Developing and Following CBPR Principles. In M. Minkler & N. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Community-based participatory research for health: From process to outcomes* (pp. 47–68). John Wiley & Sons.
- Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). Review Of Community-Based Research: Assessing Partnership Approaches to Improve Public Health. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 19(1), 173–202. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.publhealth.19.1.173>
- Jasper, J. (2018). The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Language and Communication*, 58, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.12.001>
- Johnston, A. (2017). *What's My Superpower?* Inhabit Media.
- MacLeod, A. A. N., Burchell, D., & Demers, C. (2024). Translanguaging in Pre-School Settings: The Multilingual Language Program. *Réflexions*, 43(1), 18–28.
- MacLeod, A. A. N., & Demers, C. (2023a). Transmitting White Monolingual Anglo-American Norms: A Concept Analysis of “Quality of Language” In Parent-Child Interactions. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 44(4), 431–459. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S014271642300005X>
- MacLeod, A. A. N., & Demers, C. (2023b). Understanding family factors for language transmission of minoritized languages in bilingual kindergarten children growing up in multilingual neighbourhoods. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.2251960>
- MacLeod, A. A. N., Meziane, R. S., & Pesco, D. (2020). Supporting dual language learning: a program for preschoolers from refugee backgrounds. *Canadian Diversity/Canadienne Diversité*, 17(2), 32–36.
- Mertens, D. M. (2007). Transformative Paradigm: Mixed Methods and Social Justice. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(3), 212–225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689807302811>
- Mertens, D. M. (2010a). Philosophy in mixed methods teaching: The transformative paradigm as illustration. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 4, 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.5172/mra.2010.4.1.009>
- Mertens, D. M. (2010b). Transformative Mixed Methods Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(6), 469–474. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800410364612>
- Multilingual Families Lab. (2024, November 6). *Who We Are*. Multilingual Families Lab. <https://bilingualacquisition.wordpress.com/lab-members/>
- Otheguy, R., García, O., & Reid, W. (2015). Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 6(3), 281–307. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-0014>
- Vogel, S., & García, O. (2017). Translanguaging. In S. Vogel & O. García, *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.181>
- Wallerstein, N. (2021). Engage for Equity: Advancing the Fields of Community-Based Participatory Research and Community-engaged Research in Community Psychology and the Social Sciences. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 67(3–4), 251–255. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12530>
- Wei, L., & García, O. (2022). Not a First Language but One Repertoire: Translanguaging as a Decolonizing Project. *RELC Journal*, 53(2), 313–324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221092841>
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006>