CBOs act as service providers, advocates, and community builders for immigrants and refugees, as they are typically embedded within – and staffed by members of – the same communities they serve [47, 104]. The close geographic and social proximity to their communities allows CBOs to provide culturally responsive programs that adapt to individuals' social, cultural, and linguistic needs while developing a sense of familiarity, trust, and solidarity among their members [10, 47, 104, 107]. For CBOs, this often involves translating information from public institutions (e.g., government, health, and social service systems) for their communities [104].

Despite their importance in supporting the wellbeing of immigrants and refugees, ethnic CBOs often face significant challenges related to resource constraints and technological barriers. Prior HCI scholarship has reported on CBOs' reliance on an assemblage of "homebrewed" systems consisting of free and low-cost technologies [102]. The data they collect is often imperfect and incomplete [3, 32], and increasing pressures to be data-driven can lead to tensions between meeting the needs of funders and of communities [13, 23, 73]. However, there has also been growing interest in how information and communication technologies (ICTs) can support these organizations in service provision, social inclusion, and advocacy for their communities [7, 38, 39, 59, 79]. Despite this growing body of research, there is a need for a more holistic perspective on the interrelationships and interdependencies within technology-mediated philanthropic work [101].

Our approach focuses on translation work. Here, we adopt Michael Muller's [68] definition of translation work as that which "transforms and transports knowledge from one culture to another culture." In the field of translation studies, translation is recognized as a non-innocent act that reflects power relations between cultures [9]. Past work in HCI has examined the translation work of technology professionals as they negotiate the needs of different stakeholders [68, 72, 86] and how minimizing users' perspectives for the benefit of software engineers and HCI workers can be an act of violence [68]. Several scholars also highlight the need for translation as a means to co-construct knowledge and mediate between differing worlds [17, 42, 61, 86].

In this paper, we examine the role of CBO workers as intermediaries between public institutions, funders, and communities through their technology-mediated translation work. Drawing on interviews with 16 members of 7 AAPI CBOs in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, our study addresses three key questions:

1) How do CBOs mediate translation work through data and technology infrastructures?
2) What forms of translation work do CBO workers take on to legitimate their practices?
3) How does this technology-mediated translation work impact CBO workers' efforts to improve the wellbeing of immigrants and refugees?

By unpacking the politics of translation work across two sites – as legitimacy work and as (re)mediation – we interrogate how CBOs negotiate power relations and barriers with institutions and technologies. As "interstitial sites of social formation in which the national intersects with the international" [61], the data infrastructures and translation practices of CBOs serve as a locus to critically examine how boundaries are reinforced, challenged, and reshaped, and how these practices reflect historical and sociopolitical phenomenon tied to broader migrant and diasporic conditions. We position CBO workers as creative agents who use translation to reshape and defy imposed boundaries, create new forms of knowledge, and resist hegemonic systems that treat them and their communities as "other." In doing so, we argue that the various forms of translation CBO workers take on can inform HCI research and practice in supporting the wellbeing of communities.

2 BACKGROUND

Before discussing our findings in detail, we briefly describe the social and political contexts surrounding our research site: 7 AAPI CBOs in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. We first offer an overview of AAPI as a panethnic category and later a brief history of AAPI community-based organizations and how they establish legitimacy with different stakeholders.

2.1 AAPI as a Pan-Ethnic Identity

Panethnicity is the aggregation of ethnic groups. Ethnic studies scholar Yen Le Espiritu describes this aggregation as forced categorization, where an "imposed category ignores subgroup boundaries, lumping together diverse peoples in a single, expanded 'ethnic' framework" [33]. As a panethnic category, Asian American Pacific Islander collapses together more than 25 million people and 50 ethnic groups speaking over 100 different languages [70]. The treatment of AAPIs as a monolithic group in institutional and advocacy spaces has contributed to the exclusion of different communities. For example, the dominant visibility of East Asians can overshadow other groups, including Southeast and South Asians [111]. Additionally, political advocacy that leverages the AAPI label for state-based recognition can elide the needs of Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders [41, 52]. Furthermore, the promotion of the model minority myth, which posits that AAPIs are financially and academically more successful than other racial groups, erases significant health, educational, and socio-economic disparities [20]. Even though AAPIs have the highest median household income among all racial groups, they also face the largest wealth gap, with Asian Indians earning a median household income of $100,000 and Burmese people earning $36,000 [54]. These issues have prompted advocacy for data disaggregation and even for the dissolution of "Asian American" and "AAPI" as identity labels [50, 111].

State-enforced ethnic and panethnic datafication, such as through the Census, has been part of the long history of Asian racialization in the United States. Shifting and codifying panethnicity has enabled the state to delineate "foreign otherness" by creating racialized categories of "legal" and "illegal" and "citizen" and "non-citizen" [61]. Over a century of exclusionary immigration laws, labor exploitation, incarceration, war, and military occupation wrought shifting legal definitions of "Asian American" and "AAPI" [61]. While AAPIs are often described as the fastest growing demographic segment in the U.S. [15], this history of discrimination has limited their political power [33, 61].

Building political power has thus meant navigating a system in which "numbers count" [33]. Panethnic identities can help to create a unified front to fight against racial oppression and exploitation. Advocacy organizations and communities strategically use

the AAPI label to build coalitions with different subgroups even as they challenge the same boundaries and power structures that such labels impose [33, 82]. For example, Dosono and Semaan [30, 31] have explored how AAPI Reddit communities negotiate and redefine their collective identities to mobilize and resist against white hegemony. "Asian American" and "AAPI" are not static identities. Rather, they represent "a fusion and fission" of complex political and social relations, whose boundaries and connections are constantly manipulated and negotiated by internal and external forces [33]. Our research focuses on the complex identity work that AAPI CBOs perform through their technology-mediated translation practices.

2.2 AAPI Community-Based Organizations

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, the end of the Vietnam War, and the subsequent passing of the Refugee Act in 1980 brought an influx of both "highly-skilled" immigrants from China, Korea, Japan, India, and the Philippines alongside Southeast Asian refugees from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos [108]. Many of these ethnic communities became highly concentrated and urbanized on the West Coast, with nearly a third living in California alone, primarily settling in the metropolitan areas of Los Angeles and San Francisco [16, 108]. This post-1965 influx fundamentally shifted AAPI demographics, leading to disparities in health, educational attainment, and socioeconomic status among subgroups. Southeast Asian refugees, in particular, continue to face significant health disparities due to their experiences of war, genocide, displacement, and resettlement [78, 90].

In response to their communities' diverse and rapidly growing needs, the number of AAPI CBOs grew in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and New York [33, 48]. Although AAPI CBOs existed prior to the 1960s, pressures from the civil rights movement prompted the US government to provide increased funding for minority-based social welfare programs [33]. As a result, many CBOs transitioned from being self-funded to relying on government funding, fundamentally changing long-established power and organizational structures within communities. Under this new funding model, professionally-trained and acculturated social workers, rather than grassroots activists and established community leaders, became the primary brokers in administering welfare services [33]. Neoliberal policies introduced in the 1970s and 80s led to increased privatization and decreased social welfare spending, which furthered the "professionalization" of CBOs, introduced performance-based contracting measures, and forced organizations to compete with one another for funding [33, 64].

Since funders tend to prefer pan-Asian initiatives over single ethnic ones, many CBOs formed pan-Asian coalitions or became pan-Asian organizations themselves as a tactic to increase funding [33]. However, consolidating different needs and goals can also lead to conflict among organizations, where larger, more established, and better funded agencies are favored over smaller ones [33]. As a result, a CBO's survival hinges on its ability to broker competing needs and establish legitimacy across its various networks involving communities, partner organizations, and funders [99, 105]. Here, we define legitimacy as "a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs and definitions" [87]. Our work considers contemporary efforts of CBO workers to establish forms of legitimacy with and through data.

3 RELATED WORK

In the following section, we draw on literature from multiple disciplines such as HCI, feminist science studies, translation studies, postcolonial studies, and ethnic studies to thread the connections between translation, migration, and the sociotechnical infrastructures of CBOs.

3.1 Sociotechnical Systems for Nonprofits and CBOs

HCI scholarship on nonprofits and CBOs has examined a wide array of phenomena such as volunteer coordination [96, 103], internal process management, [8], and fundraising [12, 40, 55]. Several works explore the technological infrastructures of these organizations as a result of resource constraints, such as limited funding [13, 103], expertise, and staff time [67, 103]. Voida et al. [102], for example, introduce the notion of "homebrewed" databases, or bricolage and bespoke information arrangements crafted in response to an organization's lack of resources. Others have explored how nonprofits and CBOs use data and technologies to support their legitimacy work with different stakeholders, such as communities, policymakers, and funders [32, 73, 89]. For instance, Tanaka and Voida [89] outline how much of the legitimacy work fundraisers do, such as donor interactions on social media, remains invisible in the design of crowdfunding platforms.

However, scholars highlight the tensions in making legitimacy work visible through sociotechnical systems, cautioning that datafication can lead to increased surveillance [13, 23, 73]. Crooks and Currie [23] argue that datafication ultimately creates a double bind. On the one hand, data can be used to build legitimacy and mobilize communities to action. On the other hand, it can perpetuate systemic violence and surveillance of minoritized communities. Bopp et al. [13] uncover instances of "data disempowerment" when nonprofits face data-driven pressures from funders and homebrewed arrangements that move them further from their mission. Since data requirements are usually set by funders and funding is dependent on data, organizations eventually lose control over their data practices.

HCI research has also investigated how CBOs use ICTs and data to support alternative and agonistic ways of working [3, 6, 7, 23, 38, 39, 65, 73, 106]. Asad and Le Dantec frame the ICT usage in eviction and foreclosure blockades as a form of "illegitimate" civic participation because it challenges institutional authority [7]. Alvarado Garcia et al. [3] examine activists in Latin America who make public data on human-rights violations "actionable" towards social change by informing citizens, requesting direct actions, and building capacities. However, these groups are hampered by conflicting or incomplete data and must implement strategic workarounds, usually by building alliances to address the data gaps. Others, like Whitney et al. [106], suggest HCI researchers should find other ways to align with CBOs beyond the design of technological tools, such as technical documentation analysis or speculative/critical

making. Ghoshal's [38, 39] work calls acute attention to this, arguing that the ICTs utilized by CBOs often embody values that are in opposition to the values of social movements, which tend to prioritize inclusion and participation. For example, ICTs designed with interfaces that are only accessible to those with technical expertise can exclude other members of the organization. In response, CBOs engage in additional labor to build technical capacities to mitigate exclusions [39].

We build upon these works by focusing on the technology-mediated practices of ethnic CBOs in the U.S. Although there has been some research into ethnic CBOs, such as Seguin et al. [79] who explore the design of digital systems for an Australia-based Filipino migrant organization, and Li et al. [59] who analyze CBOs' usage of Twitter to empower communities, our work specifically focuses on the work practices of CBOs. We examine how these practices become a socially-constructed space of tension that reflects wider historical and sociopolitical contexts tied to migrant and diasporic conditions.

3.2 The Politics of Translation

Translation is a non-innocent act that reflects power relations between cultures [9]. As such, scholars have emphasized the sociocultural aspects of translation to understand how knowledge is transported and transformed from one culture to another. For example, Lawrence Venuti [97] calls for interrogating the visibility and agency of the translator, recognizing that translation is a creative and, at times, subversive practice that involves active mediation and negotiation between cultures.

Scholars have surfaced how translation can be an instrument of colonial domination that promotes violence, erasure, and notions of the "other" when the colonized are subjected to Western understandings of reality, knowledge, and representation [71, 83]. The unidirectional translation from the language and culture of the colonized into those of the colonizer serves as a tool of control and containment. In other words, language can be symbolic of other forms of material violence, such as the case of dictation lessons as a site of colonial authority [18]. This reduces differences between those deemed the "other" and erases their humanity, ultimately creating "hegemonic versions of the colonized" [71] and "representations," or objects, without history [75].

However, translation can also involve more complex and "paradoxical logics of exchange" [100] where new cultural identities and hybridities are formed. Scholars have argued that immigrants are situated within an interstitial and hybrid cultural space, where translation can become a transformative tool to negotiate, resist, and reshape cultural boundaries as a means of survival and subverting domination [11, 61]. Asian American studies scholar Lisa Lowe [61] argues that the hybridity of the Asian American experience is the product of collective experiences of forced migration, nationalisms, imperialisms, and displacement. To survive, immigrants must invent different cultural alternatives that are "partly inherited, partly modified, as well as partly invented," including the appropriation of dominant practices that may subject them as the "other" [61]. Thus, translation functions as a site and reflection of hybridity and multiplicity that exceeds ethnic and national identity. In this light, translation becomes a sort of border crossing that enables alternative ways of knowing and being, and opportunities for building solidarity across differences [17]. We draw upon these theories of hybridity and exchange to unpack the politics of CBO translation work and its connections to wider sociopolitical arrangements that define migrant and diasporic conditions.

3.3 Translation Work in HCI

Past work in HCI has explored the translation work performed by HCI researchers and practitioners [68, 86], data scientists [72], programmers [5], community organizers [73], outreach workers [29], community health workers [98], and linguistic translators [45]. For example, Dombrowski et al. [29] highlight how outreach workers use translation to help clients with technological barriers, while Verdezoto et al. [98] call attention to how community health workers use translation to address gaps in data systems due to missing information.

Muller [68] draws upon translation studies to situate HCI research and practice as a form of translation work involving the negotiation of unequal power relations between users, software engineers, and HCI workers. Regarded as experts, HCI workers are not only tasked with translating users' complex worldviews into the fixed requirements of software engineering, but also often called to represent and speak for users. In both instances, the perspectives of users are minimized compared to those of software engineers and HCI workers. In line with a tradition of feminist science studies, Muller argues that HCI work is far from an objective activity, but rather a political practice that requires reflexivity in the choices HCI workers make by asking, "Whose worldview is to be supported? At what cost?"

Haraway [42] cautions against adopting a doctrine of objectivity and universality, as it inevitably leads to the erasure of languages and bodies. Instead, Haraway calls for "the ability partially to translate" across heterogeneous networks as an act of survival. Reflecting on the heterogeneity and multiple divides situated among and between technology producers and users, Suchman [86] builds upon Haraway, calling for designers to develop "partial translations" as a means to co-construct knowledge and cross boundaries within and between technology design and use. Passi and Jackson [72] examine the practices of data scientists to show how translation can be a form of collaborative storytelling, where data scientists co-construct narratives with their coworkers to make judgments about data's trust and credibility. While people largely remain invisible in data, storytelling can bring them back to the fore. Similarly, Pei et al. [73] and Erete et al. [32] demonstrate how community organizers and non-profits translate data into stories to build trust and establish legitimacy among different stakeholders.

Because of its ability to move between boundaries, translation serves as a critical entry point for HCI scholars to problematize the dichotomous distinctions between "designer" and "user" [68, 72, 86], "expert" and "novice," [5], and "human" and "machine" [86]. Treating such categories as rigid and immutable inevitably reinforces dominant power structures and colonial projects that lead to subjection, erasure, and fragmentation [14, 85]. Instead, HCI scholars call for the formation of alternative practices through participatory design [68, 69] or worker-oriented design [36, 86] that embrace the enmeshing of heterogeneous worlds toward mutual learning

and understanding. Building on this research, we focus on ethnic community-based organizations and how they use translation not only as a tool to address barriers, build trust, and mediate between boundaries but also as an act of resistance to the status quo.

4 METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Context

Our study involves 7 AAPI CBOs located in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. The CBOs serve one or more ethnic communities (e.g., Chinese, Cambodian, Korean, Vietnamese), with one organization identifying as an AAPI panethnic organization. Due to the rich ethnic and racial diversity of their localities, the CBOs also support members of ethnic groups outside of the AAPI umbrella, including the Hispanic/Latino community. While the CBOs are all classified as 501(c)3 "charitable organizations" and are involved in varying levels of service provision and advocacy, 5 organizations primarily operate as direct service agencies, while 2 operate as advocacy organizations. Direct service providers offer a wide range of services related to education, health and mental health access, immigration, citizenship, job training, affordable housing, and transportation access to low-income communities. Advocacy organizations, on the other hand, tend to focus on campaigning around specific issue-based concerns, such as LGBTQ+ or youth empowerment.

At the time of our study, 6 of the 7 CBOs were part of a larger coalition that formed in response to the COVID-19 pandemic to provide culturally responsive education, outreach, and services for the local AAPI community. In an effort to take a "data-driven approach" to health equity, the county contracted with two of the CBOs to lead the coalition in reporting and subcontracting funds out to partner organizations. Separately, the seventh organization was in a coalition with other local organizations and used digital organizing to mobilize its constituents around building a participatory budget that would support youth development at the local city level. In both scenarios, the COVID-19 pandemic forced CBOs to quickly shift from in-person to virtual-based services and ways of operating, which created considerable challenges due to a lack of technology access and issues with digital literacy, communication, and social connectedness. This created additional translation work for CBO workers to attend to, including training, maintenance, and troubleshooting of new technologies.

4.2 Data Collection and Analysis

To understand the impact of data and technologies on how ethnic CBOs connect across their various networks, we conducted semi-structured interviews with 16 members of the aforementioned 7 AAPI CBOs. The first author, Sum, was introduced to the CBOs through connections at her previous academic institution and as a member of a local AAPI coalition. She volunteered at two organizations: the first in October 2020 as a phone banker to support voter outreach and the second from January 2021 to October 2021 to support their English as a Second Language (ESL) and wellness programs. Interviewees were invited through convenience and snowball sampling facilitated by these connections. Interviewees occupied various roles, including three administrators who oversaw programs and staff, 12 workers, and one board member. Workers included non-managerial staff such as health navigators, case managers, program coordinators, and organizers. All participants identified as either Asian (N=15) or Hispanic/Latino and White (N=1), thereby sharing similar ethnic and racial backgrounds with the communities they served. Both interviewees and their organizations are referred to by pseudonyms.

Sum conducted the IRB-approved interviews over video conferencing software from September 2021 to March 2022. The interview questions centered around understanding how CBOs used data and technologies in their work, both within their organizations and across various networks involving community members, partner CBOs, and public institutions. We were interested in the opportunities these digital tools offered, the barriers they created, and the tactics CBOs used to negotiate them. Interviews lasted between 60-90 minutes and, with the interviewee's permission, were audio-recorded, automatically transcribed, and then edited to accurately reflect the conversation.

We analyzed our data using an inductive and iterative approach guided by contextualized grounded theory [19]. Through multiple rounds of coding and memoing that were reviewed weekly, we surfaced initial themes that were connected to CBO work, including building partnerships, (in)accessible technologies, limited-funded infrastructures, supporting community needs, supporting funders' needs, and doing translation work. Through subsequent refinements of our data interpretations, we elevated and focused on the concept of translation work, as it cut across all initial themes. For our analysis, we defined translation work as any type of work involving an intermediary (human or technological system) that transforms and transports data, information, or knowledge from one language or culture to another. In the sections that follow, we consider the key role CBO workers play as translators, not only in the linguistic and cultural sense but also in their work with and through data.

5 FINDINGS

In what follows, we outline three circumstances where CBOs performed translation work and how it either supported or hindered their mission of improving the wellbeing of immigrant communities. This work includes translating community-based work into numbers to access institutional resources, serving as translators between technology and communities, and translating data into stories for political advocacy. These circumstances reflect the tenuous relationships that CBOs have with funders, technologies, and policymakers, as well as showcase the strategic and creative ways that CBOs use translation to reflexively navigate these relationships.

5.1 "No data, no money": The Cost of Translating Community-Based Work into Numbers

Across our interviews, CBO workers highlighted how data served as an evaluation tool that legitimized their work to funders to receive resources. Ya Mei, an administrator, stressed the significance of her community filling out the U.S. Census. "No data, no people. No data, no money [...] The best way to advocate is. . . to be counted," she concluded. However, this sentiment shifted as workers spoke about how rigid data practices and measurements of success imposed by

funders negatively impacted their work. Although requirements for data varied across programs, funders preferred quantitative data, leading CBO workers to translate their activities (e.g., case management, benefits enrollment, care coordination, education, referrals) into numbers accordingly to meet deliverable requirements. The quantification of CBOs' efforts to receive institutional support oversimplified the complexity of their work and compromised their relationships with their communities.

5.1.1 Prioritizing one-time interactions instead of continuous community engagement. Multiple workers described how the push to be numbers-driven and the subsequent translation of their work into what program coordinator Ari described as "measurable units of accountability" shifted their work toward meeting funding deliverables and away from community building. Kay, a health navigator, put it bluntly: "The most important thing is our program goal. The second is our people, like our coworker and supervisor [...] And then the third one is the client." This shift to prioritizing programs over people was especially apparent when workers were required to meet funder-defined outreach numbers involving "unduplicated" clients, meaning the same person could not be counted multiple times under a single program. For example, even if a person attended an ESL class multiple times a month, they could only be counted once. This requirement proved challenging for CBOs with limited capacity and compromised their ability to build trust and relationships with communities because it meant prioritizing new clients over existing ones. Ari reflected that funders' rigidly defined benchmarks and constrained definitions of who should be counted in their programs negatively impacted their reporting numbers. When client engagement was inconsistent, such as someone attending infrequently one month and more frequently the next, this made "counting" difficult.

Additionally, data-driven deliverables also played a role in determining the types of interventions CBOs developed with communities. Hoang described an instance where she felt disincentivized from doing in-person canvassing to address COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy due to canvassing's low potential for meeting outreach numbers. Although canvassing may only reach ten people, Hoang believed this method was more impactful than targeting 1,000 people over social media because it led to more personal conversations with community members. However, under the objective of fulfilling high unduplicated outreach numbers, the organization prioritized social media outreach. Others, like Dom, an Outreach and Interventions Specialist, stated that while social media could be an effective tool for targeted interventions to specific members of their community who were active on the platform, it was not recognized as a legitimate method by certain funders. In both instances, workers were disempowered from choosing the interventions they believed would be most effective for their communities.

Pressures to be numerically data-driven also created tensions between managers and workers. Hoang described how some managers who were "not very grounded in community work" focused on attending to the needs of funders. While she understood that the implications of not fulfilling the deliverables meant the risk of losing funding, she lamented that there was little investment in the quality of their interventions. Other workers were constantly questioned by their supervisors and other departments: "Why is it that you guys are having such a hard time getting so many?" and "Do you think we're going to meet our numbers this year?" As an administrator, Ya Mei also felt pressure from funders. "They come up with their own parameters and their own deliverable requirements, and they expect us to run in the red," she said, alluding to funders' expectation that CBOs will underperform. The constant negotiation between meeting community needs and funders' needs deepened the emotional toll that many workers felt doing community work.

On top of this, several participants noted that deliverable requirements did not account for all the labor involved to meet these numbers. "There's so much behind-the-scenes work that goes on that doesn't get acknowledged in grants," Ari explained. With each naturalization application, Ari pieced together a long, intricate history about her client through a collection of documents, such as marriage certificates, income tax returns, travel records, and court documents that were not always readily available. By only reporting on the number of total applications, her hours worked on each application seemed to go unacknowledged.

Hoang pointed out that funders' "political imaginations," or assumptions about the community and how changes could be made, kept CBOs focused on attempting to fill gaps left unaddressed by the public sector. Instead, CBO workers felt their time would be better directed toward investing in community advocacy and empowerment, and pushed for trust-based funding models [2] that would allow communities to determine the priorities. "We want more than to survive the crisis," Hoang asserted, "[but] there's not time for that because we're so busy filling in that void." Through these examples, workers and administrators across CBOs showed how the translation of their work into quantitative data compromised their ability to serve communities' wellbeing.

5.1.2 Aggregating AAPI Communities into a Monolith. Several workers explained that being a part of an AAPI coalition was a double-edged sword. On the one hand, it allowed organizations to increase outreach numbers and receive more resources. On the other hand, it perpetuated the treatment of AAPI communities as a monolith, which led to decreased access to funding, a lack of culturally responsive interventions, and tensions between organizations.

Hoang explained that one side effect of being a part of an AAPI coalition was the lack of disaggregated data, which led to the erasure of certain communities, such as Pacific Islanders. While COVID-19 data at that time showed that AAPIs had the highest vaccination rates, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders had the highest case rate among all racial groups, and Asian Americans still faced relatively high death rates [43, 84]. She described how the focus on high vaccination rates created a false narrative that AAPI communities were inherently more successful in tackling COVID-19 when, in reality, it involved intensive on-the-ground community work. According to Hoang, this false narrative perpetuated the model minority myth and meant that AAPI CBOs were less likely to receive funding to continue their work.

Hoang further observed that the AAPI coalition no longer operated as a solidarity space but as "a strategic effort to gather funding as a collective and then divide that funding individually." This divide-and-conquer approach created a fissure between CBOs, due to funders prioritizing certain organizations over others. "It's like team sports," Hoang said, "because of the limited funding, tensions

arise." Several workers spoke about encountering issues with distrust, accountability, and transparency among organizations, as well as sociopolitical divisions between subgroups along ethnic, socioeconomic, and generational lines. Hoang stressed that the encompassing term "community" could erase complex social relationships and dynamics. Dom echoed this, adding that the homogenous treatment of AAPI communities erased clear differences and tensions between communities, as well as the critical on-the-ground translation work by CBO workers that addressed differences:

> "We are not united...We have different circumstances of migration. We have communities who hate each other because of their colonial histories. It is not an easy battle to even come together, united for things that you would think are our common enemy, right? So for COVID response, there are politics that we have to navigate when doing it in the Asian community to make sure that we're conscious of the fact that certain communities don't like working with each other."

Dom contrasted the deep care CBO workers showed in navigating complex intergroup tensions with the broad strokes that politicians and the media used in painting the Asian community. She and other CBO workers attributed this care to their experiences as members of the local community and their awareness of sociopolitical contexts that contributed to their present-day conditions, including histories of war and marginalization. CBO workers spoke of funders' lack of cultural competence in introducing interventions due to their preference for tackling issues broadly and their treatment of AAPIs as a monolith. Dom explained how specific national mental health campaigns were rarely created with communities of color or non-English speaking communities in mind. When her organization was asked to distribute suicide prevention materials associated with a national mental health campaign to local schools, they refused due to the materials' lack of cultural responsiveness to the specific communities they served. "Sometimes, that means we're sitting back and just not participating, which doesn't get us anywhere in terms of fulfilling our contractual obligations," she said.

According to the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), AAPIs are the least likely of any racial group in the U.S. to seek assistance with mental health due to stigma [76]. As mental health navigators, Dom's team not only had the difficult task of translating certain mental health messaging across multiple languages but also of doing so in a destigmatizing way:

> "Sometimes even words we take for granted in English… we all know what suicide is, we all know what depression is, we all know what anxiety is… It doesn't translate the same in Vietnamese, and choosing selectively how to word that so the community members get help, but they're not having to be subsumed in all of that stigma, is honestly harder than even just getting people help. So translation, language, is the biggest barrier."

These examples show how CBO workers performed two opposing but complementary acts of translation. On the one hand, to make themselves legible to funders and institutions to receive resources, they translated their heterogeneous communities into a broad AAPI monolith. On the other, they addressed barriers associated with the funders' homogenizing treatment of AAPI communities by translating broad health programs into culturally responsive interventions more attuned to community needs.

5.2 The Work of Translating Technology to Improve Community Access

Throughout the interviews, CBO workers stated that technologies played a critical role in building connections and capacity with communities. However, many workers noted that technology remained a barrier for many community members. To improve access, CBO workers served as interlingual and intercultural translators between technologies and their communities by providing technical training and supporting multiple modalities. In other instances, CBO workers did manual translation work to repair errors or malfunctions caused by technologies such as Google Translate. Both cases involved CBOs working closely with communities to address their specific needs. However, this technological remediation required significant invisible labor on the part of workers, who were already limited in capacity.

5.2.1 *Translation in Addressing Technological Barriers and Access.*

When the COVID-19 pandemic forced many CBOs to move to remote-based services, workers addressed barriers through translation, passing on knowledge of how to use technologies to their communities. Sadia, an administrator, and her team of case managers did 1-on-1 technology training over the phone with their community members to help them get on Zoom. Through their efforts, community members were able to continue attending classes and trainings remotely. Ya Mei attributed the success of transitioning to remote-based services during COVID-19 to their organization's willingness to tackle barriers and meet people where they were, in whatever communication modality they chose. She said, "technology for us is really important even if it is a barrier… Regardless of that, that doesn't mean we don't address it. Language is a barrier, food is a barrier… All these things are barriers… we'll find a way."

However, the desire to meet people where they were also meant additional labor for CBO workers. Dom described instances when she and her clients would run into technical difficulties over video conferencing software while clients talked about difficult topics, leaving both her and her clients confused and frustrated:

> "Sometimes I'm doing an intake… and somebody has literally given their life story and [in the] process of re-traumatizing themselves, and trying to tell me what they need. And that is the unfortunate reality of getting mental health support. But if we were in person, that would be straightforward. We would see each other. We'd be able to read each other's body language so that we're able to know when to take pauses. When we're either doing phone calls or video calls, that isn't the case, right? Sometimes technology is cutting out. So I have to say, 'Oh, can you repeat that?' And that's an extra layer of re-traumatizing for the client. And then they're not as open to sharing

> as much [. . .] My frustrations and my emotional capacity are really just exacerbated by the issues with technologies."

Technology malfunctions like what Dom described not only risks re-traumatizing the client and frustrating the CBO worker, but also it creates a disconnect between them. In cases where trust is crucial, technical malfunctions make relationship-building all the more difficult. Extending this, Alos highlighted the importance of translation when it came to making sure that technologies can be accessible to communities, but stressed that it can only do so much.

> "Tech, at least communication tech, was made with intention to bring communities together to build networks and build bridges, but it's inherently privileged, especially the nonprofit type of work where you're interfacing with communities that might not have reliable internet, have access to the specific technologies that are needed, have the technological competence...So it's being able to also translate those things to our communities. I don't know if there's a way for tech to be community-centered [. . .] Even the apps, even the ways we communicate that are supposed to be community-centered aren't because some people are always going to be left out."

Alos' skepticism of whether technologies could be community-centered alludes to his awareness that technologies are rarely created with immigrant communities in mind, and that translation is necessary to bridge this gap. For other CBO workers, improving access for their communities sometimes meant forgoing the use of technologies altogether. Several participants brought up the inaccessibility of the county's COVID-19 vaccination app. Workers described not having enough devices to support its use and frequently faced technical issues and downtime with the app. Additionally, when the app launched, it only supported the English language despite 45% of local residents speaking a language other than English at home. Knowing that it would create a barrier for community members, Sadia's agency decided instead to schedule their clients for vaccination appointments over the phone and provided on-site registration and vaccination clinics using paper-based forms. While some technologies enabled CBOs to extend their outreach efforts and provide services in new ways, workers remained at the heart of making these technologies accessible through their translation work. Central to this negotiation was the refusal of technologies when it became clear they would not work for their communities.

5.2.2 Fixing Inaccuracies in Machine Translation. As trusted translators, CBO workers were essential in addressing language barriers in their communities. However, due to their limited capacity, participants said there were often not enough translators available to support their work. Dom explained that being a panethnic organization made things especially difficult regarding language capacity because the AAPI umbrella covers over 50 ethnic backgrounds and hundreds of languages. "We're never going to have enough to target every language. . . [It] inevitably means we're leaving someone [out]," she added.

To provide multilingual support across their media campaigns, Jacob, a program administrator, would create multiple versions of the same flyers in English, Spanish, and Korean. However, his team did not always have translators on hand. As a workaround, he would try to leverage machine translation tools such as Google Translate. However, he noted that these tools were often unreliable and required an external review by a native speaker. Other workers pointed out that many of the terms they used were not easily translatable into other languages. John noted certain English terms, such as "curfew" and "quarantine," when translated into Khmer, would not make sense because they do not exist in their language. Sadia told us that her team would have to re-translate materials sent by public institutions that were not in language or were mistranslated. She described how the translation process required review from multiple case managers to ensure translations were culturally appropriate, relevant, and responsive to historical and political contexts. Jimmy, a board member, echoed the need for manual translation, adding:

> "We want to make sure that the Vietnamese we're using is what the community is using. . . Oftentimes, what Google Translate offers is, for a lack of a better term, [what] Vietnamese people in the diaspora call 'Communist Vietnamese'. . . and so a lot of the words are not what people would use here and. . . can be really triggering. So we have to be really careful with our translations."

Lynn, a program coordinator, echoed this and explained the complexities of the Vietnamese language in more detail:

> "We were refugees because of the war. . . We're 'boat people[1]'. . . So then if you use [certain] words, you would remind them of the time back then, when they had to go through war. So you need to be very careful when you use certain words and avoiding certain terms. Make sure you don't offend anyone."

As members of the Vietnamese diaspora in the US, Jimmy and Lynn demonstrated how experiences of war, occupation, displacement, and political oppression led to divergences in the Vietnamese language. They showed that Google Translate's failure to attend to the cultural, political, and historical nuances of language opened up the possibility of replicating violence through re-traumatization. These examples show how workers performed careful linguistic translation work with the awareness that some language is difficult or impossible to translate and how machine translation tools failed to attend to the complex dynamics of language.

5.3 Translation as Storytelling for Community Advocacy

While translating community-based work into numbers for institutions, CBOs also translated numbers back into stories to support community advocacy work [23, 32, 73]. At the time of the interviews, several participants from a Southeast Asian youth advocacy organization, ORG K, were in the midst of a five-year campaign that began in 2018 in collaboration with other local organizations

[1]"Boat people" refers to refugees who fled Vietnam between 1975 to 1992 following the end of the Vietnam War [93]

and their city council to implement a participatory youth budget. The youth budget aimed to ensure that the city would be held accountable for improving the wellbeing and economic development of youth and that youth members would also have input in its priorities for funding. In 2020, ORG K mobilized voters to pass a ballot measure that would provide $1M in funding for the youth budget. Their work in using technological tools and translating numerical data for community storytelling demonstrates the possibilities of using translation to enact political change.

5.3.1 Providing counter-narratives about communities. Translating numbers into stories allowed CBOs to create new avenues for dialogue with policymakers. Moon and Lani, who were part of ORG K's communication team, said that data was crucial throughout their campaign to build community empowerment. Moon would pull voter engagement data to assess how many people were registered to vote compared to previous years. Doing voting analysis helped her and the organization understand where to focus their outreach efforts and increase their voter base.

Moon, who started as a youth member of ORG K fifteen years prior, was particularly impacted as a young person watching TV and seeing dehumanizing portrayals of family members and friends who were impacted by deportation, gang violence, policing, and politicians who did not look like her or her community making decisions for them. She said, "We need to get on the media like that… we need to find a way that we can also tell our stories." Over the years, Moon transitioned from youth member to staff member to help ORG K uplift their community's stories in different forms. Their civic engagement work involved making zines and documentaries, engaging communities via social media, and translating stories from voters into data that could be used to enact policy changes. She remarked how they were very protective of their data and were mindful of what they shared with the city. According to Moon, "When we think about how the city views our folks, we know that when we think about data, our communities are just that number…[Our strategy] is making sure those numbers have a story behind it, and our folks are viewed as people."

During the youth budget campaign, Moon's organization surveyed voters about issues that were happening in the community. One finding that surfaced within their data analysis was that young people in the city historically did not have a department to invest in their development, which had long-lasting impacts on their social and economic wellbeing. By having these conversations and sharing this data with community members, ORG K spread awareness about the issue and mobilized youth and voters to act. The final report sent to the city was a collective effort informed by hundreds of testimonials from city residents that also centered on the stories of the youth behind the campaign and their work in co-designing the survey, doing outreach, collecting data, and holding town halls. ORG K utilized social media to showcase findings from the report, paired with photos and quotes from young people that, according to Moon, countered the "negative narratives they see about our people and show people that young people do turn out. They do care about their community." Moon's testimonial highlights how exposing the stories and people behind the data provided powerful counter-narratives against the negative assumptions made about the community, while also mobilizing constituents to place pressure on policymakers to act.

5.3.2 Supporting Relationships Behind the Data. The move to remote work during COVID-19 also shifted organizing tactics for ORG K. Unable to leverage traditional methods such as door knocking, ORG K began to build up their digital organizing toolkit, consisting of constituency databases like PowerBase, civic engagement apps like PDI and Phone2Action, and phone banking tools such as CallEVO. Lani explained that these tools allowed ORG K to easily identify and connect with their constituents based on shared interest and past engagement, which helped them be more responsive and impactful in their outreach and advocacy efforts. Lani said, "[It's] not just about plugging in your contact info...You start to build relationships [with your constituents] and see their activities with how they build with the organization."

Moon provided an example where these tools were used to mobilize their community and put pressure on policymakers. Before scheduling delegation meetings with elected officials, ORG K would use their civic engagement app to send out text messages to their constituents, informing them about important issues they may care about. They would then ask people to sign up for the Phone2Action app to send letters directly to the mayor or councilmember. By creating a direct line between constituents to policymakers, Moon stated that policymakers were more responsive to meeting with the public. She added, "Knowing that those are their constituents, knowing that voters have the power to vote you in and vote you out. They make those decisions to put you on the appointment, right? So I think this year, they were like, hella open. After all those letters they had, we had no problems scheduling meetings with them." According to Moon, this reflected the inside/outside strategy ORG K took, leveraging digital organizing tools and translation to cultivate more direct and bi-directional dialogue between elected officials and their constituents toward community empowerment.

6 DISCUSSION

Recalling the notion that translation reflects power relations between cultures [9, 68], our findings reveal how translation work became a rich site to examine the tensions and complexities faced by CBOs. Through our interviews, workers shared their perspectives on how data and technologies impacted their roles as intermediaries between communities, funders, and public institutions. First, workers described how translating community-based work into numbers through data-driven mechanisms hindered their community-building efforts. Second, they reflected on how they often performed critical yet unrecognized translation work to address technological barriers. Finally, workers revealed how translating numbers into stories gave communities powerful counter-narratives and more equitable avenues for dialogue with policymakers. Central to these findings is how CBO workers leveraged translation to negotiate, reshape, and defy imposed boundaries. We argue that CBO workers are not merely passive subjects or cultural mediators but creative agents who use translation as a means of subverting the status quo and enacting social change.

We close by unpacking the politics of translation within CBOs and how relationships with institutions, technologies, and policymakers are (re)mediated through the work of translation. We

highlight how knowledge is transported and transformed from one culture to another, the (in)visibility of the translator, and the processes of social construction that connect to broader sociopolitical contexts tied to migrant and diasporic conditions. Through this work, we expand the discourse on datafication and justice-oriented HCI to reflect on how the translation work of CBOs can inform HCI research and practice in supporting community wellbeing.

6.1 Translation as Legitimacy Work

In our interviews, CBO workers described how they used translation to build legitimacy with multiple stakeholders. To receive resources from funders, workers translated their work into "measurable units of accountability" and their communities into a single aggregated AAPI monolith. To build trust with communities, CBO workers disaggregated them to attend to their individual cultural and linguistic differences. These differences speak to the realities of CBOs in their roles as intermediaries, caught between addressing the localized needs of their communities and the abstract data requirements of funders.

Workers expressed frustrations when their legitimacy work for funders hindered their ability to foster trust and serve communities. For example, Hoang and Dom felt disincentivized from choosing interventions that they thought would be most effective because the methods were deemed illegitimate by funders. Hoang said that fitting into funders' "political imaginations" of their communities kept CBOs more focused on filling in the gaps left by the public sector rather than on community advocacy. Because the translation work between CBOs and funders was primarily unidirectional, this placed the burden on CBO workers to fit into the worldviews of funders with little opportunity for negotiation. This led to real consequences for CBO workers, who saw their relationships with clients weaken, their trust with their peers and partner organizations diminish, and their funding decrease. These examples not only point to how CBOs' legitimacy work for funders hindered their legitimacy work for communities, but also how the outcomes of this work made future attempts at building legitimacy with all stakeholders increasingly difficult.

While past HCI scholarship has highlighted the double binds of legitimacy work, especially when it involves the surveillant gaze and disempowering nature of datafication [13, 23, 62, 73, 89], fully capturing these complexities requires interrogating the sociopolitical contexts and histories that inform the conditions of CBOs and their communities [23]. As a result of state disinvestment and privatization of social services, organized philanthropy became the state's method of addressing systemic inequality without needing to cede power [23, 49, 64]. Thus, social welfare responsibilities fell on CBOs to handle. Although datafication has been used as an overt mechanism to disenfranchise and discriminate against AAPIs and other minoritized communities[23, 33, 61], it also became the primary mechanism for CBOs to receive resources [23, 64]. This enabled the state to define the terms for CBOs' legitimacy, where data serves as a form of social control to maintain the status quo [23, 49].

Ya Mei's assertion of "No data, no people. No data, no money" puts this into concrete terms. Indeed, datafication increased the visibility of CBOs and their communities, but the only way to be seen by the state was to be reduced to abstract "representations," [75]. In this light, we argue that the unidirectional transformation of lived experiences into hegemonic abstractions continues the long legacy of AAPI communities being deemed the racialized "other." This has the potential to lead to serious consequences, as noted by Hoang, who said that the aggregation of AAPIs into a single panethnic category meant that certain subgroups did not receive adequate healthcare access during COVID-19 as a result of erasure and the perpetuation of the model minority myth. Beyond CBO work, there is other evidence of the harms of datafication for AAPIs. The COVID-19 pandemic saw an increase in racialized violence against AAPIs, prompting calls for increased community and police data collection to track cases. However, Kuo and Bui [56] note that data capture can bolster the carceral state while continuing to ignore institutional forms of violence such as labor exploitation, lack of social safety nets, and deportation. In other words, making racialized communities more legible to institutions can also make them targets of state violence [4, 23, 24]. Therefore, we see the institutional translation of lived experiences into numbers as another form of racialized violence against Asians and Pacific Islanders.

As workers' testimonials show, building legitimacy is crucial for a CBO's survival. However, not all forms of legitimacy are equally impactful and can be disempowering. A study by Walker and McCarthy [105] found that while government grants helped CBOs establish legitimacy with the state, they did little to enhance their longevity and instead increased their likelihood of disbandment. Community-oriented legitimacy work, such as public accountability sessions with local officials, coalition building, and grassroots funding, was found to be more conducive to a CBO's survival [105]. There is an opportunity for designers to support these relational forms of legitimacy work. Ghoshal et al. [39] state that this involves decentering hegemonic technocentric values such as functionality and efficiency towards a culture of "grassroots inclusivity" that prioritizes community knowledge, values, and resources.

Many CBO workers in our interviews called for a change in funding structures toward more trust-based models with less rigid deliverables [2]. Funding structures materially affect the data and technology infrastructures of non-profits and CBOs, which HCI scholars must contend with when working in such contexts. Even though addressing this issue may not involve a sociotechnical solution, there is an opportunity to support policymaking through the use of design [57, 63, 81, 91]. Establishing more equitable funding models may involve working closely with communities, policymakers, and CBOs through participatory design to discuss shared priorities, expectations, and agreements in how and what data is collected, how funding is distributed, and mechanisms for mutual accountability [1, 60].

More broadly, HCI researchers should heavily consider the ethical implications of datafication. Although studies have shown how data can reify patterns of systemic oppression and violence [27, 28, 46, 77], HCI researchers still legitimize data as an accountability metric through the systems we build and practices we promote. The dominant notion that more data leads to more efficient outcomes and thus produces a common good [28] creates a ripple effect within the public sector, repeated across organizational contexts and incorporated as the status quo. However, determining whether and through what mechanisms to collect and classify data

is inherently a political question. In their 2020 book *Data Feminism* [28], D'Ignazio and Klein recommend asking the "who" of data: "Data science for whom? Data science by whom? and Data science with whose interests and goals in mind?." Through our analysis of CBOs' data practices, we argue that to fully grasp the repercussions of datafication, it is necessary to interrogate the power structures that guide them and consider the sociopolitical contexts of use — here, through the lens of translation.

6.2 Translation as (Re)mediation

Through their testimonials, CBO workers revealed how they not only served as intercultural and interlingual mediators between communities and public institutions but also used translation as a form of remediation to address harms under systems that viewed them and their communities as "other." Recall Jimmy, who wanted to ensure that the Vietnamese used for outreach materials "is what the community is using." He carried an acute awareness of how sentiments over language have undoubtedly been shaped by war, displacement, loss, and political oppression [25, 26]. Knowing how language can diverge and be reshaped from one place to another while carrying with it power, culture, and history, he performed re-translations as an act of care to not re-traumatize his community. Translation work, in this sense, can be a form of intimacy when the translator surrenders "to the trace of the other in the self" by attuning to their differences [83]. As Hmong scholar Ma Vang [94] observes, language work "mediates different practices of healing and care across institutional, belief, and language barriers" in ways that also incorporate community knowledge-making.

However, remediation also required significant labor on the part of workers, who already had limited capacity. With little opportunity to interact or negotiate with the originators of the barriers — in this case, technology designers — the work was not only unidirectional but also remained invisible. As a result, the root causes of the barriers were left unaddressed, leaving CBO workers to carry the burden of continuously attending to the same gaps. Although machine translation tools may provide mechanisms for feedback, this still requires communities to perform reparative labor (instead of tech companies working directly with communities to develop tools, as with [58]). Additionally, machine translation tools tend to prioritize dominant variations of language over less-resourced ones, while offering few opportunities for users to provide meaningful context into the reasons behind re-translations. If machine translation designers can become aware that certain language is particularly harmful to communities due to their political histories, how might they provide means to ensure their safety?

In the case of the COVID-19 app, by only supporting English in an area where 45% of residents speak another language at home, technology designers wittingly or unwittingly made a choice about their users, which was more representative of the dominant culture than of reality. This excluded a significant portion of the population who were essentially left with two choices: conform or be treated as the "other." In this case, being the "other" meant that non-English speaking communities were less likely to receive life-saving COVID-19 vaccines because of the app's inaccessibility. CBO workers leveraged linguistic and cultural translation as an act of care to teach clients how to navigate the platform. Though necessary at the time, this did little to challenge the exclusionary norms that caused this harm in the first place, such as only supporting English monolingualism. This shows how intimacy through translation can itself be a form of violence when it coerces communities to conform to the dominant culture. As Shaden Tageldin [88] asserts, "translation is perhaps the most seductive of imperial powers" when it offers the impression of equivalence by adhering to the "likeness" of the colonizer.

When technologies fail to account for the complexities of lived experiences, they open up the potential for real harm. In such cases, CBO workers demonstrated acts of refusal and resistance in response, such as Sadia's team, who chose to forgo the inaccessible COVID-19 app in favor of low-tech solutions. We also highlight CBO workers' use of partial translations, "partly inherited, partly modified, as well as partly invented" [61], involving reconfigurations of dominant processes as a mechanism for resistance. We point to ORG K's use of data and technologies to create new channels for direct dialogue between communities and policymakers. By using storytelling to push back against the abstraction of communities and forcing more direct engagement from policymakers, the translation work was a more complex bi-directional process involving active negotiation and exchange between groups. The worldviews of policymakers were translated into forms understood by the community, and the community was also provided with tools to help reflect their worldviews back to policymakers [35]. While CBO workers' role as mediators remained visible on both ends, creating avenues for direct dialogue meant that their role became less central, enabling the community to interact with policymakers in a more visible way. Building on Wong [109], who calls tactics that rely on dominant discourses and logics *soft resistance*, we also show that such tactics can take a more overt form.

These examples show how CBO workers not only used translation to mitigate harms under a system that viewed them and their communities as "other," but also used it as a creative practice to transform hegemony and existing power structures. As such, we argue for rethinking the role of the CBO worker, not as one subordinate to funders, policymakers, and the state, but rather as a creative agent who is a critical source of community knowledge-making against the status-quo [53]. Past HCI scholarship has challenged dominant narratives of the passive subject under datafication and technologies [31, 62, 92, 109]. As Lu et al. [62] note, such narratives leave little space to interrogate how people enact their own agency and subjectivity, which reify notions of the "other." Building on this scholarship, we add that collective histories of subjugation, which materially affect the sociotechnical infrastructures of CBOs, are also coupled with histories of resistance [31]. Specifically, we recognize how CBO workers' hybridity and careful use of partial translations ensures the constant transformation of migrant and diasporic identities so that their communities remain "untranslatable" to state apparatuses of control [11, 61].

While many CBO workers' translation efforts were directed toward repairing moments of technological and institutional breakdown or harm, we consider what it would mean if efforts were directed instead toward supporting the health and wellbeing of the communities they serve. As CBO workers' translation work demonstrates, this might mean taking a "bottom-up" approach, working closely with communities and building on their existing capacities

and knowledge [38, 106]. Supporting heterogeneity and hybridity does not mean building a broad tool intended to support all possible experiences, but rather incorporating mechanisms that reflect nuance through tinkering, reconfigurations, and re-translations [92], creating avenues for reflexive dialogue and relationship building [6, 38], and legitimizing agonistic and careful approaches to data [7, 23, 51, 65, 66, 92, 110]. Though Suchman, Haraway, and Muller encourage translation as a reflexive practice among academics and technologists [42, 68, 86], Ethnic Studies and Critical Refugee Studies scholars recognize translation as a creative practice already embedded within immigrant and refugee communities as a part of their lived experiences and collective histories [34, 37, 61, 94, 95].

As such, we challenge HCI researchers not to represent communities as bounded, fixed, and homogenous categories but instead to recognize: (1) the histories and power relations that produce subject formations, technologies, and practices [23, 44, 61, 80] (2) the pluralism that exists within a bounded category [14, 61], and (3) the contradictions that may exist when subjects are situated along multiple axes of power and subordination [21, 22, 61, 74]. We argue for the need to consider the complex translation work of those we study as well as the systems that we build – if we only focus on our own translation work, we inevitably flatten the complexity of lived experiences even more. By examining our own translation practices in relation to the practices of those we serve, we can open ourselves up to new ways of knowing and being and new opportunities for building solidarity across differences.

7 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we examine the technology-mediated translation work of ethnic CBOs as they negotiated between communities, policymakers, and funders. In exposing the power relations within these practices, we draw connections to migrant and diasporic conditions and how boundaries were reshaped and contested. Our analysis showed how CBO workers performed translation (1) as legitimacy work to establish trust with funders and communities and (2) as (re)mediation to address barriers and resist hegemonic systems that treat communities as "other." We argue for positioning CBO workers as a critical source of community knowledge-making who can inform HCI research and practice in supporting community wellbeing, such as prioritizing community-oriented forms of legitimacy work and addressing technological harms by attending to the nuances of language, culture, and lived experiences.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We extend our thanks to the CBO workers for their candid testimonials. We also thank our reviewers and colleagues for their invaluable feedback and support, including Tucker Rae-Grant, Esther Kang, Franchesca Spektor, Bonnie Fan, Kimi Wenzel, Ken Holstein, Judy Tzu-Chun Wu, and Thuy Vo Dang.

REFERENCES

[1] Jenna Allard, Carl Davidson, and Julie Matthaei. 2007. Solidarity Economy: Building Alternatives for People and Planet. https://institute.coop/resources/solidarity-economy-building-alternatives-people-and-planet-papers-and-reports-us-social
[2] R.G. Alter, R. Strachwitz, and T. Unger. 2022. *Trust in Philanthropy: A Report on the Philanthropy.Insight Project 2018-2021.* Maecenata Institut. https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/handle/document/77556.2
[3] Adriana Alvarado Garcia, Alyson L. Young, and Lynn Dombrowski. 2017. On Making Data Actionable: How Activists Use Imperfect Data to Foster Social Change for Human Rights Violations in Mexico. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 1, CSCW, Article 19 (dec 2017), 19 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3134654
[4] Miriyam Aouragh, Seda Gürses, Helen Pritchard, and Femke Snelting. 2020. The extractive infrastructures of contact tracing apps. *Journal of Environmental Media* 1, 1 (2020), 9.1–9.9. https://doi.org/10.1386/jem_00030_1
[5] Ian Arawjo. 2020. To Write Code: The Cultural Fabrication of Programming Notation and Practice. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) *(CHI '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376731
[6] Mariam Asad. 2019. Prefigurative Design as a Method for Research Justice. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 3, CSCW, Article 200 (nov 2019), 18 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3359302
[7] Mariam Asad and Christopher A. Le Dantec. 2015. Illegitimate Civic Participation: Supporting Community Activists on the Ground. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing* (Vancouver, BC, Canada) *(CSCW '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1694–1703. https://doi.org/10.1145/2675133.2675156
[8] Lauren Azevedo. 2021. The Impact of Cloud Management Platforms on Nonprofit Business Models. *Journal of Technology in Human Services* 39, 4 (2021), 405–425.
[9] Susan Bassnett. 2013. *Translation studies.* Routledge.
[10] Joseph Betancourt, Alexander Green, Juan Carrillo, and Owusu Ananeh-Firempong. 2002. Defining Cultural Competence: A Practical Framework for Addressing Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Health and Health Care. *Public health reports (Washington, D.C. : 1974)* 118 (11 2002), 293–302. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0033-3549(04)50253-4
[11] Homi K. Bhabha. 2004. *The Location of Culture.* New York: Routledge.
[12] Nicola J. Bidwell, Chris Elsden, Ludwig Trotter, Josh Hallwright, Sadie Moore, Kate Jeite-Delbridge, Mike Harding, Peter Shaw, Nigel Davies, Chris Speed, and John Vines. 2021. A Right Time to Give: Beyond Saving Time in Automated Conditional Donations. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Yokohama, Japan) *(CHI '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 49, 20 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445371
[13] Chris Bopp, Ellie Harmon, and Amy Voida. 2017. Disempowered by Data: Nonprofits, Social Enterprises, and the Consequences of Data-Driven Work. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Denver, Colorado, USA) *(CHI '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3608–3619. https://doi.org/10.1145/3025453.3025694
[14] Geoffrey C. Bowker and Susan Leigh Star. 1999. *Sorting things out : classification and its consequences.* MIT Press Cambridge.
[15] Abby Budiman and Neil G. Ruiz. 2021. Asian Americans are the fastest-growing racial or ethnic group in the U.S. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/04/09/asian-americans-are-the-fastest-growing-racial-or-ethnic-group-in-the-u-s/
[16] Abby Budiman and Neil G. Ruiz. 2021. Key facts about Asian Americans, a diverse and growing population. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/04/29/key-facts-about-asian-americans/
[17] Judith Butler. 2004. *Undoing Gender.* Routledge.
[18] Theresa Hak Kyung Cha. 2001. *Dictee.* University of California Press.
[19] Kathy Charmaz. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis.* London: Sage Publications.
[20] Rosalind S Chou and Joe R Feagin. 2015. *Myth of the model minority: Asian Americans facing racism.* Routledge.
[21] Patricia Hill Collins. 2019. *Intersectionality as Critical Social Theory.* Duke University Press.
[22] Kimberle Crenshaw. 1991. Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review* 43, 6 (1991), 1241–1299. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1229039
[23] Roderic Crooks and Morgan Currie. 2021. Numbers will not save us: Agonistic data practices. *The Information Society* 37, 4 (2021), 201–213. https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2021.1920081
[24] Jay L. Cunningham, Gabrielle Benabdallah, Daniela K. Rosner, and Alex S. Taylor. 2022. On the Grounds of Solutionism: Ontologies of Blackness and HCI. *ACM Trans. Comput.-Hum. Interact.* (aug 2022). https://doi.org/10.1145/3557890
[25] Thuy Vo Dang. 2005. The Cultural Work of Anticommunism in the San Diego Vietnamese American Community. *Amerasia Journal* 31, 2 (2005), 64–86. https://doi.org/10.17953/amer.31.2.t80283284556j378
[26] Thuy Vo Dang. 2008. *Anticommunism as cultural praxis : South Vietnam, war, and refugee memories in the Vietnamese American community.* UC San Diego. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1qf3h134
[27] Lina Dencik, Arne Hintz, Joanna Redden, and Emiliano Treré. 2019. Exploring Data Justice: Conceptions, Applications and Directions. *Information, Communication & Society* 22, 7 (2019), 873–881. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1606268

[28] Catharine DÍgnazio and Lauren F. Klein. 2020. *Data Feminism*. MIT Press.

[29] Lynn Dombrowski, Amy Voida, Gillian R. Hayes, and Melissa Mazmanian. 2012. The Labor Practices of Service Mediation: A Study of the Work Practices of Food Assistance Outreach. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Austin, Texas, USA) *(CHI '12)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1977–1986. https://doi.org/10.1145/2207676.2208342

[30] Bryan Dosono and Bryan Semaan. 2018. Identity Work as Deliberation: AAPI Political Discourse in the 2016 US Presidential Election. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Montreal QC, Canada) *(CHI '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3174207

[31] Bryan Dosono and Bryan Semaan. 2020. Decolonizing Tactics as Collective Resilience: Identity Work of AAPI Communities on Reddit. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 4, CSCW1, Article 69 (may 2020), 20 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3392881

[32] Sheena Erete, Emily Ryou, Geoff Smith, Khristina Marie Fassett, and Sarah Duda. 2016. Storytelling with Data: Examining the Use of Data by Non-Profit Organizations. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing* (San Francisco, California, USA) *(CSCW '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1273–1283. https://doi.org/10.1145/2818048.2820068

[33] Yen Le Espiritu. 1992. *Asian American Panethnicity: Bridging Institutions and Identities*. Temple University Press.

[34] Yen Le Espiritu. 2014. *Body Counts : The Vietnam War and Militarized Refuge(es)*. University of California Press.

[35] Bonnie Fan and Sarah E. Fox. 2022. Access Under Duress: Pandemic-Era Lessons on Digital Participation and Datafication in Civic Engagement. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 6, GROUP (2022).

[36] Sarah E. Fox, Vera Khovanskaya, Clara Crivellaro, Niloufar Salehi, Lynn Dombrowski, Chinmay Kulkarni, Lilly Irani, and Jodi Forlizzi. 2020. Worker-Centered Design: Expanding HCI Methods for Supporting Labor. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) *(CHI EA '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1145/3334480.3375157

[37] Evyn Lê Espiritu Gandhi. 2022. *Archipelago of Resettlement:Vietnamese Refugee Settlers and Decolonization across Guam and Israel-Palestine*. University of California Press, Berkeley. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520976832

[38] Sucheta Ghoshal and Amy Bruckman. 2019. The Role of Social Computing Technologies in Grassroots Movement Building. *ACM Trans. Comput.-Hum. Interact.* 26, 3, Article 18 (jun 2019). https://doi.org/10.1145/3318140

[39] Sucheta Ghoshal, Rishma Mendhekar, and Amy Bruckman. 2020. Toward a Grassroots Culture of Technology Practice. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 4, CSCW1, Article 54 (may 2020). https://doi.org/10.1145/3392862

[40] Jeremy Goecks, Amy Voida, Stephen Voida, and Elizabeth D. Mynatt. 2008. Charitable Technologies: Opportunities for Collaborative Computing in Nonprofit Fundraising. In *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work* (San Diego, CA, USA) *(CSCW '08)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 689–698. https://doi.org/10.1145/1460563.1460669

[41] Lisa Kahaleole Hall. 2015. Which of These Things Is Not Like the Other: Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders Are Not Asian Americans, and All Pacific Islanders Are Not Hawaiian. *American Quarterly* 67, 3 (2015), 727–747. https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2015.0050

[42] Donna Haraway. 1988. Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14, 3 (1988), 575–599.

[43] John Harlow and Mike Fricano. 2021. A COVID Crisis Comes to Light. UCLA Newsroom. https://newsroom.ucla.edu/magazine/native-hawaiians-pacific-islanders-covid-19-lab

[44] Christina Harrington, Sheena Erete, and Anne Marie Piper. 2019. Deconstructing Community-Based Collaborative Design: Towards More Equitable Participatory Design Engagements. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 3, CSCW, Article 216 (nov 2019), 25 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3359318

[45] Ari Hautasaari. 2013. "Could Someone Please Translate This?": Activity Analysis of Wikipedia Article Translation by Non-Experts. In *Proceedings of the 2013 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work* (San Antonio, Texas, USA) *(CSCW '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 945–954. https://doi.org/10.1145/2441776.2441883

[46] Anna Lauren Hoffmann. 2021. Terms of inclusion: Data, discourse, violence. *New Media & Society* 23, 12 (2021), 3539–3556. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820958725

[47] Lynn Holley. 2003. Emerging Ethnic Agencies. *Journal of Community Practice* 11 (10 2003), 39–57. https://doi.org/10.1300/J125v11n04_03

[48] Chi-Kan Richard Hung. 2008. Asian American Nonprofit Organizations in U.S. Metropolitan Areas. *Institute for Asian American Studies Publications* 2 (2008), 150–68.

[49] INCITE. 2017. *The revolution will not be funded : beyond the non-profit industrial complex*. Duke University Press, Durham.

[50] Naomi Ishisaka. 2020. Why it's time to retire the term 'Asian Pacific Islander'. The Seattle Times. https://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/why-its-time-to-retire-the-term-asian-pacific-islander/

[51] Elizabeth Kaziunas, Mark S. Ackerman, Silvia Lindtner, and Joyce M. Lee. 2017. Caring through Data: Attending to the Social and Emotional Experiences of Health Datafication. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing* (Portland, Oregon, USA) *(CSCW '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2260–2272. https://doi.org/10.1145/2998181.2998303

[52] Kauanui J. Kehaulani. 2008. *Hawaiian blood : colonialism and the politics of sovereignty and indigeneity*. Duke University Press.

[53] Vera Khovanskaya, Lynn Dombrowski, Ellie Harmon, Matthias Korn, Ann Light, Michael Stewart, and Amy Voida. 2018. Designing against the Status Quo. *Interactions* 25, 2 (feb 2018), 64–67. https://doi.org/10.1145/3178560

[54] Rakesh Kochhar and Anthony Cilluffo. 2020. Income inequality in the U.S. is rising most rapidly among Asians. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2018/07/12/income-inequality-in-the-u-s-is-rising-most-rapidly-among-asians/

[55] Louisa Küchler, Guido Hertel, and Meinald T. Thielsch. 2020. Are You Willing to Donate? Relationship between Perceived Website Design, Trust and Donation Decisions Online. In *Proceedings of Mensch Und Computer 2020* (Magdeburg, Germany) *(MuC '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 223–227. https://doi.org/10.1145/3404983.3409993

[56] Rachel Kuo and Matthew Bui. 2021. Against carceral data collection in response to anti-Asian violences. *Big Data & Society* 8, 1 (2021), 20539517211028252. https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517211028252

[57] Jonathan Lazar, Julio Abascal, Simone Barbosa, Jeremy Barksdale, Batya Friedman, Jens Grossklags, Jan Gulliksen, Jeff Johnson, Tom McEwan, Loïc Martínez-Normand, Wibke Michalk, Janice Tsai, Gerrit van der Veer, Hans von Axelson, Ake Walldius, Gill Whitney, Marco Winckler, Volker Wulf, Elizabeth F. Churchill, Lorrie Cranor, Janet Davis, Alan Hedge, Harry Hochheiser, Juan Pablo Hourcade, Clayton Lewis, Lisa Nathan, Fabio Paterno, Blake Reid, Whitney Quesenbery, Ted Selker, and Brian Wentz. 2016. Human–Computer Interaction and International Public Policymaking: A Framework for Understanding and Taking Future Actions. *Found. Trends Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 9, 2 (may 2016), 69–149. https://doi.org/10.1561/1100000062

[58] William D. Lewis and Phong Yang. 2012. Building MT for a Severely Under-Resourced Language: White Hmong. In *Conference of the Association for Machine Translation in the Americas*.

[59] Hanlin Li, Lynn Dombrowski, and Erin Brady. 2018. Working toward Empowering a Community: How Immigrant-Focused Nonprofit Organizations Use Twitter during Political Conflicts. In *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Supporting Groupwork* (Sanibel Island, Florida, USA) *(GROUP '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 335–346. https://doi.org/10.1145/3148330.3148336

[60] Natalia Linares and Caroline Woolard. 2021. Solidarity Not Charity: Arts & Culture Grantmaking in the Solidarity Economy. Grantmakers in the Arts. https://www.giarts.org/solidarity-not-charity

[61] Lisa Lowe. 1996. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Duke University Press.

[62] Alex Jiahong Lu, Tawanna R. Dillahunt, Gabriela Marcu, and Mark S. Ackerman. 2021. Data Work in Education: Enacting and Negotiating Care and Control in Teachers' Use of Data-Driven Classroom Surveillance Technology. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 5, CSCW2, Article 452 (oct 2021), 26 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3479596

[63] Jennifer Manuel and Clara Crivellaro. 2020. Place-Based Policymaking and HCI: Opportunities and Challenges for Technology Design. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) *(CHI '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376158

[64] Nicole P. Marwell. 2004. Privatizing the Welfare State: Nonprofit Community-Based Organizations as Political Actors. *American Sociological Review* 69, 2 (2004), 265–291. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240406900206

[65] Amanda Meng and Carl DiSalvo. 2018. Grassroots resource mobilization through counter-data action. *Big Data & Society* 5, 2 (2018), 2053951718796862. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951718796862

[66] Amanda Meng, Carl DiSalvo, and Ellen Zegura. 2019. Collaborative Data Work Towards a Caring Democracy. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 3, CSCW (2019).

[67] Cecelia Merkel, Umer Farooq, Lu Xiao, Craig Ganoe, Mary Beth Rosson, and John M. Carroll. 2007. Managing Technology Use and Learning in Nonprofit Community Organizations: Methodological Challenges and Opportunities. In *Proceedings of the 2007 Symposium on Computer Human Interaction for the Management of Information Technology* (Cambridge, Massachusetts) *(CHIMIT '07)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 8–es. https://doi.org/10.1145/1234772.1234783

[68] Michael Muller. 2004. HCI as Translation Work: How Translation Studies can Inform HCI Research and Practice. *IBM Research Report* (2004). https:

//dominoweb.draco.res.ibm.com/reports/rc23318.pdf
[69] Michael Muller and Allison Druin. 2002. Participatory Design: The Third Space in HCI. *Handbook of HCI* (01 2002).
[70] NAMI. 2022. Asian American and Pacific Islander. https://www.nami.org/Your-Journey/Identity-and-Cultural-Dimensions/Asian-American-and-Pacific-Islander
[71] Tejaswini Niranjana. 1992. *Siting Translation: History, Post-Structuralism, and the Colonial Context.* University of California Press.
[72] Samir Passi and Steven J. Jackson. 2018. Trust in Data Science: Collaboration, Translation, and Accountability in Corporate Data Science Projects. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 2, CSCW, Article 136 (nov 2018), 28 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3274405
[73] Lucy Pei, Benedict Salazar Olgado, and Roderic Crooks. 2022. Narrativity, Audience, Legitimacy: Data Practices of Community Organizers. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (New Orleans, LA, USA) *(CHI EA '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 328, 6 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3491101.3519673
[74] Yolanda A. Rankin, Jakita O. Thomas, and Nicole M. Joseph. 2020. Intersectionality in HCI: Lost in Translation. *Interactions* 27, 5 (sep 2020), 68–71. https://doi.org/10.1145/3416498
[75] Edward Said. 1978. *Orientalism.* Pantheon Books.
[76] SAMHSA. 2015. Racial/Ethnic Differences in Mental Health Service Use among Adults. SAMHSA. https://www.samhsa.gov/data/sites/default/files/MHServicesUseAmongAdults/MHServicesUseAmongAdults.pdf
[77] Morgan Klaus Scheuerman, Madeleine Pape, and Alex Hanna. 2021. Auto-essentialization: Gender in automated facial analysis as extended colonial project. *Big Data & Society* 8, 2 (2021), 20539517211053712. https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517211053712
[78] SEARAC. 2020. Southeast Asian American Journeys. SEARAC. https://www.searac.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/SEARAC_NationalSnapshot_PrinterFriendly.pdf
[79] Joshua Paolo Seguin, Delvin Varghese, Misita Anwar, Tom Bartindale, and Patrick Olivier. 2022. Co-Designing Digital Platforms for Volunteer-Led Migrant Community Welfare Support. In *Designing Interactive Systems Conference* (Virtual Event, Australia) *(DIS '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 247–262. https://doi.org/10.1145/3532106.3533544
[80] Robert Soden, David Ribes, Seyram Avle, and Will Sutherland. 2021. Time for Historicism in CSCW: An Invitation. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 5, CSCW2, Article 459 (oct 2021), 18 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3479603
[81] Anne Spaa, Abigail Durrant, Chris Elsden, and John Vines. 2019. Understanding the Boundaries between Policymaking and HCI. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Glasgow, Scotland Uk) *(CHI '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300314
[82] Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. 2006. *In Other Worlds: Essays In Cultural Politics.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203441114
[83] Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. 2021. *The Politics of Translation.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118613504.ch20
[84] Los Angeles Times Staff. 2022. Tracking coronavirus vaccinations in California. Los Angeles Times. https://www.latimes.com/projects/california-coronavirus-cases-tracking-outbreak/covid-19-vaccines-distribution/
[85] Susan Leigh Star and James R. Griesemer. 1989. Institutional Ecology, 'Translations' and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-39. *Social Studies of Science* 19, 3 (1989), 387–420. https://doi.org/10.1177/030631289019003001
[86] Lucy Suchman. 2002. Located Accountabilities in Technology Production. *Scand. J. Inf. Syst.* 14, 2 (sep 2002), 91–105.
[87] Mark Suchman. 1995. Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches. Academy of Management Review, 20, 571-611. *The Academy of Management Review* 20 (07 1995), 571. https://doi.org/10.2307/258788
[88] Shaden M. Tageldin. 2011. *Disarming Words.* University of California Press.
[89] Katie G. Tanaka and Amy Voida. 2016. Legitimacy Work: Invisible Work in Philanthropic Crowdfunding. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (San Jose, California, USA) *(CHI '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 4550–4561. https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858110
[90] Eric Tang. 2015. *Unsettled: Cambodian Refugees in the New York City Hyperghetto.* Vol. 204. Temple University Press Philadelphia, PA.
[91] Vanessa Thomas, Christian Remy, Mike Hazas, and Oliver Bates. 2017. HCI and Environmental Public Policy: Opportunities for Engagement. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Denver, Colorado, USA) *(CHI '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 6986–6992. https://doi.org/10.1145/3025453.3025579
[92] Anh-Ton Tran, Ashley Boone, Christopher A. Le Dantec, and Carl DiSalvo. 2022. Careful Data Tinkering. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 6, CSCW2, Article 431 (nov 2022), 29 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3555532
[93] Quan Tue Tran. 2012. Remembering the Boat People Exodus: A Tale of Two Memorials. *Journal of Vietnamese Studies* 7, 3 (2012), 80–121. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/vs.2012.7.3.80
[94] Ma Vang. 2018. The Language of Care: Hmong Refugee Activism and a Feminist Refugee Epistemology. In *Asian American Feminisms and Women of Color Politics*, Lynn Fujiwara and Shireen Roshanravan (Eds.). University of Washington Press, Seattle.
[95] Ma Vang. 2021. *History on the Run: Secrecy, Fugitivity, and Hmong Refugee Epistemologies.* Duke University Press.
[96] Delvin Varghese, Jay Rainey, Kyle Montague, Tom Bartindale, Patrick Olivier, and Matt Baillie Smith. 2020. Utilizing Participant Voice in Volunteer Training. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) *(CHI '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376208
[97] Lawrence Venuti. 1986. The Translator's Invisibility. *Criticism* 28, 2 (1986), 179–212. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23110425
[98] Nervo Verdezoto, Naveen Bagalkot, Syeda Zainab Akbar, Swati Sharma, Nicola Mackintosh, Deirdre Harrington, and Paula Griffiths. 2021. The Invisible Work of Maintenance in Community Health: Challenges and Opportunities for Digital Health to Support Frontline Health Workers in Karnataka, South India. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 5, CSCW1, Article 91 (apr 2021), 31 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3449165
[99] Floris Vermeulen, Debra C. Minkoff, and Tom van der Meer. 2016. The Local Embedding of Community-Based Organizations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 45, 1 (2016), 23–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764014558933
[100] Vanamala Viswanatha and Sherry Simon. 1999. Shifting grounds of exchange: B.M. Srikantaiah and Kannada translation. In *Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*, Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi (Eds.). Routledge.
[101] Amy Voida. 2014. A Case for Philanthropic Informatics. In *User-Centric Technology Design for Nonprofit and Civic Engagements*, Saqib Saeed (Ed.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05963-1_1
[102] Amy Voida, Ellie Harmon, and Ban Al-Ani. 2011. Homebrew Databases: Complexities of Everyday Information Management in Nonprofit Organizations. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Vancouver, BC, Canada) *(CHI '11)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 915–924. https://doi.org/10.1145/1978942.1979078
[103] Amy Voida, Ellie Harmon, and Ban Al-Ani. 2012. Bridging between Organizations and the Public: Volunteer Coordinators' Uneasy Relationship with Social Computing. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Austin, Texas, USA) *(CHI '12)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1967–1976. https://doi.org/10.1145/2207676.2208341
[104] Catherine M. Vu, Duy Nguyen, Daniel B. Tanh, and Jessica Chun. 2017. Case Study of an Ethnic Community-Based Organization in the United States. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 46, 1 (2017), 199–217. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764016654220
[105] Edward T. Walker and John D. McCarthy. 2010. Legitimacy, Strategy, and Resources in the Survival of Community-Based Organizations. *Social Problems* 57, 3 (2010), 315–340. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/sp.2010.57.3.315
[106] Cedric Deslandes Whitney, Teresa Naval, Elizabeth Quepons, Simrandeep Singh, Steven R Rick, and Lilly Irani. 2021. HCI Tactics for Politics from Below: Meeting the Challenges of Smart Cities. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Yokohama, Japan) *(CHI '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 297, 15 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445314
[107] Denise Wilson, Vanessa Heaslip, and Debra Jackson. 2018. Improving equity and cultural responsiveness with marginalised communities: Understanding competing worldviews. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 27, 19-20 (2018), 3810–3819. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.14546
[108] Morrison G. Wong. 1986. Post-1965 Asian Immigrants: Where Do They Come from, Where Are They Now, and Where Are They Going? *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 487 (1986), 150–68.
[109] Richmond Y. Wong. 2021. Tactics of Soft Resistance in User Experience Professionals' Values Work. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 5, CSCW2, Article 355 (oct 2021), 28 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3479499
[110] Ellen Zegura, Carl DiSalvo, and Amanda Meng. 2018. Care and the Practice of Data Science for Social Good. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM SIGCAS Conference on Computing and Sustainable Societies* (Menlo Park and San Jose, CA, USA) *(COMPASS '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 34, 9 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3209811.3209877
[111] Li Zhou. 2021. The inadequacy of the term "Asian American". Vox. https://www.vox.com/identities/22380197/asian-american-pacific-islander-aapi-heritage-anti-asian-hate-attacks