

Article

# Pedagogical Translanguaging as a Socially Just Strategy for Multilingual Students in Occupational Therapy

Matumo C. Ramafikeng 

School of Health and Social Care, Faculty of Science and Health, University of Essex, Colchester CO4 3SQ, UK; m.ramafikeng@essex.ac.uk

**Abstract:** Multilingual speakers' languaging practices are undervalued and problematised in formal teaching and learning spaces in higher education. The environment has legitimised monolingualism as the only acceptable practice, hence students often lack the confidence to recruit their full linguistic repertoires. In the third and fourth years of their Occupational Therapy studies, many African students faced challenges due to socio-historic-political factors that put them at risk of failure. These challenges were addressed in academic support tutorial spaces using pedagogical translanguaging. The aim of the paper is to demonstrate the use of translanguaging as a socially just strategy, its affordances, and its challenges. This paper utilises data from a case study within a larger project aiming to describe the use of translanguaging in multilingual teaching and learning settings at a historically White university in South Africa. The case study comprised of eight African students. Linguistic ethnography and Moment analysis were employed. Pedagogical translanguaging and humour were used to create a space conducive to collaborative learning and co-construction of knowledge that granted epistemic access to occupational therapy discourse. Respect and dignity were fundamental in fostering cohesion, improving confidence, enacting speaking rights, and creating a sense of belonging among students who often felt alienated.

**Keywords:** discourse; higher education; occupational therapy; social justice; translanguaging



**Citation:** Ramafikeng, M.C.

Pedagogical Translanguaging as a Socially Just Strategy for Multilingual Students in Occupational Therapy. *Educ. Sci.* **2024**, *14*, 462. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14050462>

Academic Editors: Glenda Cox, Bianca Masuku and Msakha Mona

Received: 26 March 2024

Revised: 20 April 2024

Accepted: 23 April 2024

Published: 26 April 2024



**Copyright:** © 2024 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Inequalities in higher education across the world remain persistent, resulting in disproportionate attainment of outcomes among population groups (see Chesters and Watson [1], Dube [2] and Glass et al. [3]). In South Africa, despite the overall racial composition of the student body changing in the last two decades, with Black students making up the majority [4,5] their rate of success remains disproportionately low. In addition, Black students continue to be the minority in some programmes across historically White institutions.

Meaningful transformation therefore remains a priority as systemic issues like inequalities and various forms of oppression, including ongoing blatant racism and sexism, persist in the South African higher education system [6]. These inequalities are a legacy of colonialism and apartheid that continue to shape higher education today [7,8]. The need for social justice and decolonisation of higher education is therefore more urgent for improvement of retention and graduation rates among Black students.

In addition to systemic issues, a multitude of factors have been indicated as the cause of poor performance among Black students in higher education [6,9]. However, the most referenced cause of poor success among these students is the 'language problem' [5]. This is despite extensive literature citing linguistic, academic, and socio-cultural factors as perpetuating challenges experienced by these students [10–12]. This relentless perception of a 'language problem' often refers to limited proficiency in English and ignores the students' full linguistics repertoire.

South Africa boasts a rich multilingual landscape, comprising of 11 official languages, alongside numerous others spoken as primary, or home languages acquired during early

schooling [13]. Recently, the South African sign language was added as the 12th official language. Most South Africans, particularly the African people, are multilingual. According to the 2022 census [14], a majority of South Africans stated an African language as a home language. However, as is common in African and Latin American countries, the continuing legacy of colonisation has rendered the colonial language as the language of power and dominance in the education system [15] and beyond. This dominance of English in South African higher education [13] is coupled with an overbearing anglonormative ideology, which is “the expectation that people will be and should be proficient in English and are deficient, even deviant, if they are not” [16] (p. 80). Hence the dominant ‘language problem’ narrative.

Although referring to students as having a ‘language problem’ unfairly blames students for their failure to succeed [17], it is important to acknowledge that a problem of proficiency in the medium of instruction does exist. Many students accessing higher education experience challenges due to the dominance of English, unequal access to English education and exposure, resulting in reduced confidence; limited engagement; and, ultimately, poor performance [13]. As part of the transformation agenda, universities are therefore expected to effectively respond to students’ needs, including addressing the language of instruction, which poses an additional threat to success and throughput [6] among Black students.

## 2. A Discourse Perspective of the Attainment Gap

Definitions of discourse highlight its multifaceted nature that includes a complex interplay of its linguistic and social dimensions. The conventional socio-linguistic interpretation of discourse as language in use or language in action [18], which Gee [19] denotes with a “little d”, was critiqued as confining language to discrete speech contexts that do not take its ideological nature into account.

To foreground the socio-historical, cultural, and political nature of language, Gee [19] proposed the notion of Discourse (with a big “D”). The following updated definition was coined:

Discourse refers to *distinctive* ways of speaking/listening and often writing/reading *coupled* with distinctive ways of acting, interacting, valuing, feeling, dressing, thinking, believing, with other people and with various objects, tools, and technologies, so as to enact specific socially recognisable identities engaged in specific socially recognisable activities [20] (p. 155).

This definition highlights the inextricable link between ways of using language and ways of “doing-being-valuing-believing” within specific social contexts [19] (p. 142). This perspective recognises that “language is productive and shapes our understandings of ourselves, others, and what is or is not possible” [21] (p. 81). This notion of Discourse as a conceptual tool to describe and analyse student learning facilitates an understanding of the role of language in meaning making and identity development as well as how it facilitates or hinders the learning process [22].

Discourses belong to social groups and their continuity and regulation rely on the structures and technologies developed and policed by these groups [19,20,23]. In a specific context, a social group and its Discourses become dominant when its ideologies and practices become naturalised and perceived as the norm or standard [19], as is the case of English South Africa. Through language practices, the interests of some groups are sustained while simultaneously marginalising those of others [24]. Gaining access to disciplinary Discourses entails negotiating and understanding the accepted “ways of using language and thinking, feeling, believing, valuing, acting, reading and writing, and using symbolic expressions and artefacts” of the discipline while developing an identity that must be recognised by established members of the discipline [19] (p. 143). This process is value-laden and fundamentally exclusionary, hence one can either be accepted or rejected by the discipline through a monitoring system such as the university.

In the Theory of Discourse, Gee [19] proposes two types; namely, primary and the secondary Discourses. Primary Discourse refers to the initial Discourse that a person acquires through socialisation in “whatever constitutes their primary socialising unit early

in life” and secondary Discourses are acquired through socialisation and association with social groups beyond the primary socialising unit [20] (p. 156). Primary Discourses have distinct ways of integrating words, actions, and values that are shared by the family or community and are aligned to the social practices of a particular group, and therefore constitute the first social identity of the person [25]. Secondary Discourses, meanwhile, are in the public sphere, located within institutions, and are often specialised [20]. Primary Discourses serve as a point of reference from which other Discourses are acquired or resisted [20].

Incompatibility between primary and secondary Discourses leads to conflicts, contradictions, and tensions that could hinder fluency in the secondary Discourse, thereby limiting access to the associated social goods [19,20]. In a study among African students enrolled in an Occupational Therapy programme at a historically White university in South Africa, it was established that the privileged ways of knowing, doing, valuing, being, and thinking in practice were not familiar to these students [22]. This impacted their performance in practice settings, as they often had to independently negotiate taken-for-granted assumptions and decode Occupational Therapy literacy practices that were not made explicit [26]. This finding resonated with the Council of Higher Education’s [6] observation that curriculum structure was singled out as a key factor that impacts teaching and learning in higher education.

Unpacking the attainment gap through a Discourse lens foregrounds the important role played by language in continuing social inequalities in education. This lens also facilitates uncovering of the hegemonic nature of dominant discourses and their practices that perpetuate them and marginalise others, particularly students from non-dominant social groups [22].

### 3. Translanguaging for Social Justice

The increasing social disparities within and due to education systems underscores the role of the teacher in facilitating equitable attainment of educational achievements for marginalised students [27]. To restore humanity, dignity, and ensure equitable treatment of marginalised, racialised, and minoritised students it is crucial to embrace a critical approach in both research and teaching.

Social justice has been used as a critical framework in educational research to enable a more profound comprehension of social disparities and to advocate for fairness and equity in teaching marginalised and underprivileged students [28]. Sensoy and DiAngelo [29] critique principles of “fairness” and “equality,” commonly emphasised in definitions of social justice and discussions on its implementation, for their vagueness and neglect to recognise the deep stratification within society. Hence, they posit that the ideal of universal fairness and equality may remain elusive, therefore propose an alternative definition: *critical social justice*.

Critical social justice refers to specific theoretical perspectives that recognise that society is *stratified* (i.e., divided and unequal) in significant and far-reaching ways along social group lines that include race, class, gender, sexuality, and ability. Critical social justice recognises inequality as deeply embedded in the fabric of society and actively seeks to change this through critical social justice literacy [29] (pp. xx–xxi).

This definition is a call to scholars and teachers to be more critical and intentional in their implementation of social justice.

From a language-use perspective, aspects of the Theory of Discourse [19] resonate with this definition of critical social justice. Dominant Discourses in society tend to silence and negate Discourses of less dominant social groups [20]. Translanguaging is therefore a powerful practice that gives voice to linguistically minoritised social groups [30].

Translanguaging refers to “the deployment of a speaker’s full linguistic repertoire without regard for adherence to socially and politically defined boundaries of named languages” [31] (p. 283). Translanguaging is what multilingual speakers do daily to make sense of their world [28,32], what Wang [33] refers to as a linguistic reality. Garcia

and Kleifgen [34] provide a detailed account of the evolution of translanguaging as a sociolinguistic theory, its conceptualisations, and its origins in educational practice, giving attention to the performances of multilinguals and relation to literacies.

Pedagogical translanguaging is therefore defined as “a theoretical and instructional approach that aims at improving language and content competencies in school contexts using resources from the learner’s whole linguistic repertoire” [35] (p. 1). This can include purposely alternating languages of input and output [36]. Translanguaging is recognised as “a mechanism for social justice, especially when teaching students from language minoritised communities” [37] (p. 200). The approach promotes and valorises languages and linguistic repertoires that are often marginalised, [36] and disrupts prevailing anglonormative practices in education settings [38]. However, a study exploring educators’ perspectives on the link between translanguaging and social justice found that only a few recognised the connection and with little evidence of how this is enacted in practice [39]. This could indicate the need for intentionality and a critical approach when using translanguaging for social justice.

Translanguaging scholarship has been mainly in language teaching, with growing evidence in other disciplines and fields of study, such as science education (see Karlsson, Nygård Larsson, and Jakobsson [40]; Suarez [41]; Pun and Tai [42]). However, pedagogical translanguaging is not yet well-established in health sciences education and research [26]. Therefore, this study makes an original contribution to scholarship on implementation of pedagogical translanguaging; an innovative strategy in health sciences education using occupational therapy as a case example. Although this study was conducted in South Africa, insights gained could be relevant beyond the setting as translanguaging is a global phenomenon shared by bi/multilingual societies.

This paper reports on data from one case study within a larger project across three pedagogical sites in a historically White university in South Africa. This project involved three years of data collection; 2017–2019. The aim was to describe the use of translanguaging in multilingual teaching and learning settings at a historically White university in South Africa.

#### 4. Materials and Methods

Linguistic ethnography was used in this study. This is a multidisciplinary field that combines linguistic and ethnographic approaches to study social and communicative processes in various contexts [43]. It foregrounds the reciprocal influence between language and social interactions and emphasises that analysis of situated language use can offer valuable and unique perspectives on the mechanisms and dynamics of socio-cultural production in everyday activity [44,45]. Linguistic ethnography is therefore particularly useful for examining the situatedness of language in use alongside multiple identities and roles that people play as they use language in context; it foregrounds the interactional nature of discourse [46].

##### 4.1. The Case

The participants were a group of African students ( $n = 8$ ). To protect their identity, brief demographic details are presented in Table 1 below:

**Table 1.** Participant demographics.

Participant Code	Age	Sex
F1	21	Female
F2	21	Female
F3	21	Female
F4	21	Female
M1	23	Male
M2	23	Male
M3	22	Male
M4	22	Male

The participants were all registered for the BSc in Occupational Therapy degree as their first degree and were in their fourth year of study. They were attending academic support tutorials, which are part of a proactive approach within the programme aimed at supporting senior students (3rd and 4th year) complete their degree. A procedure is implemented to identify students considered at risk of failing, directing those who achieve a grade of 55% or lower in coursework towards these support tutorials. They serve as supplementary tutorials and are not formally assessed, hence the number of attendees fluctuated from week to week. While not all attendees were at risk of failing, the space gained popularity among African students seeking a place to connect. The author was the educator for these sessions, which occurred weekly for two to three hours depending on the needs of the group. The inclusion criteria for participation in the study was:

- All students attending academic support tutorials
- Those who were available on the day of data collection and gave consent.

#### 4.2. Data Collection

The ethnographic data collection tool used in this study was participant observation to collect data on how translanguaging was enacted in a real tutorial situation. Four tutorial sessions were audio recorded. This method enabled naturalistic observation of social interactions as well as how translanguaging was used to create a translanguaging space in a classroom setting. A translanguaging space is a space for the act of translanguaging as well as a space created through translanguaging by creatively and critically deploying semiotic resources [47].

#### 4.3. Data Analysis

Moment analysis [32] and some elements of Discourse analysis [19] were used to analyse the transcribed audio recordings. Moment Analysis “focuses on the spur-of-the-moment actions, what prompted such actions, and the consequences of such moments including the reactions by other people” [32] (p. 1224). The elements of Discourse analysis that were drawn on were the six building tasks, which were used to varying degrees to construct the activity of learning within the tutorial space. These tasks are:

1. *Semiotic building*, that is, using cues or clues to assemble situated meanings about what semiotic (communicative) systems, systems of knowledge, and ways of knowing are here and now relevant and activated.
2. *World building*, that is, using cues or clues to assemble situated meanings about what is here and now (taken as) “reality”, what is here and now (taken as) present and absent, concrete and abstract, “real” and “unreal”, probable, possible, and impossible.
3. *Activity building*, that is, using cues or clues to assemble situated meanings about what activity or activities are going on, composed of what specific actions.
4. *Socio-culturally, situated identity and relationship building*, that is, using cues or clues to assemble situated meanings about what identities and relationships are relevant to the interaction, with their concomitant attitudes, values, ways of feeling, ways of knowing and believing, as well as ways of acting and interacting.
5. *Political building*, that is, using cues or clues to construct the nature and relevance of various “social goods”, such as status and power, and anything else taken as a “social good” here and now (e.g., beauty, humor, verbalness, specialist knowledge, a fancy car, etc.).
6. *Connection building*, that is, using cues or clues to make assumptions about how the past and future of an interaction, verbally and non-verbally, are connected to the present moment and to each other—after all, interactions always have some degree of continuous coherence” [48] (pp. 85–86).

To generate the themes, questions drawn from moment analysis were used, namely, what is being done with language in this moment, and which languages are used for what purpose? This was followed by, what are the consequences of using language in this way

(with reference to the building tasks) and lastly, how are others reacting to or collaborating in the meaning-making process?

## 5. Results

The findings are presented as specific moments that showcase how translanguaging is used within the space, the affordances, and how social justice was enacted.

### 5.1. Moment 1: Building Confidence

The excerpt starts with a question directed at M1, who had just shared practice-related challenges and attempted to answer a question about his intervention focus, but without using disciplinary discourse.

**Educator:** Aha, now talk to me in occupational therapy terms. **Kere na** in this block, your focus . . . is it performance, occupational performance, or occupational engagement? [*I'm asking whether, in this block, your focus . . . is it performance, occupational performance, or occupational engagement your focus?*]

**M1:** (chuckles) I think . . . I'll have to think hard on that one because performance is like working . . . with a . . .

**Educator:** Tangible, **akere ke** the tangible? [*Tangible, it is the tangible right?*]

**M1:** Yes

**Educator:** Yes, think like that. So now you need to define engagement **le** participation. [*Yes, think of like that. So now you need define engagement and participation.*]

**M1:** OK

The educator starts by acknowledging M1's response without commenting on whether it is correct or not, before posing the question again using translanguaging instead of directly providing the correct answer. This encourages collaborative problem solving and active participation while legitimising use of African languages in the space; an occurrence that is not common in other formal spaces within the setting. This moment creates a translanguaging space where there is creative and flexible use of named languages and language varieties [47] without paying attention to correct grammar or register boundaries. In this case the named languages were Sesotho and English.

In addition, the educator is making explicit the privileged ways of enacting disciplinary discourse, which are to start by defining concepts and then to apply them. The rest of the group attentively listens to the interaction between M1 and the educator, as they are also co-creating the space through their silence and attention, holding the space for M1 to gain clarity. This action reduces performance anxiety and boosts the confidence of M1, who then openly acknowledges his own limitations in knowledge, even though he masks the embarrassment with a chuckle. Drawing on social justice, this moment shows how the space fosters respect and dignity to all, as M1 is afforded the time to process information without disruption, thereby granting him equitable access to knowledge. As shown in the trailing, M1 tends to speak slowly without completing sentences most of the time.

The next moment, the educator draws in the group strategically, shifting prolonged attention from M1:

**Educator:** . . . and if any of you doesn't know the difference between the things I'm talking about, write yourselves notes because somewhere in this degree you will deal with either participation, engagement, or performance. So, know your stuff.

**M3:** I wanna try. Is it like engagement because performance you do tangible things. With engagement you increase engagement in performance. So, I help B with physical abilities or physical skills. SO now his engagement into other things has increased. So, engagement comes when there is an increase in terms of participation.

M3 seeks permission to respond but proceeds without waiting for formal approval, because, in this translanguaging space, there is an understanding that speaking rights are

shared and that the group, including the educator, collaborates in co-creating knowledge and enhancing understanding. Interaction flows without adhering to the rigid confines of a conventional classroom setting, where students must seek and be granted permission to speak from the educator before speaking. Unlike in mainstream classrooms where African students often hesitate to share their opinions unless prompted, M3 volunteers to attempt a response to the question. In addition, even though M3 speaks in English, he does not adhere to grammatical conventions or academic register which is permitted in this space.

### 5.2. Moment 2: Multimodality and Humour in Translanguaging

Recognising the vagueness and limited understanding of the distinction between the concepts, the educator instructed the group to search in their notes and online for the definitions. Only two participants had their laptops, but all had their smartphones. The participants were now accustomed to using their phones for academic purposes, when initially they did not. During the search, the educator used this emergent opportunity to guide the group on preferred sources of evidence; for example, why Wikipedia cannot be used as an academic reference. It often taken for granted that students know how to assess the legitimacy of a source of evidence. However, these participants, whose 'primary Discourse' is very different from the Occupational Therapy 'Discourse' [19] literacies that they are acquiring, often did not know this.

The next moment happens within an hour-long discussion and searching online for definitions; F1 has just demonstrated an understanding of two of the concepts but was unsure of one.

**F1:** Ok, ok. . .

**Educator:** You're with me?

**F1:** Ok? Sooo . . . so is that a point where they [patients/clients] don't need us though?

**Educator:** Yes. They're living . . . they're living their lives. . .

**M1:** Because you reached your intervention . . . You reached your goal.

**M4:** *ja* [yes] that's why we chose this creative participation. Remember when we chose our aim? OK performance is there, engagement is there, but what is lacking is something tangible [pause- brief silence] *Mare nna ha ke utlwisisi* [but I don't understand]

In this moment, F1 signals both uncertainty as well as deeper recognition that, when one of the concepts is applied, at some point, the patients would no longer need intervention. M1, who has now grasped the concepts, confirms F1's observation. However, M4 expresses a lack of understanding in Sepedi after trying to make sense of the concepts. Both M1 and M4 are aware of turn-taking in interactions and, instead of interrupting F1, they each wait for a moment to express their view. This resonates with Li's [32] proposition that multilingual speakers have an innate capacity to read a situation, choose a linguistic resource in a moment, and use it to create a space for their benefit, but in a situation-sensitive manner. M4 initially agrees, suggesting comprehension, but while he talks, he realises that he does not yet fully understand. This could signal reflection in action.

The online exploration and discussion about concepts continued alongside making notes and documenting useful references. The group had reached a moment where they collectively understood two of the concepts but could not find a definition for the last one and frustration was becoming evident. M2 then fiddles with the camera-blocker on M3's laptop and M3 shuts it instantly. Then this moment follows:

**M2:** *Ha hona motho ao shebileng* [no one is watching you]

**M3:** *Mmata ba nsheba Mmata* [my friend they are watching me my friend]

**M2:** *Ke manga o shebileng? Jeeessis!! O rata* paranoia. Delusions! [who is looking at you? Jeez/my goodness!! you like paranoia. Delusions!]

**M3:** *Mmata a o ntloele* [my friend please leave me alone]

**(Group laughing)**

**M2:** Hyper paranoia. **Mmotse o diyang ekana e batho ba moshebang ka teng.** [*Ask him what it is that he's doing that would make people watch him*]. Who is watching you?

**M1:** If [xx-refers to participant by name] you just put him in a gown saying Valkernburg [a psychiatric hospital in Cape Town]. All of this would be a case study.

**[Group laughing]**

**M3:** *Mmata* [my friend] functionally I'm fine. . . it doesn't affect me functionally.

**[Group laughing]**

**M1:** That's what I'm saying. You are considered normal within the context you are in at that moment. But if we were to take you to Valkernburg then you say they are watching me. . .

M2 starts off by reassuring M3 that no one is watching, but after M3's response, M2's tone changes and he teases M3 while drawing in M1. They use translanguaging fluidly moving between frivolous register to academic register; incorporating four named languages; Sepedi, Sesotho, English, and Afrikaans. As García and Wei [49] indicate, translanguaging involves creating a space where multilingual students have the freedom to intentionally use their full linguistic repertoire to enhance learning and optimise participation. They naturally and strategically incorporate occupational therapy discourse to diagnose M3 and he also draws on it to argue in defence. This playful exchange remains between the three male participants and the rest of the group responds with laughter. In this exchange, they claim their speaking rights using translanguaging and express themselves effectively, creating a moment that strengthens group cohesion.

This moment illustrates that this translanguaging space is a safe space where the group engages playfully about a sensitive topic infused with humour. According to Whiting-Madison [50] humour in college classrooms can lighten the mood, provide a mental break, promote social cohesion, and increase information retention.

**6. Discussion**

The educator and the students collaboratively created a translanguaging space, through translanguaging, to enhance learning. Collaborative learning is an instructional strategy where students actively share knowledge and expertise while partaking in small group activities [51]; it has widely reported benefits including a deeper understanding of concepts and a higher quality of social interaction [52]. Although the benefits of collaboration are widely reported for students, there is a need for more research on the benefits for the educator.

Participants showed both creativity and critical thinking in their selection and use of a range of their linguistic, discursive, and semiotic resources to collaborate in their learning. According to Darwin [53] (p. 581), "creativity and criticality are inextricably intertwined concepts embedded in the production of discourse". This process led to a translanguaging space that was constructed by fluidly moving between naturally occurring conversation and academic register. The educator intentionally facilitated this kind of a conversation to reduce anxiety among the participants and encourage active participation. Active learning among the students was evident through them asking questions and sharing opinions and feelings openly. García and Leiva [37] posit that, when educators employ pedagogical translanguaging, they are engaging in a process of social transformation. This was achieved through collaboratively creating a safe space and promoting a sense of belonging among students who often felt alienated.

Paudel [54] argues that translanguaging pedagogy is socially just, as it primarily preserves students' linguistic identities, enhances their participation, and aids comprehension of content and literacy. It is within this space that students' emergent learning needs were met with little consideration of time; it took however long it took to ensure that all the students understood the concepts. Using translanguaging to aid meaning making was a way of granting epistemic access [36]. This strategy could demonstrate an equitable approach

to meeting needs; not all students gained understanding at the same time, but those that grasped quicker were then involved in the process of assisting others. The educator was aware that, as Gee [19] asserts, the process of negotiating access to secondary Discourse can be more challenging for some students than others depending on their primary Discourse and previous secondary Discourses. The approach promoted social justice by encouraging collaboration and inclusion, rather than using time as a means of exclusion.

In summary, translanguaging offers cognitive, affective, and linguistic affordances [55], as was also established in this study. In addition, as widely acknowledged, translanguaging supports learning (see, for example, Garcia and Kleifgen [34]; Rosiers, [56]; Rajendram [55]), identity development [57] and is empowering [13,33]. However, due to institutional and societal constraints [55,56] the use of translanguaging remains limited. Prinsloo and Krause [58] caution that translanguaging, particularly in Southern settings, might not always lead to educational equality.

## 7. Further Recommendations and Implications

Despite the challenges, pedagogical translanguaging legitimises Discourses of students from linguistically and culturally minoritized social groups; therefore, it is a useful strategy for learning. Translanguaging has immense potential in enabling equitable attainment of educational outcomes among multilingual students. However, there is a dire need for further research to explore the affordances and challenges of pedagogical translanguaging, particularly in health sciences education. A curriculum requirement for health sciences students is that they spend time in real-world settings, learning and providing services related to their respective professions. In multilingual societies, these services are provided to people with a range of linguistic repertoires; therefore, translanguaging could be useful in mediating communication between the students and service users.

## 8. Conclusions

Adopting a perspective on language that considers the socio-historic-political dimensions is useful for understanding the attainment gap and reorients focus to the hegemonic power of dominant Discourses. Translanguaging was used as an act of resistance to disrupt monolingual practices and ideologies in a higher education space, an example of multilingual speakers' agency as they reclaimed their speaking rights and identity in a context where they were often limited, denied, and prohibited. In collaboration with each other, the students and educator created a sense of connectedness, where there were moments of recognising the self in others' narratives, hence the level of respect and dignity that was afforded to each person's input. Legitimising the recruitment of multilingual and other semiotic resources was liberating for both the students and the educator. The space was a shared space for meaning making with the aim of co-constructing knowledge and ensuring the attainment of fluency in the Occupational Therapy Discourse, while developing confidence and a sense of belonging.

**Funding:** This research was funded by National Research Foundation (NRF) South Africa. Grant number 113359. The University of Essex funded the publication costs.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Institutional Review Board (or Ethics Committee) of Faculty of Health Sciences Research Ethics Committee, University of Cape Town (HREC 239/2017) for studies involving humans.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent was obtained from all participants involved in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** The raw data from this study has not been added to any database. The participants are a minority group that could be identifiable if the data is made available, therefore, to protect their privacy, the data is unavailable.

**Acknowledgments:** The author is grateful to Carolyn McKinney who was the Principal Investigator of the main project that the reported case study was part of.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The author declares no conflicts of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results.

## References

1. Chesters, J.; Watson, L. Understanding the persistence of inequality in higher education: Evidence from Australia. *J. Educ. Policy* **2013**, *28*, 198–215. [CrossRef]
2. Dube, T. Gender Disparities in Educational Enrollment and Attainment in Sub-Saharan Africa. *J. Educ. Soc. Res.* **2015**, *5*, 279–284. [CrossRef]
3. Glass, C.R.; Streitwieser, B.; Gopal, A. Inequities of global mobility: Socioeconomic stratification in the meanings of a university education for international students. *Comp. J. Comp. Int. Educ.* **2019**, *51*, 43–60. [CrossRef]
4. Dominguez-Whitehead, Y. Impediments to pursuing graduate studies in South Africa: The role of the family, social class, and race. *J. Comp. Fam. Stud.* **2017**, *48*, 197–215. [CrossRef]
5. Council on Higher Education (CHE). *South African Higher Education Reviewed: Two Decades of Democracy*; Council on Higher Education: Pretoria, South Africa, 2016. Available online: <https://www.che.ac.za/index.php/file/6468/download?token=6N18Fnsb> (accessed on 23 October 2017).
6. Council of Higher Education (CHE). *Council on Higher Education (CHE) 2022/2023 Annual Report*; Council on Higher Education: Pretoria, South Africa, 2023. Available online: <https://www.che.ac.za/publications/reports/council-higher-education-che-2022-2023-annual-report> (accessed on 18 March 2024).
7. McKeever, M. Social stratification and inequality in South Africa. *Sociol. Compass* **2023**, *18*, e13173. [CrossRef]
8. Badat, S. Redressing apartheid’s legacy of social exclusion: Social equity, redress and admission to higher education in South Africa. In *One World, Many Knowledges: Regional Experiences and Cross-Regional Links in Higher Education*; Southern African–Nordic Centre: Bellville, South Africa, 2016; pp. 71–99.
9. Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). *White Paper for Post-School Education and Training: Building an Expanded, Effective and Integrated System Post-School System*; Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET): Pretoria, South Africa, 2013. Available online: <http://www.justice.gov.za/commissions/FeesHET/docs/2013-WhitePaper-Post-SchoolEducationAndTraining.pdf> (accessed on 13 July 2016).
10. Thomas, T.A.; Maree, D.J. Student factors affecting academic success among undergraduate students at two South African higher education institutions. *S. Afr. J. Psychol.* **2021**, *52*, 99–111. [CrossRef]
11. Pym, J.; Kapp, R. Harnessing agency: Towards a learning model for undergraduate students. *Stud. High. Educ.* **2013**, *38*, 272–284. [CrossRef]
12. Bangeni, B.; Kapp, R. Identities in Transition: Shifting Conceptions of Home among “Black” South African University Students. *Afr. Stud. Rev.* **2005**, *48*, 1–19. [CrossRef]
13. Hurst, E.; Mona, M. “Translanguaging” as a socially just pedagogy. *Educ. Chang.* **2017**, *21*, 126–148. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
14. StatsSA. *Census 2022*; Department of Statistics South Africa: Pretoria, South Africa, 2022. Available online: [https://census.statssa.gov.za/assets/documents/2022/P03014\\_Census\\_2022\\_Statistical\\_Release.pdf](https://census.statssa.gov.za/assets/documents/2022/P03014_Census_2022_Statistical_Release.pdf) (accessed on 22 March 2024).
15. Christie, P.; McKinney, C. Decoloniality and “Model C” schools: Ethos, language and the protests of 2016. *Educ. Chang.* **2017**, *21*, 1–21. [CrossRef]
16. McKinney, C. *Language and Power in Post-Colonial Schooling: Ideologies in Practice*; Routledge: New York, NY, USA; London, UK, 2017.
17. Smit, R. Towards a clearer understanding of students disadvantage in higher education: Problematizing deficit thinking. *High. Educ. Res. Dev.* **2012**, *31*, 369–380. [CrossRef]
18. Bloor, M.; Bloor, T. *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*; Hodder Arnold: London, UK, 2007.
19. Gee, J.P. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*; Falmer Press: London, UK, 1990.
20. Gee, J.P. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourse*, 3rd ed.; Routledge: London, UK, 2008.
21. Barrett, M.J. Making (Some) Sense of Feminist Poststructuralism in Environmental Education Research and Practice. *Can. J. Environ. Educ.* **2005**, *10*, 79–93.
22. Ramafikeng, M.C. *Students’ Negotiation of Practice Education in Occupational Therapy: A Case Study*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa, 2018.
23. Fairclough, N. *Discourse and Social Change*; Polity Press: Cambridge, UK, 1992.
24. Tejada, C.; Espinoza, M.; Gutierrez, K. Toward a decolonizing pedagogy: Social justice reconsidered. In *Pedagogies of Difference*; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2003.
25. Gee, J.P. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*, 2nd ed.; Falmer Press: London, UK, 1996.
26. Ramafikeng, M.C. Making Implicit Occupational Therapy Curriculum Expectations Explicit and Using Translanguaging to Navigate Literacy Practices. In *Transforming Teaching and Learning Experiences for Helping Professions in Higher Education*; Koninklijke Brill: Leiden, The Netherlands, 2023; pp. 194–210.

27. Mills, C.; Ballantyne, J. Social justice and teacher education: A systematic review of empirical work in the field. *J. Teach. Educ.* **2016**, *67*, 263–276. [[CrossRef](#)]
28. Garcia, O. *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*; Wiley-Blackwell: Oxford, UK, 2009.
29. Sensoy, O.; DiAngelo, R. *Is Everyone Really Equal?: An Introduction to Key Concepts in Social Justice Education*; Teachers College Press: New York, NY, USA, 2017.
30. Flores, N.; Rosa, J. Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harv. Educ. Rev.* **2015**, *85*, 149–171. [[CrossRef](#)]
31. Otheguy, R.; García, O.; Reid, W. Clarifying translanguaging and deconstructing named languages: A perspective from linguistics. *Appl. Linguist. Rev.* **2015**, *6*, 281–307. [[CrossRef](#)]
32. Li, W. Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *J. Pragmat.* **2011**, *43*, 1222–1235. [[CrossRef](#)]
33. Wang, D. Translanguaging as a social justice strategy: The case of teaching Chinese to ethnic minority students in Hong Kong. *Asia Pac. Educ. Rev.* **2023**, *24*, 473–486. [[CrossRef](#)]
34. García, O.; Kleifgen, J.A. Translanguaging and literacies. *Read. Res. Q.* **2020**, *55*, 553–571. [[CrossRef](#)]
35. Cenoz, J.; Gorter, D. *Pedagogical Translanguaging*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2021.
36. Makalela, L. Moving out of linguistic boxes: The effects of translanguaging strategies for multilingual classrooms. *Lang. Educ.* **2015**, *29*, 200–217. [[CrossRef](#)]
37. García, O.; Leiva, C. Theorizing and enacting translanguaging for social justice. In *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy*; Blackledge, A., Creese, A., Eds.; Springer: Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 2014; pp. 199–216. [[CrossRef](#)]
38. Guzula, X.; McKinney, C.; Tyler, R. Linguaging-for-learning: Legitimising translanguaging and enabling multimodal practices in third spaces. *S. Afr. Linguist. Appl. Lang. Stud.* **2016**, *34*, 211–226. [[CrossRef](#)]
39. Bhasin, A.; Castro, M.; Román, D. Translanguaging through the lens of social justice: Unpacking educators’ understanding and practices. *Int. Multiling. Res. J.* **2023**, *17*, 304–317. [[CrossRef](#)]
40. Karlsson, A.; Nygård Larsson, P.; Jakobsson, A. Multilingual students’ use of translanguaging in science classrooms. *Int. J. Sci. Educ.* **2019**, *41*, 2049–2069. [[CrossRef](#)]
41. Suarez, E. “Estoy Explorando Science”: Emergent bilingual students problematizing electrical phenomena through translanguaging. *Sci. Educ.* **2020**, *104*, 791–826. [[CrossRef](#)]
42. Pun, J.K.; Tai, K.W. Doing science through translanguaging: A study of translanguaging practices in secondary English as a medium of instruction science laboratory sessions. *Int. J. Sci. Educ.* **2021**, *43*, 1112–1139. [[CrossRef](#)]
43. Shaw, S.; Copland, F.; Snell, J. An introduction to linguistic ethnography: Interdisciplinary explorations. In *Linguistic Ethnography: Interdisciplinary Explorations*; Palgrave Macmillan: London, UK, 2015; pp. 1–13.
44. Rampton, B.; Maybin, J.; Roberts, C. *Methodological Foundations in Linguistic Ethnography. Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*; Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies: Paper 102; King’s College London: London, UK, 2014.
45. Copland, F.; Creese, A. *Linguistic Ethnography: Collecting, Analysing and Presenting Data*; Sage: London, UK, 2015.
46. Hornberger, N.H. Ethnography in linguistic perspective: Understanding school processes. *Lang. Educ.* **1995**, *9*, 233–248. [[CrossRef](#)]
47. Li, W. Translanguaging as a practical theory of language. *Appl. Linguist.* **2017**, *39*, 9–30. [[CrossRef](#)]
48. Gee, J.P. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 1999.
49. García, O.; Wei, L. Language, Bilingualism and Education. In *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*; Palgrave Pivot: London, UK, 2014; pp. 46–62. [[CrossRef](#)]
50. Whiting-Madison, C.; Woller, K.M.P. Humor in the Classroom: Learning Through Laughter. *J. Ment. Health Soc. Behav.* **2021**, *3*, 127. [[CrossRef](#)]
51. Scager, K.; Boonstra, J.; Peeters, T.; Vulperhorst, J.; Wiegant, F. Collaborative learning in higher education: Evoking positive interdependence. *CBE—Life Sci. Educ.* **2017**, *15*, ar69. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
52. Visschers-Pleijers, A.J.; Dolmans, D.H.; De Leng, B.A.; Wolfhagen, I.H.; Van Der Vleuten, C.P. Analysis of verbal interactions in tutorial groups: A process study. *Med. Educ.* **2006**, *40*, 129–137. [[CrossRef](#)]
53. Darwin, R. Creativity and criticality: Reimagining narratives through translanguaging and transmediation. *Appl. Linguist. Rev.* **2020**, *11*, 581–606. [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Paudel, J. Translanguaging as a Pedagogy of Enacting Social Justice in a Multilingual Setting. In *Teaching Practices and Language Ideologies for Multilingual Classrooms*; IGI Global: Hershey, PA, USA, 2021; pp. 131–150. [[CrossRef](#)]
55. Rajendram, S. Translanguaging as an agentive pedagogy for multilingual learners: Affordances and constraints. *Int. J. Multiling.* **2021**, *20*, 595–622. [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Rosiers, K. Translanguaging revisited: Challenges for research, policy and pedagogy based on an inquiry in two Belgian classrooms. *Transl. Translanguaging Multiling. Contexts* **2018**, *4*, 361–383. [[CrossRef](#)]
57. Creese, A.; Blackledge, A. Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annu. Rev. Appl. Linguist.* **2015**, *35*, 20–35. [[CrossRef](#)]
58. Prinsloo, M.; Krause, L. Translanguaging, place and complexity. *Lang. Educ.* **2019**, *33*, 159–173. [[CrossRef](#)]

**Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.