Katja Thieme and Jennifer Walsh Marr

First-Year International Students and the Language of Indigenous Studies

We advocate for the inclusion of Indigenous studies within first-year writing and academic English courses, particularly those taught to multilingual, international students. We argue that asking international students to learn about local and international Indigenous issues productively intersects with coursework in academic English. Our pedagogical approach emphasizes metalanguage and allows Indigenous studies and explicit language instruction to work in tandem, thereby recognizing the agency of Indigenous scholars and guiding non-Indigenous students in relation to it.

> *The critical rational thinking, questioning, and writing required by academe is like one of the mismatched eyes that Coyote acquires. . . . A First Nations way of thinking and communicating may be the other eye. Being university-educated, I have to work hard at showing others of my community that I still share their cultural values and that I am still at heart a First Nations person—that I have some form of harmony and balance. I have learned to use either eye when necessary.*
> **Jo-ann Archibald (Stó:lō) (40)**

Introduction

As participants in the academy, most students, staff, and faculty come to a particular place or location to study, research, and work. It is rare that one is born, raised, and formally educated all in the same place. In North America, all academic institutions occupy Indigenous land (Gould; Lee and Ahtone), but not all participants in academic communities recognize all the histories, knowledges, and cultures the land has hosted. When members of an academic community gather in a certain place, there is a responsibility to learn about the land and its peoples. This responsibility translates into making space for and teaching such history and knowledge to the novice academics in our classes. As scholars working in first-year language and academic writing, incorporating Indigenous studies into our pedagogy is a way to address some of the gaps and questions that learners have when they come to a new place. International students and students from away have much to navigate when they move to the Indigenous territory on which their institution is located. Attending to the work of Indigenous scholars is an opportunity to situate students' writing and themselves in relation to the Indigenous land the academy occupies. As instructors, we need to position these students and their work in such a way that they are not only learning about but learning from Indigenous history, knowledge, and scholarship. This expanded scope of representation and knowledge-building is an opportunity to disrupt some of the hegemonic practices of the Western academy and to make room for broadened ontologies and epistemologies. In this article, we propose language-focused ways of engaging with Indigenous ways of knowledge-making in first-year academic writing classrooms, particularly if they enroll international student populations.

As settler scholars on Musqueam land, we write here about our work with multilingual international students in courses on English for academic purposes and academic writing. Our project focuses on activating Indigenous history and knowledge in first-year academic writing instruction in order to situate students in their new place and expand shared frames of reference. We work in an institutional context—detailed later—that includes university ties to local Indigenous communities, various Indigenous initiatives, and a growing number of Indigenous scholars. Our teaching incorporates resources produced by Indigenous scholars and their varied voices. These resources include online teaching materials as well as published research writing in favor of, for instance, classroom visits. With this

approach, we honor the considerable work already produced and avoid further burden on the time of Indigenous colleagues who are already doing significant representational work within the academy (Chrona; Popp). In this paper, we argue for the need to integrate this scholarship and these resources by Indigenous authors to teach both the issues addressed and the language features mobilized.

The approach we offer will apply to instruction in various arts and social science disciplines if that instruction includes students producing research writing in the style of the discipline. We present the language of Indigenous scholarship as a resource for teaching how the North American academy is indebted to Indigenous land. One of the authors teaches English for academic purposes from the perspective of applied linguistics, specifically systemic functional linguistics; the other is trained in rhetorical genre theory and pragmatic language studies. Among the strongly shared tenets of our disciplinary training are the ideas that language use is always socially and culturally situated and that language users—even highly experienced ones—often enter new situations that require them to learn about the particular language features favored within a discourse community. Our collaboration highlights our shared understanding that language is functional and should be taught as such. In our courses, we are not testing whether students' grammar is correct or incorrect, complex or simple; instead we help them build the phrases and understand the structures with which academic discourse communities do their work. In our pedagogy we are committed to explicitness, to not only perform situated language use for our students but also to guide them towards strategic and critical language use. These shared principles between our approaches require the use of metalanguage—terms that name functional aspects of grammatical and genre structures.

Attending to the work of Indigenous scholars is an opportunity to situate students' writing and themselves in relation to the Indigenous land the academy occupies.

In this article, we propose that asking international students to learn about local and international Indigenous issues productively intersects with a functional approach to teaching academic English and writing, as well as how we present our position as non-Indigenous settler faculty in the process of this teaching. In the first section of the article, we explain our institutional context and highlight how work by Indigenous scholars and

with the local community facilitates the approach to academic language for which we advocate in this project. In the subsequent section, we make the case for the language approaches on which our teaching in an international student college is founded. The third section focuses on particular examples from our courses and demonstrates how our approaches to Indigenous studies and explicit language instruction work in tandem. The fourth and last section argues how this project pushes forward the practice of teaching academic English in a way that recognizes the agency of Indigenous scholars and guides non-Indigenous students in relation to it.

Our Institutional Context

Since the creation of its Point Grey campus in the early twentieth century, UBC Vancouver has been located on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded territory of the Musqueam people. In 2006, the university officially recognized its unique relationship with the Musqueam community in a memorandum of affiliation (The University of British Columbia and The Musqueam Indian Band). UBC has had an Indigenous Strategic Plan since 2009. In the fall of 2013, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada conducted its final West Coast National Event at UBC, and in 2018 the Indian Residential School History and Dialogue Centre opened in a new building centrally located on our Point Grey campus. The year 2020 saw the unveiling of a new Indigenous Strategic Plan with eight central goals and forty-three associated actions (The University of British Columbia).

Numerous initiatives in various areas of university work have preceded and accompanied these high-level administrative efforts. Our teaching at this university has been reshaped by the work of Indigenous students, faculty, and staff and by maintaining good relations with local and regional Indigenous communities and their knowledges. To credit just some of this work, in 2008, then-students Amy Perreault (Red River Métis) and Karrmen Crey (Stó:lō) filmed a documentary that recorded Indigenous students' experiences in classes taught by non-Indigenous faculty (Perreault and Crey). Since the release of that film, Perreault, and colleagues Janey Lew, Erin Yun, and Sue Hampton have had a central role in programming "Indigenous Initiatives," a professional development series for UBC faculty. Several online resources have been developed by and in collaboration with Indigenous faculty, as well as in consultation with Musqueam community members. For instance, the Indigenous Foundations website presents information on

land rights, government policy, and Indigenous cultures, along with explanations of key terms (Indigenous Foundations). The IN/Relation blog features teaching modules and resources for instructing international students in Indigenous topics, histories, and relations ("IN/Relation").

In 2009, Linc Kesler (Oglala Lakota), then director of the First Nations and Indigenous Studies Program, became UBC's first Senior Advisor to the President on Aboriginal Affairs as well as director of the First Nations House of Learning ("What Are You Working On?"). In these roles, he developed key measures to improve working conditions for Indigenous students and faculty and contributed to the growth in Indigenous enrollment from 719 students in 2009 to 1,540 in 2017 (Vescera).

> **How do we, as non-Indigenous instructors, introduce this Indigenous context, its scholarship, and its political implications to the international students in our writing and language classes?**

During Kessler's tenure as director of the First Nations House of Learning, Larry Grant (Musqueam) was appointed as elder-in-residence, continuing and expanding Musqueam presence on campus, supporting Indigenous students, and furthering Indigenous education and language initiatives (Yoshizawa; Zhou). In 2018, when Sheryl Lightfoot (Anishinaabe) took over the position of Senior Advisor to the President on Indigenous Affairs, she emphasized how much ground UBC had gained in its work on Indigenous issues: "The fact that a university has an Aboriginal Strategic Plan in [2009], it was beyond what I could even comprehend in terms of progressiveness. . . . I've seen that continued" (Nguyen).

Working in this institutional context, we as instructors have built relations with Indigenous faculty, have contributed to Indigenous initiatives, and have taken up the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's Calls to Action in our curricular and pedagogical work (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada; Walsh Marr, "An English Language Teacher"). Many questions arise from our location in this historical and political context on Musqueam land. How do we, as non-Indigenous instructors, introduce this Indigenous context, its scholarship, and its political implications to the international students in our writing and language classes? How do we do this work without running the risk, as Lisa King warns, of "misrepresenting indigenous texts or even making them as simply one more 'minority' discourse in a multicultural sampling" (King 18)? UBC is an internationalized institution, and efforts at internationalization jostle up, in critical and productive ways,

against the university's Indigenous context. Like many other universities, UBC actively recruits international students, whose needs and linguistic familiarity may significantly differ, for instance, between students from the United States and from China or South Korea (Kenyon et al.). According to our university's 2020/21 enrolment report, of the 70,000 undergraduate students enrolled that year, about 18,000 are international students and 2,000 are Indigenous students (Mukherjee-Reed and Szeri).

Public reaction to the international program in which we work has been critical of how international recruitment may detract from support for local student populations (Neatby and Yogesh). On the other hand, some of the international students joining us on Musqueam land have brought Indigenous identities and knowledges from their home countries, and one of the actions in UBC's 2020 Indigenous Strategic Plan is to "develop a global strategy for the advancement of Indigenous peoples' human rights in research and curriculum" (The University of British Columbia). Knowing that newcomers to Canada have typically encountered a whitewashed version of Canadian history, how can writing and language instruction counter this version and help students position themselves in relation to Indigenous history and land? We take up Kumari Beck and Michelle Pidgeon's advocacy to incorporate Indigenous principles in international education and to "engage in respectful and mutual educational relationships across and within borders" (Beck and Pidgeon 392). Our project asks: how should our own particular location on Musqueam territory shape the work of teaching first-year international students, and how can our practice in academic language and writing instruction be mobilized to make space for Indigenous perspectives and the work of Indigenous scholars?

Our project asks: how should our own particular location on Musqueam territory shape the work of teaching first-year international students, and how can our practice in academic language and writing instruction be mobilized to make space for Indigenous perspectives and the work of Indigenous scholars?

Each year since 2014, the University of British Columbia has welcomed a new group of international students to Vantage College. Vantage College is a first-year, cohort-based program with integrated language support—currently the only one of its kind in North America. The students—the majority of whom are from mainland China—are admitted on their academic accomplishments but do not yet fully meet UBC's English language require-

ments. Our teaching and this project are situated within humanities and social science courses at Vantage College, whose instructors have directed consistent attention to the dismantling of hegemonic assumptions related to Western epistemology while, at the same time and somewhat paradoxically, facilitating students' uptake of the literacy practices of Canadian university culture. In some ways, this tension translates into a typical pedagogical dynamic of both clearly outlining parameters and expectations for students' work in assignments and encouraging critical and creative thinking about course materials and assignments. This tension also relates to our efforts of teaching predominantly Western disciplinary knowledge via anticolonial materials. With some of the other instructors—including from political science, geography, and history—we have integrated material on Indigenous land, history, and politics into our instruction. In this article, we—as two settler-scholars—address the language strategies we have developed as we engage international students in relation to Indigenous scholarship.

In this first-year cohort program, there are two sets of faculty who teach language and writing courses—instructors in Vantage College's own Academic English Program (AEP) and instructors who teach writing studies courses that are also offered to students in other UBC programs. Both sets of instructors deliver courses that emphasize the situatedness of English for academic purposes and make explicit use of metalanguage in order to show and analyze language patterns. In the genesis of the Vantage College program, the metalanguage approaches were set out well before the Indigenous studies materials were developed, and we will introduce these approaches in that order before analyzing their productive intersection with teaching Indigenous studies.

Language and Writing Instruction at Vantage College

The Vantage College program takes particular pride in its integrated teaching of English for academic purposes, its attention to disciplinary genres and language patterns, and its close collaborations between instructors from different disciplines (Ferreira and Zappa-Hollman; Zappa-Hollman). Instructors with expertise in teaching English as an additional language run courses and tutorials that provide integrated language support specific to the disciplines students are studying. For her sections of these courses, Jennifer Walsh Marr developed language support materials for political science, history, and human geography, all with a focus on Indigenous studies.

This embedded, discipline-specific form of support is unique to Vantage College and is not offered to any other students at UBC. In contrast, writing studies instructors, like Katja Thieme, who teach first-year research writing courses also offer the same or similar courses to several thousand other students each year. Both the programs—AEP and Writing, Research, and Discourse Studies (WRDS)—and their instructors have developed innovative research-based approaches for their teaching (Thieme, "Surface and Depth"; Walsh Marr, "Moving from Form to Function"). These approaches to language and writing are partially shared across the two programs. They rely on discussion of the lexicogrammatical choices and genre moves that help mark Indigenous scholarship, particularly as it challenges existing academic discourses. Among the language features we focus on—in our teaching and in this paper—are nominalization, self-location and positionality, and evaluative expressions. In the following section, we explain the way both programs are built from related but different research traditions within language and writing studies.

The Academic English Program (AEP):Content and Language Integrated Learning and Systemic Functional Linguistics

The AEP at Vantage College is an evolution of practices in English for academic purposes (EAP). EAP has become more common with increasing numbers of multilingual learners in postsecondary education where English is the medium of instruction. EAP is a "needs-driven activity," focusing on developing the English-language proficiency of non-native users in preparation for participating in the academy (Bruce 7). It has traditionally focused on vocabulary and (grammatical) form development, and is typically offered in decontextualized, preparatory contexts prior to credit-bearing, disciplinary studies. This English for general academic purposes is often limited to highlighting general, transferable skill development and lacks the attention to discipline-specific features and practices of English for *specific* academic purposes (ESAP). ESAP programming focuses its attention on the literacy practices of specific fields, preparing students to participate as novice scholars in those disciplines.

The Vantage College AEP is further specialized in that it is based on many of the principles of content and language integrated learning (commonly referred to as CLIL) where both disciplinary knowledge and linguistic proficiency are developed with focused attention on one another. Within

courses developed by AEP faculty members, lexicogrammatical features are highlighted in disciplinary texts to demonstrate "how knowledge structures in the disciplines . . . match textual structures" (Lorenzo 387). In this way, students' attention is directed beyond the surface features of grammar to connect them with more abstract "semantic notions which link content and language" (Lorenzo 387). Atypically for additional language learning contexts, our academic English courses and bespoke materials also draw from genre pedagogy and do not rely on grammar as syllabus structure, where various language forms (typically of increasing complexity) mark the milestones of progression towards proficiency. Instead, we expand our students' attention to the meso level connecting lexicogrammatical features to text purpose and context.

> **Among the language features we focus on—in our teaching and in this paper—are nominalization, self-location and positionality, and evaluative expressions.**

The grammatical framework deployed at Vantage College is informed by research in systemic functional linguistics (SFL), which understands language as a system of functional choices that play out differently in different contexts and genres (Duff et al.; Halliday and Matthiessen; Martin and Rose). Systemic functional linguistics looks at instantiations of meaning-making through ideational, textual, and interpersonal lenses—or "metafunctions"—and systematically describes the language choices deployed in relation to not only their form but their social function as well (Halliday and Hasan).

SFL approaches to teaching academic English present the language choices that are inherent in research discourse in explicit and scaffolded ways and support students' need to acquire the linguistic resources that produce this discourse. These resources include linguistic metalanguage that helps students categorize, and thereby see, functional units of language and then analyze, practice, and creatively use those patterns in their own speech and writing. This teaching of metalanguage might take the form of looking at process (verb) types across stages of texts and in support of various purposes (Walsh Marr, "Moving from Form to Function"), recognizing the role of nominalization in condensing meaning into abstractions and moving argument forward (Pessoa et al.), and deciphering implicit logic through grammatical metaphor (Walsh Marr and Mahmood).

Writing, Research, and Discourse Studies (WRDS): Genre-Based Pedagogy

The writing studies faculty at Vantage College come from research backgrounds in English language and literary studies and employ genre-based pedagogy in their courses (Bawarshi and Reiff; Hyland, "Genre-Based Pedagogies"; Paré). Genre-based pedagogy highlights that academic texts perform social actions within research environments, shows how these genres and their language patterns are linked to disciplinary activities, and analyzes language patterns to enable comparison between different genres and disciplines. In this view, research genres—such as research notes, proposals, articles, and posters—and their forms are shaped and associated with the situations in which they perform social action. These writing studies courses combine genre move analysis and its attention to how sentences work together to perform complex moves (Swales) with pragmatic language studies' more detailed focus on how choices of words and phrases signal positions and turns in argument (Hyland, *Disciplinary Discourses*). This focus on language features is particularly fruitful for Vantage College students because it links closely with terms introduced in AEP courses and because it is tied to specific words and phrases, a level of analysis that is often already familiar to EAL students through their previous language learning.

WRDS courses' attention to genre moves, for instance, results in students practicing the following typical progression of moves in a proposal text: (1) introducing broad research issues, (2) sketching out a state of research knowledge, (3) asserting a knowledge gap and posing a research question or claim that will address the gap, (4) stating the primary materials and method of analysis, and (5) speculating about the project's contribution to the research discussion or its implications for societal practices (Giltrow et al.). Through analysis of these genre moves in sample proposals, students learn to recognize how certain moves are associated with detailed language features. For instance, they learn to notice that the broad introduction of a research issue will not require integral or direct forms of citation and that a description of a broadly agreed upon state of knowledge often uses typified phrases that group several studies together into fields and subfields (Hyland and Jiang). Students become alert to the fact that while most genre moves are typically written in the third person, first-person pronouns or discursive

self-mentions (like "this paper" or "this project") appear frequently when authors' arguments are asserted or when the project's method of analysis is described (Hyland, "Humble Servants of the Discipline?"). Students learn to recognize and practice genre moves and patterns of language in tandem: as they begin to see and name these language patterns, they start to produce them in their own writing (Thieme, "Surface and Depth").

The genre-based work in WRDS courses is rooted in functional approaches to language and thereby emphasizes the typical language forms and conventionalized genre expectations of research writing. In that sense, students are encouraged to reproduce what have become widely accepted elements of academic genres. However, rhetorical genre theory also emphasizes possibilities of resistance, creativity, and invention. Genre scholars hold a central place for invention in their thinking, going so far as to warn of the "Traps and Trappings of Genre Theory" lest it becomes too formalized (Freadman; Giltrow). The explicit teaching of genre expectations and genre moves therefore comes with the encouragement that such expectations are always open for subversion, change, and challenge. Some of that challenge has come from Indigenous scholars and their profound questioning of Western academic practices, including its forms of writing (Archibald; Baca; Kuokkanen, *Reshaping the University*; Thieme and Makmillen). How do we teach first-year students to recognize the political dynamics of such subversion, change, and challenge? How do we guide them in the production of innovative writing?

Metalanguage as a Tool for Critical Engagement

For both our types of approaches, metalanguage is part of the process of transferring knowledge gained in a class dedicated to academic English to the diverse research and writing settings students encounter in subsequent work. When students enter new and different discursive situations, their knowledge of metalanguage is meant to help them adapt through a practice of analyzing texts and their purposes. Metalanguage allows students to notice how genres mobilize language features differently and how disciplines have developed varying patterns of language use within those genres supporting the production of new genres. Metalanguage also helps novice scholars identify in a critical way how writers create meaning, making students alert to the unique language choices by Indigenous scholars and revealing more precisely how these writers "use either eye," to speak in

Jo-ann Archibald's (Stó:lō) metaphor (Archibald 40). The ability to notice differential use of language features is crucial not only in terms of recognizing disciplinary and generic differences but also in recognizing the political choices within disciplines and genres. Patterns and details of citation, for instance, are well known for their potential to maintain or shift a field's politics and are connected to outspoken campaigns for more equitable representation of women, Black, or trans authors (Beaulieu et al.; Inge; Thieme and Saunders). Teaching the features of research genres needs to address political dynamics and choices as well, including in the context of Indigenous knowledge.

> **The ability to notice differential use of language features is crucial not only in terms of recognizing disciplinary and generic differences but also in recognizing the political choices within disciplines and genres.**

This engagement with the political dimensions of language features in academic English pushes the boundaries of traditional practices in English for academic purposes. There is a history of critical discussion, with Alistair Pennycook warning of "the danger of reinforcing norms, beliefs and ideologies that maintain inequitable social and cultural relations" (256) and Sarah Benesch advocating for critical pedagogy that invites students to question the status quo. Despite such warnings, EAP has staunchly remained a pragmatic if not accommodationist pursuit, working to develop linguistic proficiency so LX users can adapt to the accepted conventions of existing discourse communities (Bruce). Students' compliance with accepted norms of codified language usage has been the primary means of entrance into communities of discourse practice. The troubling of these conventions represents a significant shift in pedagogical practice.

In some disciplines—including in the discipline of writing studies itself—scholarship by Indigenous authors has been productively resistant to replicating received conventions of disciplinary writing. For instance, the Indigenous scholars in Lisa King and colleagues' collection *Survivance, Sovereignty, and Story* describe the multiple ways in which their teaching of writing studies and rhetoric courses subverts and decolonizes writing expectations that govern the discipline (King et al.). Lisa King writes of helping students understand that the discourses surrounding Indigenous issues are "not transparent" and need to be interrogated such that the aim is to "recognize [the] rhetorical sovereignty" of Indigenous cultures (King 27). Gabriela Raquel Ríos notes that an Indigenous writing studies pedagogy

asks students to "see writing as a politicized act that has as much potential for bad as it does for good" and also to "decentralize writing as the primary mode of epistemic engagement" (Ríos 89). Andrea Riley-Mukavetz (Chippewa) and Malea Powell (Indiana Miami and Eastern Shawnee) explain their premise that "even the most highly published and critically acclaimed Native writings are rooted in the everyday practices of Native peoples," not as "representations of 'real' Native cultures but as orientations, inclinations, approaches that reflect body, land, culture, history in particular ways" (Riley-Mukavetz and Powell 141). They assert that to teach Indigenous writing and rhetoric means "to visibilize this truth" (Riley-Mukavetz and Powell 141). How can courses focused on academic English participate in making Indigenous orientations, inclinations, and approaches visible?

How We Do It

To exemplify how students' attention can be drawn to the features of variously provocative texts, in this section we share and discuss specific examples from our bespoke teaching materials, designed for our first-year courses with multilingual, international students. These materials draw from texts written by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars and serve a variety of purposes across the span of our courses. They are united in making connections between the contextualized needs of our students, the disciplinary traditions into which they enter, and the work of scholars who engage with Indigeneity. We offer these examples to demonstrate how analyses of lexicogrammatical features in disciplinary texts can serve critical reading and writing. We believe that the underlying principles of critical engagement with Indigenous topics can be taken up across a variety of language and writing-focused contexts.

Two Examples from AEP Courses

The materials discussed in this section were developed by Jennifer Walsh Marr for a language course that highlights valued linguistic features of the other disciplines students are studying—in this case, political science, history and human geography. The excerpts analyzed here are from a curated selection of disciplinary course readings that discuss Indigenous histories, politics, and relations. The rationale for revisiting texts assigned elsewhere is to move beyond what a text says to an examination of how it creates meaning. This closer examination of lexicogrammatical structures builds

students' repertoires of features and enables them to observe how discrete choices position the author, audience, and topic. The linguistic features may appear across a few disciplines or be localized, but the materials developed draw from situated examples of texts students have already discussed with their other instructors in those courses. The analyses and materials draw from linguistic research and develop students' metalanguage to recognize linguistic features across academic texts. One such key feature of academic discourse is that of nominalization—the process of making nouns (Halliday and Matthiessen).

Textual and Argumentative Role of Nominalization

Nominalization occurs when the congruent, verb-centered description of what happens and who does what is transformed to a more metaphoric, noun-centered abstraction of an event in order to name it, hold it still, and study it. The congruent is considered closer to reality (by being verb-centered, it is representative of something happening), whereas the metaphoric is an abstraction (by being noun-centered, it is a phenomenon or entity with its own characteristics). As an example, in the UBC president's speech at the opening of the Indian Residential School History and Dialogue Centre, he acknowledged the "imperialistic acquisition of land" as part of the university's history (Ono). The "acquisition of land" is an abstracted nominalization of the act of taking land, divorced from the actors who participated; it is here premodified with its "imperialistic" underpinnings. Likewise, the process of colonizing an area for settlers' use becomes nominalized as "colonization." Once nominalized, we can see the term used in political science texts within larger noun groups such as "socioeconomic legacies of colonization" (Belfer et al. 58) and "colonization's tangible impact on mitigation and adaptation resources" (Belfer et al. 66). After introducing the phenomenon of nominalization, typical features of its forms and how to unpack the meanings within, we interrogate how writers deploy nominalization to summarize and move an argument forward within academic texts (Pessoa et al.). To do this, we revisit an excerpt from an assigned history text problematizing a judge's misrepresentation of history, the historical method, and reliance on exclusively written texts to determine an Indigenous nation's land claim:

> [less obvious, perhaps, are] the consequences of McEachern's complete faith in the documentary record as the primary, if not the only, reliable source of

insight into the past. He hearkens back to the old view that history, based on the study of written sources, is the appropriate discipline for understanding European cultures, whereas anthropology, based on the use of oral and material sources, is the discipline devoted to indigenous peoples. One of the many problems with this dichotomy is that exclusive reliance on written documents to interpret history confirms the hegemony of the colonizers. And that is part of the reason why historians have concluded that they must move beyond their traditional reliance on written words if they are ever to understand the indigenous past. (Fisher 46–47)

Students begin with interrogating the location and purpose of the term "dichotomy" and see how the abstract nominalization summarizes the hierarchical juxtaposition of knowledge and disciplines; in doing so, "dichotomy" unfairly excludes the oral histories that establish land rights.

We also see how the head noun "problems" of the participant (nominal group) "[O]ne of the many problems with this dichotomy" takes a clear position in the starting point (or theme) of this clause. It then uses a clause as its second participant to make a clear argument in its second part (or rheme) of the clause: "exclusive reliance on written documents to interpret history confirms the hegemony of the colonizers." That rheme indicates where the author is taking the argument, as it then becomes the theme (starting point) of the subsequent sentence. This progression is a typical strategy of developing a coherent argument within history (Coffin). It is an example of the interplay between concepts within the ideational metafunction (nominalizations) and the role of the textual metafunction (theme and rheme) in arranging ideas in valued ways (Eggins). The class materials illustrate how the nominalization of abstract concepts is often preceded by a demonstrative pronoun or definite article (also known as "pointers" to develop cohesion through a text). Our class activities then continue with opening up an electronic version of the text for students to perform lexical searches to find other summarizing nominalizations. We note patterns of how these lexicogrammatical features summarize the previous paragraph by pointing to its concepts as a theme in the new paragraph's topic sentence.

These tasks not only draw students' attention to lexicogrammatical features of their texts but also give them a name to refer to what they are and how they function. Instead of merely practicing rules for grammatical accuracy, students note patterns of usage across contexts, features of notable exceptions, and ways in which they can incorporate their expanding repertoires of interacting features.

Breaking Binaries between Written Features and Expert Speakers

In other lessons comparing features of more spontaneous, typically spoken language and more careful, revised, typically written language, the class studies a radio interview with Pam Palmater, a Mi'kmaq lawyer, professor, and activist in Canada (*Pam Palmater on Idle No More*). She discusses treaty rights, the deeply problematic Indian Act, and the legal implications of federal legislation, and we note both the lexicogrammatical features of the questions and responses and the paralinguistic aspects such as tone of voice and turn-taking. We then turn our attention to a written research article (Morris) where the interview is both cited and summarized. The lecture discusses some of the research literature on common features of written versus spoken texts (Weissberg), and students identify features such as increased nominalization and the prevalence of embedded clauses as being typical of careful, written texts that we have worked with in earlier lessons. We then return to the archived radio interview and do a clausal analysis of the transcript, noting the features within. Comparing the summarized excerpt in the written article to the audio transcript, we note some features typical of the different modes of delivery, but recognize how the speaker's authority, expertise, and preparation can take the manifestation of actual language use outside a simple binary of "written versus spoken" language. Students look up who Pam Palmater is and get an enhanced appreciation of how a hyperarticulate expert's preparation, practice, and embodied knowledge impact language usage.

Details from WRDS Courses

The sections of the research writing course taught by Katja Thieme, the writing studies instructor of the two coauthors, have focused on Olympic studies and have included Indigenous scholars and activists commenting critically on Olympics held on Indigenous land. In analyzing the language choices of these authors, class discussion has highlighted, for instance: (1) phrases with which Indigenous authors locate themselves and others in relation to their topic, (2) the changing political value of terms related to Indigeneity, and (3) evaluative expressions authors use to create critical stance. These observations of language choices in course readings lead to questions of how students can and should make their own choices in the process of writing. For instance, students who decide to work on Indigenous topics are encouraged to clarify their own positionality in the text, to orchestrate

sources in a judicious way, and to make use of evaluative expressions when developing their stance.

Self-Location and Positionality

In terms of disciplinary variation in research writing, the use of self-location is a practice that marks Indigenous studies scholarship from other disciplines. In her groundbreaking work, Linda Tuhiwai Smith (Ngāti Awa and Ngāti Porou, Māori) has called for Indigenous agendas to be situated within and against the research methods in different disciplines (Smith). This practice of situating can involve Indigenous authors identifying to which community they belong and what experience they have with the cultural concepts they employ. Margaret Kovach (Cree and Saulteaux) has described such self-location as a "means of cultural identification" that shows how researchers "interpret the world from the place of our experience" (Kovach 110). One of Thieme's course readings, for instance, has as its very first sentence, "As a fair-skinned âpihtawikosis-âniskwéw (Cree-Métis woman), I am one of many Indigenous peoples who have been, as Emma Larocque writes, 'hounded and haunted by White North America's image machine'" (Adese 479). This self-introduction contains what Ellen Cushman (Cherokee) terms authenticity markers, to which she adds and contrasts the concept of accountability markers: "evidence of commitment to Native issues, communities, and betterment of the People" (Cushman 344). In Cushman's view, Indigenous self-representation becomes more persuasive when authenticity and accountability markers work together. In a study of self-location in research writing by Māori scholars, Shurli Makmillen and Michelle Riedlinger have found that such markers can be expressed through first-person pronouns and personal experience, geographical positioning and acknowledgments, tribal affiliation, and reference to community elders (Makmillen and Riedlinger).

In addition to situating themselves in relation to their own Indigenous communities, authors also situate those whose work they cite. In another course reading, the author introduces her Indigenous sources in the following ways: "Susan Shown Harjo, a prominent Cheyenne and Hodulgee Muscogee writer and activist" (O'Bonsawin 146); "Judith Lowry, a painter of Maidu and Pit River ancestry" (O'Bonsawin 146); and "Kanien'kehaka (Mohawk) scholar, Taiaiake Alfred" (O'Bonsawin 150). With these examples, students witness the practice of identity location by and in relation to In-

digenous scholars. Such identity location hints at the links that the cited authors' work makes between "principles of Indigenous knowledge systems" and published research writing (Kovach et al. 488).

In order to name and analyze language features that express those links, Thieme's course looks at aspects of citation. Citation analyses show that in some disciplines research writing has higher rates of integral citation than in others. Integral citation situates the authors as participants in the sentence, rather than in parentheses or footnotes after a paraphrase of their work. Among those disciplines, some have a practice of attaching modifiers to integral citations—for instance, by adding nouns or adjectives to the cited author's name phrase so as to describe and characterize the author and their work with more precision (Thieme and Saunders). Both of these tendencies, especially if taken together, accommodate the written practice of identity location. Attention to these aspects of citation invites students to consider their agency in writing: Are they going to integrally cite some authors; which ones and why? If they are citing integrally, are they going to add further modifiers to that integral citation, and which ones? Agency in these language choices helps students clarify their positionality in relation to the material they study. Such consideration also offers students language to assert their own community knowledge where it is relevant, including the knowledge of Indigenous people in their home countries.

Changing Political Values of Words and Concepts

Indigenous studies is a field where an author's choice of terms is part of the position they are taking and where the political nuances of those terms can shift at a fast rate given intense discussions around them. The implications of terms differ across continents and borders, and they differ across time. Thieme's course on Olympic studies includes an opinion piece about the Salt Lake City Olympics—written, some time ago now, in 2002 by Susan Shown Harjo (Cheyenne and Hodulgee Muscogee)—that refers to "Indian people," "Native participants," and "Indians in the Olympics opening" (Harjo). Given the date and place of publication, these noun phrases are an opportunity to address differences of terms for Indigenous people between the United States and Canada, as well as between 2002 and today. Indigenous studies re-evaluates the implications of its terms on an ongoing basis. In a Canadian context and when writing from a non-Indigenous position, terms like Harjo's are not a good choice, and students in Thieme's courses can, for instance,

consult the Indigenous Foundations website to learn more about shifts in meaning between these terms (Indigenous Foundations). Awareness of the changing nature of terms also facilitates students' database research and manipulation of search terms. Library keywords will not be in perfect tune with the terms that are introduced in course readings, and there is ongoing debate about how library classification systems and metadata need to be challenged and revised as the terms used by Indigenous scholars change (Farnel et al.; Lee; Nathan and Perreault).

> Attention to these aspects of citation invites students to consider their agency in writing: Are they going to integrally cite some authors; which ones and why?

Choices of terminology in research writing are not always simple, and a researcher will not always adopt a term in the way it is given. In a research context where terms change meaning, writers often discuss their choice of term in their research articles. For students, too, it can be wise to include clauses and sentences that clarify the choice, source, or implication of terms which are central to their discussion. For instance, in Thieme's sections, students look at how Jennifer Adese (otipemisiw/Métis) explains her use of the term "multiculturalism," a term that is not treated in the same way in older research or in other research fields: "multiculturalism can be understood as a tool through which the nation has sought to conceal its intolerance while maintaining its core ethnic genus, reinventing itself free of its colonialist past" (Adese 484). Students who work with Adese's article can choose to fully adopt her critical understanding of the term, but they can also decide to bring it more in line with their position as novice researchers and newcomers to Canada. It is important to highlight to students their agency in both adopting contemporary terms with critical potential and calibrating the critical nature of those terms to help delineate their position as novice researchers (Thieme, "Spacious Grammar"). Students might choose to take such calibration toward an even more or a less critical perspective than the ones they encounter in course readings.

Evaluative Expressions

The previously mentioned examples of identity location of Indigenous sources and calibration of terms invite us to discuss how much research writing in arts and social science fields depends on language of self-positioning, stance, and evaluation (Hood). Stance and evaluation contribute

to the delineation of an epistemological perspective, a large part of which is disciplinary and subdisciplinary. UBC's WRDS courses provide practice and guide students in taking on disciplinary perspectives in their writing. Disciplinary epistemology is communicated primarily through research materials and methods, through research questions and terms, and by the nature of evidence and structures of argument. All of these are central topics of courses focused on research writing. Within disciplinary epistemologies, academic writers also need to delineate a perspective more particular to their research project. They need to be able to show that their work presents something new and contributes to the research discussion. Evaluative expressions are one of the language tools students can use to mark the stance and contribution of their work.

In a North American context, Indigenous studies scholarship is often produced in highly critical distance to both contemporary politics and academic practices.

In a North American context, Indigenous studies scholarship is often produced in highly critical distance to both contemporary politics and academic practices. As a result, it is rich with evaluative expressions that create this critical distance. In a course reading by Christine O'Bonsawin (Abenaki), students are able to count at least two evaluative expressions per sentence in the abstract alone, including "powerful," "unnecessary," "radical crusade," "unceded," "non-surrendered," "contentious," "to temporarily silence," and "fragile tension" (O'Bonsawin 143). Clearly, O'Bonsawin takes strong stances, and the topic seems to demand a certain strength of stance. If students choose to write about that topic, they will become aware that some kind of stance is expected of them. In one instance, students developed such interest in the possibilities for creating and expressing their critical stance, that—with great aplomb—they used it to challenge the course instructor's choice of terminology in a set of course documents. While these students were ready to take on the challenge, others decided that instead of taking a stance on a topic related to Indigenous studies, they would continue to listen rather than speak on these topics.

Pushing Practice Forward

The pedagogical use of systemic functional linguistics as described by Sydney School linguists David Rose and J. R. Martin has, historically, been grounded in the need to change the teaching of reading and writing for the

benefit of, in their case, Australian Indigenous students. Rose and Martin's book *Learning to Write, Reading to Learn* positions SFL language teaching as more effective than traditional or constructivist approaches in successfully counteracting unequal educational outcomes among Aboriginal and migrant children (Rose and Martin). Rose and Martin show that explicit instruction with the use of appropriate linguistic metalanguage is particularly helpful for students whose culturally different reading and meaning-making practices put them in a disadvantaged position when implicit forms of literacy instruction are favored. However, despite their proximity to questions of Western educational attainment among Indigenous students, their SFL curriculum does not seem to include language resources and genre structures that are valued by Indigenous writers themselves. Intentional or not, there is a risk in training students how to recognize lexicogrammatical features in order to comply with hegemonic practices rather than casting for a wider repertoire of voices and possibilities.

While we embrace the explicit exposition of language features, their patterns, and their role in making texts academically successful, we push beyond normative bounds so as to be able to engage with and embrace emerging and marginalized traditions in the academy. We expand our practice beyond training students in the recognized patterns of language use that are valued (but somewhat codified) and empower them to take those features beyond their existing confines. In doing so, we hope they, too, can express and make use of their unique positions as international students in relation to the Canadian academy and in relation to Indigeneity in order to further inform our rhetorical understanding and use of academic writing conventions. In this way, we argue, the fields of writing studies and EAP can become agents for bending Western concepts of knowledge-making and research writing to become more expansive and inclusive.

In the words of Rauna Kuokkanen (Sámi), such bending of Western concepts requires us to do our homework. Doing our homework—a phrase borrowed from Gayatri Spivak—means "scrutinizing the historical circumstances and articulating one's own participation in structures that created various forms of silencing" (Kuokkanen, "The Responsibility of the Academy" 68). Homework is contrasted to fieldwork. Whereas fieldwork is often elsewhere, homework "starts from where we are, from our homes, academic and otherwise" (Kuokkanen, "The Responsibility of the Academy" 68). Homework involves examining academia's complicity in

historical injustice: "What is the academy's responsibility in creating the conditions that are required to make indigenous people's rights and self-government agreements meaningful" (Kuokkanen, "The Responsibility of the Academy" 68)? Rather than assuming we already know or are entitled to know, Kuokkanen asks us to engage with "recognition of the agency in others" (Kuokkanen, "The Responsibility of the Academy" 69). Such agency extends to the phrases and structures used in the writing of Indigenous scholars. As Makmillen and Riedlinger suggest, agency and constraint in genre production are not at odds, but "mutually sustaining," and teaching of academic English should move away from "assumptions about unproblematic genre adherence in homogeneous communities

We highlight the language agency and genre innovation in research writing on Indigenous issues and support students in their own language choices in relation to these writing practices.

of practice" such as those of disciplines or professions (Makmillen and Riedlinger 169). The reciprocal and responsible practice we propose here is to convey to students the range of language and argumentation used in current scholarship on Indigenous studies, and thus to show "the scholarly research article as an expanding space for innovation, improvisation and even resistance to dominant and dominating norms of academic research and writing" (Makmillen and Riedlinger 171).

We hesitate to tell others how to teach their own classes, but encourage readers to consider the issues we have raised. We have institutional factors in our favor, such as our university's reinvigorated Indigenous Strategic Plan (https://isp.ubc.ca/) that explicitly values the type of work we do through building respectful relations. These relations draw upon cultural humility, "a process that requires humility to develop and maintain mutually respect-ful and dynamic partnerships with communities" (Murray-García and Tervalon 21). This is an ongoing, responsive process rather than a definite destination. While readers at other institutions have different contextual factors, we maintain that a disposition of cultural humility makes room for the larger questions we ask.

In this paper, we have showcased how working with students on disci-plinary language patterns provides a partial pathway toward decolonizing writing instruction and support. In our work with international students, the teaching resources we have developed rely on scholarship published by Indigenous researchers and online material produced by and with Indig-

enous community members. We pinpoint and give language to the lexico-grammatical choices and genre features that distinguish such scholarship as attuned to questions of Indigeneity and decolonization. We highlight the language agency and genre innovation in research writing on Indigenous issues and support students in their own language choices in relation to these writing practices. Our integration of Indigenous studies material in the Vantage College curriculum adds a critical layer to academic language learning and an enhanced sense of place for international students studying on Musqueam territory. Our teaching materials introduce Indigenous perspectives and encourage international students to adopt language resources that help develop their critical perspective and expression of location. Some caution is built into our work, as it is important that we clarify our own positioning to the students while we guide them in theirs. By teaching in this way, we are pushing our combined fields of EAP, SFL, rhetorical genre theory, and pragmatic language studies into new realms for research and teaching, bringing the work of EAP and writing studies into necessary and ongoing contact with questions of decolonization and Indigenization.

Works Cited

Adese, Jennifer. "Colluding with the Enemy? Nationalism and Depictions of 'Aboriginality' in Canadian Olympic Moments." *American Indian Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 4, 2012, pp. 479–502, https:// doi.org/10.5250/amerindiquar.36.4.0479.

Archibald, Jo-ann (Q'um Q'um Xiiem). *Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body, and Spirit*. UBC Press, 2008.

Baca, Damián. *Mestiz@ Scripts, Digital Migrations, and the Territories of Writing*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Bawarshi, Anis S., and Mary Jo Reiff. *Genre: An Introduction to History, Theory, Research, and Pedagogy*. Parlor Press, 2010.

Beaulieu, Emily, et al. "Women Also Know Stuff: Meta-Level Mentoring to Battle Gender Bias in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics*, vol. 50, no. 3, 2017, pp. 779–83, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096517000580.

Beck, Kumari, and Michelle Pidgeon. "Across the Divide: Critical Conversations on Decolonization, Indigenization, and Internationalization." *International Education as Public Policy in Canada*, edited by Merli Tamtik et al., McGill-Queen's UP, 2020, pp. 384–406.

Belfer, Ella, et al. "Representation of Indigenous Peoples in Climate Change Reporting." *Climatic Change*, vol. 145, no. 1, 2017, pp. 57–70, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-017-2076-z.

Benesch, Sarah. *Critical English for Academic Purposes : Theory, Politics, and Practice*. Routledge, 2001, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410601803.

Bruce, Ian. *Theory and Concepts of English for Academic Purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Chrona, Jo. "Beyond Culturally Responsive Education." *Transformative Education Leadership Journal*, Nov. 2021, https://teljournal.educ.ubc.ca/2021/10/beyond-culturally-responsive-education/.

Coffin, Caroline. "Learning the Language of School History: The Role of Linguistics in Mapping the Writing Demands of the Secondary School Curriculum." *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol. 38, no. 4, 2006, pp. 413–29, https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270500508810.

Cushman, Ellen. "Toward a Rhetoric of Self-Representation: Identity Politics in Indian Country and Rhetoric and Composition." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 60, no. 2, 2008, pp. 321–65.

Duff, Patricia A., et al. "Putting (Functional) Grammar to Work in Content-Based English for Academic Purposes Instruction." *Teaching and Learning English Grammar: Research Findings and Future Directions: A Festschrift for Betty Azar*, edited by MaryAnn Christison et al., Routledge, 2015, pp. 139–58.

Eggins, Suzanne. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Pinter Publishers, 1994.

Farnel, Sharon, et al. "Rethinking Representation: Indigenous Peoples and Contexts at the University of Alberta Libraries." *The International Journal of Information, Diversity, & Inclusion (IJIDI)*, vol. 2, no. 3, 2018, https://doi.org/10.33137/ijidi.v2i3.32190.

Ferreira, Alfredo A., and Sandra Zappa-Hollman. "Disciplinary Registers in a First-Year Program." *Language, Context and Text*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2019, pp. 148–93, https://doi.org/10.1075/langct.00007.fer.

Fisher, Robin. "Judging History: Reflections on Reasons for Judgment in Delgamuukw v. B.C." *BC Studies: The British Columbian Quarterly*, no. 95, 1992, pp. 43–54, https://doi.org/10.14288/bcs.v0i95.1436.

Freadman, Anne. "The Traps and Trappings of Genre Theory." *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 33, no. 5, 2012, pp. 544–63, https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams050.

Giltrow, Janet. "Form Alone: The Supreme Court of Canada Reading Historical Treaties." *Genre Studies Around the Globe: Beyond the Three Traditions*, edited by Natasha Artemeva and Aviva Freedman, Trafford Publishing, 2016, pp. 207–24.

Giltrow, Janet, et al. *Academic Writing: An Introduction*. 3rd ed., Broadview Press, 2014.

Gould, Janice. "The Problem of Being 'Indian': One Mixed-Blood's Dilemma." *De/Colonizing the Subject: The Politics of Gender in Women's Autobiography*, edited by Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson, University of Minnesota Press, 1992, pp. 81–87.

Halliday, M. A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Deakin University, 1985.

Halliday, M. A. K., and Christian M. I. M. Matthiessen. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 3rd ed, Hodder Arnold, 2004.

Harjo, Suzan Shown. "Indians in the Olympics Ceremony? Postcard from the Past." *Indian Country Today*, 16

Feb. 2002, https://indiancountrytoday.com/archive/indians-in-the-olympics-ceremony-postcard-from-the-past.

Hood, Susan. *Appraising Research: Evaluation in Academic Writing*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Hyland, Ken. *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. U of Michigan P, 2004.

---. "Genre-Based Pedagogies: A Social Response to Process." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2003, pp. 17–29, https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00124-8.

---. "Humble Servants of the Discipline? Self-Mention in Research Articles." *English for Specific Purposes*, vol. 20, no. 3, 2001, pp. 207–26, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00012-0.

Hyland, Ken, and Feng (Kevin) Jiang. "Points of Reference: Changing Patterns of Academic Citation." *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2019, pp. 64–85, https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amx012.

Indigenous Foundations. https://indigenousfoundations.arts.ubc.ca/home/. Accessed 28 Aug. 2020.

Inge, Sophie. "'Cite Black Women' Campaign Gains Momentum." *Times Higher Education (THE)*, 22 Jan. 2018, https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/cite-black-women-campaign-gains-momentum.

"IN/Relation: Educational Resources for International Students Learning Indigenous Contexts and Histories at UBC." *IN/Relation*, http://blogs.ubc.ca/inrelation/. Accessed 25 Aug. 2020.

Kenyon, Kristi, et al. "Falling Between the Cracks: Ambiguities of International Student Status in Canada." *Canadian*

Journal of Higher Education, vol. 42, no. 2, 2012, pp. 1–24.

King, Lisa. "Sovereignty, Rhetorical Sovereignty, and Representation." *Survivance, Sovereignty, and Story: Teaching American Indian Rhetorics*, edited by Lisa King et al., Utah State UP, 2015, pp. 17–34.

King, Lisa et al., editors. *Survivance, Sovereignty, and Story: Teaching American Indian Rhetorics*. Utah State UP, 2015.

Kovach, Margaret. *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations and Contexts*. University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Kovach, Margaret et al. "Stories of Diverse Identity Locations in Indigenous Research." *International Review of Qualitative Research*, vol. 6, no. 4, 2013, pp. 487–509, https://doi.org/10.1525/irqr.2013.6.4.487.

Kuokkanen, Rauna. *Reshaping the University: Responsibility, Indigenous Epistemes, and the Logic of the Gift*. UBC Press, 2008.

---. "The Responsibility of the Academy: A Call for Doing Homework." *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2010, https://journal.jctonline.org/index.php/jct/article/view/262.

Lee, Deborah. "Indigenous Knowledge Organization: A Study of Concepts, Terminology, Structure and (Mostly) Indigenous Voices." *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2011, https://doi.org/10.21083/partnership.v6i1.1427.

Lee, Robert, and Tristan Ahtone. "Land-Grab Universities: Expropriating Indigenous Land Is the Foundation of the Land-Grant University System." *High Country News*, 30 Mar. 2020,

https://www.hcn.org/issues/52.4/indigenous-affairs-education-land-grab-universities.

Lorenzo, Francisco. "Genre-Based Curricula: Multilingual Academic Literacy in Content and Language Integrated Learning." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, vol. 16, no. 3, 2013, pp. 375–88, https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2013.777391.

Makmillen, Shurli, and Michelle Riedlinger. "Markers of Identification in Indigenous Academic Writing: A Case Study of Genre Innovation." *Text & Talk*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2020, pp. 165–85 https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2020-2073.

Martin, J. R., and David Rose. *Genre Relations: Mapping Culture*. Equinox Publishing, 2008.

Morris, Amanda. "Twenty-First-Century Debt Collectors: Idle No More Combats a Five-Hundred-Year-Old Debt." *Women's Studies Quarterly*, vol. 42, nos. 1/2, 2014, pp. 242–58.

Mukherjee-Reed, Ananya, and Andrew Szeri. *University of British Columbia Annual Enrolment Report*. 2021, p. 66. https://pair.ok.ubc.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/145/2022/02/2021-22-Enrolment-Report.pdf.

Murray-García, Jann, and Melanie Tervalon. "Rethinking Intercultural Competence: Cultural Humility in Internationalising Higher Education." *Intercultural Competence in Higher Education: International Approaches, Assessment and Application*, edited by Darla K. Deardorff and Lily A. Arasaratnam-Smith, Routledge, 2017, pp. 19–31.

Nathan, Lisa P., and Amy Perreault. "Indigenous Initiatives and Information Studies: Unlearning in the Classroom." *The International Journal of Information, Diversity, & Inclusion (IJIDI)*, vol. 2, no. 1/2, 2018, https://doi.org/10.33137/ijidi.v2i1/2.32212.

Neatby, Stuart, and Bala Yogesh. "High Fees at the Heart of International Student Controversies in B.C." *Vancouver Sun*, 10 Oct. 2017, https://vancouversun.com/feature/how-international-students-are-filling-funding-shortfalls/high-fees-at-the-heart-of-international-student-controversies.

Nguyen, Alex. "UBC Appoints a Familiar Face and a Newcomer on Campus to Top Indigenous Affairs Positions." *The Ubyssey*, 3 Sept. 2018, https://www.ubyssey.ca/news/ubc-appoints-top-positions-on-Indigenous-affairs/.

O'Bonsawin, Christine M. "'No Olympics on Stolen Native Land': Contesting Olympic Narratives and Asserting Indigenous Rights within the Discourse of the 2010 Vancouver Games." *Sport in Society*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2010, pp. 143–56, https://doi.org/10.1080/17430430903377987.

Ono, Santa J. *Statement of Apology*. 9 Apr. 2018, https://president.ubc.ca/homepage-feature/2018/04/09/statement-of-apology/.

Pam Palmater on Idle No More. 5 Jan. 2013, https://www.cbc.ca/player/play/2323100229.

Paré, Anthony. "Rhetorical Genre Theory and Academic Literacy." *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2014, pp. A83–94.

Pennycook, Alastair. "Vulgar Pragmatism, Critical Pragmatism, and EAP." *English for Specific Purposes*, vol. 16, no. 4, 1997, pp. 253–69, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(97)00019-7.

Perreault, Amy, and Karrmen Crey. *What I Learned in Class Today: Aboriginal Issues in the Classroom.* 2008, https://intheclass.arts.ubc.ca/video/.

Pessoa, Silvia, et al. "Emergent Arguments: A Functional Approach to Analyzing Student Challenges with the Argument Genre." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 38, 2017, pp. 42–55, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.10.013.

Popp, Jesse. "Want to Reach out to an Indigenous Scholar? Awesome! But First, Here Are 10 Things to Consider." *The Conversation*, 28 Oct. 2021, http://theconversation.com/want-to-reach-out-to-an-indigenous-scholar-awesome-but-first-here-are-10-things-to-consider-168558.

Riley-Mukavetz, Andrea, and Malea D. Powell. "Making Native Space for Graduate Students: A Story of Indigenous Rhetorical Practice." *Survivance, Sovereignty, and Story: Teaching American Indian Rhetorics*, edited by Lisa King et al., Utah State UP, 2015, pp. 138–59.

Ríos, Gabriela Raquel. "Performing Nahua Rhetorics for Civic Engagement." *Survivance, Sovereignty, and Story: Teaching American Indian Rhetorics*, edited by Lisa King et al., Utah State UP, 2015, pp. 79–95.

Rose, David, and J. R. Martin. *Learning to Write, Reading to Learn: Genre, Knowledge and Pedagogy in the Sydney School*. Equinox Publishing, 2012.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. 2nd ed, Zed Books, 2012.

Swales, John M. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge UP, 1990.

The University of British Columbia. *UBC Indigenous Strategic Plan*. 2020, https://aboriginal-2018.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2021/06/UBC.ISP_Strategic Plan2020-SPREAD-Borderless-REDUCED.pdf.

The University of British Columbia and The Musqueam Indian Band. *Memorandum of Affiliation*. 2006, https://aboriginal-2.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2011/01/UBC-Musqueam-MOA-signed1.pdf.

Thieme, Katja. "Spacious Grammar: Agency and Intention in the Teaching of Research Writing." *Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, vol. 32, 2022, pp. 281–99. https://doi.org/10.31468/dwr.931.

---. "Surface and Depth: Metalanguage and Professional Development in Canadian Writing Studies." *Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*, vol. 29, 2019, pp. 148–58, https://doi.org/10.31468/cjsdwr.757.

Thieme, Katja, and Shurli Makmillen. "A Principled Uncertainty: Writing Studies Methods in Contexts of Indigeneity." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 68, no. 3, 2017, pp. 466–93, http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/M6QJ77X8P.

Thieme, Katja, and Mary Ann S. Saunders. "How Do You Wish to Be Cited? Citation Practices and a Scholarly Community of Care in Trans Studies Research Articles." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 32, 2018, pp. 80–90, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.03.010.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action*. 2015, https://nctr.ca/records/reports/#trc-reports.

Vescera, Zak. "Our Campus: A Champion for Indigenous Peoples at UBC, Linc Kesler Looks Back." *The Ubyssey*, 21 June 2018, https://www.ubyssey.ca/features/our-campus-linc-kesler-is-done-hiding/.

Walsh Marr, Jennifer. "An English Language Teacher's Pedagogical Response to Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, vol. 2019, no. 157, 2019, pp. 91–103, https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20332.

---. "Moving from Form to Function: Leveraging SFL Metalanguage to Illuminate Features and Functions of Texts in First-Year University EAP." *Pedagogies in English for Academic Purposes: Teaching and Learning in International Contexts*, edited by Carole MacDiarmid and Jennifer J. MacDonald, Bloomsbury Academic, 2021, pp. 43–58, https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350164833.

Walsh Marr, Jennifer, and Fatimah Mahmood. "Looking Past Limiting Conditions: Prioritizing Meaning in EAP." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 51, 2021, p. 100979. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.100979.

Weissberg, Robert. *Connecting Speaking & Writing in Second Language Writing Instruction*. U of Michigan P, 2006.

"What Are You Working On? Linc Kesler." *What Are You Working On?*, https://www.ubc.ca/about/what-are-you-working-on/linc-kesler.html. Accessed 1 Dec. 2019.

Yoshizawa, Alejandro. *All Our Father's Relations*. Right Relations Productions, 2016.

Zappa-Hollman, Sandra. "Collaborations between Language and Content University Instructors: Factors and Indicators of Positive Partnerships." *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, vol. 21, no. 5, 2018, pp. 591–606, https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1491946.

Zhou, Helen. "Our Campus: Elder Larry Grant Finds a Voice for Indigenous Languages." *The Ubyssey*, 12 May 2017, https://www.ubyssey.ca/features/larry-grant-finds-a-voice/.

Katja Thieme

Katja Thieme teaches courses on research writing and discourse analysis at UBC's Vantage College, Department of English Language and Literatures, and School of Journalism, Writing and Media. Her research is located in the field of rhetorical genre theory. She is particularly interested in how written genres constitute political movements, how genres in academic contexts interact with each other, and how language-focused analysis can increase students' agency in their research writing practice. Her work has appeared in *Written Communication, Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, and *Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie*,

Jennifer Walsh Marr

Jennifer Walsh Marr is an academic English lecturer at the University of British Columbia's Vantage College. She holds a BA in applied linguistics and Japanese studies, an MA in curriculum and instruction, and is a doctoral student in language and literacy education at the University of Toronto's Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Her research work has looked at intersections of power, identity, and language in the academy, particularly with regard to Indigenous and settler histories in Canada, and incorporating systemic functional linguistics (SFL) and genre research into pedagogical practice. For her classroom practice, she draws on critical pedagogy and discourse analysis to facilitate her students' familiarity with valued features of the disciplines.