

“Be brave to seek our own opinions”: Empowered Identities of Emergent Multilinguals as Producers of Meaning

Won Kim

In an effort to develop disciplinary literacy in English as an Additional Language (EAL) students in tertiary-level learning contexts, there have been various linguistically responsive instructional (LRI) approaches to fostering the learning of both language and content. The LRI approaches point to the importance of nurturing discipline-specific literacies of students as apprentice scholars who can appropriately participate in the scholarly conversations and practices of a discipline. There is, however, little known about whether and in what ways tertiary-level LRI-based approach can be realized and contribute to students' empowered identities as legitimate participants in the consumption, construction, and representation of disciplinary knowledge.

This autoethnographic teaching reflective account chronicles a ground-up pedagogical effort by university educators in Canada aiming to develop the disciplinary literacies of international undergraduate students in a course integrating content and language in conjunction with the content of first-year history, psychology, and geography courses. Illuminating specific instructional examples, this article illustrates how such a pedagogical effort informed by task-based, functional approaches to language learning may create an educational space within which students are invited to position themselves and others as producers of meaning. Drawing on students' reflective voices, the article closes with pedagogical implications for fostering students' empowered identities with a stronger sense of affective, cognitive, and communicative dispositions (beyond being “non-native” speakers/writers of English) while critically exploring the inextricable relationship between language and disciplinary knowledge.

Dans le but de développer la littératie disciplinaire chez les étudiants dont l'anglais est une langue additionnelle (ALA) dans des contextes d'enseignement supérieur, diverses approches pédagogiques adaptées sur le plan linguistique ont été mises en place pour favoriser l'apprentissage à la fois de la langue et du contenu. Ces approches soulignent l'importance de cultiver les littératies disciplinaires spécifiques des étudiants en tant qu'apprentis chercheurs, capables de participer de manière appropriée aux conversations et aux pratiques savantes d'une discipline. On sait toutefois peu de chose sur si, et de quelle manière, une approche adaptée sur

le plan linguistique au niveau tertiaire peut être mise en œuvre et contribuer à renforcer l'identité des étudiants en tant que participants légitimes à la consommation, à la production et à la représentation des connaissances disciplinaires.

Ce récit réflexif d'enseignement autoethnographique rend compte d'un effort pédagogique mené sur le terrain par des enseignants universitaires au Canada, visant à développer les littératies disciplinaires d'étudiants internationaux de premier cycle dans un cours intégrant le contenu et la langue, en lien avec les cours de première année en histoire, psychologie et géographie. À travers des exemples pédagogiques concrets, cet article illustre de quelle manière une telle initiative, inspirée par des approches d'apprentissage des langues fonctionnelles et basées sur les tâches, peut créer un espace éducatif dans lequel les étudiants sont invités à se positionner, eux-mêmes et les uns les autres, en tant que producteurs de sens. En s'appuyant sur les réflexions des étudiants, l'article conclut avec des implications pédagogiques visant à favoriser le développement d'identités autonomes chez les étudiants, dotées d'un sens accru des dispositions affectives, cognitives et communicatives (au-delà du simple statut de locuteurs/scripteurs « non natifs » de l'anglais), tout en explorant de manière critique la relation inextricable entre la langue et les connaissances disciplinaires.

Keywords: autoethnographic pedagogical reflection, content and language integrated learning, disciplinary literacies, linguistically responsive instruction, L2 pedagogy, student identity

With a significant increase in the number of international students in higher education witnessed over the past decades in many parts of the world, educators continue to speak to the significance of considering its educational impact for institutions, faculty, staff, and students, who bring a diverse range of beliefs and stances to the role of language in the development of academic rigour and to the need for scaffolding international students in an inclusive way (De Costa et al., 2021; Gallagher et al., 2020). One important area with such an impact is classroom pedagogy, which needs to respond to a call for generating desired learning outcomes in content knowledge while developing the academic literacies of international students. As part of the pedagogical and scholarly effort, there have been various linguistically responsive instructional (LRI) approaches to fostering the learning of both language and content (Finn & Avni, 2021; Haan & Gallagher, 2022; Lucas & Villegas, 2010; Tomaš & Shapiro, 2021). In particular, LRI practices combined with English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP) have been recognized for their emphasis on nurturing discipline-specific literacies of English as an Additional Language (EAL) students as multilingual apprentice scholars with dispositions, knowledge, and “the ability to appropriately participate in the communicative practices of a discipline” (Airey, 2011, p. 3). Despite a growing interest in nurturing EAL students as disciplinary-literate emergent multilinguals, there still is a need for more classroom-grounded accounts of whether and how linguistically responsive disciplinary literacies-based instructional approaches can actually and potentially be realized in a tertiary-level course. Such classroom-based accounts can also make important contributions to a more nuanced understanding of how students' empowered identities as legitimate participants may be developed in the consumption, construction, and representation of disciplinary knowledge.

The purpose of this article is to chronicle examples of a ground-up pedagogical effort made by two university educators in Canada (the author and his colleague, who both have many years' experience teaching international students at a tertiary level and have shared growing nuanced understandings of the affordances and challenges of LRI, both as language educators and as emergent multilinguals themselves). The primary aim of the pedagogy described in this article is to foster the disciplinary literacies of undergraduate international students in an adjunct course integrating language and content, in conjunction with its corresponding disciplinary courses. The examples of the pedagogical effort are documented and presented as autoethnographic pedagogical reflections (Ellis, 2004). I will first describe the nature, components, and theoretical underpinnings of the course. Drawing on specific instructional examples and students' voices (gathered through end-of-term critical personal learning reflections on their learning experiences with unit projects and in the course as well as program-administered course evaluations), I will illustrate how such a pedagogical effort may create an educational space within which students are invited to position themselves and others as producers of meaning with a stronger sense of affective, cognitive, and communicative dispositions. The article will close with pedagogical insights for educators supporting international students in higher education.

Course Description

The course was designed as a multi-section, content-and-language-integrated core course of a first-year pathway program for international students at an English-dominant university in Canada. The first-year pathway program offers a range of credit-bearing courses across three streams (arts, science, and engineering) categorized into disciplinary content courses or those focusing on the development of English language and literacy for general and specific academic purposes. The successful completion of the course work in the program can lead to advancement to the second year of their degree of study at the university (see Zappa-Hollman & Fox, 2021, for more details of the program). The curricular content and purpose of the course described here were closely linked with three disciplinary courses (geography, history, and psychology) in the arts stream, in which a cohort of 75 undergraduate students were enrolled during their first year.

One primary aim of the course was to help students raise their critical awareness of the form and function of academic language. Also, it aimed to apprentice them into the disciplinary ways of thinking, reading, listening, speaking, and writing of scholars within and beyond the corresponding arts disciplines. It was hoped that such apprenticeship would contribute to developing relevant disciplinary strategies, skills, and attitudes, instilling the habits of mind as novice scholars (Moje, 2015). In achieving the primary aims of the course, going beyond serving the role as supplementary to the corresponding content courses, the curriculum of the course was centred on the development of disciplinary literacies. This curricular decision was in line with pedagogical insights by scholars such as Carter (2007) and Hyland (2016), who underscore the importance of meaningful opportunities for students to build and reflect on their nuanced understanding of language, text types, skills, knowledge, and practices that are discipline-specific. In realizing the curricular decision, and being informed by some of the main learning objectives of the three arts content courses, this two-term disciplinary literacy course was designed with six main learning units anchored around knowledge in and through language: language and knowing, representing knowledge, speaking (about) knowledge, researching knowledge, responding to knowledge, and finally disseminating knowledge (see Table 1 for summarized specific learning outcomes of each unit adapted from the course outline).

Table 1
Purposes of Learning Units

Units	Learning outcomes	Main activities/projects
Unit 1: Language and knowing	1. (Re)think about the relationship between language and knowledge 2. Recognize epistemic stances underlying the production of knowledge in the disciplines of the first-year studies by unpacking the corresponding course syllabi	Discourse analysis of academic and non-academic texts
Unit 2: Representing knowledge	1. Explore terms and salient nature of varied text types of genre families (e.g., literature review, lab report, reflections, case study) across disciplines 2. Identify the functional meanings of the language of instruction embedded in the instructions for assignment/test conceptualized as text 3. Compare content at a clause level across text types (e.g., spoken and written) 4. Recognize morphemes as meaningful units of representing disciplinary knowledge	In-class tasks exploring: Genre families Test as text Academic vocabulary and morphemes Academic registers
Unit 3: Speaking (about) knowledge	1. Review, synthesize, and mobilize a disciplinary concept across interactional contexts 2. Imagine and perform a realistic interaction with different groups of target audiences using appropriate vocabulary, registers, and discourse	Multimodal speaking knowledge group project
Unit 4: Researching knowledge	1. Explore databases and academic journals common in the disciplines 2. Acquire online library search strategies using appropriate search terms of abstraction	Library search task: Determining the credibility and relevance of searched texts

	represented through nominalization 3. Apply appropriate criteria to determine the reliability and relevance of searched journal articles 4. Identify salient linguistic features of the main stages of psychology journal articles (e.g., title, introduction, method, results/findings, and discussion) in comparison to those in history/geography	
Unit 5: Responding to knowledge	1. Describe, interpret, and explain a phenomenon in a critical film observation report from a disciplinary perspective 2. Link theory and an inquiry (connecting abstract ideas with concrete examples) 3. Build evidence-grounded arguments and articulate them in speech in a public debate setting	Individual critical film observation report Multi-disciplinary public debates
Unit 6: Disseminating knowledge	1. Identify typical stages and language features of slides-based academic presentations as a genre 2. Acquire strategies and skills for preparing, designing, and delivering academic presentations in alignment with its field (content), tenor (audience/context), and mode (textual organization) 3. Deliver a formal academic presentation on a topic of interest selected from one of the required content courses	Discipline-specific research-based Powerpoint slide presentations

Essentially, the pedagogy of the course can be characterized as task-based, genre-oriented, and functional approaches to academic literacies. Specifically, it is theoretically informed by systemic functional linguistics (SFL), in which language is viewed as a semiotic system appropriated as resources for making ideational, textual, and interpersonal meanings situated in context (Coffin, 2010; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004), allowing a critical lens for students to unpack and repack the connection between texts and contexts. Such a critical social-semiotic orientation to language intersects with other

theoretical underpinnings of pedagogy such as multi-literacies pedagogy (New London Group, 1996), in which learners are viewed as meaning designers who recognize and construct meanings creatively and critically across modes; and genre-based perspectives on language conceptualizing genres as “staged, goal-oriented social processes” (Martin & Rose, 2008, p. 6). Congruently, the pedagogy of the course is centred on disciplinary literacies, which points to the importance of fostering students’ competence in appropriately engaging with disciplinary interactions and practices (Airey, 2011) in a critical way such that “the appropriateness of usage is determined if a speaker’s needs are met” (Mizell, 2022, p. 106). The disciplinary literacies-centred perspective allows a lens to situate literacies as ways of knowing and thinking reflected in or reflecting purposeful inquiry-based practices specific to a given disciplinary culture (Lemke, 1990).

Examples of Instructional Tasks and Approaches

In light of the theoretical stances described above, pedagogical efforts were made to design in-class tasks, activities, assessments, and classroom interactions of the course in a way to engage students centrally in purposeful, multimodal meaning-making practices. As an illustration, as part of Unit 3 (speaking knowledge) in the first term, students in groups were asked to produce a multimodal representation of performed discourses in the form of one of two video genres: an educational video with aims to teach a disciplinary concept chosen from one of the linked content courses (i.e., psychology, geography, and history) for two different imaginary target audiences (i.e., educated adults and six-year-old children); or a set of three videos presenting three distinct performed oral interactions involving experts, college students, and children (expert–expert, expert–college student, and expert–child) in conversations about a chosen disciplinary concept. This multimodal project in Unit 3 aimed to invite students to multiple meaning-filled opportunities to review, deconstruct, reconstruct, and mobilize a disciplinary concept learned in arts courses across interactional contexts and genres that they would encounter in their respective courses (e.g., extended definitions written in a geography textbook or in an academic journal article or a face-to-face panel discussion at a conference). In imagining and performing a realistic interaction with different groups of target audiences, students were invited to make context-relevant choices of appropriate vocabulary, registers, and discourse (e.g., reader-friendly, concrete, contextualized, general vs. abstract, dense, technical, and more discipline-specific), drawing on their functionally oriented metalinguistic perspectives on language as a system of meaning-making resources.

Another illustration of pedagogical efforts fostering purposeful multimodal meaning-making practice was a group project in the second term, namely multi-disciplinary public debates. This project was part of Unit 5 (responding to knowledge), which aimed to engage students in approaching knowledge in critical and informed ways as listeners to and readers of knowledge. The project involved two phases: first, students watched a selected film as a class and wrote a critical-analytical paper from a disciplinarily informed perspective (psychological, geographical, or historical) by linking and applying a self-chosen relevant disciplinary concept or theory to aspects of the film in focus. In writing the critical analysis (deconstructed and reconstructed mainly in two stages, i.e., a descriptive summary and an evaluative analysis), students were required to navigate diverse academic discourses of the written academic language of summary of chosen scenes from the film (i.e., objective, non-interpretative, descriptive) and that of analysis of the summarized scenes (i.e., analytic, evaluative, argumentative). Following this first individual writing phase, the students were then invited to respond to the film jointly as a group, this time in spoken academic discourse in the context of interdisciplinary public debates. The public debate project aimed to engage students in deconstructing and redesigning disciplinary knowledge across multiple genres (e.g., films, written critical analysis, and interdisciplinary public debates), potentially aiming to position students as both active participants and reflective observers in the meaning-making practices. The project was collaborative in nature on multiple levels, realizing and constituting the interactive space of diverse scholarly voices of

participants involved in the debate, including experts in the scholarly texts, instructors, and, importantly, students. That is, it involved multi-sections of the course taught by two course instructors, groups of students within and across debate teams, and joint conversations among both academic language and disciplinary content course instructors in selecting a film and constructing discipline-specific debate topics that intended to stimulate theoretically informed and evidence-grounded arguments about the film in three arts disciplines (see Table 2 for the specific disciplinary topics of the debate).

Table 2

Disciplinary Debate Topics

Discipline	Topic
Geography	The characters in <i>Apocalypse Now</i> are motivated to participate in the Vietnam War by their concept of ‘home’.
	The behaviour and attitudes of American soldiers towards the Vietnamese people can be justified given the global conflict between the USSR and the USA at that time.
History	The Vietnam War was, in reality, a Vietnamese civil war.
	The United States should have won the Vietnam War.
Psychology	War attracts people with certain personality types, then reinforces those personality characteristics.

Teacher Rumination: Affirming Student Identity as Producers of Meaning

The collective pedagogical efforts put into creating a space for fostering disciplinary literacies for international students, as described above, can be construed as the ground-up educational pursuit of recognizing and empowering the students as emergent multilinguals who are competent and confident producers of meanings. On the premises that academic English is a second language for all, not just for emergent multilinguals (Flowerdew, 2019), and that “knowing disciplinary content includes knowing the language of the discipline and that knowledge is created in and through language” (Coffin, 2010, p. 4), which were shared and reflected on in the very first class of the course, students were overtly encouraged to position themselves and others as competent emergent multilinguals. They were invited to draw on their plurilingual resources, including their emerging academic English, in consuming, communicating, researching, representing, and responding to existing knowledge and also in

constructing and disseminating developing knowledge of their own as they entered the scholarly communities of practice in the faculty of arts at a North American university as apprentice scholars (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Over the 26 weeks organized into six units, the students encountered multiple opportunities to engage with aspects of disciplinary literacies as producers of meaning. The apprenticeship of students into the practices, skills, and knowledge of the disciplines was evidenced and illustrated by the projects described earlier. For example, the speaking disciplinary knowledge project (Unit 3 on speaking knowledge) intended to engage the students to imagine the habits of mind of experts in a chosen discipline and to think, act, and speak like a geographer, historian, or psychologist in an imaginary face-to-face interaction with a fellow expert, an undergraduate student, or a child, using and construing contextually appropriate registers and content in having their communicative needs met in interaction. Such purposeful and meaningful literacy engagement seems to have continually invited the students to explicitly think out loud about the connection between context and the ideational, textual, and interpersonal meaning potential of language choices, which is complex and often implicit (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Also, being able to mobilize appropriate and relevant academic discourse and knowledge across mediums and contexts (e.g., from a psychology textbook to performed oral conversation in pretended office hours) in having their needs met involved competence in knowledge mobilization, which necessarily required a deeper understanding of the disciplinary knowledge being discussed at hand (New London Group, 1996; Zapata & Lacorte, 2018).

In addition to learning content and language, the project also aimed to help students hear themselves as confident, clear speakers, with any accents seen not as deviant forms of idealized native speakers of English but rather as audible forms of their identity. This message was explicitly passed to the students during the class on key segmental and suprasegmental aspects of pronunciation for clearer speech, and I constantly brought it back to students' attention in feedback (e.g., during individual group formative feedback sessions where sample draft audio/video recordings of the speaking knowledge project were jointly heard and discussed). This explicit instruction was pedagogically significant in that it potentially empowered the students, especially those who tend to be heard (or who self-perceive their identities) as deficient speaking subjects, especially from the perspective of white listening subjects (Flores & Rosa, 2015).

Students' identity as competent emergent multilingual speakers with the habits of scholarly mind was further cultivated by the disciplinary public debate project (Unit 5 on responding to knowledge). In this project, the students had to be prepared with language of discussion and evaluation, a depth of relevant knowledge, and confidence to perform in a spontaneous public speech event on intellectually demanding disciplinary topics. The project called for interpreting critically what was observed, building warrantable claims, and considering limitations of one's own arguments and those of others. The students were also engaged with mapping disciplinary content and concepts into the topics portrayed in the film. They were tasked with articulating theoretically sound arguments in a linguistically and affectively challenging public speech setting while showing their awareness of contextually appropriate interpersonal positioning of their counterarguments and audience. The project held significance for the affirmation of identities of the students as it allowed a safe performative space where an individual student was invited to hold the legitimacy and right to speak as an informed knower, speaking up their research-based scholarly voices of imagined experts in the as-if context of public debates where different, evidence-grounded viewpoints were interwoven and negotiated. As evidenced in (and assessed through, on the basis of functionally oriented evaluation rubrics) the students' written, spoken, and performed identity texts produced in and through the learning units described above, the projects contributed to students' expanded positioning affirmed and heard as confident legitimate producers and interpreters of meaning beyond passive consumers of knowledge. The pedagogical importance of having opportunities to experience and expand such affirmed identities resonates well with existing pedagogical endeavours informed by tenets of culturally sustaining SFL-based pedagogies centred on reflection literacy (Hasan, 2011) that position students as agentive, critical,

and creative multimodal designers of meaning (Harman & Burke, 2020; Mizell, 2022). The significance of such positioning also seems to be recognized by a number of students, as captured in their end-of-term self-reflections or the course evaluations. Some frequently and commonly noted student reactions are represented anonymously in students' own words below:

I think the most important thing I learned from the course was debate skills and how to look at one scene from a different academic lens like history or geography. I learned that different disciplines have a different lens, different perspectives and skills to be used to view things.

The most important thing in the course is that we build a strong connection between construction of disciplinary knowledge and language, which helps us get a deep understanding of the courses.

It [the debate] was an excellent way to discuss the same topic in the disciplines that we studied from various perspectives. By doing this, my understanding of the knowledge was more comprehensive.... I received a great opportunity to use and apply the knowledge into real world.... I learned the knowledge that I learnt from lecture is not only used for the exams but also can be used to understand things that are around me.

These students' voices can be heard as having valued the potential educational impact of the opportunities on their cognitive dispositions as empowered, emergent multilinguals. With such dispositions, the students explore the role of language in constructing knowledge that can be viewed and applied from multiple perspectives. Additionally, the students seem to have also recognized the impact of the meaning-making practices that they experienced on their affective and communicative dispositions, as reflected below:

The academic awareness is the most important thing I have developed through entire course. The course helped me to build awareness as academic writer or presenter. It literally taught me the appropriate language usage in academic occasions ... it taught me the importance of audience while conducting projects; I became aware of how to position myself in academic writing or oral presentation ... considering the target audience.

One most important learning I would want to take away from the entire course is that always be confident and trust myself. I did not like to talk in front of others. However, since this course had so many opportunities for us to practice our public speaking skills in English, and now I feel less scared and more confident about talking in front of others.

I learned that we should think from different perspectives and be brave to seek our own opinions.... We should be brave enough to find, think about, and challenge the so-called truth rather than blindly believe it.

These reflections suggest how the students recognized their nurtured affective and communicative dispositions as they continually (re)built and negotiated their confidence and agency as academic writers and speakers (who become brave to seek their own opinions), potentially with what Turkan et al. (2014) refer to as "disciplinary linguistic knowledge." As advocated by scholars (e.g., Benesch, 2001; de Oliveira, 2020), nurturing such affirmed dispositions can contribute to developing students' critical awareness of their positionality with respect to knowledge and audience across disciplinary academic texts that they are expected to face and produce in their evolving, ongoing journey of academic socialization, which is particularly significant in a higher educational context.

Pedagogical Insights

In this article, I have highlighted some salient features of pedagogical efforts into creating an educational space in which disciplinary content and language intersect in a visible and audible way, with an aim to apprentice international students into the practices, skills, and cultures of academic communities in a range of social science and humanities disciplines. The apprenticeship was to nurture students' disciplinary literacies encompassing the habits of scholarly minds in understanding, constructing, representing, speaking about, researching, responding to, and disseminating disciplinary knowledge.

Cultivating the habits of scholarly minds is important for all students in higher education, and particularly for international students who tend to view themselves or are often seen as marginalized, incompetent, and deficient from a deficit model perspective (De Costa et al., 2021; Flores & Rosa, 2015). In achieving such an educational goal in tertiary-level classrooms with international students (in both ESL and EFL learning settings), it is fundamental to recognize and reify the pedagogical importance and impact of creating and fostering the instructional spaces in classrooms that can embody the following:

- bolstering heteroglossia of both scholarly voices of existing texts and students themselves (both as active participants and as reflective spectators in disciplinary knowledge production) (de Oliveira, 2020);
- engaging students with a wide range of meaningful, identity-affirming interactions positioning students as competent and legitimate, for example as knowers/experts/creative video producers/public debaters/analytical junior scholars, offering meaningful opportunities for critical and agentive reflection literacy (Hasan, 2011);
- allowing authentic moments for students to pause and reflect on their lived experiences in a course and self-assess a range of identity options being invited to negotiate, construct, and affirm (e.g., through student autoethnographic critical reflections, such as the one shared in this article, that can be a powerful tool for assessment for both teachers and learners [Ellis, 2004], etc.);
- boosting high literacy engagement and investment in learning while creating various multimodal texts (e.g., educational videos, performed interactions, public debates, podcast, etc.) involving the incorporation of their plurilingual, metalinguistic, and meta-discursive perspectives and skills as critical and creative meaning designers (Martin & Rose, 2008; Zapata & Lacorte, 2018);
- encouraging affectively, communicatively, and cognitively empathetic dispositions as producers of meaning with openness to different ways of feeling, being, becoming, knowing, and interpreting across disciplines and contexts (Turkan et al., 2014).

In creating such transformative learning spaces, instruction that is identity-affirming and linguistically responsive as well as culturally sustaining has a role to play in higher education, calling for joint coordinated effort among faculty, staff, and programs (Zappa-Hollman & Fox, 2021). Making such collective effort can, however, be challenging because it primarily necessitates in the minds of faculty, staff, and students (1) a joint nuanced conceptualization of language as resources for not only communicating but also constructing meaning; (2) the intricate and inextricably interwoven relationship between language and content; and (3) "the development of disciplinary literacy practices as a human, social construction rather than merely the learning of discrete skills" (Moje, 2015, p. 255). As echoed by other educators (Gallagher et al., 2020; Zappa-Hollman, 2018), I share a conviction that the challenge in gaining such an understanding can be negotiated and tackled through meaningful opportunities for continuous faculty professional development within programs, a committed willingness to sustain open conversations and collaborations among content and language instructors,

and wider access to curricular resources (e.g., course syllabi or assignment expectations shared in program-wide online platform, etc.). It is arguably not always feasible to create and engage with these opportunities meaningfully as intended. It is, nonetheless, undoubtedly vital to strive toward it because such a pedagogical endeavour can ultimately open up a meaningful opportunity to create and sustain a learning space for students that is more inclusive, identity-affirming, diversity-grounded, and equity-generating.

Acknowledgement

I sincerely thank the reviewers for their thorough and thoughtful reviews and suggestions. My deepest appreciation also goes to my dear colleague Brett Todd, whose joint pedagogical efforts and insights have contributed to the students' learning experiences in the course in significant ways. I also express my gratitude to all the students in this multi-section course. I wish them well in their continued journey as apprentice scholars.

The Author

Won Kim is currently a professor in the English Education program at Miyazaki International University, Japan. His research interests include classroom-based research, English for academic purposes, multiliteracies, discourse analysis, learner/teacher identity, and L2 pedagogy with arts/drama.

References

- Airey, J. (2011). The disciplinary literacy discussion matrix: A heuristic tool for initiating collaboration in higher education. *Across the Disciplines*, 8(3), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2011.8.3.18>
- Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for academic purposes: Theory, politics, and practice*. Routledge.
- Carter, M. (2007). Ways of knowing, doing, and writing in the disciplines. *College Composition & Communication*, 58(3), 385–418. <https://doi.org/10.58680/cc20075912>
- Coffin, C. (2010). Language support in EAL contexts: Why systemic functional linguistics? *NALDIC Quarterly*, 8(1), 2–5.
- De Costa, P. I., Green-Eneix, C., & Li, W. (2021). Problematizing language policy and practice in EMI and transnational higher education: Challenges and possibilities. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 44(2), 115–128. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aryl.44.2>
- de Oliveira, L. C. (2020). The potential of second language writing in higher education: Expectations for graduate students. *NYS TESOL Journal*, 7(2), 3–6.
- Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. AltaMira Press.
- Finn, H. B., & Avni, S. (2021). Linguistically responsive instruction in corequisite courses at community colleges. *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(4), 1221–1246. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3080>
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>
- Flowerdew, J. (2019). The linguistic disadvantage of scholars who write in English as an additional language. *Language Teaching*, 52(2), 249–260. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000041>

- Gallagher, C., Haan, J., & Lovett, S. (2020). Faculty and international student perceptions of language performance and instructional support: A mismatch of expectations. *TESOL Journal*, 11(1), <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.462>
- Haan, J., & Gallagher, C. (2022). Situating linguistically responsive instruction in higher education contexts: Foundations for pedagogical, curricular, and institutional support. *TESOL Quarterly*, 56(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3087>
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). Arnold.
- Harman, R. M., & Burke, K. J. (2020). *Culturally sustaining systemic functional linguistics praxis: Embodied inquiry with multilingual youth*. Routledge.
- Hasan, R. (2011). *Language and education: Learning and teaching in society*. (J. Webster, Ed.). Equinox.
- Hyland, K. (2016). General and specific EAP. In K. Hyland & P. Thompson (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 17–29). Routledge.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lemke, J. L. (1990). *Talking science: Language, learning, and values*. Ablex.
- Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2010). The missing piece in teacher education: The preparation of linguistically responsive teachers. *Teachers College Records*, 112(14), 297–318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811011201402>
- Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2008). *Genre relations: Mapping culture*. Equinox.
- Mizell, J. D. (2022). Culturally sustaining systemic functional linguistics: Towards an explicitly anti-racist and anti-colonial languaging and literacy pedagogy. *Linguistics*, 72, 101–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101108>
- Moje, E. B. (2015). Doing and teaching disciplinary literacy with adolescent learners: A social and cultural enterprise. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 254–278. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.254>
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 60–92. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.66.1.17370n67v22j160u>
- Tomaš, Z., & Shapiro, S. (2021). From crisis to opportunity: Turning questions about plagiarism into conversations about linguistically responsive pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(4), 1102–1113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3082>
- Turkan, S., De Oliveira, L. C., Lee, O., & Phelps, G. (2014). Proposing a knowledge base for teaching academic content to English language learners: Disciplinary linguistic knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 116(3), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811411600303>
- Zapata, G. C., & Lacorte, M. (Eds.). (2017). *Multiliteracies pedagogy and language learning: Teaching Spanish to heritage speakers*. Springer.
- Zappa-Hollman, S. (2018) Collaborations between EAP and disciplinary instructors: Factors and indicators of positive partnerships. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21 (5), 591–606. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1491946>
- Zappa-Hollman, S., & Fox, J. A. (2021). Engaging in linguistically responsive instruction: Insights from a first-year university program for emergent multilingual learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(4), 1081–1091. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3075>