

Closing the Umbrella: A Call for Nation-Specific Indigenous Scholarship

Laura Forsythe
University of Winnipeg

Jennifer Markides
University of Calgary

Lucy Delgado
University of Manitoba

Abstract

Indigenous umbrella scholarship speaks about Indigenous Peoples, knowledges, and cultures as a monolith instead of recognizing the specific Indigenous nations from which these peoples, knowledges, and cultures come. Indigenous umbrella scholarship was long a necessity due to the scarcity of nation-specific scholarship. In recent years, Indigenous scholars have made strides in the academy to legitimize our communities' knowledges and practices. As three Métis scholars, we argue that we have reached a tipping point in the movement toward nation-specific work, and we offer three recommendations to scholars writing with, for, and about Indigenous Peoples.

Keywords: umbrella scholarly work, nation-specific, methodology, epistemology, Indigenous knowledge, Métis knowledge

Résumé

Les études générales sur les peuples autochtones traitent ces derniers, leurs savoirs et leurs cultures comme un tout homogène, au lieu de reconnaître les nations dans leurs spécificités. Une telle approche généraliste s'est longtemps justifiée par la rareté des recherches portant sur des nations spécifiques. Or, ces dernières années, les chercheuses et chercheurs universitaires autochtones ont réalisé des avancées majeures en légitimant les savoirs et les pratiques propres à nos communautés. En tant que trio de chercheuses métisses, nous soutenons que le mouvement vers la recherche axée sur les nations a atteint un point de bascule. Nous proposons à cet égard trois recommandations pour les chercheuses et chercheurs qui travaillent avec, pour ou sur les Autochtones.

Mots-clés : recherche généraliste, recherche axée sur les nations, méthodologie, épistémologie, savoirs autochtones, savoirs métis

Introduction

Universities across Canada are pursuing reconciliation and Indigenization through hiring Indigenous scholars, allocating funds to Indigenous research, and adding Indigenous courses as graduation requirements in programs across campus. While each institution is situated geographically in the home territories of specific nations, the opportunities to hire scholars from those nations were, and are, not always sought out or even possible. This coursework aims to prepare students to obtain work across the country and beyond. Thus, Indigenous course content includes many nations from both in and outside the territory of a given institution. Much of this work purports to bring Indigenous voices into the academy, but in doing so, it promotes and engages in *Indigenous umbrella scholarship*, which assumes pan-Indigeneity across homogenous nations and a single Indigenous worldview or Indigenous lens with which we all work. Indigenous umbrella scholarship speaks about Indigenous Peoples, knowledges, and cultures as a monolith instead of recognizing the specific Indigenous nations from which those peoples, knowledges, and cultures come. As we argue, much of the research that is touted as Indigenous research methodology comes from specific Indigenous nations and yet becomes swallowed up by the language of Indigenous umbrella scholarship. Our aim in this call to end Indigenous umbrella scholarship is not to undermine or devalue the important work that has come

before. Instead, we offer a pointed argument about why acknowledging and prioritizing nation-specific scholarship is important, and what shift is necessary in the academic and publishing worlds to achieve it.

Why Umbrella Scholarship Exists: How We Got Here Politically

Indigenous political organizing predates the country called Canada by millennia. The Indigenous umbrella and inter-nation alliances picked up significantly after the world wars (Duhamel, 2013; Langford, 2016; Story, 2015), when First Nations veterans came home to find that they were unable to return to their communities and, contrary to promises made by the Canadian government, unable to qualify for any veterans' benefits (Thompson, 2004). Duhamel (2013) notes that "Aboriginal veterans often returned to find that their reserve lands had been given away and that the ideal of freedom that they had fought so hard to defend had failed to materialize in post-war Canada" (p. 65). Métis veterans, who had not been able to identify as Métis when enlisting, struggled to access the benefits promised to them in light of their service (Innes, 2004, p. 687). Changes to the Indian Act in 1951, despite lifting potlatch and Sundance bans, continued to oppress First Nations through the principles of termination and assimilation, causing a rise in Indigenous political organizing.

Simultaneously, Métis and non-status First Nations found themselves in similar situations more broadly, ignored and disenfranchised from accessing services and compensation earmarked for status First Nations and (after 1939) Inuit.¹ Many Métis and First Nations lived in urban centres at that time and needed housing and employment support. With their aligning interests, Métis and non-status First Nations began organizing together across Canada, including opening the North American Indian Club in 1951 in Toronto and the Indian and Métis Friendship Centre in Winnipeg in 1959. These alliances between Métis and non-status First Nations grew in number, and with this collaborative strength they pushed for services that were withheld from them. When the National Association of Friendship Centres emerged in the 1970s, Indigenous nations came together in solidarity to

1 For more information regarding Inuit policy, read E. Anderson and S. Bonesteel's 2010 article, "A Brief History of Federal Inuit Policy Development: Lessons in Consultation and Cultural Competence."

organize and resist as collectives, generating reformism, which turned into activism (Langford, 2016). This also lumped distinct nations under the term “Aboriginal” in the pursuit of government funding (Tait, 2024). These organizations provided services, including housing, education, employment support, and advocacy in political spaces across the country. Regardless of nation, the Friendship Centre programming participants struggled with the same issues, calling for a united stand against the Canadian government.

While there was strength in the relationship between non-status First Nations and Métis, the Métis realized that the collective approach meant their distinct needs were often unmet as they were ineligible for housing aid; the Métis needed an independent voice. This move to separate representation of non-status First Nations and Métis was solidified during the Indian and Métis conference in 1967, when the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood adopted a resolution stating that they would represent only treaty people (Barkwell, 2018). It was at that time that the Métis resolved to create their own representative body, forming the Manitoba Métis Federation on October 1, 1967. First Nations and Inuit also moved toward organizing in their own individual interests. The National Indian Brotherhood, now the Assembly of First Nations, was created in December 1967, with hundreds of First Nations chiefs organizing into one collective voice (McFarlane & Manuel, 2020), while the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (2023) was formed in 1971 to become the national voice for 51 Inuit communities. Five Métis governing bodies—located in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Ontario—came together in 1983 to form the Métis National Council to speak with a collective Métis voice on the national and international stage.

However, the creation of individual bodies did not mean that collective organizing for Indigenous Peoples was over. The Native Council of Canada was founded in 1971 for non-status First Nations and Métis and would become the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples in 1993; it included off-reserve First Nations and southern Inuit in the fight to improve socio-economic conditions for its members (Congress of Aboriginal Peoples, 2023). Throughout the history of Indigenous political organizing in Canada, there were both moments of Indigenous umbrella efforts and recognition of the need for individual representation. With these collective efforts, Indigenous Peoples made progress in their fight for recognition and rights and simultaneously sent First Nations, Métis, and Inuit communities on trajectories toward nation-specific organizing that could speak to the needs of individual nations and peoples.

Why Umbrella Scholarship Exists: How We Got Here Academically

The political situation facing Indigenous Peoples necessitated this collective approach, and a similar collective front was necessary in academia to advance Indigenous representation. For decades, the only Indigenous content in academic literature was written *about* Indigenous people (Smith, 1999). Portrayals of our histories, beliefs, and ways of living often perpetuated the image of the “noble savage” or stereotypes of primitive creatures (King, 2003). It was not long ago that scholars recounted being the only Indigenous academic in their institutions, and Indigenous researchers who made the first inroads in the academy often had a lonely fight, having to prove themselves again and again as legitimate within the academic world while also carrying larger expectations of service between institutions and their home communities (Louie, 2019).

For decades, Indigenous scholars have also had to demonstrate their ability to use Euro-Western methodologies and show how Indigenous frameworks align with or depart from the context of inherited frameworks. Then, and only then, Indigenous research methodologies and frameworks could be legitimized. This added level of authentication saw the onus put on Indigenous scholars to prove the worth of their own ways of knowing. One example of this type of mapping between Indigenous knowledges and Euro-Western frames can be seen in the work of Hawaiian scholar Manulani Aluli Meyer (2008). Writing to show parallels allows outsiders to these knowledges to see value in the similarities but does not support readers in understanding the value in what makes Indigenous knowledges and methodologies distinctly different and intrinsically worthwhile.

It has been a long, taxing road for the first generations of Indigenous scholars to validate millennia-old knowledges and practices against and within widely accepted academic paradigms. Along with the slow rise of Indigenous scholarship, there was also an eventual recognition of the need for change within higher education systems to address their role in perpetuating the legacies of colonization. In 2010, the Association of Canadian Deans of Education published the *Accord on Indigenous Education*, which was developed under the guidance of Stólō scholar Jo-Ann Archibald, John Lundy, Cecilia Reynolds, and Lil’wat scholar Lorna Williams. The accord was published five years before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada released their 94 calls to action in 2015 and represented a commitment by deans of education across Canada to develop

and teach Indigenous education courses to pre-service teachers as a requirement for graduation. This was a bold move that was met with resistance in many cases, with students reflecting the deep-seated racism that has been tacit and normalized in Canadian society (M. Battiste, personal communication, May 29, 2024).

While a few teacher education programs included “Aboriginal” education components or courses, the accord led to more widespread adoption of the required course for pre-service teachers generally called “Indigenous Education.” Those courses needed to include many Indigenous perspectives, Peoples, histories, and ontologies and prepare teachers to teach in and about Indigenous communities across the country. Thus, educators incorporated the available literature and media depicting local First Nations, Métis, and Inuit, as well as other foundational Indigenous scholarship from around the globe. Educators continue to draw on what might be relevant locally and what will support teaching each of the recognized First Peoples across Canada. While seeking out primary sources to model best practices for including Indigenous voices and first-hand sharing of stories and knowledges, it is a piecemeal selection of what is gathered that becomes required readings for the courses.

Professors are used to preparing students to be experts in subject matter and pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986). In Indigenous education, this task is impossible because Indigenous communities are as vast and diverse as the geography of Canada itself, and each has distinct languages, values, cultures, and ways of living (Markides, 2018, 2022). Decolonization and Indigenous education are monumental undertakings (Poitras Pratt et al., 2018), but the teaching is distilled into one tidy, semester-long course.

At the graduate level, there are similar offerings of Indigenous research methodologies and a variety of Indigenous master’s programs in Indigenous studies, education, and social work, among others. Instructors in those faculties have cautioned against perpetuating pan-Indigenous teachings and beliefs (Chartrand, 2012, p. 146; Chrona, 2022, p. 146, 177, 193), but the intermingling of Indigenous scholarship representing different nations, knowledges, and cultures muddies students’ learning to create a generalized, homogenous framing of all Indigenous groups. Hence, the very existence of Indigenous education has both necessitated and perpetuated Indigenous umbrella scholarship. Deg Xit’an (Athabaskan) scholar Beth Leonard (2022) describes the pros and cons of the language used in higher education:

Use of the terms *Indigenous* and *knowledge* in their singular forms can also be problematic as this pan orientation often erases the diverse perspectives and practices of Indigenous communities. However, the term *Indigenous* is useful in promoting solidarity among Indigenous communities, and highlighting similarities in ways of knowing, being, and doing.

While recognizing the benefits that Leonard acknowledges, this article focuses on issues of erasure and homogenization.

What Became the Umbrella of Indigenous Scholarship Canon: Cobbling It Together

Initially, Indigenous scholarship of any kind was novel or romanticized. What existed historically was “about us, not by us.” The Indigenous people who worked their way into academic spaces created whole books about their specific topics related to Indigenous epistemologies, methodologies, and cosmologies. These pathbreakers in Indigenous research include Māori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), Quechua scholar Sandy Grande (2004), and Tewa scholar Gregory Cajete (1994), to name a few. That canon now includes work by Archibald (2008), Opaskwayak Cree scholar Shawn Wilson (2008), and Cree scholar Margaret Kovach (2009).

As we Indigenous scholars have become more numerous in the academy, we have created scholarship that draws on the work of the Indigenous academics who preceded us. In many cases, this has been the product of our own instructors teaching Indigenous research methodologies. We have followed the standards of literature reviews and research framing established in the colonial and colonizing systems of higher education that espouse the practice of acknowledging the scholarship from which we learn and on which we base our contributions to the field, but we thus perpetuate the myth of pan-Indigeneity and exacerbate the Western world’s fragmentary worldview, as Blackfoot scholar Leroy Little Bear has described (2000). Even when we name specific nations represented in Indigenous scholars’ work—assuming that the ontologies and epistemologies of the scholar’s individual nation are reflected in their writing—the simple act of drawing from the self-created and widely recognizable canon of Indigenous scholarship creates a body of Indigenous ideas, views, framings, and knowledges that resembles Frankenstein’s monster, resulting in non-nation-specific ways of thinking and generally taken Indigenous research contributions.

Cobbling it Together in Practice: Jennifer Markides's Example

Rather than calling out someone else's work, I will share my doctoral thesis, *Wisdom and Well-Being Post-Disaster: Stories Told by Youth* (Markides, 2020), as evidence of umbrella work. I refer to Smith's (1999) decolonizing methodologies and use Archibald's storywork methodology (2008) and Wilson's epistemological framework (2008), which centres responsibilities to relationships as the primary ethical research consideration. While relationships are a central value in many Indigenous communities, Wilson's approach does not particularly situate my work as Métis in ways that others may assume it does. If I were to start my doctoral project with what I know now, I would recognize that Métis-specific literatures exist. I would prioritize scholarship around *Keeoukaywin* (Flaminio et al., 2020; Gaudet, 2018) and Métis epistemology (Adese, 2020; Macdougall, 2017). This is not to discount powerhouses like Smith, Archibald, or Wilson, who brought nation-specific knowledges into academic spaces and paved the way for those who have followed.

The issue with edited collections of Indigenous methodologies and research—which we have both edited and in which we have published as authors—is that weaving together contributions from diverse nations can reinforce a reader's experience of pan-Indigenous scholarship. While each chapter might speak to teachings or learning from a specific nation, the methodologies, literature reviews, and theoretical frameworks often draw on scholarship taken from other nations, including works in the “Indigenous canon,” whereby we animate Frankenstein's monster, otherwise known as the umbrella of Indigenous scholarship, in each iteration of our outwardly appearing nation-specific work. If, as a Métis scholar, I continue to draw on the theoretical underpinnings of other Indigenous scholars' specific work, the next generations of Métis thinkers might assume that this is the Métis way: to draw a little from, say, Māori, Stólō, and Cree to situate our thinking and knowledge production in the academy. While some nations have had greater influence on Métis knowledge systems than others, it is still inaccurate to conclude that my research as a Métis scholar was in any way Métis-specific or informed by Métis-specific research practices. My sources *are* Indigenous. These were the scholars I was exposed to in the doctoral courses intended to prepare me for conducting educational research. With little to no Métis-specific literature to draw from and no real inclination or model to seek it out, I did what I thought best with what I had. I bricolaged my way through it and assembled my monster (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Kincheloe, 2001; Kincheloe et al., 2011; Rogers, 2012; Steinberg et al., 2020).

To reiterate, we do not want to disrespect the work of these foundational scholars of Indigenous research. Without their fighting tough battles—often alone—none of us would be here. Spaces in the academy and publications had to be made through these groundbreaking contributions. We are not suggesting that Indigenous scholarship cannot or should not recognize previous work. Nor are we suggesting that there are no affinities and overlaps in the orientations to our worldviews, research, and practices. It had to happen this way. However, now that we are here, it does not have to continue. Instead, we envision an academic world where Métis scholars can draw on Métis-specific teaching, knowledges, and scholarship that frame their work from Métis ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies, inclusive of Métis ethics and outputs.

Moving Away from Indigenous Umbrella Scholarship

“The term ‘indigenous’...is not itself indigenous.” (Peters & Mika, 2017, p. 1229)

We are reminded by Michael Peters and Māori scholar Carl Mika (2017) that Indigenous Peoples largely prefer to be referred to by the names of their own nations and that the homogenous or umbrella terms assigned to them by governments and institutions are offensive due to their imperial origins, which differentiated colonial settlers from Indigenous Peoples. D’harawal scholar Bodkin-Andrews and Carlson (2016) argue that the construction of pan-Indigenous identity is created from “biased Eurocentric epistemologies” (p. 785). The danger in this essentialism and the description of so-called universal Indigenous values is not merely the tendency to gloss over differences but also—and more importantly—in the way that pan-Indigenous values can be “all too easily weaponized in colonialist authenticity debates against Indigenous individuals and groups” (Justice, 2018, pp. 27–28). Questions of authenticity are frequently raised around the identities of Indigenous scholars. For a long time, institutions were not discerning of Indigenous identities, leading to issues of fraudulent claims by non-Indigenous scholars taking up spaces and funding targeted for Indigenous academics (Brice et al., 2024; Kolopenuk, 2023; Leroux, 2019).

Post-secondary institutions’ support of Indigenous umbrella scholarship is demonstrated by the practice of pan-Indigenous hires. There are subtleties and nuances that emerge under the discussions of Indigenous hires in institutions. Should priority be given

to a scholar from that territory? What happens with those not from the territory? Will the institution lose them when a position becomes available somewhere closer to home? The postings are often vague, as witnessed below, in looking for an “Indigenous” hire to address the gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous faculty cited by scholars such as Brodt et al. (2019), Mohamed and Beagan (2019), and Pewewardy (2013), while having more people to teach required Indigenous courses, support Indigenous graduate students, and join committees and task forces to decolonize the institution in efforts toward reconciliation. It is a daunting, service-laden role that needs to be filled urgently.

Three examples of 2024 academic postings highlight the use of Indigenous umbrella language: the University of Winnipeg (UW), Simon Fraser University (SFU), and the University of Calgary (U of C). University of Winnipeg’s (n.d.) recent cluster hire announces “the cluster hiring of 9 Indigenous open-rank, tenure-track academic appointments representing various disciplines and career stages. These cluster hire appointments will contribute to Indigenous excellence across the University of Winnipeg” (para. 2). The phrasing of a U of C posting in search of any Indigenous person practising any type of Indigenous art reads, “an Indigenous artist-researcher whose work encompasses performance as well as oral and text-based creation, to join an accomplished cohort of Indigenous researchers residing in the Faculty of Arts” (Native American and Indigenous Studies Association, 2024, para. 5). Finally, in their posting, SFU (2024) casts a wide net to include international indigeneity, stating that

Preference will be given to Indigenous candidates, including First Nations, Metis, and Inuit candidates from Canada, Native American candidates from the United States, and Indigenous candidates from Mexico, Central America, and South America within Native American and Indigenous Studies (NAIS) and Indigenous knowledge. (para. 3)

Will *any* Indigenous scholar do? Indigenous umbrellas extend to job advertisements that speak to Indigenous connections, knowledges, and ways of being that do not expect or demand specificity. It is a challenging path to take up this work and fill these spaces while expecting to be recognized in nation-specific ways. What is the way forward that allows us to be Indigenous scholars in ethical and honourable ways, so that we can be fully ourselves in our nation-specific identities?

In the past two decades, scholars have theorized Indigenous studies methodologies using a series of Rs. Wilson (2008) stresses the need for healthy relationships attained through adherence to the four Rs originally theorized by Cree scholar Verna Kirkness and Ray Barnhardt (1991): respect, relevance, reciprocity, and responsibility. Archibald (2008) adds the fifth sentiment of reverence, and Goenpul scholar of the Quandamooka people Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2017) argues that generosity and obligation are needed alongside the Rs. Other scholars have written about the inclusion of additional Rs, including resurgence (Gaudry, 2011) and refusal (Simpson, 2014).

Considering the importance of what are now the eight Rs of research (respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility, relationship, reverence, resurgence, and refusal), it is impossible to imagine a cohesive and homogenous Indigenous identity that views each R in the same way. When research implies a pan-Indigenous identity formulated on umbrella work, the results do not serve communities or align with the Rs. For example, were researchers approaching a First Nations community to do work for them with a Métis-specific research paradigm, that nation would be quite right to require the researchers to revise the plan to better represent First Nations' experiences and perspectives. We adhere to the protocols required of individual communities when collecting data, as "Indigenous ethics strive for nation-specificity, including around how knowledge is understood and shared, and demand agreements that are mutually beneficial" (Przybylo, 2019, p. 41). Research must be relevant to the community, and researchers must act in the interests of the communities that they serve by acting in reciprocity, demonstrating respect through humility, acknowledging community sovereignty and right of refusal, and holding themselves accountable through relationship (Archibald, 2008; Johnston et al., 2018; Kovach, 2009; Moreton-Robinson, 2017; Warrior, 2014; Wilson, 2008).

Umbrella work generalizes Indigenous existence without honouring the variety of nations, "ignoring how beliefs can vary at individual, communal, and national levels" (Alderson, 2019, p. 40), with these generalizations often taken as facts applicable to all Indigenous Peoples. Disseminating community-specific findings under a generalized Indigenous umbrella presents a standardized reality that fails to acknowledge the source of the knowledge stemming from a particular community or even individual (Younging, 2018, p. 31). Mary Cardinal Collins (a Plains Cree Elder) argues that respecting individual nations and cultures is paramount, although Collins also recognizes that diversity can complicate things, offering an example of the way that certain ceremonies and traditional dances are discussed in curricula:

There's a place in *Aboriginal Studies 10* where we talk about communal ceremonies such as the *Dawats'ethe* of the Dené Tha' (the English for the dance is "Tea Dance"), the *M Mâskisimowin* of the Woodland Cree ("Round Dance"), and the *Pâhkwesimôwin* of the Plains Cree and the *Akóka'tssin* of the Blackfoot Confederacy (both of these are "Sundances" in English). This section also talks about the Sweat Lodge...but there are all kinds of styles for the Sweat Lodge that are valid for different Indigenous Peoples. (Collins, as quoted in Younging, 2018, pp. 46–47)

Taylor (2020) speculates that researchers' pan-Indigenous assumptions "create expectations for all Indigenous people to behave or think in the same ways" (p. 224). While scholarship would perhaps be simpler if all Indigenous ontologies, epistemologies, and axiologies could be collapsed into the same broad categories, that is impossible while respecting the specific contexts, histories, knowledges, and understandings of each Indigenous community.

How We Got Here: Publishing Indigenous Umbrella Scholarship and Its Impacts

In an early overview of Indigenous scholarship, Heiss (2003) praises the work of Indigenous scholars and writers for creating an Indigenous publishing industry. Fagan et al. (2009) discuss the move toward nation-specific writing and publishing. Over the past 40 years, several Indigenous publishing houses were founded, such as Theytus Books (1980), Pemmican Publications (1980), Gabriel Dumont Publishing (1980), Kegeonce Press (1983), and the Nigwakwe Learning Press (1999); each featured nation- or people-specific content, and none was considered an academic press. All are weighted differently in tenure track and promotion applications than conventional university presses, which is one of the many tensions between tenure and promotion policies and procedures and Indigenous scholarship (Henry, 2012; Kovach, 2019; Louie, 2019). The issue lies in the colonial underpinnings of institutions that decide the merit of the research and its ability to be appreciated by wider audiences.

Taylor (2020) argues that, in a Canadian context, settler-colonial policies and ideals are designed to shape the publishing world. Forsythe (2022) points to the issues of

publishing houses' demand for Indigenous umbrella versus nation-specific content. The grandmothers and aunties in (Forsythe, 2022) speak to broader research and publishing opportunities that result from undertaking content that fits under that umbrella, obscuring Métis-specific work. Despite communities and scholars calling for nation-specific work and publications, generalizations continue. Deanna Reder, a Cree-Métis professor of Indigenous studies, predicted the next generation's return to a pan-Indigenous approach due to the "possibilities to theorize aspects of common experience and common aesthetics" (Fagan et al., 2009, p. 35). The umbrella persists despite generations of Indigenous scholars working to assert diversity against a system that supports homogeneity due to the benefits perceived by colonial institutions.

A leading scholar in Indigenous education research is Marie Battiste, a Mi'kmaw educator from the Potlotek First Nation, who first explored nation-specific research decades ago (Battiste, 1987), bringing awareness to her own people while writing with a specific epistemology embodying that people's ontologies and axiologies to share their truth with the academy. As time passed, the demands of the academy and publishers to be relevant to all Indigenous Peoples meant that Battiste's work became pan-Indigenous (1998, 2011, 2013). Due to its popularity and influence, this type of writing emerged as what the academy craved; it also needed to generalize knowledge systems because of the shortage of Indigenous voices. Most interestingly, Battiste (2013), although using pan-Indigenous language, writes through a Mi'kmaq lens. However, this knowledge has been bent by readers to fit any Indigenous student or situation without recognizing the wisdom gifted by the Mi'kmaq Peoples. As end users, academics often take knowledge out of context, tearing it from its roots to apply it to all Indigenous Peoples regardless of their ways of knowing or being in the world.

Writing under the Indigenous umbrella creates a false narrative that erases individual nationhood that differs in epistemology, axiology, and ontology. The danger of having a homogeneous voice in scholarship is the blanketing use of academia to view the issues through this lens, which can be detrimental to students. Métis and non-Indigenous scholars have criticized the academy for its pan-Indigenous approach (Anuik & Gillies, 2012; Campbell-Chudoba, 2019; Gaudry, 2013; Scott, 2020, 2021a, 2021b). If Métis do not see themselves explicitly labelled in research, they may wonder if the term "Indigenous" even applies to them. Maud (2021) asserts that "contemporary scholars, academics and government agencies continue to use the generic terms Aboriginal or Indigenous

when, more often than not, their work is First Nations specific” (p. 5). Biin et al. (2021) champion the need for Métis-specific research, stating the need to “clarify that Métis research is different from other Indigenous research because of the unique experiences of the Métis people” (p. 40). Indigenous umbrella research does not answer this call.

The hegemony of Indigenous umbrella publications has led to umbrella teachings throughout Canadian classrooms. Based on research partnerships with school systems across the country, children learn the seven sacred teachings, smudging, powwows, and colour totem poles with no context or association with the communities that cherish those teachings. These actions are devoid of the required underpinning that explains the epistemology, ontology, and axiology of the people they represent when homogenized into an Indigenous identity. The Seven Grandfather Teachings in Anishinaabe cosmology are taught from British Columbia to Newfoundland and Labrador and distorted to fit the local context. Over a decade ago, Chartrand (2012) called for accountability in both terms of both authenticity and integrity when teaching:

The homogenous term Aboriginal education can overshadow and simplify the diversity that exists amongst Indigenous nations in Canada. This can occur when our teachers do not have the knowledge to understand how local First Nations’ ways of teaching and learning contribute to our understanding and implementation of Aboriginal education. (p. 145)

The issue of teachers not having crucial tools starts with Indigenous umbrella scholarship that smooths the edges of diversity in Indigenous nations, distilling knowledge into bite-size pieces. Our words and scholarship are internalized, synthesized into curricula, and taught in contemporary classrooms. The nation-to-nation relationships throughout colonization occurred along different timelines under different laws that oppressed Indigenous people. Each nation has its own story; the homogenized Indigenous account is inaccurate, and we should no longer tell it to ourselves or our students. The impact on learners’ understandings of indigeneity is jeopardized, but it does not stop there. Learners with histories and ways of being that are not taught in traditional academic spaces lack a sense of belonging and well-being (Kristoff & Cottrell, 2021; Nelson et al., 2019).

Prioritizing Nation-Specific Work

As discussed above, we are not the first scholars to argue for nation-specific scholarship, which many Indigenous scholars continue to undertake. We present four examples of those who have modelled how to undertake nation-specific work.

Nicole Bell has forged a path to speaking specifically about Anishinaabe ways of knowing and being. Bell (2013a) demonstrates how to meet the needs of Anishinaabe children using Anishinaabe culture-based education, which she does not define but explains as the integration of culture into all aspects of educational experiences, including where the school building is located, who does the teaching, how rooms are set up, and the pedagogies and curricula used. In other publications, Bell demonstrates the importance of learning from the teachings of Anishinaabe Elders in what Bell calls “traditional holistic education” spaces (2016a); earlier, she had introduced Anishinaabe ontology, axiology, epistemology, and pedagogy to environmental education (2013b). Bell (2016b) also contextualizes the Medicine Wheel teachings within an Anishinaabe culture-based educational setting and addresses the pan-Indigenous way that the Medicine Wheel is often incorporated into the classroom. To counter this discussion of the Medicine Wheel without cultural context, Bell highlights how it is taught in the Anishinaabe Bimaadiziwin Cultural Healing and Learning Program.

The Canadian Council on Learning (CCL), through its Aboriginal Learning Knowledge Centre, created three distinct holistic lifelong learning models (Bouvier et al., 2016). Working groups crafted three distinct learning models representing the dominant understandings in (1) First Nations, (2) Métis, and (3) Inuit societies. Holistic lifelong learning models specifically looking at Métis highlight the emerging trend to bring Métis ways of knowing and being into the classroom (see the “Métis Holistic Lifelong Learning Model” [CCL, 2007]). This approach to distinction recognizes the need for varied models for First Nations, Métis, and Inuit models of education.

Métis graduate students’ scholarly endeavours address the need for Métis-specific tools for learning, including Métis scholar Nicki Ferland (2022), who speaks to the importance of Métis learning on the land in urban spaces like Winnipeg: there is “a need for Métis-centred education aimed at reclaiming women-centred stories and figures, engaging ancestral places and practices, and reconnecting to the land” (p. 102). This call will remain unanswered under the Indigenous umbrella. (Re)storying, as depicted by Ferland

(2022) and Bouvier et al. (2016), requires specific and detailed accounts that address harmful narratives that need to be re-learned.

Yvonne Vizina is another Métis scholar challenging us to do better and shift to nation-specific publications; her master's thesis examines traditional Métis environmental knowledge as a modality of science education (Vizina, 2010). That work incorporates the CCL (2007) model of learning and reminds us that “developing a culturally appropriate science education paradigm is...an argument to augment Métis identity with advanced education and vice versa” (Vizina, 2010, p. 44). We must include Métis ways of knowing and being in all classrooms.

Blackfoot scholar Leroy Litte Bear has shifted from speaking in a place of Indigenous umbrella to highlighting specific worldviews:

Of course, we offered a course in native thinking and philosophy, and this [*sic*] how Blackfoot, Cree and Navajo and others look at it. To this day, I am still taking that approach. I am more specific now. I am making people look at the paradigms, the metaphysics they operate from. (Henderson & Little Bear, 2021, p. 208)

Little Bear's earlier work juxtaposes an Aboriginal worldview with a Western view (Little Bear, 2000) and describes (Little Bear, 2009) the impacts of incorporating Indigenous knowledge into the education system; he speaks to Indigenous knowledge as a monolith bringing together knowledge from a variety of nations. Little Bear has also written and spoken about Blackfoot-specific ways of knowing and being and articulated the importance of place in the Blackfoot cosmology (Little Bear, 2004). Little Bear and Head's (2004) work on Blackfoot metaphysics closely examines how the Blackfoot understand the world around them, arguing that this understanding differs from other Indigenous nations and Western traditions. Throughout his career, Little Bear has written from a Blackfoot perspective and shared his cultural knowledges. At times, his work is couched in broader terminology like “Aboriginal” or “Indigenous.” Ironically, these latter cases advance and ground umbrella scholarship for the subsequent generations of scholars citing his work.

Listening to Community: Laura Forsythe's Example

After completing my master's, *In Search of Indigenous Educational Sovereignty*, which explored the educational sovereignty of First Nations with self-government agreements utilizing Rigney's (1999) vision of indigenist research, I heard from numerous community members that my work should centre on my own community. I recognized that I had wasted an opportunity to use my voice and education to tell Métis stories and lift up our knowledge. This realization, along with the recognition that I had just come from territories not my own, working to lift up nations not my own in British Columbia, was only evident when I reflected on my new position as the Métis Inclusion Coordinator at the University of Manitoba (Forsythe, 2021)

In an attempt to live up to the communities' expectations, my dissertation—*It Needs to Be Said: Exploring the Lived Realities of the Grandmothers and Aunties of Métis Scholarship*—sought to uncover the attempted points of erasure of the grandmothers and aunties of Métis scholarship. I interviewed 13 self-identifying Métis women and analyzed their academic work as knowledge producers, as well as shared their journeys, motivations, and advice for future generations of Métis scholars. Working with Métis methodologies and with a Métis paradigm theorized by Métis women, I committed my scholarship to lifting up Métis scholars past, present, and future.

Recommendations

As we reflect on the more than 55 years since the first Indigenous Studies (then Native Studies) department came into existence in Canada at Trent University in 1969, we recognize the significance of the work that has come before us, and we are now in a position to stop and ask whether the term “Indigenous” is serving us as educational researchers. There is some safety in the world of the Indigenous umbrella; as soon as one steps into nation-specific scholarship, there may be more nation-specific scrutiny from other scholars, from community members, and from community leadership. There is an often-tacit expectation that those who participate in nation-specific work are themselves of that community. It is not sufficient to be a community member by name or card only; rather, some view it as essential to be engaged in community and claim one's nation for more than cultural capital in academia.

So, what *is* the vision? Where do we move toward if we are moving away from the Indigenous umbrella? The same work that was done over decades to create space for Indigenous scholarship now needs to be done to create space for nation-specific scholarship. We share the following three recommendations to scholars in the academy as invitations to shift the way that we write and research as Indigenous or non-Indigenous scholars.

1. An Indigenous scholar should work toward nation-specific research.

As Métis scholars, we cannot and should not speak for other nations and their protocols, practices, histories, and knowledges. While our work may have implications for other Indigenous nations, and there may be instances where comparisons between Indigenous Peoples and non-Indigenous peoples are appropriate, we will continue to work to prioritize our own Métis nation in our scholarship and urge other Indigenous scholars to do the same with their own nations. There must be space for nation-specific work focused on specific community teachings, voices, histories, and realities in all areas of scholarship for critical mass to be reached and permanent spaces to be created.

2. Nation-specific work should be introduced and discussed alone or in nation-specific groupings so that nation-specific assertions and understandings may form and remain together, rather than alongside the ideas of other nations.

We recognize that much of the work that we characterize as Indigenous umbrella scholarship was actually written with the intention to be nation-specific, and scholars were urged by publishers and colleagues to increase the reach of their scholarship by generalizing (Forsythe, 2022). We also recognize that much of what is cited as Indigenous umbrella scholarship is actually nation-specific, but, as we note above, this scholarship is treated by academics as interchangeable with other Indigenous research. We thus call on all scholars to recognize the nation-specific knowledge that guides these foundational texts from Indigenous scholars and highlight those knowledge systems and their distinctive positioning when citing authors. When the academic canon demands that we state how they all fit together under the same umbrella, we can exercise refusal and speak in defense of our recognition of nation-specific knowledges.

3. All scholars and educators can share the importance of nation-specific work with colleagues, students, and administrators by noting that the academic landscape has shifted, enabling and necessitating a new era of nation-specific scholarship.

Whether it is empowering those who are already doing nation-specific work or gently calling on those who are bringing nation-specific work under the umbrella to do

better, it is crucial to share the significance of those efforts. Bell (2016a, 2016b) serves as an excellent example of producing acts of clarification and reclamation that model how to be intentional and transparent about the teachings we bring into the classroom.

Non-Indigenous peoples who have been learning from and with Indigenous scholars for decades may have internalized their own misunderstanding of nation-specific knowledge and unwittingly reproduce a monolithic version of Indigenous epistemology or ontology. Explaining to those who are unaware of the importance of citing the origins of nation-specific knowledge will be complex and ongoing, but we believe that, just as Indigenous umbrella scholarship has been accepted in most academic spaces, so too will nation-specific scholarship.

Recognizing Intentions and Limitations

We do not come to this work lightly. Neither are we able to explore all areas of the literature relating to sovereignty and ongoing efforts to assert Indigenous rights. All three authors work in Faculties of Education. There is undoubtedly more to say on these topics from an Indigenous studies perspective. This is not a comprehensive article on the full history of Indigenous scholarship and its ebbs and flows. We forward a notion with which other scholars are grappling (e.g., Leonard, 2022). Indigenous communities have long defined themselves by their distinct identities, and Indigenous scholars have long brought forward theories, frameworks, and practices from their communities' distinct ways of being in the world. We are opening a conversation and offering a provocation. We hope that other scholars will enter a dialogue with us around these ideas.

Further, we are not ignoring the collaborative efforts of Indigenous Peoples who have joined together to fight our shared—past and ongoing—experiences of colonization and to contest our common enemies of racism and oppression. We know that we are stronger when we stand together on issues such as the inherent and unmet rights of Indigenous Peoples (United Nations, 2018). Undoubtedly, these joint organizations and coalitions have made our work, and even the lives we lead, possible. The steps taken to change the experiences and realities for Indigenous people have been, and continue to be, hard-fought battles. There is good reason to band together as Indigenous people. It is also because of this action and the progress it has engendered that we can situate ourselves more fully in our distinct communities' values, beliefs, knowledges, and ways.

Conclusion

We share these recommendations knowing that the path forward is not simple for all scholarship; not all research is nation-specific. Sometimes it *can* be helpful to tease out connections shared across nations, such as when examining Two-Spirit/Indigiqueer experiences or those of Afro-Indigenous Peoples. Research can sometimes involve many nations, and the issues communities face as a result of colonization are often similar. For these reasons, we have often chosen to stand together and lean on one another's scholarship to highlight the shared—historic and ongoing—experiences of racism, oppression, and discrimination.

From our standpoint as three Métis citizens and scholars, the Indigenous umbrella is more perilous than protective. Métis perspectives can rapidly become lost in umbrella scholarship that does not speak to or about us. Métis people have distinct experiences in the context of the colonial project in Canada and our own relationships and histories with governmental and educational bodies that cannot be subsumed into Indigenous umbrella contexts. At the same time, Métis experiences are sometimes othered as not being genuinely Indigenous experiences, and the word “Indigenous” is used as a stand-in when the author really means only First Nations. This misuse of the term excludes Métis voices from conversations that are rightfully theirs and that have an impact on their community members.

Understandably, not every nation has reached the pivotal moment when an abundance of nation-specific work means that scholars can cite work solely from their own communities, but some have done so and will continue on that path. We are at a crucial turning point in Indigenous scholarship where we can turn to nation-specific work and move away from artificial pan-Indigenous constructs. This is an exciting time to be early-career Métis academics. We have much of our scholarly careers ahead of us, which should be filled with years of research, writing, and contributing to Métis-specific bodies of work. Over time this research stream will surely continue to diversify as more Métis methodologies are used in research, Métis pedagogies are offered in teaching, Métis epistemologies are theorized and explored, and the Métis worldview is lived and expressed unapologetically. We wish this future for every nation and the scholars working to highlight the knowledges, teachings, and wisdom of their peoples.

References

- Adese, J. (2020). The trouble with the town: Reading for peoplehood in Métis children's literature. *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 89(1), 107–125. <https://doi.org/10.3138/utq.89.1.07>
- Alderson, A. (2019). Reframing research in Indigenous countries: A methodological framework for research with/within Indigenous nations. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, 15(1), 36–57. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-07-2018-1666>
- Aluli Meyer, M. (2008). Indigenous and authentic: Hawaiian epistemology and the triangulation of meaning. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 217–232). SAGE.
- Anuik, J., & Gillies, C. L. (2012). Indigenous knowledge in postsecondary educators' practices: Nourishing the learning spirit. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 42(1), 63–79. <https://journals.sfu.ca/cjhe/index.php/cjhe/article/view/1902/182507>
- Archibald, J-A. (2008). *Indigenous storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body, and spirit*. UBC Press.
- Archibald, J-A., Lundy, J., Reynolds, C., Williams, L. (2010). *Accord on Indigenous education*. Association of Canadian Deans of Education. <https://csse-scee.ca/acde/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2017/08/Accord-on-Indigenous-Education.pdf>
- Barkwell, L. (2018). *The history of the Manitoba Métis Federation and memorable Métis personalities of Manitoba*. https://www.academia.edu/39074062/The_History_of_the_Manitoba_M%C3%A9tis_Federation_and_Memorable_M%C3%A9tis_Personalities_of_Manitoba
- Battiste, M. (1987). Mi'kmaq linguistic integrity: A case study of Mi'kma'wey School. In J. Barman, Y. Hébert, & D. McCaskill (Eds.), *Indian education in Canada, volume 2: The challenge* (pp. 107–125). UBC Press. <https://doi.org/10.59962/9780774845243-008>
- Battiste, M. (1998). Enabling the autumn seed: Toward a decolonized approach to Aboriginal knowledge, language, and education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 22(1), 16–27. <https://doi.org/10.14288/cjne.v22i1.195792>

- Battiste, M. (2011). *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision*. UBC Press.
- Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. UBC Press.
- Bell, N. (2013a). Anishinaabe Bimaadiziwin: Living spiritually with respect, relationship, reciprocity, and responsibility. In A. Kulnieks, D. Roronhiakewen Longboat, & K. Young (Eds.), *Contemporary studies in environmental and Indigenous pedagogies* (pp. 89–107). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25016-4_5
- Bell, N. (2013b). Just do it: Anishinaabe culture-based education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 36(1), 36–58. <https://doi.org/10.14288/cjne.v36i1.196553>
- Bell, N. (2016a). Mino-Bimaadiziwin: Education for the good life. In F. Deer & T. Falkenberg (Eds.), *Indigenous perspectives on education for well-being in Canada* (pp. 7–20) Education for Sustainable Well-Being Press. https://www.spriglearning.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Centering_Indigenous_Intellectual_Traditions_on_Holistic_Lifelong_Learning.pdf
- Bell, N. (2016b). Teaching by the medicine wheel. *Education Canada*, 54(3), 14–16. <https://www.edcan.ca/articles/teaching-by-the-medicine-wheel/>
- Biin, D., Canada, D., Chenoweth, J., & Neel, L. (2021). *Pulling together: A guide for indigenization of post-secondary institutions, Hilkala*. BCcampus Open Publishing. <https://opentextbc.ca/indigenizationresearchers/>
- Bodkin-Andrews, G., & Carlson, B. (2016). The legacy of racism and Indigenous Australian identity within education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 19(4), 784–807. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2014.969224>
- Bouvier, R., Battiste, M., & Laughlin, J. (2016). Centering Indigenous intellectual traditions on holistic lifelong learning. In F. Deer & T. Falkenberg (Eds.), *Indigenous perspectives on education for well-being in Canada* (pp. 21–40). Education for Sustainable Well-Being Press. https://www.spriglearning.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Centering_Indigenous_Intellectual_Traditions_on_Holistic_Lifelong_Learning.pdf

- Brice, M. G., Fayant, R., Sterzuk, A., & Lewis, P. J. (2024). Wena ka tapaymish ekwa ka-kway ka dipayhtamun? (Who claims you and what do you claim?). In A. L. King, K. O'Reilly, & P. J. Lewis (Eds.), *Indigenization, decolonization, and unsettling: Stories from the land* (pp. 282–298). Canadian Scholars Press. <https://hdl.handle.net/10294/16588>
- Brodt, E., Bruegl, A., Miller, M. F., Taylor, C., Kamaka, M., Carpenter, D. A., Wong, V., & Carney, P. A. (2019). The Indigenous faculty forum: A longitudinal professional development program to promote the advancement of Indigenous faculty in academic medicine. *Hawai'i Journal of Health & Social Welfare*, 78(12 Suppl 3), 8–13. https://hawaiijournalhealth.org/past_issues/hjhs7812_S3_0008.pdf
- Cajete, G. (1994). *Look to the mountain: An ecology of Indigenous education*. Kivaki Press.
- Campbell-Chudoba, R. (2019, June 1–5). *Métis student engagement at the University of Saskatchewan* [Paper presentation]. 2019 Annual Conference of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- Canadian Council on Learning. (2007). *Redefining how success is measured in First Nations, Inuit and Métis learning: Report on learning in Canada 2007*. https://education.afn.ca/afntoolkit/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/5_2007_redefining_how_success_is_measured_en.pdf
- Chartrand, R. (2012). Anishinaabe pedagogy. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 35(1), 144–162. <https://doi.org/10.14288/cjne.v35i1.196534>
- Chrona, J. (2022). *Wayi Wah! Indigenous pedagogies: An act for reconciliation and anti-racist education*. Portage & Main Press.
- Congress of Aboriginal Peoples. (2023). *About us*. <https://abo-peoples.org/homepage/about-congress-of-aboriginal-peoples/>
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 1–28). SAGE.

- Duhamel, K. R. (2013). *“Rise up-make haste-our people need us!”: Pan-Indigenous activism in Canada and the United States, 1950 to 1975* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Manitoba]. MSpace. <https://mspace.lib.umanitoba.ca/items/a703eec2-4640-44de-aca0-79919783bdf9>
- Fagan, K., Justice, D. H., Martin, K., McKegney, S., Reder, D., & Sinclair, N. J. (2009). Canadian Indian literary nationalism? Critical approaches in Canadian Indigenous contexts – A collaborative interlogue. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, 29(1), 19–44. <https://cjns.brandonu.ca/wp-content/uploads/29-1-2-04Collaborative.pdf>
- Ferland, N. A. (2022). *“We’re still here” : Teaching and learning about Métis women’s and two-spirit people’s relationships with land in Winnipeg* [Master’s thesis, University of Saskatchewan]. HARVEST Repository. <https://harvest.usask.ca/items/d8d0f00b-d2ae-4731-a4d7-e653fe2f3f11>
- Flaminio, A. C., Gaudet, J. C., & Dorion, L. M. (2020). Métis women gathering: Visiting together and voicing wellness for ourselves. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 16(1), 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180120903499>
- Forsythe, L. (2018). *In search of Indigenous educational sovereignty* [Master’s thesis, University of Manitoba]. MSpace. <http://hdl.handle.net/1993/33372>
- Forsythe, L. (2021). Metis in the third space. In J. Macdonald & J. Markides (Eds.), *Brave work in Indigenous education* (pp.181–187). DIO Publishing.
- Forsythe, L. (2022). *It needs to be said: Exploring the lived realities of the grandmothers and aunties of Métis scholarship* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Manitoba]. MSpace. <http://hdl.handle.net/1993/37131>
- Gaudet, J. C. (2018). Keeoukaywin: The visiting way – Fostering an indigenous research methodology. *Aboriginal Policy Studies*, 7(2), 46–65. <https://doi.org/10.5663/aps.v7i2.29336>
- Gaudry, A. (2013). The Métis-ization of Canada: The process of claiming Louis Riel, Métissage, and the Métis people as Canada’s mythical origin. *Aboriginal Policy Studies*, 2(2), 64–87. <https://doi.org/10.5663/aps.v2i2.17889>
- Gaudry, A. J. (2011). Insurgent research. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 26(1), 113–136. <https://doi.org/10.5749/wicazosareview.26.1.0113>

- Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Heiss, A. (2003). *Dhuuluu-Yala: To talk straight-publishing Indigenous literature*. Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Henderson, S., & Little Bear, L. (2021). Coming home: A journey through the trans-systematic knowledge systems. *Engaged Scholar Journal: Community-Engaged Research, Teaching, and Learning*, 7(1), 205–216. <https://doi.org/10.15402/esj.v7i1.70771>
- Henry, F. (2012). Indigenous faculty at Canadian universities: Their stories. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 44(1), 101–132. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.2012.0005>
- Innes, R. A. (2004). “I’m on home ground now. I’m safe”: Saskatchewan Aboriginal veterans in the immediate postwar years, 1945–1946. *American Indian Quarterly*, 28(3/4), 685–718.
- Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. (2023). *Who we are*. <https://www.itk.ca/national-voice-for-communities-in-the-canadian-arctic/>
- Johnston, R., McGregor, D., & Restoule, J-P. (2018). Relationships, respect, relevance, reciprocity, and responsibility: Taking up Indigenous research approaches. In D. McGregor, J.-P. Restoule, & R. Johnston (Eds.), *Indigenous research: Theories, practices, and relationships* (pp. 1–21). Canadian Scholars Press.
- Justice, D. H. (2018). *Why Indigenous literatures matter*. Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2001). Describing the bricolage: Conceptualizing a new rigour in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(6), 679–692. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107780040100700601>
- Kincheloe, J. L., McLaren, P., & Steinberg, S. R., (2011). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research: Moving to the bricolage. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 163–177). SAGE.
- King, T. (2003). *The truth about stories: A native narrative*. House of Anansi.

- Kirkness, V. J., & Barnhardt, R. (1991). First Nations and higher education: The four R's—Respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 30(3), 1–15. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24397980>
- Kolopenuk, J. (2023). The Pretendian problem. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 56(2), 468–473. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423923000239>
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. University of Toronto Press.
- Kovach, M. (2019). Indigenous evaluation frameworks: Can the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage be a guide for recognizing Indigenous scholarship within tenure and promotion standards? *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 15(4), 299–308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180119887185>
- Kristoff, T., & Cottrell, M. (2021). Supporting First Nations and Métis post-secondary students' academic persistence: Insights from a Canadian First Nations-affiliated institution. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 51(2), 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.vi0.188993>
- Langford, W. (2016). Friendship centres in Canada, 1959–1977. *American Indian Quarterly*, 40(1), 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.5250/amerindiquar.40.1.0001>
- Leonard, B. (2022). Indigenous knowledges and methodologies in higher education. In L. Fickel (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of education*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.527>
- Leroux, D. (2019). *Distorted descent: White claims to Indigenous identity*. University of Manitoba Press.
- Little Bear, L. (2000). Jagged worldviews colliding. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 77–85). UBC Press.
- Little Bear, L. (2004, October 28–30). *Land: The Blackfoot source of identity* [Conference presentation]. Beyond Race and Citizenship: Indigeneity in the 21st Century Conference, University of California – Berkeley, CA, United States.

- Little Bear, L. (2009). *Naturalizing Indigenous knowledge: Synthesis paper*. University of Saskatchewan, Aboriginal Education Research Centre. http://neatoeco.com/iwise3/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/NaturalizingIndigenousKnowledge_Leroy-Littlebear.pdf
- Little Bear, L. (2012). Traditional knowledge and humanities: A perspective by a Blackfoot. *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 39(4), 518–527. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6253.2012.01742.x>
- Little Bear, L., & Head, R. H. (2004). A conceptual anatomy of the Blackfoot world. *ReVision*, 26(3), 31–39. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A116450552/AONE?u=anon~aba2822a&sid=googleScholar&xid=8c60f6c0>
- Louie, D. (2019). Aligning universities' recruitment of Indigenous academics with the tools used to evaluate scholarly performance and grant tenure and promotion. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 42(3), 791–815. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26891585>
- Macdougall, B. (2017). *Land, family and identity: Contextualizing Métis health and well being*. National Collaborating Centre for Aboriginal Health. <https://www.ccsa-nccah.ca/docs/context/RPT-ContextualizingMetisHealth-Macdougall-EN.pdf>
- MacLeod, L. (2021). More than personal communication: Templates for citing Indigenous Elders and knowledge keepers. *KULA: Knowledge Creation, Dissemination, and Preservation Studies*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.18357/kula.135>
- Markides, J. (2018). Being Indigenous in the Indigenous education classroom: A critical self-study of teaching in an impossible and imperative assignment. In E. Lyle (Ed.), *Fostering a relational pedagogy: Self-study as transformative praxis* (pp. 35–44). Brill.
- Markides, J. (2020). *Wisdom and well-being post-disaster: Stories told by youth* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Calgary]. Prism. <http://hdl.handle.net/1880/112606>
- Markides, J. (2022). Examining the ethical implications and emotional entailments of teaching Indigenous Education: An Indigenous educator's self-study. In J. Kitchen, D. Tidwell, & L. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Self-study and diversity, Volume 3* (pp. 103–121). Brill.

- Maud, V. (2021). Health of the prairie Métis 1900-1960: An examination of the social determinants of health and infectious disease [Doctoral dissertation, University of Manitoba]. MSpace. <http://hdl.handle.net/1993/35904>
- McFarlane, P., & Manuel, D. (2020). *Brotherhood to nationhood: George Manuel and the making of the modern Indian movement*. Between the Lines.
- Mohamed, T., & Beagan, B. L. (2019). “Strange faces” in the academy: Experiences of racialized and Indigenous faculty in Canadian universities. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 22(3), 338–354. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2018.1511532>
- Moreton-Robinson, A. (2017). Relationality: A key presupposition of an Indigenous social research paradigm. In C. Andersen & J. M. O’Brien (Eds.), *Sources and methods in Indigenous studies* (pp. 69–77). Routledge.
- Native American and Indigenous Studies Association. (March 18, 2024). *Assistant professor Indigenous epistemologies*. <https://web.archive.org/web/20241012165107/https://naisa.org/job/university-of-calgary-canada-2-assistant-professor-in-indigenous-epistemologies/>
- Nelson, H. J., Cox-White, T. L., & Ziefflie, B. A. (2019). Indigenous student: Barrier and success strategies—A review of existing literature. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, 9(3), 70–77. <https://doi.org/10.5430/jnep.v9n3p70>
- Peters, M. A., & Mika, C. T. (2017). Aborigine, Indian, Indigenous or First Nations? *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 49(13), 1229–1234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2017.1279879>
- Pewewardy, C. (2013). Fancy war dancing on academe’s glass ceiling: Supporting and increasing Indigenous faculty role models in higher education. In H. J. Shotton, S. C. Lowe, & S. J. Waterman (Eds.), *Beyond the asterisk: Understanding Native students in higher education* (pp. 139–150). Routledge.
- Poitras Pratt, Y., Louie, D. W., Hanson, A. J., & Ottmann, J. (2018). Indigenous education and decolonization. In L. Fickel (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of education*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.240>
- Przybylo, E. (2019). Publishing revolution: Publishing praxis in the classroom. *Radical Teacher*, (115), 39–47. <https://doi.org/10.5195/rt.2019.654>

- Rigney, L. I. (1999). Internationalization of an Indigenous anticolonial cultural critique of research methodologies: A guide to Indigenist research methodology and its principles. *Wicazo sa review*, 14(2), 109–121. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1409555>
- Rogers, M. (2012). Contextualizing theories and practices of bricolage research. *The Qualitative Report*, 17(48), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2012.1704>
- Scott, B. (2021a). Métis women’s experiences in Canadian higher education. *Genealogy*, 5(2), Article 49. <https://doi.org/10.3390/genealogy5020049>
- Scott, B. (2021b). *Reconciliation through Métissage in higher education* [Doctoral dissertation, Lakehead University]. Lakehead U Knowledge Commons. <https://knowledgecommons.lakeheadu.ca/handle/2453/4802>
- Scott, B. R. (2020). Reconciliation through Métissage. In S. Cote-Meek & T. Moeke-Pickering (Eds.), *Decolonizing and Indigenizing education in Canada* (pp. 32–49). Canadian Scholars Press.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004>
- Simon Fraser University. (2024). *Arts and social sciences*. <https://www.sfu.ca/vpacademic/academic-careers/faculty-positions/arts-social-sciences.html>
- Simpson, L. B. (2014). Land as pedagogy: Nishnaabeg intelligence and rebellious transformation. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 3(3). <https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/22170>
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Bloomsbury.
- Story, E. (2015). “The awakening has come”: Canadian First Nations in the Great War era, 1914–1932. *Canadian Military History*, 24(2), 11–35. <https://scholars.wlu.ca/cmh/vol24/iss2/2/>
- Steinberg, S. R., Berry, K., & Kincheloe, J. (2020). *Behind the bricolage: Critical qualitative research for the 21st Century*. DIO Press.
- Tait, C. (2024). Foreword. In L. Forsythe & J. Markides (Eds.), *Around the kitchen table: Métis aunties’ scholarship* (pp. ix–xiii). University of Manitoba Press.

- Taylor, R. (2020). Gathering knowledges to inform best practices in Indigenous publishing. *Ariel*, 51(2–3), 205–232. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ari.2020.0015>
- Thompson, C. (Ed.). (2004). *Saskatchewan First Nations: Lives past and present* (vol. 12). University of Regina Press.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Calls to action*. https://eh-prnh2mwo3.exactdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf
- United Nations. (2018). *United Nations declaration on the rights of Indigenous peoples (UNDRIP)*. https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP_E_web.pdf
- University of Winnipeg. (n.d.). *The University of Winnipeg joint Indigenous faculty cluster hire – 9 positions full time tenure-track assistant professor/associate professor/professor (open rank)*. <https://www.uwinnipeg.ca/hr/docs/indigenous-cluster-hire-posting.pdf>
- Vizina, Y. N. (2010). *Métis traditional environmental knowledge and science education* [Master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan]. HARVEST Repository. <https://harvest.usask.ca/bitstreams/e4e93b60-37a4-4169-b25a-be533ca514b2/download>
- Warrior, R. (2014). 2010 NAISA presidential address: Practicing Native American and Indigenous studies. *Journal of the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association*, 1(1), 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.1353/nai.2014.a843654>
- Younging, G. (2018). *Elements of Indigenous style: A guide for writing by and about Indigenous peoples*. Brush Education.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood.