Introducing Indigenising education and citizenship

Torjer A. Olsen and Hilde Sollid

This book is about Indigenous education and citizenship. Our centre of attention is the politics of Indigenous education, and the way conditions are set and met for it to be put into practice. We emphasise the processual aspects of both education and citizenship. We investigate how having both Indigenous *and* non-Indigenous citizens in nation state education systems is reflected in policy, pedagogy, and practice, and to consider the implications for future forms of education and citizenship. The book has a Sámi and northern starting point. Sápmi refers to the traditional area of the Sámi people, an area that is spread across four nation states: Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia. The articles are mainly about Sápmi in the Nordic countries, and there is only brief reference to the Russian side of Sápmi. When we hereafter refer to Sápmi, we refer to Sápmi in the Nordic countries unless specified. Also, we mainly use the North Sámi name in this introductory chapter, a choice that reflects where the authors of this chapter come from. We return to the Sámi and northern starting point below.

We aim to look beyond the contextual boundary of Sápmi to understand more about Indigenous education and citizenship. We are aware of the differences and difficulties of moving from one context to another. Indigenous rights recognition and decolonisation processes have differently experienced histories across all the countries described by authors in this book. However, to see the different experiences together and the use of Indigenous perspectives is not only about differences. The book contributes to knowledge about Indigenous education as a field of research, policy, and practice around the world. To reach this goal, we examine the conceptual, political, and pedagogical issues relating to Indigenous citizenship and education in four different contexts, namely Sápmi, Australia, Aotearoa New Zealand, and Namibia.

Together, the book's contributors have different relationships with Indigenous communities, from insiders to outsiders. Also, we come from different research disciplines, from Indigenous studies, education, and social anthropology to sociolinguistics, political science, and philosophy. Potentially, the different research

positions and interdisciplinarity represent pitfalls, but we see this as a strength. This enables our explorations of Indigenous education to highlight some of the many possible dialogues and relevant viewpoints of Indigenous education as a field of research and as a policy field. Together, our research highlights continua and diversity rather than dichotomies and unity. We look for how local practices relate to national and international demands and perspectives, and for different ways of performing citizenship. Our methods are also diverse: we observe, we study texts like curricula, textbooks, and education policy documents, we talk with local actors in interviews and through questionnaires. Together we seek to see the connections between the local, the national and the international, and between educational policy and practice.

What we have learned from the different case studies and contexts that we have worked in is that there are many ways to Indigenise education and to envision Indigenous citizenship through education. A theme that runs through the book is the challenges of articulating and implementing Indigenous education that is situated in collective and national guidelines and regulations and simultaneously framed by more local needs to value difference and diversity within the collective.

This introductory chapter both presents the overarching themes of the book and a thematic basis for the following articles. The overarching themes include our reflections on key concepts like education, Indigenous education, citizenship, as well as different perspectives on and concepts for diversity, colonisation, and Indigenisation. The different chapters of the book all relate to and expand on these matters based on a range of cases and situations. The articles are referred to throughout this introduction, and we also include a presentation of each contribution at the end of this introduction.

PREMISES, PERSPECTIVES, AND TENSIONS

To open the conversation in the book, we start by highlighting three important premises. First, the Sámi situation is part of a bigger picture of a wider international context. The similarities when it comes to the situation for Indigenous peoples worldwide are many – despite the different geographical and political contexts. This is important as a way of creating and showing the rationale for international research collaboration and comparisons.

Secondly, educational systems provide arenas for diverging ideologies and policies regarding Indigenous peoples. Education can be a state's space for colonisation, assimilation, and marginalisation. Education can also be a state's opportunity to come to terms with their own colonised pasts and practices. Further, education

can also be an opportunity for Indigenous people to engage in (re)claiming, transmitting, and articulating their own cultures and languages. Thus, both colonisation, decolonisation, and Indigenisation are part of the picture.

Thirdly, education is connected to citizenship. On the one hand, an education system builds on a nation state's ideas of citizenship, and on the other, education becomes practice in communities with more local expectations to a citizen's identities, knowledges, values, and actions. This makes Indigenous peoples' rights to education as well as 'Indigenous people' as educational topic complex. Historically, through colonisation and assimilation, Indigenous peoples have been marginalised, made invisible, wiped out, assimilated – colonised – through educational systems. This historical background clearly complicates contemporary educational systems' articulation of Indigenous peoples' rights and Indigenous peoples as topic. An important (and even potentially toxic) tension here concerns the idea and ideal of education creating community and togetherness. Which community and sense of togetherness is created and articulated through education? Do Indigenous peoples have a place in this?

For us, these three premises have enabled – and made it necessary for – us to do this project beyond our local context and situation of the Sámi people. Despite similarities related to colonialism, there are of course different ways of putting education and citizenship into action, and different ways of experiencing this in different parts of the Indigenous world. Thus, the situation in Australia, as discussed by Diane Smith and by William Fogarty and Hilde Sollid (this volume), that in Aotearoa New Zealand, as examined by Sharon Harvey and by Melinda Webber and Selena Waru-Benson, and the circumstances in Namibia, as presented by Velina Ninkova, are both interesting and communicative in themselves as well as providing a comparative dimension to the different parts of Sápmi. Similarly, the different texts about education in Sámi settings do also show diversity and belong to different levels of the nexus of education. Else Grete Broderstad and Pigga Keskitalo, in their respective articles, give the historical background and draw connections between Sámi aspirations and state policies. Annamari Vitikainen and Kjersti Fjørtoft undertake philosophical and conceptual analyses of the Norwegian national curriculum and its articulation of citizenship, democracy, and Indigenous rights. Sollid analyses Sámi language subjects in the Sámi curriculum in Norway. Torjer A. Olsen, Kristin Evju, and Åse Mette Johansen and Elin F. Markusson investigate different levels of the implementation and articulation of Sámi education as raised in policy and brought to life in pedagogy, educational institutions, and classrooms. Hanna Outakoski and Kristina Belančić both take the situation in Sweden as a starting point; they explore educational practices and their reception.

A fundamental difference between the four contexts is the kind of colonisation and thus the colonial history that people struggle with today. External colonialism means the expropriation and extraction of different parts and resources of Indigenous worlds to build the wealth and privilege of the colonisers. Internal colonialism is of course related to this, but means the management or take-over of people, land, and resources from within the borders of, for instance, a nation state (Tuck & Yang, 2012, pp. 4–5). The colonisation of the Sámi people are primarily examples of internal colonialism, whereas the Americas, Aotearoa New Zealand and Australia are examples of external colonialism, or what has been referred to as 'settler colonialism'. Namibia and the southern African contexts represent a combination of both (Saugestad, 2001).

In all our contexts, education carries a colonial legacy of asymmetrical relations and deficits. In this legacy lies tensions and dilemmas that educational systems in the respective states and areas we study attempt to resolve and/or face, with varying luck, it must be said. In some cases, the attempts have the best aims, but fail to involve or take the perspective of the Indigenous people. Harvey's contribution in this volume is a relevant example, as she analyses a case of language policy borrowing from a European context to Aotearoa New Zealand. The dilemma, then, is a tendency that colonial educational ideas function as benchmarks in processes of decolonisation (see also Rassool, Canvin, Heugh, & Mansoor, 2007). As benchmarks, the colonial ideas are recursively reproduced in new contexts, thus they keep shaping and framing the goals and desires for future generations. Yet another tension concerns the curriculum, which has the power to define which students are seen as citizens and which are outsiders of the school community. As Smith (this volume) and Sollid (this volume) show, this tension becomes highly visible when analysing nation states' ideas of citizenship over longer timescales.

Still, there is a move and tendency towards the recognition of Indigenous peoples and their rights – albeit probably more on the rights and policy level than on the implementation level. One of the dilemmas we see from the different contributions in the book is a (too) wide gap between overarching national policies and what is possible and/or desirable in Indigenous communities (see also Ninkova, in her analysis of language policies in Namibia). At the same time, a school has, through its practices and pedagogy, the power to translate state policy into meaningful activities in a local community. In this implementation space, the local process can potentially transgress the national curriculum to include or exclude students or communities beyond the intentions of the curriculum. As Outakoski shows, there are possibilities for redefining the theoretical basis (theories of language and writing in Outakoskis's paper) for pedagogical practices to include Indigenous perspectives.

In a broad perspective, what Indigenous communities see as distinctive elements that form the basis for ethnicity and belonging to a collective varies. Due to colonisation, the basis for belonging is disrupted, for instance through occupation of land and recourses, forced relocations, and removal of cultural knowledges and practices. Today, in the process of revitalisation and reclamation, these elements become the centre of attention in Indigenous politics, and in Indigenous education. Because of colonisation, the extent to which individuals can base their identity and belonging on the same elements differs, which in turn might become a source of tension. One example from the Norwegian context is Sámi languages. In his study of foundations of Sámi identity, Berg-Nordlie (2021) finds that for some, language is a necessary marker of ethnicity, while for others it is not. In an educational context then, it might pose a dilemma of how an overarching national education system can adapt to the local and individual needs and desires. Sollid focuses on this dilemma in her analysis of Sámi language curricula in Norway.

At the heart of education and on all its different layers, there are always people – individuals and groups, teachers, students and families – who act and make choices, who are acted upon, and who relate to each other in a variety of ways. This book is about how people, in all these contexts, shape and reshape education systems.

INDIGENOUS EDUCATION AND CITIZENSHIP: DIVERSITY AND INTERFACE

A crucial distinction in the field of Indigenous education is the difference between Indigenous education as education for and of Indigenous peoples, and Indigenous education as education about Indigenous peoples to all. In either case, this distinction can be talked of either as a dichotomy or as a continuum. The same goes for the distinction between who is Indigenous and who is not Indigenous. We argue that the continuum better describes reality than does the dichotomy in both cases.

The politics of education and Indigeneity

Neither Indigenous research, Indigenous methodologies nor Indigenous education can be seen as existing independently from politics. They are inherently political fields, as shown in the chapters by Broderstad, Ninkova, Harvey, Sollid, Belančić, Smith, Evju, and Olsen. The entrance of Indigenous scholars into the world of research happened parallel to and connected to the growing movement of Indigenous politics (Virtanen, Olsen, & Keskitalo, 2021). Broderstad (this volume)

shows how the situation for Sámi rights is directly related to education. Ninkova, Harvey, Sollid, and Belančić, from four different contexts, demonstrate how the situation of Indigenous languages in schools grows out of political struggle and discourse.

The same can be said about Indigenous research in general. The movement or establishment of Indigenous methodologies comes with the criticism of existing research as colonial and with the claim of the autonomy of the Indigenous scholar as a necessary reaction. Hence, even the identity of the scholar is potentially a topic for political discussion. Who has the power and the resources to define and do research? The field of Indigenous education is, with a certain amount of variation, developed and articulated through the encounter between Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars and educators working more or less closely with Indigenous communities (see also Battiste, 2013; Bishop, 2008; Keskitalo, Määttä, & Uusiautti, 2013). The authors of this book come from different places in the cultural interface, from non-Indigenous to Indigenous, and various places in-between.

The concept of Indigenous education can be used to cover a broad range of educational needs, from the education of members of mainstream society about Indigenous affairs and issues to the education of members of Indigenous communities. The initial distinction between education for and of Indigenous peoples on the one side and education about Indigenous peoples on the other is primarily descriptive. It relates what the situation is in many countries, regions, and communities with the presence of Indigenous peoples. For instance, in Norway, the national curriculum has, since 1997, two distinct, but equally recognised, parts – one for Sámi schools and one for Norwegian or majority schools. Together, the curricula describe the learning outcomes for Sámi students (in the Sámi curriculum) and what all students should learn about the Sámi (in the Norwegian curriculum). Within the Norwegian context, the curriculum is explicitly rights based. The implications of this, as stated in the core curriculum, are directed towards three groups in the school system: Sámi students in Sámi schools, Sámi students regardless of which schools they attend, and all students in the school system. The first have the right to have their education in their Sámi language. The second have the right to have Sámi language education. And the school is obliged to provide the third with knowledge of Sámi history, language, society and rights, and Indigenous perspectives when teaching about democracy. This is a rather formal, but still quite pragmatic approach. It is the result of political and mandatory consultations between the Sámi parliament and the Norwegian government. Thus, the politics of education and Indigeneity are made explicit on this level. On the community and school level, the politics are there, but often more implicit.

Decolonisation and Indigenisation

The concepts of decolonisation and Indigenisation have been covered and written about in a series of scholarly works (e.g., Battiste, 2013; Nakata, 2007; Smith, 2012; Tuck & Yang, 2012). The concepts describe two different strategies and sets of ideas to handle the colonial past, but which have many tangents. Decolonisation has an emphasis on the critical and deconstructive dimension, exploring the continuous colonial impact on Indigenous communities. Indigenisation focuses more on the making and remaking of Indigenous spaces, methods, and voices. Of course, the relationship between the two is more complex. In an educational context, there is a general agreement that both are needed. Decolonisation provides critical deconstruction of how educational systems have been and continue to be based on colonial structures. Indigenisation brings diverse attempts to build, claim, and articulate places, structures, and arrangements that are based on local and Indigenous practices and traditions.

In the early stages of the discourse on decolonisation, the difference between Indigenous people and non-Indigenous was key. The emphasis on the difference between the Indigenous and the non-Indigenous led to the necessary articulation of what distinguishes the two. This relates to Linda Tuhiwai Smith's reflections on strategic essentialism, where the markers that set the Indigenous community apart were highlighted and presented as defining. Smith (2012, p. 74) argues that such essentialism has been an important strategy within Indigenous politics. In the fight for Indigenous rights and sovereignty, the differences between the Indigenous and the non-Indigenous have been more important than have the similarities.

In recent years, the claims for nuances and internal diversity have also reached the surface. Still, in a Sámi educational context, as most probably in other Indigenous contexts as well, there is a dilemma or tension related to such matters. Is highlighting Sámi diversity rather an expression of division? In a Sámi educational context, this is seen through the articulation of the Sámi school in the first Sámi curriculum in 1997. This was based on a rather narrow part of Sápmi and the Sámi communities. In addition, the writings of Sámi pedagogue Asta Mitkija Balto about Sámi child-rearing and pedagogy, which also was based on a similarly narrow part of the Sámi community, formed the basis of an overarching Sámi pedagogy (Gjerpe, 2017). As necessary as it was more than 20 years ago, our work in this book suggests the need to Indigenise education through an approach that opens for diversity. This does not nullify or downplay the work of the early educators, but opens the space for diversity and local approaches to Sámi education.

Continua within the continuum: The cultural interface

The building, enactment, and articulation of Indigenous education has an explicitly decolonising point of departure, wherein the critique of mainstream education is key. Indigenous education as a field has traditionally had a dichotomous approach, where the distinction between Indigenous and non-Indigenous education has been important. In fact, the field of Indigenous studies itself carries and is built on a distinction or a dichotomy. If framed as an essentialist dichotomy, however, it rests on the assumption that both sides – the West and the Indigenous – are homogenous. Such a claim is patently false, and a political one. We argue that diversity and an understanding of diversity are key to the analysis of Indigenous education. Our main point of departure for making this argument is that in many Indigenous contexts, the boundaries can be blurry between who is Indigenous and who is not (e.g., Nakata, 2007; Sarivaara & Keskitalo, 2016). Also, as many Indigenous children attend mainstream schools (Bishop, 2008; Gjerpe, 2018), a pure distinction between education for Indigenous peoples and education about Indigenous peoples and issues is over-simplified.

In an earlier work (Sollid & Olsen, 2019) we suggested a two-stage model for the understanding of Indigenous education. A simple two-sided model is built on the distinction between Indigenous and non-Indigenous, and on the education connected to each. In Sámi contexts, especially on the legal and curricular side, this describes the situation. For instance, there is a mainstream curriculum and a Sámi curriculum in Norway. In the former, the Sámi content is an example of education about Indigenous peoples for all citizens. In the latter, the curriculum expresses education for and of the Sámi. We did see the need, however, to expand the model to include a more nuanced and dynamic understanding of Indigenous communities and education. In the states and situations that the scholars of this book are working, the Indigenous communities are closely connected to mainstream society. Indigenous education, as such, is also more complex and less dichotomous.

Following this, we argue that both ends of the original continuum seem to carry a continuum of their own, and at the same time they are related. Indigenous education, we argue, happens along continua within the continuum. Firstly, Indigenous education as education for Indigenous people will, in practice, vary from Indigenous schools using Indigenous curricula, languages, and pedagogies on the one hand, to Indigenous students attending an Indigenous education within the frames of non-Indigenous schools. Secondly, education about Indigenous peoples and issues will, in practice, vary from a decolonised and/or Indigenised mainstream school using decolonised and/or indigenised curricula and pedagogies, on the one hand, to schools that in different ways are colonised, on the other (Sollid & Olsen, 2019). Referring to our model, the movement from one side of the

continuum to the other can be understood as a movement from decolonisation to Indigenisation.

Seeing Indigenous education as constituted by continua within continuum is inspired by Nakata's (2007) idea of the cultural interface. As a concept, cultural interface is coined to describe the complex situation both of Indigenous individuals and of Indigenous communities. Cultural interface proposes an alternative to dichotomies, and describes a space of relations that an individual person (and community) lives by and with. This space has numerous subject positions available, is multi-layered and multi-dimensional, and shapes how you speak of yourself and of others. Notions of continuity and discontinuity may provide good ways for understanding Indigenous people's relationships both to other groups of people and to the past. Thus, cultural interface, and the idea of numerous subject positions, seems a constructive alternative to simplistic dichotomies, also when speaking of Indigenous education.

As such, it is a way of describing how Indigenous education, in practice, can have a lot of subtle variations and articulations, and that different educational systems can be located on different parts of the continuum(s). The Norwegian educational system seems in itself to host different parts of the continuum(s). The schools used to be a key arena for colonisation and assimilation through its curriculum, pedagogy, and practice. In the decades following, the schools have developed through an era of decolonisation and recognition of Sámi students in a mainstream school, to being defined as Sámi schools following a Sámi curriculum. At the same time, there is an institutional slowness at work at a systemic level – as there is in any educational reform – slowing down local efforts of decolonisation and Indigenisation.

The concept of citizenship

With schools as arenas for nation state policy, education policy becomes citizenship policy. What is taught in school is a way of communicating who is included and excluded in the community of citizens, and whose knowledge and values are relevant. In general terms, citizenship is related (but not restricted) to democratic values where members of a community can exchange ideas and act together to shape their future. One of the core values of democracies is the possibility of real influence on society through participation in economic, social, and political aspects of the community. As such, citizenship presupposes the individuals' sense of belonging to a larger collective, where people want to and are allowed to engage. In this sense citizenship as a verb – to citizen – points to doings and practices that are based on a set of shared values. This way, citizenship in an educational context

is ideas about knowledge and values that a society see as important for future generations. Diane Smith (this volume) argues in her chapter that citizenship can be understood not only as a legal entitlement of individuals to rights and affiliation common to all citizens of a polity, but also as fundamentally entailing cultural and social entitlements and obligations, which may be differentiated from collective rights.

Also, citizenship is about different available subject positions (see also the articles by Fjørtoft, Smith, Sollid, and Vitikainen, this volume). A person can be an insider (citizen), an outsider who can become insider, an insider becoming an outsider, or even an outcast who despite attempts to become a citizen is kept outside or silenced (Isin & Nielsen, 2008, p. 6). For the individual, thus, citizenship is a social contract in flux that, at a formal level, is expressed through formalised rights and responsibilities that a person has – for instance, the right to Sámi-medium education (citizenship as status). At the level of practice, citizenship is about stability in what people do to uphold citizenship (citizenship as practice). Citizenship as practice shows that a way of doing something has become established norms that frame future actions. This way, citizenship is a mode of conduct that is acquired through 'routines, rituals, customs, norms and habits of the everyday' (Isin, 2008, p. 17). Education thus plays a major role in developing modes of conduct in the relationships between the individuals and the community.

In the process of decolonisation and Indigenising education, a final perspective on citizenship is present in social and political processes in a time of change. In a context of marginalisation, citizenship can be expressed and negotiated through acts that create or recreate social belonging and relations. These acts of citizenship potentially pave the way for new ways of doing citizenship, and they can supplement or reject the current citizenship frames (Isin, 2008, 2009), for instance as what happens when Indigenous movements start to question colonial education. Acts of citizenship are connected to participation and can be interpreted as taking a stance (Jaffe, 2009) on previous practices and habitual social actions. Taking a stance shows agency and potentially points to a range of possible citizen positions, not only either-or. This connects acts of citizenship to cultural interfaces (Nakata, 2007), which describes a similar space for relations that an individual person (and community) lives by and negotiates with.

Citizenship is thus both about the individual member's engagement with communities and also something that is achieved interactionally between participants and something that can be ratified, ignored, modified, or contested. Education plays an important role in developing citizens for the future – on the basis of the governments' ideas of citizenship.

While throughout colonialism the colonisers took the right to make decisions over Indigenous people, today there are processes to redefine this unequal distribution of power. In doing so there is also a process of redefining citizenship in Indigenous communities through performative acts. As Smith (this volume) describes, the term 'jurisdiction' is defined in its common-sense meaning as 'the right, power, or authority to administer the law by hearing and determining controversies'; 'the extent or range of judicial or other authority'; and the 'territory over which authority is exercised'. In education, this is first and foremost a question of having (or taking) the authority to describe the value basis of Indigenous education, and to decide what counts as relevant knowledge. Jurisdiction is thus closely related to the process of decolonisation and Indigenisation.

Moreover, we see that in Indigenous contexts, Indigenous polities take a specific form, which leads to a specific form of citizen and an identifiable collective citizenship. Within the Australian Indigenous domain (Smith, this volume) there is a cultural preference, on the one hand, for autonomy, that is marked by a tendency towards localism and the value accorded to small kin-based congeries of people attached to core geographic heartlands. Here the Indigenous citizens belong to their own local clan group or extended family and know their own 'country' – though today they are more than likely not to be residing in their traditional country. In this context, Indigenous modes of education and socialisation are place-based and local (see Fogarty & Sollid, this volume). But this societal momentum towards 'atomism' and autonomy is balanced, on the other hand, by an equally compelling strain towards 'collectivism', connectedness, and interdependence. This brings small-scale groups together into sometimes lasting, sometimes short-term collectives for particular purposes. At these aggregating levels, Indigenous people are citizens of a meshed network of polities and can activate claims to rights and responsibilities according to circumstance and need. In the Sámi context, we find similar nested citizenships, from family and the local community to the Sámi nation. One could also add both an overarching nation state and even international level of Indigenous networks. This is, for instance, evident in on a curricular level, where nested citizenship within local and global communities is expressed. This nestedness is a relevant perspective for the Norwegian core curriculum, where Sámi citizenship is linked to Norwegian citizenship, a relationship that Vitikainen (this volume) analyses through an idea of shared fate.

Curricula in Indigenous education

A curriculum is a document that governs the activity of a school or a school system, and it is a statement about what is the imagined shared knowledge across a

nation or a federal state. There is a connection to citizenship in this. A curriculum expresses what it takes to be or become a citizen. Whether or not this includes people from Indigenous communities seems to vary from state to state. As such, curricula and accompanying policy documents are powerful texts. Statements – or lack of statements – on Indigenous issues in national curricula can be seen as expressions of state policy on Indigenous issues: expressions of the state wanting to constitute truth regimes (Ball, 1994). This may point to a critical perspective on representation and position. A critical question can be raised concerning the possibility for Indigenous people to speak and be heard (Buras & Apple, 2006).

Format and power vary from country to country and context to context. This goes both for how a curriculum is made, what it looks like, how it is introduced, how much juridical power it has, and how it is used. Further, the level of the curriculum authority varies. In Australia as a federal state, the different states make curricula for the state's schools. In Norway, Sweden, Finland, Aotearoa New Zealand, and Namibia, the curriculum is a matter for the nation state and government (see chapters by Olsen, Sollid, Harvey, and Ninkova, this volume). We also see that Indigenous communities are gaining more jurisdiction over Indigenous issues in curriculum processes.

We base this book on an understanding of curriculum that acknowledges this kind of document as the total array of efforts of a nation to develop programs for education (see also Goodlad, 1979, p. 44). As will be evident from the chapters in this book, the complexity and layers of content in a curriculum are captured by Goodlad, Klein, and Tye's (1979) conceptualisation of curriculum through five perspectives: ideal, formal, perceived, operational, and experienced. For example, the Norwegian curriculum has a strong standing and legal status, as it is an amendment to the Education Act. This makes the curriculum a legal document. The curriculum governs the nationwide system of public schools, and to illustrate the reach of the document even further it is important to note that almost all Norwegian children attend public schools. With the curriculum counted as part of national law, as a precept to the law on education, it is clearly an authoritative document, and a public expression of the official state policy. Nonetheless, there is not necessarily coherence between policy and practice. The implementation gap prevails as a global phenomenon (see chapters by Smith, Ninkova, Olsen, and Harvey), and points to possible tensions concerning the expectations towards what Indigenous students and communities can achieve through education. This clearly has practical and financial dimensions as well as ideological and pedagogical dimensions. Olsen (this volume) shows how educational leaders struggle to find the resources (human, financial, teaching) to fully implement the goals and demands of the Sámi curriculum.

It is not only the nation's total array of efforts that are relevant here, but also the Indigenous people's contributions. A curriculum can potentially be the total array of efforts by Indigenous peoples to insert their understandings, knowledge systems, and content into programs for education. In other words, it is not necessarily simply top-down from the state and its efforts, but potentially also bottom-up. When it comes to Indigenous participation in the making of curricula, as well as the curricular representation of Indigenous peoples and communities, a similar kind of diversity is found. This mirrors the varying levels of recognition of Indigenous peoples and rights in the different states at hand.

The different perspectives on curriculum communicate well with the concept of scale, that is, the perspectives are a way to describe and see the relationships between the layers of the curriculum. It is important not to see each of the layers as independent from the others. On the contrary, we argue for a need to investigate the encounters and intersections of the perspectives. As policy documents with an ideological content, analysis of curricula includes paying attention to intertwined discourses about academic content and political and ideological values. As such, they illustrate what the nation state imagines as shared knowledge and values, and hence what is the ideal curriculum to keep a sense of belonging and coherence across the nation or federal state, including the space for Indigenous people.

A NORTHERN STARTING POINT: INDIGENISING EDUCATION IN SÁPMI?

As is evident from our introduction so far, our point of departure for discussing Indigenous education and citizenship is the educational context of the Indigenous Sámi people in the northernmost part of Europe. We have already shared some perspectives, and here we provide a more coherent overview of the processes and the shift from colonising to Indigenising education in Sápmi. The Sámi today live in Sápmi, a continuous territory in four different nation states: Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia. When the borders between the four nation states became more fixed during the 19th century, the Sámi people's formal status as citizens were linked to these four states (see also Lantto, 2010). From the 1950s onwards, the border-transcending identification as a Sámi collective has become more prominent, but the nation state citizenship remains (see also Berg-Nordlie, 2017, for an analysis of pan-Sámi politics). All this suggests that although there is a sense of unity among the Sámi, the four nation states provide different political and ideological frames for the processes of decolonising and Indigenising education.

For legal reasons, there are no official statistics on the exact number of Sámi. Nevertheless, an estimate indicates that there are approximately 100 000 Sámi in

the four states, with the majority living in Norway. A recent report (Melhus & Broderstad, 2020) suggests that almost 40 percent of the population in the northernmost counties of Norway have Sámi or Kven heritage. This would increase the number of Sámi at least on the Norwegian side. Any number must, however, be interpreted with caution as there so far is no consensus about how to count – or about what it takes to identify or to be identified – as Sámi.

In Sápmi, colonisation is about political, economic, cultural, and linguistic oppression and about building and maintaining social hierarchies. Colonisation is here a process that works on many levels describing how a coloniser, the nation state and its agents, such as the church and its missionaries, takes over and/or has an impact on others' land and resources, political power, culture, identity, language, and mind. From the beginning, schools were inherently involved in this process, and as such must be seen as an important colonising agent, first and foremost with an assimilatory goal. For example, when Sámi land was taken, the colonial educational system supported state positions by telling stories where the land was presented as 'ours' (the state's and majority's) not 'yours' (the Indigenous community's). A colonial archive of knowledge where Sámi knowledge systems were excluded was thus constructed and communicated to the following generations. Schools, as part of a colonial system, justified colonisation by providing stories, 'knowledge' and frameworks where the majority owned land and held the power to define terms of ownership, facts, and practices. In consequence, colonial schools were agents of assimilation, which means working towards the marginalisation of Sámi languages and cultures with juridical instruments like education acts, instructions, and curricula. Colonisation was part of the entire nexus of education, from national and foreign policy, via local and regional regulations, to specific classrooms. In the classrooms, the most concrete work of colonisation was the way some teachers shamed Sámi children for speaking Sámi languages. As Sara Ahmed has shown (2004), emotions too are cultural and political. As such, colonisation implies weakening and challenging the emotional and cosmological connections of Sámi people to their land, culture, and community.

From the 1850s, Norway started an official assimilation policy aimed at the minorities. The Sámi, together with the Kven/Norwegian Finns (see below), were at the receiving end of this Norwegianisation policy that had schools as a key arena (Andresen, Evjen, & Ryymin, 2021). Through the means of educational legislation, all students were given the same goals, and there was hardly any space for adapting the content or pedagogy on the basis of the students' cultural or linguistic backgrounds. In Sweden, the government issued two different educational pathways for the Sámi. Firstly, most Sámi faced assimilatory efforts, in many ways similar to what we find in Norway. Secondly, the reindeer herding Sámi were facing a policy

of segregation through the nomad school. The lower expectations of Sámi students' school achievements is noticeable (Huss, 1999). In this process, and through educational oppression, many Sámi learned to feel ashamed about their own culture and language. By the end of the official assimilation policy, the Sámi communities were deeply changed. Along the Norwegian coast, many Sámi became or appeared to be Norwegian. However, the Sámi did not disappear completely. In some areas, the language and the culture endured despite such pressures, and contemporaneously Sámi are characterised by a continuity of linguistic and cultural practices.

In the Nordic countries, the period after World War II was both a time for silence and continued marginalisation, and a time for decolonisation through political activism and revitalisation and reclamation of language and culture (Andresen et al., 2021; Broderstad, this volume; Sollid, this volume). With the emergence of local Sámi organisations, Nordic and later also pan-Sámi cooperation and international orientation, we see an important ethnopolitical mobilisation from the 1950s and onwards. The major political achievements for Sámi in the Nordic countries came during the 1970s and 1990s. In this situation, the areas where Sámi language and practices had survived became a source for inspiration and mobilisation, for instance in the process of decolonising schools and curricula. Broderstad (this volume) sees the implication of this development for the education policy. Today, Norway, Sweden, and Finland have – to varying degrees – acknowledged their active role in the oppression and assimilation of the Sámi communities, and have – to varying degrees – recognised the Sámi as an Indigenous people.

Important in the process of Indigenising education is that the Sámi have, both on a political and a cultural level, embraced and integrated the matter of being Indigenous into their own culture and language, a process that is also about identity (Lane & Makihara, 2017). A telling progress on these matters is the ratification of international conventions and charters. In this picture, the ILO convention on the rights of tribal and Indigenous peoples and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, and the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities are important documents at the international level which have influence on the national level. Here, among other aspects, the right to self-determination, land rights, the duty to consult Indigenous communities, and education are mentioned as areas that bind the states in their relationship with their Indigenous communities. In Norway, the political and juridical recognition of the Sámi as an Indigenous people is today explicitly expressed in the national curriculum (see Fjørtoft and Vitikainen, this volume). The question nevertheless becomes how to address both the unity between Sámi across the four nation states in Sápmi, and at the same time address the diversity that characterises Sápmi.

This diversity is shown in the three officially recognised Sámi languages in Norway and the names of the Sámi nation. *Sápmi* is the name of the Sámi nation in North Sámi. North Sámi is the language with the highest number of speakers. Sábme is the Lule Sámi name, and Saepmie is the South Sámi name. Both Lule and South Sámi languages were severely affected by assimilation to the extent that there are now only a few hundred speakers of each language. In addition, Skolt Sámi, Pite Sámi, and Ume Sámi have historical links to Norway, and today there are initiatives to reclaim these languages. Norwegian is the most common language spoken in the different Sámi communities. Sámi diversity is also prevalent when it comes to places, ways of living, culture, and gender. Reindeer herding is an important culture and industry in Sápmi. At the same time, despite its high ranking within Sámi community, fewer than ten percent of the Sámi are connected to reindeer herding. Along the coast, Sámi have traditionally made a livelihood based on a combination of fishing, agriculture, gathering, and trading. This diversity is acknowledged through Norway's system of administrative areas of Sámi languages. Today, there are 13 municipalities where Sámi is on equal footing with Norwegian. The first municipalities to become part of this administrative area were six municipalities in the North Sámi area, including Gáivuotna-Kåfjord-Kaivuono, where Evju (this volume) is undertaking her research. Later, municipalities in Lule Sámi and South Sámi areas have also entered the area. These 13 municipalities all take on a responsibility to strengthen Sámi language and culture. Within this area, schools follow the Sámi curriculum.

Today, following the recent centuries of urbanisation, industrialisation, and modernisation, Sámi communities have changed. There is an ongoing urbanisation, increasingly making cities and towns important Sámi places (Berg-Nordlie, Dankertsen, & Winsvold, 2022; Pedersen & Nyseth, 2015). To add another layer, Norway is a diverse country, with the Indigenous Sámi as but one part of a diversity that also includes both five national minorities and transnational migrants. Two of the national minorities traditionally partly reside in the same area as the Sámi, namely the Kven/Norwegian Finns and Forest Finns. The distinction between the juridical status – Indigenous people and national minority – indicates that this diversity is also the foundation of differentiation in politics and jurisdictions.

Indigenising education in one of the Sámi contexts is a process filled with and defined by a series of dilemmas and paradoxes. If we follow Tuck & Yang (2012) and their demand that decolonisation is not a metaphor but something that needs to be concrete, this could mean that all schools as well as the education system need to be torn down. Indigenising education, in this sense, would mean the rebuilding of schools – from top to bottom – on basis of Sámi priorities and practices. In practice, we know and realise that this will not happen. Indigenising

schools and education needs to be a process that takes place within the existing system. The internal decolonisation needs to be followed (or accompanied?) by internal Indigenisation.

PRESENTATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS

What unites the papers in this book is that they all build on insights from nation states and contexts where one or more Indigenous people are recognised. As such, the different education systems are framed by a political willingness to accept ethnic, linguistic, and cultural pluralism. As we have emphasised in this introductory chapter, there is, however, not *one* solution for how to Indigenise education, where the needs and dreams of Indigenous people are accommodated both in terms of national education policies and in terms of local practices. Nor is there one shared point of view within the Indigenous group. Rather, what constitutes acceptable political goals and educational solutions differ from context to context and across timescales. The reader is thus encouraged to take each contribution as an expression of the different ways of decolonising and Indigenising education. Each contribution stands on its own feet and can thus be read independently from the rest of the chapters. We nevertheless encourage the reader to start from the beginning and see the different contributions together.

Three of the papers provide a historical overview of education and citizenship. Pigga Keskitalo presents a historical overview of Sámi education through different time periods as well as some of the ongoing legal and curricular processes. Else-Grete Broderstad writes about the place of education and language in the 20th century processes concerning Sámi rights. She includes both the Sámi political movements and the growing state recognition. Diane Smith carefully traces the changes in how Indigenous citizenship is governed in Australia.

Four other papers go into the matter of curriculum and policy. Kjersti Fjørtoft and Annamari Vitikainen both go into the core curriculum of the Norwegian school from a perspective of political philosophy and the conceptual discussion of citizenship and democracy. Hilde Sollid discusses the curricula for the subjects of Sámi as a first language and Sámi as a second language respectively, articulating and implying two different ideas of citizenship. Sharon Harvey writes on the challenge of transferring a concept of language policy from one context to another and relates this to the multilingual situation in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Four chapters study the implementation of policies. Åse Mette Johansen & Elin Furu Markusson analyse textbooks for the school subject Norwegian. They explore how Sámi multilingual citizenship is presented in four textbooks in junior high school. Torjer A. Olsen uses research conversations with educational leaders as

a way of understanding the situation for Sámi schools and kindergartens. Hanna Outakoski investigates the appropriateness of an influential Anglophone model for writing instruction in an Indigenous Sámi context. Velina Ninkova writes about the implementation gaps of mother-tongue education for the Omaheke Juǀʼhoansi in Namibia.

Lastly, there are four chapters which examine issues related to local practices and dilemmas. Kristin Evju writes about school practices in the municipality of Gaivuotna-Kåfjord-Kaivuono in Norway. Kristina Belančić focuses on the language beliefs and practices of Sámi pupils in Sweden, analysing them as implicit language policy. Melinda Webber and Selena Waru-Benson go into the role of cultural connectedness and ethnic-group belonging in Aotearoa New Zealand, looking into the social and emotional well-being of diverse students. William Fogarty and Hilde Sollid connect citizenship and education, relating land, place, and country to educational practices.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. (2000). *Strange encounters. Embodied others in post-coloniality*. London, UK: Routledge.

Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotions*. London, UK: Routledge.

Andresen, A., Evjen, B., & Ryymin, T. (2021). *Samenes historie fra 1751 til 2010* (1st ed.). Oslo, Norway: Cappelen Damm akademisk.

Ball, S. J. (1994). *Education reform: A critical and post-structural approach*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. Saskatoon, Canada: Purich.

Berg-Nordlie, M. (2017). *Fighting to be heard – in Russia and in Sápmi: Russian Sámi representation in Russian and pan-Sámi politics, 1992–2014* [Ph.D. thesis]. UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø.

Berg-Nordlie, M. (2021). 'Sámi in the Heart': Kinship, culture, and community as foundations for Indigenous Sámi identity in Norway. *Ethnopolitics*, *21*(4), 450–472. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2021.1932116

Berg-Nordlie, M., Dankertsen, A., & Winsvold, M. (Eds.). (2022). *An urban future for Sápmi? Indigenous urbanization in the Nordic states and Russia*. New York, NY/Oxford, UK: Berghahn Books.

Bishop, R. (2008). Te Kotahitanga. Kaupapa Māori in mainstream classrooms. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 439–458). Los Angeles, CA: Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483385686.n21

Buras, K. L., & Apple, M. (2006). The subaltern speak: Curriculum, power, and educational struggles. In K. L. Buras & M. Apple (Eds.), *The subaltern speak: Curriculum, power, and educational struggles* (pp. 1–42). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gjerpe, K. K. (2017). Samisk læreplanverk – En symbolsk forpliktelse? *Nordic Studies in Education, 3*(4), 150–165. https://doi.org/10.18261/issn.1891-5949-2017-03-04-03

Gjerpe, K. K. (2018). From indigenous education to indigenising mainstream education. *FLEKS – Scandinavian Journal of Intercultural Theory and Practice, 5*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.7577/fleks.2190

Goodlad, J. I. (Ed.). (1979). *Curriculum inquiry: The study of curriculum practice*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Goodlad, J. I., Klein, M. F., & Tye, K. A. (1979). The domains of curriculum and their study. In J. I. Goodlad (Ed.), *Curriculum inquiry. The study of curriculum practice* (pp. 43–76). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Hornberger, N. H. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy, 1*(1), 27–51. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014548611951

Huss, L. (1999). *Reversing language shift in the far North: Linguistic revitalization in Northern Scandinavia and Finland*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Uralica Upsaliensia.

Isin, E. F. (2008). Theorizing acts of citizenship. In E. F. Isin & G. M. Nielsen (Eds.), *Acts of citizenship* (pp. 15–43). London, UK: Zed Books.

Isin, E. F. (2009). Citizenship in flux: The figure of the activist citizen. *Subjectivity, 29*(1), 367–388. https://doi.org/10.1057/sub.2009.25

Isin, E. F., & Nielsen, G. M. (2008). *Acts of citizenship*. London: Zed Books.

Jaffe, A. (2009). *Stance: Sociolinguistic perspectives*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Keskitalo, P., Määttä, K. & Uusiautti, S., (2013). *Sámi education*. Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.

Lane, P., & Makihara, M. (2017). Indigenous peoples and their languages. In O. García, N. Flores, & M. Spotti (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of language and society (pp. 299–330).* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190212896.013.7

Lantto, P. (2010). Borders, citizenship and change: The case of the Sami people, 1751–2008. *Citizenship Studies, 14*(5), 543–556. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2010.506709

Melhus, M., & Broderstad, A. R. (2020). *Folkehelseundersøkelsen i Nordland. Tilleggsrapport om samisk og kvensk/norskfinsk befolkning*. Tromsø, Norway: Senter for samisk helseforskning, UiT Norges arktiske universitet. https://www.tffk.no/_f/p1/i2c5ac7f4-6b0d-485d-96d2-a68d-9de030c2/rapport_troms_finnmark_sshf_redigert_april2020.pdf

Nakata, M. (2007). *Disciplining the savages: Savaging the disciplines*. Canberra, Australia: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Pedersen, P., & Nyseth, T. (2015). *City-Saami: Same i byen eller bysame? Skandinaviske byer i et samisk perspektiv*. Kárášjohka, Norway: ČálliidLágádus.

Rassool, N., Canvin, M., Heugh, K., & Mansoor, S. (2007). *Global issues in language, education and development: Perspectives from postcolonial countries*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Sarivaara, E., & Keskitalo, P. (2016). Mediating structures in Sami language revitalisation. *Social inclusion, 4*(1), 11–18. https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v4i1.359

Sarivaara, E., & Keskitalo, P. (2019). Sámi language for all: Transformed futures through mediative education. In E. McKinley & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of Indigenous education* (1st ed., pp. 467–482). Singapore: Springer.

Saugestad, S. (2001). *The inconvenient Indigenous: Remote area development in Botswana, donor assistance, and the First Peoples of the Kalahari*. Uppsala, Sweden: The Nordic Africa Institute.

Scollon, R. & Scollon, S. W. (2004). *Nexus analysis. Discourse and the emerging internet*. London, UK/New York, NY: Routledge.

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London, UK: Zed Books.

Smith, L. T., Tuck, E. & Yang, W. K. (2019). *Indigenous and decolonizing studies in education. Mapping the long view*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Sollid, H., & Olsen, T. A. (2019). Indigenising education: Scales, interfaces and acts of citizenship in Sapmi. *Junctures: The Journal for Thematic Dialogue* (20), 29–41. https://doi.org/10.34074/junc.20029

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1*(1), 1–4.

Virtanen, P., Olsen, T. A., & Keskitalo, P. (2021). Contemporary Indigenous research within Sámi and Global Indigenous studies contexts. In P. Virtanen, P. Keskitalo, & T. A. Olsen (Eds.), *Indigenous research methodologies in Sámi and global contexts* (pp. 7–32). Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.