



6. Sámi language education policy and citizenship in Norway

Hilde Sollid

Abstract The Sámi languages are important for contributing to social cohesion in the Sámi society; as a result of colonisation and assimilation, they have a complex role. In this context, language education policy plays a key part. This article investigates how social cohesion and the recognition of diversity is expressed in Sámi language curricula from 1974 to 2020. The analysis shows that from being a tool for literacy learning, today's curricula additionally are mediating belonging to and participation in Sámi societies.

Keywords Sámi language education policy | citizenship | social cohesion | diversity | curriculum analysis

INTRODUCING SÁMI LANGUAGE EDUCATION POLICY

The Sámi languages are at the heart of belonging to Sámi cultures and communities. They are important for creating distinct Sámi identities and contributing to social cohesion within Sámi society. This role is, however, complex due to centuries of colonisation and assimilation policies. This article investigates how social cohesion and the recognition of diversity is expressed in Sámi language education.

The destructive policies of colonisation and assimilation have resulted in the fragmentation of Sápmi, and in the social and political marginalisation and what Léglise and Alby (2006) describe as the minorisation not only of the Sámi languages, but also of Indigenous and other minority languages around the world (see also Costa, De Korne, & Lane, 2017). In Norway, the Norwegianisation policy was a political strategy of fragmentation and the eventual assimilation of the Sámi people (Andresen, Evjen, & Ryymin, 2021; Minde, 2003), with the majorisation and extensive distribution of Norwegian as a nation-state language as part of the process. Processes which devalue the Sámi languages are a long-term outcome of minorisation as are the shifts in language use from Sámi to Norwegian. (see Huss, 1999).

Today, language revitalisation and reclamation (cf. Leonard, 2017) are prioritised in the Sámi communities (cf. Aikio-Puoskari, 2018; Todal, 2002). The goal is to value Sámi languages and their users, and to increase the number of Sámi language users. In Norway, this broad priority has political and juridical support for three Sámi languages – North Sámi, Lule Sámi and South Sámi – through the ratification of The European Charter of Regional or Minority Languages (cf. Pietikäinen, Huss, Laihiala-Kankainen, Aikio-Puoskari, & Lane, 2010). In addition, Skolt Sámi, Pite Sámi and Ume Sámi have historical links to Norway, but today these languages are mainly connected to Finland (Skolt) and Sweden (Pite and Ume). There are initiatives to strengthen these languages in Norway as well. Language revitalisation and reclamation are thus ongoing processes in communities where access to Sámi languages is not equally distributed. Some have access to Sámi through intergenerational transmission within the family and support from Sámi medium education. Others identify as Sámi through a range of discursive means like political engagement and personal narratives about the family's language history, but with limited or no access to developing Sámi language competence. Thus, the complexity involves diverse values attributed to the Sámi languages under different political regimes, and to the fact that today some have Sámi language competence whilst others do not.

The role of Sámi languages in creating Sámi identities and belonging to Sámi cultures and communities is an expression of the relationship between language and citizenship (cf. Horner, 2015; May, 2017). In general terms, the language–citizenship relationship is expressed by implicit or explicit language requirements for people to be considered as a member of a community. As citizens we are individuals with agency and legitimacy to act to shape our own future together with other citizens (cf. Ahearn, 2001; Isin, 2008). To identify with others is thus a basis for citizenship. A view of citizenship as active participation in nested networks on any part of the scale between the community, society, and the nation-state is also integrated here (see Olsen & Sollid, this volume). As colonialism had the fragmentation of Indigenous societies and linguistic and cultural assimilation as a main goal, in a postcolonial setting it is important to find a strategy to re-create and maintain social cohesion. As May (2017) shows, social cohesion can be achieved through either ignoring or appreciating pluralism. On this basis, an important question becomes how Norway and the Sámi society deal with the complexity connected with the Sámi language–citizenship relationship. From other contexts we know that the main debates over language and citizenship revolve around whether a language should be a requirement for citizenship, and whether this mandated language should be at the expense of or in addition to other languages in the society (May, 2017, p. 2).

In Norway, from 1950s and onwards one of the key responses to the challenges created by internal colonisation has been to focus on Sámi languages through the education system (Andresen et al., 2021, pp. 327–335). This suggests that Sámi language education is important for social cohesion and that there is also a space for three Sámi languages. All educational institutions are part of reclaiming Sámi language in this political turn, from kindergarten (see Storjord, 2008) to school (see Todal, 2002) and higher education (see Porsanger, 2019). In this education system, de-minorisation of Sámi and breaking with the suppressive colonisation and assimilation politics are connected with decolonising and Indigenising the field of education through centring Indigenous perspectives (cf. Sollid & Olsen, 2019). The introduction of the first national Sámi subject language curriculum in 1974 (cf. Todal, 2009) and the introduction of a parallel Sámi curriculum for Sámi schools in 1997 (cf. Gjerpe, 2017; Todal, 2003) are achievements in the process of Indigenising the education system. Additionally, Norwegian language plays a role in the multilingual Sámi society.

Today, the Sámi languages are important to the individual Sámi, and they are politically and socially supported by the Sámi society. Also, the Norwegian state provides political and juridical support through national as well as international laws and agreements. Taken together, this points to a language policy for social cohesion in Sámi societies, where also diversity within Sámi societies is recognised and part of the ideas of citizenship. Against this backdrop, the research question of this article is how social cohesion and the recognition of diversity is expressed in Sámi language education. This question is explored through a critical discourse analysis of the relationship between language and citizenship articulated in Sámi language curricula for primary and secondary school between 1974 and 2020.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

This chapter builds on theories of language education policy and citizenship that view language policy and citizenship as processes rather than static objects, the concepts point to something we do rather than something we possess. Following McCarty (2011, p. 2) language policy is ‘processual, dynamic, and in motion’, and a field of social practice where overt and covert policies work for or against each other, sometimes creating ambivalence. An official language education policy builds on what is considered shared language ideologies, that is, cultural, or sub-cultural beliefs about language (cf. Irvine & Gal, 2000). These language ideologies frame and regulate language use and language competence in official educational settings on shorter and longer timescales. As such, language education policy is an

expression of the society's imagined role for the language users and languages in the future society.

Likewise, Isin (2008, 2009) emphasises citizenship as dynamic and in flux – as doings – which echoes current theorising in language policy through highlighting actions and practices. As citizens we are formally linked to a nation, and we can also be citizens of several collectives on different parts of a place scale (cf. Hult, 2015) where we are able and allowed to participate together with others to shape our future. Citizenship is, however, not a static practice, it can change, for instance in response of a society's policies, through performative acts of citizenship (cf. Isin, 2008).

Colonisation and Norwegianisation have contributed to an erasure of Sámi languages as part of the collective idea of Norway (cf. Sollid, 2009). These political processes have affected the Sámi languages, language users and Sámi societies differently and at different times. Todal (2015) therefore emphasises that there is not one but several Sámi language situations. Between these language situations, the local language policies, ideologies and practices might diverge, but on an overarching level, three of the Sámi languages are part of the same Sámi language education policy in Norway.

Today's Sámi language education policy in Norway builds on past and present Sámi grassroot initiatives to provide education in and on Sámi languages (see Broderstad, this volume). The policy is today situated in a public education system which is a top-down policy mechanism that reaches all members of society. As such, education is a powerful tool for implementing ideas of citizenship through creating and shaping collective knowledge and social roles for Sámi language students as active participants. From overt, *de jure* language policy, we can infer ideas of what are considered legitimate languages and language use for doing citizenship and becoming a citizen of a society. The policy can thus tell us something about the language rights and obligations sanctioned by national and international laws and charters, for example Norway's constitution, the Norwegian Education Act, the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, and ILO Convention No. 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples. It is at the same time important to emphasise that local conditions in the different Sámi language situations have implications for how the overarching language policy is locally adopted and how policy mechanisms work in practice. Therefore, even if official regulations like Education Acts and curricula are powerful texts with a wide scope of authority on long timescales, there is an ideological and implementational space, to use Hornberger's (2002) ideas. In this space, local ideas and social practices can resist or support the overarching official policy. These *de facto* language policies can be mediated by for instance teachers, teaching resources and actions in classrooms (e.g., Menken & García, 2010). This suggests a dynamic relationship between

bottom-up resistance and activist citizenship on the one hand, and overt, official minorising policies on the other. As with language policy, citizenship can be negotiated locally through acts of citizenship (cf. Isin, 2008) that potentially change the future for the individual and the communities.

METHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

To explore the research question of how social cohesion and the recognition of diversity is expressed in Sámi language education, the following analysis is based on twelve Sámi language curricula. Curricula are pedagogical documents, as well as instantiations of policies and ideologies envisioned by politicians and curriculum designers (e.g., Apple, 1990). In addition to the national and international laws and charters, curricula are framed by both the politicians' mandates but also the curriculum designers' beliefs, knowledge, and experiences. As such, a curriculum is the powerful result of a multifaceted social action (cf. Scollon & Scollon, 2004) of adapting an overarching language policy to education contexts, and simultaneously paying attention to the grassroots level where the curricula become practice. The goal of the curriculum is to imagine future citizens' virtues on basis of the past and present policies and ideologies.

The Norwegian curriculum of 2020 consists of four parts: 1) the Education Act, 2) the quality framework, 3) the core curriculum, and 4) subject curricula for primary and secondary schools. Each part is important for understanding the complexity of the policy and must thus be read and interpreted together. In Norway's system of parallel Norwegian and Sámi curricula, parts 1, 2 and 3 are the same, while the difference between them is expressed in the subject curricula.

The following analysis is based on Sámi subject curricula from 1974 to 2020. Analysing curricula from a timespan of almost 50 years enables us to trace changes in the curricula with respect to the language–citizenship relationship. The emphasis is on the first section of 12 Sámi language curricula. This section is relatively short (322 words on average) and connects the overarching goals in the Education Act and the core curriculum to specific competency goals in the subject curricula. This section is therefore a statement about the central values and goals of the subject. Between 1974 and 2020, Norway has had five curriculum reforms: in 1974 (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1974), 1987 (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1987), 1997 (Kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet, 1996), 2006¹ (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2006) and 2020 (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2020).

1 The 2006 reform had three revisions, thus there are four versions of each curriculum. Since the revisions of the first sections are minor, only the 2006 versions are included in the analysis.

Table 6.1 is an overview of the Sámi language curricula of these reforms, and the documents analysed in this paper, with names given in North Sámi and Norwegian and translated into English.² The analysis is based on the Norwegian versions of the documents.

Table 6.1: Overview of Sámi language curricula between 1974 and 2020

Year (Short name)	North Sámi name	Norwegian name	English translation
1974 (M74)	–	Samisk m/skriftforming	Sámi with handwriting
1987 (M87)	Sámeigiella vuosttašgiellan Sámeigiella nubbingiellan	Samisk som førstespråk Samisk som andrespråk	Sámi as first language Sámi as second language
1997 (L97)	Sámeigiella vuosttašgiellan Sámeigiella nubbingiellan Sámeigiella ja kultuvra	Samisk som førstespråk Samisk som andrespråk Samisk språk og kultur	Sámi as first language Sámi as second language Sámi language and culture
2006 (LK06)	Sámeigiella vuosttašgiellan Sámeigiella nubbingiellan	Samisk som førstespråk Samisk som andrespråk	Sámi as first language Sámi as second language
2020 (LK20)	Sámeigiella vuosttašgiellan Sámeigiella nubbingiellan 2 Sámeigiella nubbingiellan 3 Sámeigiella nubbingiellan 4	Samisk som førstespråk Samisk som andrespråk 2 Samisk som andrespråk 3 Samisk som andrespråk 4	Sámi as first language Sámi as second language 2 Sámi as second language 3 Sámi as second language 4

In the analysis, the attention is on the circulating discourses about the relationship between Sámi language and citizenship. I see these discourses as discourses in place (see Hult, 2015; Scollon & Scollon, 2004), in that they are both expressed in the texts but also connected to the wider circumference and scales of space and time of Sámi language in education. The analysis thus describes both the ways language and citizenship are linked in the texts and how this relationship is linked with the broader context of the Sámi languages and Sámi language education.

The analysis builds on the perspectives of critical discourse analysis, where the use of language and other semiotic resources are not only simple reflections of social life; they are used by someone to accomplish some action in the social world (Scollon & Scollon, 2004, p. 2). In the analysis there is a special focus on how difference and diversity in terms of Sámi language competence is expressed, and how these expressions produce power (Scollon & Scollon, 2004, p. 173), for instance,

2 In 1974 there was no Sámi version of the curriculum. In 1987 the curricula are in North Sámi and Norwegian. Since 1997 the curricula are also available in Lule and South Sámi. Names and quotes from the curricula in English are my translations.

in terms of legitimacy to practice citizenship. I have searched for relevant content, for instance, choice of words or phrases and presence vs. absence of themes. As the texts are relatively short, each choice of linguistic and semiotic resource is significant.

Here I want to include a note on researcher positionality. I consider myself both Norwegian and Sámi, and as for all researchers my social and theoretical background influence my questions and interpretations. Transparency in the analysis is therefore crucial.

As emphasised above, language policy is here viewed as dynamic. This suggests that a curriculum is a space where we find variation, contestations, and contradictions. Thus, as part of a Sámi language policy, the ideas about language and citizenship in the curricula are framed by policy and social practice, and they are not stable or static across time or space. The ideas are situated and in a dialectic relationship with historical, current, and future discourses about Sámi language, (see the notion of discourses in place above). The curriculum analysis is framed by links across time and place scales of Sámi language policy.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON LANGUAGE AND CITIZENSHIP IN NORWAY

Before analysing the Sámi language curricula, it is important to reveal ideas about the relationship between language and citizenship in Norway in a historical perspective. Going back to the start of Norway's compulsory education in 1739, we can trace Norway's response to the question of a mandated language for citizenship. This response is associated with the Danish-Norwegian union on the one hand, and restrictions of diversity through colonisation and assimilation of the Sámi people on the other.

Language education in Norway was, at the time of the introduction of compulsory education, related to the church's promotion of the Lutheran religion. In 1736, when confirmation became compulsory by law, citizen rights, like getting married and participation in military service, became connected to the confirmation certificate (Dahl, 2017, p. 80). In addition to intercession, confirmation included a knowledge component, which in turn instigated the first Education Act for compulsory schooling in 1739. The goal was that students should learn to read religious texts. In the beginning, the language of instruction depended on the teachers' beliefs about whether Sámi or Danish (the majoritised language of the Danish-Norwegian union), was most effective in promoting God's word. However, Danish soon became the main medium of education. This way, education for confirmation linked citizenship to language.

The idea of using the language of the majorised people in education continued after the end of the Danish-Norwegian union in 1814 and during the subsequent building of the Norwegian nation. For the new Norwegian nation-state, it became important to educate Norwegian citizens. Significantly, in this phase of language education policy, it was Norwegian that was promoted rather than Danish; it therefore linked the Norwegian language with Norwegian citizenship. This differentiation policy was at the expense of Sámi and other minorised languages (Sollid, 2009). The promotion of Norwegian as a mandatory language became part of the official assimilation policy towards the Sámi people in Norway that started around 1850 (Minde, 2003). Opposition towards linguistic diversity was not the main force behind the assimilation policy, as the processes that led to praise of the Norwegian dialects and a situation with two written standards, *bokmål* and *nynorsk* (Venås, 1993) in Norway, emerged around the same time as Norwegianisation became more targeted. Rather, the Sámi languages (and other languages, e.g., Kven) represented people and cultures of little value to the Norwegian state.

The role of national education in the Norwegianisation policy cannot be underestimated (see Dahl, 1957; Huss, 1999). The education system became more extensive through official policy mechanisms like education acts, curricula, and teachers' instructions (Dahl, 1957). Norwegianisation policy was thus explicitly voiced in the curricula of the expanding education system at the turn of the 19th century. Following May (2017, p. 4), mass education played a key role in choosing Norwegian as the only nation-state language. From this it is fair to say that the compulsory schooling system from its beginning was all about colonisation and minorisation, creating social cohesion within Norway through ignoring Sámi languages in education (or in other official domains for that matter). Using Irvine and Gal's (2000) theory of language ideology and linguistic differentiation, an iconic relationship between Norwegian language and education emerged, and is recursively reproduced linking the Norwegian nation with its education system to the Norwegian language. In this process, Norwegianisation was naturalised in language education, and languages other than Norwegian were erased as relevant for learning and for citizenship in Norway.

DISCOURSES IN SÁMI SUBJECT LANGUAGE CURRICULA 1974–2020

Since 1974 there has been a development with respect to the offer of Sámi as a subject language in Norway. Based on the main question of the article, in the following analysis, the focus is on three discourses: discursive shifts towards decolonisation,

the discourse of the differentiation of language experiences and the discourse of active participation.

Discursive shifts towards decolonisation

Gradually and as part of the political shift from official colonisation to decolonisation after World War II, Sámi language education has become prioritised both in Sámi and Norwegian politics (Andresen et al., 2021). When the reorientation of Sámi in schools and in learning processes occurred, we saw grassroots attempts to break the iconic relationship between education and the Norwegian language. These are important steps towards renegotiating the idea of one mandatory language for Norwegian citizenship, and making space for diversity and multilingualism. In this process, promoting Sámi language education might be seen as what Isin (2008, 2009) describes as acts of citizenship. There are many examples, but it is worth mentioning that in two municipalities from 1967, students with Sámi as their home language have been able to choose to have initial literacy training in Sámi. In 1969 the Education Act included a sentence giving parents of children with Sámi as a 'daily spoken language' the right to claim education in Sámi (Todal, 2009). In 1974, the 1967-project became part of the official national language education policy, and the first national Sámi subject language curriculum was introduced (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1974). It was labelled *samisk m/skriftforming* ('Sámi with handwriting'), a naming practice that linked the Sámi subject to the Norwegian subject *norsk m/skriftforming* ('Norwegian with handwriting'). There is no doubt that Sámi with handwriting was a breakthrough for Sámi language education, and it was oriented towards early literacy development in Sámi. It was, however, also a pathway to establishing Norwegian as the main language for learning. The goal was to keep Sámi as *sidemål*, after the initial years of literacy learning. The notion *sidemål* (literally 'side language') applies to Norwegian language situation through the use of two written Norwegian standards, *bokmål* and *nynorsk*. Students have one of the two standards as their first written language, and the other as the second. There are lower competence expectations in the second written language, be it Sámi or one of the Norwegian standards as *sidemål*. The choice of terminology indicates how Sámi language education policy is based on ideas of the Norwegian subject, and that Sámi and Norwegian were not equally valued. Note that the use of *sidemål* was dropped in later Sámi language curricula.

Despite the goal of transition from Sámi to Norwegian, the 1974 curriculum states that teaching about Sámi enables the students to 'love one's own mother tongue' (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1974, p. 116). This phrase also

links the Sámi subject to the Norwegian subject where there is an identical phrase (Johansen & Markusson, this volume), and it is an example of recursively produced language policy from Norwegian to Sámi (Irvine & Gal, 2000). To love one's own mother tongue is a noteworthy statement in an educational context where minorisation of Sámi language has been a naturalised idea for so long. In this case, recursivity contributes to a recognition of the value of Sámi language in a process of de-minorising a previously suppressed language and language users. Hence, in 1974 we see a process of discursive shift from Norwegianisation to acknowledging Sámi language and culture. At this stage of the long timescales of language education policy in Norway, Sámi was no longer erased from the curriculum, but was not fully recognised as a main language for learning.

Discourse of differentiation of language experiences

From 1974 to 2020 there has been a process of differentiation of the Sámi language subject. In this discourse, the number of curricula is a relevant semiotic resource. Today, there are four different curricula for Sámi language education, covering primary and secondary school. This process started with only one subject curriculum in 1974, which according to Todal (2009) with goodwill could be called a curriculum for modern first-language education. At this point, differentiation was about the relationship between Sámi and Norwegian, which created a space for the Sámi language in the Norwegian curriculum. The 1987 reform introduced differentiation within the Sámi subject, more specifically through the curricula labelled 'Sámi as first language' and 'Sámi as second language' (see Table 6.1). This differentiation could be said to be a step towards an acknowledgement of students who come to school with different Sámi language experiences. For some students, Sámi is their 'mother tongue' as they start school. This group of students were the first to have their educational needs acknowledged by the Norwegian education authorities. With the 1987 reform, Sámi became a legitimate language for learning not only basic literacy, but also a medium for learning subject content and a space for exploring one's Sámi identity. This was important for the individual student, but also for the wider Sámi society as these students were seen as bearers and future cultivators of the Sámi language that others could learn from. Sámi as a first language is thus a subject mainly for this group of students.

For other students, Sámi was weakened or lost as a family and community language due to colonisation and Norwegianisation. These students' educational needs in Sámi language were not considered before 1987. With the 1987 reform, they were able to choose Sámi as a second language, which is a curriculum that

takes little or no Sámi language experience as a point of departure for learning the Sámi language. This curriculum is for students who are in the process of reclaiming the language (Leonard, 2017) for themselves, their families and for the Sámi community. From the 1997 reform onwards, the system of differentiation has been further developed. Today there are two tracks into the subject Sámi as a second language, one for students with some Sámi language experience (Sami as second language 2), and one for students with no experience in Sámi (i.e., Sami as second language 3 in primary and lower secondary school, and Sami as second language 4 in upper secondary school).

In a broader perspective, the 1974 curriculum could be said to express an idea of social cohesion (May, 2017) in the Sámi society through the Sámi as 'mother tongue'. Since the 1987 curricula, the curricular differentiation between first and second language acknowledges diversity in Sámi language experiences and competences. With this differentiation, the education system is not only about maintaining Sámi for those who managed to keep the language despite the Norwegianisation politics. This differentiation also shows how the education system invests in reclaiming Sámi for students with little or no Sámi language experience.

Discourse of active participation

Sámi political engagement and activism have been important for finding new directions for Norway's Sámi politics from the 1950s. This value is also present in the Sámi language curricula, where active participation is described as a value for future Sámi citizens. From the 1987 reform and until today, this discourse of active participation is linked to Sámi language competence, like in this quote from the 1987 Sámi as first language curriculum: 'The society needs people who can participate actively in society, who express their opinions and through this contribute to influence the future development' (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1987, p. 157). In the 2020 Sámi as first language curriculum, we find a similar goal:

'The subject shall contribute to the students' social learning and to preparation of students for participation in democratic processes in different parts of society and in working life' (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a).

Given the context of the Sámi language curricula, the quotes refer to Sámi values and language use in Sámi society.

At the same time there is a noticeable difference between the first-language and second-language subjects with respect to the connection between language and

participation. The overall discourse is that first-language students are considered to have Sámi as their mother tongue, and they are learning to express themselves and participate actively in and for the Sámi society. Second language students are framed to be part of a bilingual society where active knowledge in both languages is required. In this bilingual society, they have Norwegian as their mother tongue, and through Sámi as second language they ‘develop practical and functional knowledge of Sámi’ (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1987, p. 170), rephrased in L97 as ‘functional bilingualism’ (Kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet, 1996, p. 141). Second language students are developing Sámi language competence to the extent that they can be active participants in Sámi societies. These ideas are followed up in the 2020 curricula, in which second-language students are envisaged as becoming users of Sámi and developing their sense of belonging to their own Sámi communities:

The subject shall contribute to that the students become Sámi language users. [...] The subject shall contribute to that the students get a positive self-image and a safe identity as Sámi language users, and that they develop their belonging to their own language community, to Sápmi/Sábme/Saepmie and the global Indigenous community. (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020b)

For second-language students, participation in democratic processes is not mentioned. In comparison, first-language students already belong to Sámi communities, and they participate in democratic processes. This difference is expressed partly by the absence of the ideas of *becoming* and of *developing*, and partly by explicit mentioning of participation in democratic processes in Sámi as a first language, which as we saw was not mentioned in the 2020 Sámi as second language curriculum (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a, 2020b).

There are also different participation roles apparent in a language policy and planning discourse that is present in the Sámi as first language curricula in 1987 and 2020. In 1987 the teaching of Sámi as a first language should emphasise ‘language cultivation’ (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1987), and in 2020 knowledge and awareness about Sámi contributes to that students ‘can care for and develop the language for the future’ (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a). This social role as a language cultivator is not described in any of the second-language curricula.

The difference in social roles between first- and second-language students is highlighted by the fact that in the 2006 curricula, the distinction in terms of language competence and membership was downplayed. The following phrase was used in both of the 2006 curricula: ‘Education in Sámi language shall contribute to that children and adolescents can be incorporated into Sámi culture and society’ (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2006a, 2006b). Here, the use of the modal verb

‘can’ in the phrase ‘can be incorporated’ is important, as both first- and second-language students were considered to be becoming members of the Sámi societies. Nevertheless, the main idea that has developed over the decades is that there is a difference with respect to active participation between those who already have Sámi and those who are becoming speakers of Sámi. Embedded in the discourse on participation as part of citizenship is a view of Sámi societies and Sámi citizens that is based on Sámi language competence.

As language is important in the discourse of participation, it is interesting to identify the ‘articulated imagined communities’ (see Gjerpe, 2017) where the students can participate. Over the reforms since 1974, there is a growing awareness of society and place in the curricula. As the 1974 curriculum aimed to transition the student into Norwegian as a main language of learning, this suggests that the Norwegian society is an implicit imagined community for participation. In the 1974 core curriculum, there is a chapter about students in ‘language mixed areas’ that serves to locate Sámi languages to areas in the north (North Sámi) and in the middle of Norway (South Sámi) (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1974, pp. 71–72). With updated terminology, the 1987 core curriculum describes the distribution of Sámi languages, and in addition mentions the unity between Sámi people across Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1987, pp. 33–35). This practice is continued in later curricula, and, from 2006, with reference to the name of the Sámi nation in three Sámi languages, Sámegiella/Sápmi/Saepmie (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2006; see also Gjerpe, 2017). In the 2020 curricula, Sámi language competence is considered to connect the students to Sámi societies in Norway as well as the whole of Sámegiella and the global Indigenous community.

Although the focus in the Sámi language curricula is on Sámi language competence for Sámi societies, this is situated in a context where Norwegian is the majorised language. The Norwegian language therefore is present in the discourse on active participation in the Sámi language curricula. In the 1974 curriculum, the students were expected to develop competence through Sámi that would later be useful in Norwegian and in a Norwegian context (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1974, p. 116). In the 1987 Sámi as second language curriculum, the first sentence states that ‘a bilingual society needs participants with active competence in both languages’ (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1987, p. 170). In the 2020 curricula, the role of Norwegian in active participation is connected to multilingualism, and students ‘shall be able to use their multilingual and multicultural competence in different Sámi, national, international and Indigenous contexts’ (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a; see also Johansen & Markusson, this volume, on multilingual citizenship).

When it comes to the description of Sámi communities in Norway, there is a discursive difference between the Sámi as first language and the Sámi as second

language curricula. In the 1987 Sámi as second language curriculum, there was a goal of learning to express oneself in formal and informal situations in daily life (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1987, p. 170). From this goal, the students' Sámi language competence is linked to daily life in their 'milieu' (*miljøet*). In comparison, in the M87 first language curriculum, the place of participation is the 'society' (*samfunnnet*) (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet, 1987, p. 157), which denotes a wider space scale than milieu. This difference in scale in the perspective of place and society is also present in the 2020 curricula. The Sámi as first language curriculum mentions both the Sámi society, the Norwegian society and 'area belonging' (*områdetilhørighet*) (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020a). The latter is described as one of the fundamental Sámi values in Sámi language education. The phrase 'area belonging' is vague, but might refer to the wider language areas (e.g., North Sámi, Lule Sámi and South Sámi areas). Interestingly, this phrase is missing in the second-language curriculum (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2020b). Here belonging to place is linked to 'own language community' (*eget språksamfunn*), which denotes a more specific place, for instance, where the student comes from. From this, we see that the 2020 curricula express a place scale (see Hult, 2015), where the Sámi as first language students have a wider and more overarching 'articulated imagined community' (see Gjerpe, 2017) compared to the Sámi as second language students. This difference is also connected to power, as the overarching society is linked to wider political power than a local community, hence the curricula express a hierarchy within the Sámi society (see also Olsen, this volume).

To summarise, the three discourses are intertwined and point towards the same direction, namely to centre Sámi language as a part of a process of de-minorising Sámi and creating social cohesion within Sápmi. At the same time, the language education policy acknowledges pluralism, both through references to different social settings across Sápmi, to diverse starting points for pursuing Sámi language education, and to multilingualism. How this acknowledgement is discursively constructed has developed through the reforms since 1974. Depending on their Sámi language competence, which is linked to the colonial past and the history of family and place, the students are or can become active citizens using Sámi in Sámi societies and communities. In the curricula, the idea of belonging to a Sámi society and place is part of the idea of the active, participating citizen. These changes in the curriculum discourse represent a development in the society towards seeing Sámi language competence as not only relevant for the individual student's language learning and development, but also a foundation for an idea of collectiveness and social cohesion within Sápmi. In this context where colonialism and assimilation politics hit hard, social cohesion is complemented with an acknowledgement of diversity within the Sámi society.

DISCUSSION

The analysis has shown that there have been developments in the Sámi language curricula between 1974 and 2020, and through this development we see that official Sámi language education policy is dynamic (see also McCarty, 2011). The changes emerge from chains of what Isin (2008) describes as acts of citizenship, and they reflect political activism during the years 1950–2020 for the Sámi living in Norway (see also Andresen et al., 2021; Broderstad, this volume). This development includes dealing with the complexity and diversity of Sámi language experiences created by colonisation and assimilation politics. Given the view that the use of language and other semiotic resources in the curricula not only reflects social reality but is also used to accomplish something (see also Scollon & Scollon, 2004, p. 2), it is interesting to discuss what the curricula do.

One of the discourses that has developed over the years is the close relationship between Sámi language competence and citizenship as active participation in Sámi society and Sámi communities. This finding supports the idea of developing social cohesion (see May, 2017), and mass education plays an important role in promoting Sámi as a highly important language in Sámi society. The legacy of colonial de-legitimisation and minorisation of the Sámi languages and its users is nevertheless still causing language shifts. According to Aikio-Puoskari (2018, p. 356), even in the few communities where Sámi is the majority language, the language is not safe. In this way, the role of the Sámi languages in social cohesion seems to be linked to two diverging processes that on both long and short timescales frame Sámi language education policy, namely nation-state-initiated language shifts on the one hand, and Sámi initiatives to maintain, revitalise and reclaim Sámi on the other. In this context, the Sámi language curriculum envisions a special role for the Sámi as first language students in Sámi society. As language bearers they are the future Sámi language cultivators. As Sámi language education is a tool to decolonising and Indigenising education, these students are at the front of resisting and overcoming the legacy of colonialism and Norwegianisation on a societal level. There is thus an urgent need for Sámi society to support those who grow up using Sámi daily (see also Todal, 2004).

The curricula differentiate between different levels of Sámi language competence, namely Sámi as a first language and two tracks of Sámi as a second language. The ideas of diversity and differentiation in Sámi language education acknowledge that language shift is one of the effects of colonisation and Norwegianisation, and that it is possible and desirable on an individual as well as societal level to reclaim Sámi. In addition to the two second language tracks in the curriculum, diversity is also supported by the role of local place and belonging in language learning.

Acknowledging diversity makes space for many ways of creating a sense of Sámi belonging, and thus also many ways of active participation. The main role envisioned for the second-language students is, according to the curriculum, to be active users of the Sámi language in local communities, and thus from the ground up to be part of the overarching process of language (re)vitalisation and reclamation (see also Todal, 2004).

In the 2020 curricula, there is a balancing act between creating and maintaining social cohesion and acknowledging diversity. In seeing Sámi language competence as a criterion for participation in Sámi societies, the Sámi language is linked to citizenship in the curricula. Sámi as first language students are from the outset considered to be Sámi citizens, while Sámi as second language students can become citizens through becoming active users of Sámi. Following Isin (2009, p. 371), this is a differentiation between ‘citizens’ and ‘subjects’, or insiders and outsiders, which is in a hierarchical relationship. This is, however, not a clear or static situation, as second-language students can develop their status to become insiders and citizens at least through becoming new, active users of Sámi. Labelling the Sámi subjects as ‘first language’ and ‘second language’ therefore seems to not only point to students’ sequenced language acquisition trajectories (Sámi or Norwegian first), but it also differentiates social roles and power relations in the Sámi societies.

Curricula are statements about the past, the present and the future. Based on the past experiences and ideas about the future, the 2020 curricula see Sámi language competence as essential for active citizenship and ultimately also social cohesion. My interpretation is that seeing Sámi language competence as an indicator of citizenship is a language ideology (see Irvine & Gal, 2000) that has been expressed since 1974, and the first phase of dismantling the Norwegianisation policies in and through education. The 1974 curriculum was primarily for Sámi ‘mother tongue’ students, and typically these students are from North Sámi areas where Sámi language against all the odds was maintained throughout the long phase of assimilatory politics. In the later reforms, this language ideology has become an integrated part of the Sámi language education policy.

At this point, it is interesting to ask how the expressed relationship between language and citizenship in the curriculum relates to the wider Sámi society today. Looking at the Sámi political system in Norway, the link between language competence and citizenship seems to be less strict compared to the curricula. To enter the electoral registry for the Sámi parliament, a person must fulfil subjective and objective criteria. Firstly, a person must identify as Sámi and then demonstrate that they, or that at least one of their parents, grandparents or great-grandparents spoke Sámi at home, or that one of their parents is or was registered in the Sámi electorate (see Sametinget, n.d.; Berg-Nordlie, 2021, p. 3). Hence, there is no

requirement to be an active user of Sámi to be eligible for a seat in the parliament. At the same time, the question of Sámi language competence and citizenship is an emotional topic that from time to time emerges in public debates (Berg-Nordlie, 2021, pp. 12–13). While there is a strong shared determination to strengthen the Sámi languages, this determination in some cases creates a feeling of marginalisation among Sámi who do not (yet or anymore) have Sámi language competence. For people, families and communities who have experienced language shift, these are multifaceted discussions, which involve values like legitimacy and authenticity as Sámi.

In practice and looking beyond the curricula and the electoral register, identifying as Sámi, belonging to Sámi societies, and active participation is not dependent on a person's language competence. This suggests that the links between language competence and citizenship in the Sámi language curricula is an expression of dominant language ideologies in official language education policies, and of the significance of Sámi language as a value and an indicator of distinct Sámi identity. What we learn, then, from the role of Sámi language in the electoral registry for the Sámi parliament and public debates, is that there are more language ideologies at work in the Sámi society than what we find in the curricula. There is thus an ambivalence between the language education policy, and other language policy domains. Potentially, the tension can affect a sense of belonging to and thus also active participation as citizenship practice in the Sámi society, or as Stroud (2016) writes,

‘Feeling in or out of place is one of the main determinants behind whether individuals are able to exercise agency and local participation, as well as whether encounters across difference are expressed as contest or conviviality. (p. 3)

At this point it is important to notice that curricula are intentions, something to work towards. There is thus a space for local interpretation and practice (see Hornberger, 2002; Menken & García, 2010). Following this, the overarching language policy can be adapted locally to the specific Sámi language situation. In this context, the emphasis of the dynamics of place and place-based pedagogy (see Fogarty & Sollid, this volume) is an ideological space where the complex and dynamic links between Sámi language competence and citizenship can be worked out.

FINAL REMARKS

The relationship between language and citizenship in Sámi language curricula has developed from 1974 to 2020, and they show how the society through the curricula

is dealing with the colonial past. In 1974 the Sámi language curriculum was a tool for early literacy learning for the individual students who would eventually transition into using Norwegian as the medium for learning. Today, in addition to goals of language competence in Sámi, the curricula mediate belonging to and encouraging active participation in Sámi communities and societies within and across nation-state borders. The Sámi language curricula are both an expression of social cohesion and a recognition of Sámi diversity and multilingualism. The development in the curricula shows that the balance between cohesion and diversity is not decided once and for all in the official language education policy. Also, there is an ideological space where teachers, students, and parents as local policy makers can implement the language policy according to the local context.

REFERENCES

- Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual review of anthropology*, 30(1), 109–137. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.109>
- Aikio-Puoskari, U. (2018). Revitalization of Sámi languages in three Nordic countries. In L. Hinton, L. Huss, & G. Roche (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of revitalization* (pp. 355–363). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Andresen, A., Evjen, B., & Ryymin, T. (2021). *Samenes historie fra 1751–2010*. Oslo, Norway: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Apple, M. J. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum* (2nd ed.). New York, NY, London, UK: Routledge.
- Berg-Nordlie, M. (2021). ‘Sámi in the Heart’: Kinship, culture, and community as foundations for indigenous Sámi identity in Norway. *Ethnopolitics*, 21(4). <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2021.1932116>
- Costa, J., De Korne, H., & Lane, P. (2017). Standardising minority languages. Reinventing peripheral languages in the 21st century. In P. Lane, J. Costa, & H. De Korne (Eds.), *Standardizing minority languages: Competing ideologies of authority and authenticity in the global periphery* (pp. 1–23). London, UK: Routledge.
- Dahl, G. (2017). Konfirmasjonen i gamle dager – Tvang eller tilpasning? Kirkebøkene forteller. *Prismet*, (1–2), 77–93. <https://doi.org/10.5617/pri.4766>
- Dahl, H. (1957). *Språkpolitikk og skolestell i Finnmark 1814–1905*. Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Gjerpe, K. K. (2017). Samisklæreplanverk – En symbolsk forpliktelse? *Nordic Studies in Education*, (3–04), 150–165. <https://doi-org.mime.uit.no/10.18261/issn.1891-5949-2017-03-04-03>
- Hornberger, N. (2002). Multilingual language policies and the continua of biliteracy: An ecological approach. *Language Policy*, 1, 27–51. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014548611951>
- Horner, K. (2015). Discourses on language and citizenship in Europe. *Language and linguistics compass*, 9(5), 209–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12133>
- Hult, F. M. (2015). Making policy connections across scales using nexus analysis. In F. M. Hult & D. C. Johnson (Eds.), *Research methods in language policy and planning* (pp. 217–231). Malden, MA: Wiley.

- Huss, L. (1999). *Reversing language shift in the far North: Linguistic revitalization in northern Scandinavia and Finland*. Uppsala, Sweden: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language. Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 35–83). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Isin, E. F. (2008). Theorizing acts of citizenship. In E. F. Isin & G. Nielsen (Eds.), *Acts of citizenship* (pp. 1–12). London, UK, New York, NY: Zed Books.
- Isin, E. F. (2009). Citizenship in flux: The figure of the activist citizenship. *Subjectivity*, 29, 367–388. <https://doi.org/10.1057/sub.2009.25>
- Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet. (1974). *Mønsterplan for grunnskolen*.
- Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet. (1987). *Mønsterplan for grunnskolen*.
- Kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet. (1996). *Læreplanverket for den 10-årige grunnskolen*.
- Kunnskapsdepartementet. (2006). *Læreplan for kunnskapsløftet 2006*.
- Kunnskapsdepartementet. (2020). *Læreplan for kunnskapsløftet 2020*.
- Leglise, I., & Alby, S. (2006). Minorization and the process of (de)minoritization: The case of Kali'na in French Guiana. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 182, 67–85.
- Leonard, W. Y. (2017). Producing language reclamation by decolonising 'language'. *Language Documentation and Description*, 14, 15–36. <http://www.e-publishing.org/PID/150>
- May, S. (2017). Language education, pluralism and citizenship. In T. L. McCarty & S. May (Eds.), *Language policy and political issues in education* (pp. 31–45). Cham, Switzerland: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02344-1_3
- McCarty, T. L. (Ed.). (2011). *Ethnography and language policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Menken, K., & García, O. (2010). *Negotiating language education policies: Educators as policy-makers*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Minde, H. (2003). Assimilation of the Sami – Implementation and consequences. *Acta Borealia*, 20(2), 121–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08003830310002877>
- Pietikäinen, S., Huss, L., Laihiala-Kankainen, S., Aikio-Puoskari, U., & Lane, P. (2010). Regulating multilingualism in the North Calotte: The case of Kven, Meänkieli and Sámi languages. *Acta Borealia*, 27(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08003831.2010.486923>
- Porsanger, J. (2019). Building Sámi language higher education: The case of Sámi University of Applied Sciences. In E. A. McKinley & L. Tuhiwai Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of Indigenous education* (pp. 969–995). Singapore: Springer.
- Sametinget. (n.d.). Innmelding i valgmanntallet. Retrieved from <https://sametinget.no/politikk/valg/sametingets-valgmanntall/innmelding-i-valgmanntallet/>
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (2004). *Nexus analysis. Discourse and the emerging internet*. London, UK, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sollid, H. (2009). Utforsking av nordnorske etnolekter i et faghistorisk lys. *Maal og Minne*, 2–2009, 147–169. <https://ojs.novus.no/index.php/MOM/article/view/299>
- Sollid, H., & Olsen, T. A. (2019). Indigenising education: Scales, interfaces and acts of citizenship in Sápmi. *Junctures*, 20, 29–42. <https://doi.org/10.34074/junc.20029>
- Storjord, M. H. (2008). *Barnehagebarns liv i en samisk kontekst. En arena for kulturell meningskaping* (Ph.D. dissertation). University of Tromsø, Tromsø.

- Stroud, C. (2016). Turbulent linguistics landscapes and the semiotics of citizenship. In R. Blackwood, E. Lanza, & H. Woldemariam, (Eds.), *Negotiating and contesting identities in linguistic landscapes* (pp. 3–18). London, UK, New York, NY: Bloomsbury.
- Todal, J. (2002). ‘-jos fal gáhttet gollegielat’: *Vitalisering av samisk språk i Noreg på 1990-talet* (Ph.D. dissertation). Universitetet i Tromsø, Tromsø.
- Todal, J. (2003). The Sámi school system in Norway and international cooperation. *Comparative Education*, 39(2), 185–192. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3099878>
- Todal, J. (2004). ‘Det lappiske Tungemaal til at forstaa’. Ei vurdering av andrespråkfaget som reiskap for språkleg vitalisering. In T. O. Engen & K. J. Solstad (Eds.), *En likeverdig skole for alle?* (pp. 220–235). Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Todal, J. (2009). Undervisninga i samisk som førstespråk i Noreg. Eit kort tilbakeblikk. In S. Lund, E. Boine, S. B. Johansen, S. Rasmussen (Eds.), *Samisk skolehistorie 3. Kárašjohka: Davvi Girji*. <http://skuvla.info/skolehist/todal-n.htm>
- Todal, J. (2015). Forvaltningsområdet for samisk språk i tju år: Kva rolle har forvaltningsområdet spela i offentleg samisk språkplanlegging? In B. Bjerkli & P. Selle (Eds.), *Samepolitikken utvikling* (pp. 198–224). Oslo, Norway: Gyldendal Akademisk.
- Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2006a). *Læreplan i samisk som førstespråk* (SFS-01). Retrieved from <https://www.udir.no/kl06/SFS1-01>
- Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2006b). *Læreplan i samisk som andrespråk* (SAS1-01). Retrieved from <https://www.udir.no/kl06/sas1-01/>
- Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020a). *Læreplan i samisk som førstespråk* (SFS01-05). Retrieved from <https://www.udir.no/lk20/sfs01-05/om-faget/fagets-relevans-og-verdier?lang=nob>
- Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020b). *Læreplan i samisk som andrespråk* (SAS02-01). Retrieved from <https://www.udir.no/lk20/sas02-01/om-faget/fagets-relevans-og-verdier?lang=nob>
- Venås, K. (1993). On the choice between two written standards in Norway. In E. H. Jahr (Ed.), *Language conflict and language planning. Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs* (pp. 263–278). Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.