International Journal of Inclusive Education

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tied20

Inclusion as indigenisation? Sámi perspectives in teacher education

Hege Merete Somby & Torjer Andreas Olsen

To cite this article: Hege Merete Somby & Torjer Andreas Olsen (2022): Inclusion as indigenisation? Sámi perspectives in teacher education, International Journal of Inclusive Education, DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2022.2127495

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2022.2127495

© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

Published online: 02 Oct 2022.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 312

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=tied20

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION
https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2022.2127495

Inclusion as indigenisation? Sámi perspectives in teacher education

Hege Merete Somby [a] and Torjer Andreas Olsen [b]

[a]Faculty of Education, Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences, Hamar, Norway; [b]Olsen Centre for Sámi studies, The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway

ABSTRACT
The Norwegian educational system is in the process of recognising and incorporating the rights of the Sámi as an Indigenous people. This transition will place new and challenging demands on teacher education programmes. The international goal within the field of inclusive education has been to give all children and youth equal opportunities for education, as exemplified by the UN Sustainable Development Goals and the Salamanca Statement. However, the literature still commonly defines inclusive education according to the place of education (inclusion as placement). Moreover, the Indigenous community in Norway has largely been victimised by an assimilation process that employs *placement* in ordinary education as a primary strategy. Now that the Norwegian education system has placed more emphasis on recognising and incorporating the rights of the Sámi as an Indigenous people, teacher programmes must be examined to determine how they reflect this added focus on the Sámi culture. Will an inclusion approach be sufficient? Or are more radical strategies towards indigenisation needed?

KEYWORDS
Inclusion; Indigenous people; teacher education

Introduction

In Norway, where the Sámi are recognised as an Indigenous people, Sámi issues are gaining more attention in the educational context, exemplified by the 'Framework Plan for Kindergartens' (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training 2017) and the 'National Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion in Primary and Secondary Education and Training' (Ministry of Education and Research 2017). For instance, the 'Framework Plan for Kindergartens' has acknowledged the rights of Indigenous peoples and Sámi children as part of its '*Core Values*' since the plan was originally approved in 1996. The 2017 version has moved beyond recognising the specific legislative rights for Sámi children by adding a passage in the '*Core Values*' section pointing to kindergarten programmes' responsibility for ensuring 'respect for and solidarity with the diversity of Sami culture' (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training 2017, 9). The publication of

CONTACT Hege Merete Somby hege.somby@inn.no Fakultet for lærerutdanning og pedagogikk, Høgskolen i Innlandet, Postboks 400 Vestad, 2418 Elverum, Norway

© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

the current national curriculum in 2017 marked the first time the Sámi were acknowledged as an Indigenous people, anchoring rights for Sámi pupils in the International Labour Organisation Convention C169 Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (International Labour Conference [ILO-169] 1989). Before being finalised in 2017, the curriculum underwent substantial changes related to the education of Sámi pupils and the incorporation of Sámi themes for all pupils (see, for instance, Olsen and Andreassen 2018). At the end of the nineteenth century, Sámi language was only allowed for educational purposes when absolutely necessary, and according to an 1880 directive from the Directors of Troms, 'all Sami and Kven[1] children were to learn to speak, read and write Norwegian, while all previous clauses saying that the children were to learn their native tongue were repealed' (Minde 2005, 13). Today, Sámi students have the right to speak and learn their mother tongue, both in kindergarten and compulsory school. Moreover, all pupils must learn about the Sámi as an Indigenous people, and this knowledge 'must be carried forward by present and future generations' (Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research 2017, 5), the quoted verbiage representing a historical change in rhetoric by the ministry. These changes require revisions in teacher education programmes to reflect the current content and intentions of the curriculum.

Although Sámi perspectives are included in the curriculum, teaching and training related to Sámi perspectives do not necessarily ensure the provision of an inclusive education, nor do they necessarily offer an inclusive education for Sámi pupils. Although the Sámi area extends from the far north to central parts of Norway, Sámi children live in all Norwegian municipalities. In some, Sámi schools are teaching from a Sámi curriculum (since 1997); otherwise, most Sámi children attend regular schools (Gjerpe 2017) where the main educational language and culture is Norwegian.

Many countries have supported inclusive education for decades in policy documents, practice and research (see, for instance, Ainscow and César 2006; Göransson and Nilholm 2014). However, the gap between *integration* and *inclusion* with respect to marginalised groups in education is still debated by scholars, although with some agreement that 'inclusion is not only about physical placement' (Göransson and Nilholm 2014, 265). Indeed, integrating students into regular classes does not necessarily constitute an inclusive education. The fact that the 'placement' definition of inclusion remains the most common (Nilholm and Göransson 2017) indicates a narrow understanding of inclusive education.

Norway has a long tradition of universal schooling with a guiding principle of providing education to all within mainstream learning environments, regardless of individual or social conditions (Nes, Demo, and Ianes 2018). However, some student populations have been educated outside the mainstream class, specifically, children receiving special education (Demo et al. 2021). In the context of the Sámi, the integration versus inclusion issue is especially relevant because the education Sámi pupils in Norway have traditionally received is based on the Norwegian curriculum, with Norwegian-centred topics and values, demonstrating that the strategy for integrating Sámi learners into mainstream education has been one of 'placement'. Although Sámi students have been integrated, the education they have received has not been inclusive and has not met their formal educational needs; instead, while overlooking Sámi values and worldviews and the history and needs of the Sámi population, the education reflects a Norwegian majority perspective, teaches the traditional Norwegian history (e.g. Pedersen 2021),

presents traditional Norwegian literature in textbooks (Bakken forthcoming) or presents Lutheran Christianity as the mainstream Norwegian religious culture (see, e.g. Olsen 2017). Eriksen (2018) argued that teaching about and for 'the Other' (in this case, the Sámi) is visible in Norwegian textbooks. The Sámi are depicted, however, in a way that maintains stereotypes about them, a finding supported by multiple studies (Askeland 2016; Kolpus 2015; Mortensen-Buan 2016 in Eriksen 2018). Historically, establishment of a monocultural education has been part of a nation building process that aimed for assimilation for several groups and/or individuals (see, for instance, Skrefsrud 2016). Today, teacher education programmes are criticised for not adequately preparing Norwegian teacher students to teach in a multicultural school and society (Cochran-Smith et al. 2020)

Within Indigenous education, both 'decolonisation' and 'indigenisation' can describe the relation to the colonial system. They form an interesting contrast as different but connected strategies related to addressing the colonial past, present and future. Where decolonisation is primarily oriented towards the critical and deconstructive approach to lasting colonial structures, indigenisation takes a more (re)constructive approach, aiming to articulate Indigenous spaces, voices and ideas. We argue that, in order to achieve an inclusive approach within mainstream education, we need both, that one without the other is not sufficient, and an education that reflects these notions represents a broad understanding of inclusive education. We need the critical approach to the past and the proper analysis of how colonialism has impacted, damaged and stolen Indigenous land, culture and language, but we also need the space in teacher education to discuss the reclamation of Indigenous land, culture and language in current and future settings. To this end, we address the current representation of Sámi people and issues in teacher education programmes.

Theoretical points of departure

Even though *inclusion* as an educational phenomenon is much debated in the research (Göransson and Nilholm 2014; Kiuppis and Hausstätter 2014; Messiou 2017), that the concept revolves around terms such as fellowship, participation, democratisation, benefit, equal access, quality, equity and justice (see, for instance, Haug 2017) seems to be globally understood. However, *inclusive education* is often seen in combination with special education or special educational needs (see, for instance, Göransson and Nilholm 2014; Hausstätter and Vik 2021) and concerns that 'inclusion equals special education' have been raised in the field of research (see, for instance, Hausstätter 2013; Magnússon 2019; Nilholm and Göransson 2017). A review from Göransson and Nilholm (2014) confirmed that 'placement' as a category for inclusive education still has explanatory ability, despite the critique of such a narrow perspective. Swedish researchers investigated how inclusive education is understood in research and identified four categories that emerged in the literature: (a) inclusion as placement of pupils with disabilities in mainstream education, (b) inclusion as meeting both social and academic needs of pupils with disabilities, (c) inclusion as meeting both social and academic needs of all pupils and (d) inclusion as creation of communities with specific characteristics. Under the first two categories, an individualised definition of needs and research concerning children with disabilities is targeted, confirming the concerns mentioned

previously and reflecting a narrow definition of inclusion (for a supplementary discusson, see Haug 2017). The third category embraces all students but still targets individual learners' needs as 'meeting the (…) needs of *all* pupils' (Göransson and Nilholm 2014, 268), while the fourth views inclusion on the community level, not the individual level; both categories reflect a broad definition of inclusion (see Haug 2017). Indeed, a broad definition of inclusion extends beyond disabilities to concern all students and marginalised groups but, also, and important for education for Indigenous people, encompasses a non-categorical approach in which diversity is a starting point for educational theory and practice (Kiuppis and Hausstätter 2014). Similar theoretical constructs have been drawn previously. For example, Kiuppis and Hausstätter (2014) identified three agendas in the international literature that cover (1) inclusion as special needs education in mainstream education for children with disabilities (like a and b in the previous list), (2) inclusion as meeting special needs in mainstream education for all but, especially, for targeted groups conceived as vulnerable (for instance, Indigenous groups, as in the previously described category c) and (3) inclusion as an approach to diversity and heterogenous learning populations without categorising specific groups (similar to category d).

Opertti, Zachary, and Zhang (2014) also described these trajectories but placed them on a timeline. Initially, inclusion is understood as a right, building on the 1948 United Nations Declaration of Human Rights to proclaim all children's right to an education, aiming towards social justice (Opertti, Zachary, and Zhang 2014, referring to Rioux 2007). Second, inclusion is understood as an action to improve education for children with special needs, supporting the Salamanca Statement from 1994 and the Framework for Action on Special Needs Education (UNESCO 1994). Then, considering the developments for marginalised groups that followed from the World Education Forum in Dakar (World Education Forum 2000), as of 2014, inclusion is understood as transforming education 'across all its levels, provisions, and settings, to deliver on the promise of a quality education for all' (Opertti, Zachary, and Zhang 2014, 150).

Expanding the perspective on inclusive education to embrace Indigenous peoples has been achieved by researchers such as Maxwell and Bakke (2019), who argued for 'educational inclusiveness in general as well as cultural inclusiveness', and Keskitalo and Olsen (2019), who highlighted the need for 'avoiding various types of othering'. From an Indigenous perspective, this can imply that children from essentially marginalised Indigenous communities have access to education equal to that of any other child (United Nations 2014). Inclusion is, thus, connected to a rights discourse and to Indigenous peoples' rights to education, as stated in international treaties. However, from a Norwegian and Sámi perspective, inclusive education also has considered the Norwegian comprehensive school's ideas and practices and the assimilation policy directed towards the Sámi (Maxwell and Bakke 2019, 102).

Indigenisation forms an interesting pair with decolonisation, and both concepts have been investigated by scholars (c.f. Battiste 2013; Nakata 2007; Smith 2012; Tuck and Yang 2012). In their often-cited paper, Tuck and Yang (2012) emphasise that decolonisation must be understood as something physical and concrete – not as a metaphor. If colonisation involves the takeover of land, institutions, language, knowledge, minds and other resources, then decolonisation must involve their reclamation. Decolonising education, then, may equate to reclaiming knowledge, institutions and minds. In academic and

educational texts, decolonisation still often involves a critical investigation into the colonial impacts on Indigenous communities. Nakata (2006) references indigenisation as a strategy within research and academic work, creating a recognisably Indigenous space within universities that culturally affirms Indigenous people and practices. This is clearly transferrable to the sphere of primary and secondary education, indicating the need to create educational spaces in that context that culturally affirm Indigenous people and practices, which we consider the realisation of a broad understanding of inclusive education that can benefit Indigenous and non-Indigenous people alike. Smith, Tuck, and Yang (2019) presented a bridge between decolonisation and indigenisation and added critical remarks, stating that their work to decolonise education included creating 'new approaches to education that theorise, revitalise, enhance, and produce Indigenous educational experiences that support Indigenous futures' (Smith, Tuck, and Yang 2019, 6). This seems an appropriate characterisation of indigenisation. The authors also warned readers to be cautious by investigating who makes the call to indigenise and controls how it is articulated, as well as the Indigenous capacity being established (Smith, Tuck, and Yang 2019).

Context: Sámi education and teacher education

In Norway, the Sámi situation and Sámi languages have undergone dramatic changes. As they are for Indigenous peoples worldwide, questions regarding language and identity are highly politicised in the Sámi context. As such, global, national, regional, local and personal perspectives must be considered to gain a full understanding when discussing Sámi education. In the current analysis, although we start in this section at the national level, we recognise implications for and connections to the other perspectives.

A historical overview

Many have already provided historical overviews of Sámi education in Norway (Bergland 2001; Hirvonen 2004; Keskitalo and Olsen 2019; Olsen 2019), which we summarise here. From the time of Christian missions in the early 1700s, school was a key arena for practicing state politics, including those related to Sámi matters. Through Christian missionary work, the Sámi Indigenous religion (*noaidevuohta*) essentially disappeared. This became more evident with the introduction of Norwegianisation, the assimilation policy followed from the mid-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. A goal of Norwegianisation was to assimilate minority groups living within the state borders. The Sámi, one of these groups, experienced the multi-faceted political ideology and practices this involved. Norwegianisation had a devastating impact on Sámi communities. Some Sámi dialects disappeared; some Sámi languages were pushed to (near) extinction. Schools' and teachers' practices varied, but the results are clear: The Sámi society changed.

Contemporary politics pertaining to Sámi education depends on assimilation and colonisation. Norway began in the mid-1980s to change its policy towards the Sámi. The 1987 Sámi Act, the 1988 Sámi Constitution Article, the 1989 establishment of the Sámi Parliament and the 1990 ratification of ILO-169 'On the Rights of Tribal and Indigenous Peoples' (International Labour Conference [ILO] 1989) reflect the policy of recognition. Lule Sámi, South Sámi and North Sámi are now official languages in Norway. Moreover, 1997 saw the launch of the first national Sámi curriculum, a separate but

equivalent and parallel curriculum for education in Sámi schools or for pupils with a legal right (through the Education Act) to education in and on the Sámi language. This was an important milestone for Sámi education in Norway (Gjerpe 2017).

The curricula for all educational levels – early childhood through higher education – continue to more closely represent the ideological statements of a system wherein the recognition of Sámi rights is significant and defining (Olsen 2021). The education system, from kindergarten to teacher education programmes, is bound by law to provide education in Sámi languages for Sámi students and education about Sámi history, society, language and rights for all students in Norway.

The implementation of these curricula, however, is challenging, as the historical lines cannot be ignored. One result of the long Norwegianisation period was a dramatic decline in the number of Sámi language speakers. Thus, although many have found their Sámi ancestry and identity through the revitalisation of the culture in Norwegianised contexts, the languages are not as easily reclaimed, leading to declining numbers of *current* and *potential* Sámi language speakers.

Another consequence of Norwegianisation is that many pre-service teachers lack knowledge on Sámi history, society, languages and rights for Sámi-speaking students, especially outside Sámi areas (in some municipalities from Norway's far north to its centre). Pedersen (2021) proposed as a possible reason the exclusion of Sámi history from the national history, which led to the absence of Sámi people and history in literature. From an Indigenous perspective, such a strategy is not unknown. Olsen (2017) observed three approaches to representing Indigenous peoples and histories in publications: absence, inclusion and indigenisation. The first is characterised by the absence of Indigenous peoples and issues from literature and textbooks; history is told from a perspective that excludes these minorities. Under the inclusion strategy, only certain aspects of Indigenous peoples' stories are told, which in practice, according to Olsen (2017), presents a majority perspective on the terms of the majority. The indigenisation approach implies that Indigenous perspectives are valued and can contribute to our understanding of various issues (Olsen 2017). According to Olsen (2017) and Eriksen (2018), textbooks in mainstream Norwegian compulsory education linger in the second strategy. Therefore, the current implementation of new curricula in primary, lower and upper secondary schools presents two challenges: offering education in Sámi languages and providing education and knowledge about Sámi history and society.

Teacher education in Norway faces related dilemmas. Teacher education programmes exist throughout Norway in universities and university colleges. These programmes must comply with the teacher education study curriculum and the curriculum of compulsory education. Thus, all programmes are obliged to provide their students with an education that includes proper knowledge about the Sámi culture.

The three teacher training institutions in the northernmost part of Norway (in the Sámi area) – Nord University, UiT the Arctic University of Norway and Sámi University of Applied Sciences – have an additional mandate related to the three official Sámi languages. Nord University offers a Lule Sámi and a South Sámi teacher education programme, as well as an early childhood teacher education programme with a special Sámi focus. Sámi University of Applied Sciences provides the North Sámi teacher education for both compulsory school and early childhood education. UiT The Arctic University also has a North Sámi teacher education programme for upper secondary school for

teachers in Sámi schools, as well as an ambition to integrate Sámi knowledge and perspectives in its main teacher education programmes attended by Sámi and non-Sámi learners.

Teacher education

Teacher education in Norway encompasses several levels of the profession, from early childhood to vocational and/or upper secondary teacher education. The examples in this paper are from the primary and lower secondary education (GLU) level for grades 1–10. This teacher education programme was recently (fall 2017) revised from a four-year bachelor's to a five-year master's programme; the first students to graduate from the new teacher education programme are still enrolled, scheduled to graduate in 2022. These teacher education programmes are accredited and, hence, regulated at the national level, and an independent governmental committee monitors their overall quality, but they maintain a high level of autonomy in establishing and maintaining their standards of quality at the local level (Cochran-Smith 2021). The content of Norway's teacher education system is anchored in the accreditation regulations outlined in the Ministry of Education and Research's (2016a, 2016b) 'Regulations Relating to the Framework Plan for Primary and Lower Secondary Teacher Education', both 'for Years 1–7' and 'for Years 5–10'. These regulations, developed by a committee appointed by the Ministry, establish an accreditation framework with regulations for primary and lower secondary teacher education. Based on the framework, each institution establishes study plans for its teacher education programme. This is also applicable to Sámi teacher education.

In the regulations, Sámi conditions are mentioned in the first paragraph and the purpose clause (§1–5) (we have referred from the 5–10 version).

> Teacher education 1–7 and 5–10 (primary and lower secondary teacher education) shall qualify students to instruct their students on Sámi conditions, including knowledge of the status of Indigenous peoples internationally and on Sámi pupils' right to education in accordance with the Education Act and current curricula. [authors' translation]

This specified, for the first time, the status of Indigenous peoples internationally. Sámi subjects are also mentioned for the first time under 'Programme Plan and National Guidelines', §4–3:

> The programme plan must describe how internationalisation is incorporated and how interdisciplinary themes are addressed in the structure of the programme. This includes work with adapted education, basic skills and competencies, use of ICT in work with subjects, Sámi subjects, the multicultural and multilingual aspect, professional ethics and knowledge about violence and sexual abuse of children and young people. [authors' translation and emphasis]

Still, reports on the 2010 teacher education reform (Følgjegruppa for lærarutdanningsreforma 2013, 2015) highlight, as an unresolved matter, that neither teacher education programme professors nor pre-service teachers had knowledge and competence in the Sámi culture. One report was also concerned that the incorporation of a topic in each subject depended on the teacher of that subject. Olsen, Sollid, and Johansen (2017) concluded implementing the accreditation plan for teacher education would be

difficult, especially due to teacher educators' lack of knowledge of Sámi culture, thereby making teaching vulnerable to the responsible educator.

To further discuss inclusive education, we investigated the core values in teacher education study programmes from two selected institutions to visualise the inclusion of Sámi issues in teacher education studies.

Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences (INN)

INN's study facility is in central southern Norway, outside a Sámi area and far from Sámi language administrative districts but near a South Sámi county. Sámi people and issues are less visible in the local environment than in Tromsø, in northern Norway, where Arctic University of Norway is located. INN's study programme follows a core curriculum supported by syllabi for all subjects. We concentrated on the core curriculum, in which Sámi issues are incorporated twice, first in the 'Goals of the Subject' section (The Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences 2021, 3):

> (…) The student can strengthen international and multicultural perspectives in the school's work, contribute to an understanding of the Sámis' status as Indigenous peoples and stimulate democratic participation and sustainable development. [authors' translation]

The second reference appears in the 'Description of the Academic Content' in the programme of study (The Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences 2021, 12) after a description of connections between subjects and general didactics and an account of how cross-curricular topics are addressed and integrated in different subjects:

> Multidisciplinary topics, such as the psychosocial learning environment, citizenship and the multicultural society, Sámi conditions and Sámi students' rights, sustainable development and aesthetic and professional digital learning processes, are addressed during seminar days and conferences at the university college. [authors' translation]

Although 'Sámi' and/or 'Indigenous' are only mentioned twice, concepts like 'diversity' and 'culture' are also relevant for an inclusive education. In the study programme, 'pupil diversity' is a core theme within the subject of pedagogy. However, in the programme's core curriculum, the concept is only mentioned under 'Practice' and related to the diversity the students will encounter during their practicum. In contrast, the concept of 'multiculture' is part of the core values of teacher education (The Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences 2021, 1–2):

> In the primary school teacher education for grades 5–10, the Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences places special emphasis on: (…) a multicultural perspective on teaching and learning (…). [authors' translation]

The concept is also mentioned in relation to Sámi conditions and the Sámis' status as Indigenous peoples (as the first two excerpts illustrate).

Uit the Arctic University of Norway

UiT's teacher study programme facility is situated in a Sámi area and has, as noted, a specific obligation regarding Sámi languages in addition to a more general ambition to provide education on Sámi issues. In UiT's study programme for teacher education (5–10) (The Arctic University of Norway 2021), we found three references to Sámi people or Sámi issues. The first paragraph in the 'Goals of the Subject' section (The

Arctic University of Norway 2021, 3) overlaps the 'Goals of the Subject (3) from INN. The second reference is in the 'Description of the Academic Content and Study as a Whole' (The Arctic University of Norway 2021, 4):

> Primary school teacher education contains an additional perspective and theme: Adapted education, assessment, basic skills, citizenship and the multicultural society, psychosocial learning environment, Sámi conditions and the rights of Sámi students, sustainable development and aesthetic learning processes. [authors' translation]

In contrast to INN's study programme, the concept of 'pupil diversity' is only mentioned as a core theme in the subject of pedagogy. Multicultural perspectives are, however, used similar to the way they are used in the INN study programme, with specific mention of Sámi conditions and the Sámis' status as Indigenous peoples.

Crossing lines

Both study programmes are legally required to educate for and about Sámi people and their institutions take similar approaches to comply. First, both institutions and their respective programmes state that teacher education students shall have knowledge about Sámi issues, as the excerpts provided illustrate. Second, they both address the issue of rights, which applies to Sámi students and follows the ILO-169 by asserting the Sámis' status as an Indigenous people. Third, both programmes incorporate knowledge for and about Sámi issues in close relation to cross-curricular topics, such as democracy, citizenship, multicultural society and similar subjects. This represents an advancement towards a more inclusive education, far from the starting point at which Sámi languages and issues were absent from all levels of education. The study programmes are, however, the only national guidelines established at a general level as core values and, hence, vulnerable to those interpreting them. The inclusion of educational goals for and about Sámi students and Sámi issues in teacher education has the potential to facilitate an inclusive education, but the manner in which those goals are realised can also potentially follow the trajectory of how marginalised groups are presented in the inclusive education research literature: inclusion as meeting the needs of the students in question (in this case, possibly the Sámi student) and maintaining a monocultural education, thus fulfilling only part of the compulsory education curriculum, ensuring the rights of Sámi students.

Discussion

When addressing rights and content regarding education for and about Indigenous people, we find inclusive education has the necessary vocabulary and ideals. However, establishing an inclusive education is challenging when the concept is narrowly defined so that inclusion is understood merely as a matter of students' rights and access to mainstream classes. In discussing inclusive education for Indigenous peoples, the right to education is an important issue, as 'children and young people of indigenous families remain less likely to be enrolled in school or in training programmes and more likely to underperform than non-indigenous children' (UNESCO n.d., second paragraph). In the accreditation plans for teacher education (both 1–7 and 5–10) and in the teacher education programmes at INN and UiT, the rights of Sámi students are specifically expressed. These efforts to offer Sámi language education or to provide an

overall education in the Sámi language for Sámi children and youth are important. However, from a Sámi perspective, such efforts are not sufficient due to the teacher educators' lack of knowledge about Sámi history and society. Prior education about and for Sámi pupils has taught both the Sámi and the non-Sámi population that Sámi language, culture and general values are not acknowledged. Hoëm (1978), a well-known Norwegian commentator, shed light on possible socialisation consequences when Sámi children receive a majority education, arguing that a conflict of values between school and home would lead to de-socialisation, re-socialisation or shielded socialisation, and for any of these, the risk of failure in education and training can be equal to separation, segregation or marginalisation (Engen 2009). Therefore, a discourse on inclusive education for Indigenous people as a 'right to education' or as 'inclusion as placement' is an important step but does not maintain the broad understanding of inclusive education where 'the idea is that education develops human capital for everyone' (Haug 2017, 209).

Moreover, a narrow discourse on inclusive education can potentially maintain the relation between the majority–minority perspective as highlighted by Olsen (2017). An education based on the majority's perspectives is not necessarily an education that views Indigenous perspectives as important. It can, instead, maintain an illusion of inclusive education. In the accreditation plans of INN and UiT, knowledge about Sámi issues is closely connected to cross-curricular topics such as democracy, citizenship and multicultural society, but what these concepts entail fails to reflect the knowledge of other worldviews and value systems. Therefore, inclusive education also needs to address the content of education.

In the discourse on pedagogy in diverse contexts, both cultural-sensitive pedagogy and the pedagogy of tolerance are approaches for addressing cultural diversity but in different ways. Still, they have been criticised for mainly suggesting efforts designed by majority teachers to be culturally sensitive and tolerant towards those who are different (Røthing 2019). Within the field of Indigenous education, some other strategies are potentially relevant that challenge this approach. Graham Smith and Russell Bishop have both articulated Māori educational approaches from *Aotearoa* [New Zealand]. Bishop (2008) argued for a culturally responsive education articulated in Indigenous contexts that can create 'learning contexts for previously pathologized and marginalized students in ways that allow them to participate in education on their terms as Māori, as well as becoming citizens of the world' (Bishop 2008, 457). The change of starting point is key here, with the emphasis on education on their terms as Māori. Along similar lines is Smith's discussion of culturally transformative pedagogy *kaupapa* [principles] guiding Māori theory and/on education (2017). Smith takes as a starting point that Māori are not homogenous in their educational aspirations, which is important to an inclusive education approach. The transformative dimension of education requires making space for Indigenous and minority cultures, protecting languages at risk, struggling for the minds to be educated out of false consciousness and hegemony and recognising the small victories along the way to transformation. Smith's and Bishop's perspectives find resonance also in United States Indigenous contexts. *Red Pedagogy,* as described by Grande (2008), is an Indigenous pedagogy combining critical pedagogy and Indigenous knowledge. Amongst the main principles are the emphasis on 'red pedagogy' as rooted in Native American Indigenous knowledge, the connection to mainstream critical theories and the desire to relate to democracy and self-determination (Grande 2008).

We see, from a Sámi and Norwegian context, that thoughts from Indigenous contexts elsewhere connect well. For our discussion on inclusive education, we note that both the 'red pedagogy' and culturally responsive/transformative pedagogies grow out of and aim to address the relationship between mainstream society and Indigenous communities. However, the recentring of Indigenous knowledge and perspectives suggests a new way of thinking about inclusion. Instead of a mainstream system tolerating and including the Indigenous 'Others', proper inclusion can be achieved through indigenising the mainstream system, working to build education (also) on Indigenous terms. This aligns with the broad definition of inclusion and with the possibility to raise human capital for all (cf. Haug 2017).

We view the general formulations in the study programmes as contributing to a narrow understanding of including Indigenous perspectives in teacher education and see a need for certain structural measures. The curricular obligation given to all teacher education institutions to provide knowledge about and perspectives on Sámi society, history, language and rights is an important driving factor. Inclusion, in its broadest sense, is a potential method for teaching in these programmes. This means that such knowledge and perspectives need to be part of all aspects of the programme. When teaching national history, students need to be asked, for example, about how the Sámi were impacted by Norwegian independence from Sweden (1905) and Denmark (1814), by the resultant nationalist streams, by the Second World War when Norway was occupied by Germany and by the urbanisation present since the latter half of the nineteenth century. When teaching music, students need to be asked to give examples from and reflect on Sámi music. Inclusion through systematic articulation may be a fruitful measure.

From an inclusive education perspective, the content of the curricula is as important as the pupils receiving it. 'If education is really going to be for all, it must be inclusive not only legally, but in the sense that the content is relevant and accessible to all' (Nes 2003, 78). The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2018) promote education that is sensitive to Indigenous peoples' cultures, languages, lifestyles, world views and more. Efforts to provide access to and equal education for Indigenous learners as well as 'education that is culturally and linguistically appropriate and that does not aim at or result in unwanted assimilation' are among key messages promoted by the United Nations (2014, 1). Seeing how Sámi issues are articulated in plans and programmes, this is a particular concern for Norwegian teacher education.

Inclusion and indigenisation are concepts that involve processes. As such, the meaning of each can and should evolve. Indigenisation is, compared to inclusion, a rather new strategy that is still being (re)defined and negotiated in the context of Norwegian experiences with their long historical heritage of state building following independence from neighbours. The general purpose is quite clear, though: Indigenisation means the active process of changing a system in a way that makes it better for Indigenous peoples and communities. Inclusion can and should clearly be part of that.

Note

1. Norwegian minority group that migrated from northern Finland and Sweden over several hundred years that holds specific legal rights as one of the national minorities.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributors

Hege Merete Somby (b. 1974) is an associate professor of education at Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences. Her teaching and research focus on inclusion in education and her PhD (2017) investigated this. Somby is particularly concerned with safeguarding Sami perspectives in education and the inclusion of Sami pupils in schools. She has also published research on Vygotsky's theories of learning in Virtual Reality simulation. Somby is Sámi and Norwegian.

Torjer A. Olsen (b. 1975), professor in Indigenous studies at The Centre for Sámi Studies, UiT The Arctic University of Norway. Olsen had his PhD in 2008 in religious studies. His research interests are Indigenous education, gender and power in Indigenous research and Christianity in Sámi and Indigenous contexts. Olsen is Sámi and Norwegian.

ORCID

Hege Merete Somby http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5713-9239
Torjer Andreas Olsen http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7571-4652

References

Ainscow, Mel, and Margarida César. 2006. “Inclusive Education Ten Years After Salamanca: Setting the Agenda.” *European Journal of Psychology of Education* 21 (3): 231–238.

Askeland, Norunn. 2016. “Kan positiv diskursanalyse bidra til nye måtar å framstille “den globale andre” på? [Can Positive Discourseanalysis Contribute to New Ways of Presenting ‘The Global Other’?]. In *Folk uten land? Å gi stemme og status til urfolk og nasjonale minoriteter* [People Without Land? To Give Voice and Status to Indigenous People and National Minorities], edited by N. Askeland and B. Aamotsbakken, 77–92. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Bakken, Jonas. Forthcoming. “Sámi Literature in Norwegian Language Arts Textbooks.” *Scandinavian Studies*.

Battiste, Marie. 2013. *Decolonizing Education*. Saskatoon, SK: Purich Publishing Ltd.

Bergland, Einar. 2001. *Samisk skole og samfunn: plattform for pedagogisk utviklingsarbeid* [Sami School and Society: Platform for Pedagogical Development Work]. Guovdageaidnu: Sámi instituhtta.

Bishop, Russell. 2008. “Te Kotahitanga: Kaupapa Māori in Mainstream Classrooms.” In *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, edited by K. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, and L. Tuhiwai Smith, 497–510. Los Angeles: Sage.

Cochran-Smith, Marilyn. 2021. “Rethinking Teacher Education: The Trouble with Accountability.” *Oxford Review of Education* 47 (1): 8–24.

Cochran-Smith, Marilyn, Lexie Grudnoff, Lily Orland-Barak, and Kari Smith. 2020. “Educating Teacher Educators: International Perspectives.” *The New Educator* 16 (1): 5–24. doi:10.1080/1547688X.2019.1670309.

Demo, Heidrun, Kari Nes, Hege Merete Somby, Anna Frizzarin, and Sofia Dal Zovo. 2021. “In and Out of Class–What Is the Meaning for Inclusive Schools? Teachers’ Opinions on Push-and Pull-Out in Italy and Norway.” *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1–19. doi:10.1080/13603116.2021.1904017.

Engen, Thor Ola. 2009. “Socialization, Literacy, and Empowerment.” In *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*, edited by James A. Banks, 252–262. New York: Routledge.

Eriksen, Kristin Gregers. 2018. “Teaching About the Other in Primary Level Social Studies: The Sami in Norwegian Textbooks.” *Journal of Social Science Education* 17 (2): 57–67.

Følgjegruppa for lærarutdanningsreforma. 2013. *Drivkraft i utviklinga av lærarprofesjonen? Framsteg og utfordringar for grunnskulelærarutdanningane* [Driving Force in the Development of the Teaching Profession? Progress and Challenges for Primary School Teacher Education]. Rapport nr. 3.

Følgjegruppa for lærarutdanningsreforma. 2015. *Grunnskulelærarutdanningane etter fem år: status, utfordringar og vegar vidare* [Primary School Teacher Education After Five Years: Status, Challenges and Ways Forward]. Rapport nr 5.

Gjerpe, Kajsa Kemi. 2017. ““Samisk læreplanverk – en symbolsk forpliktelse?” [Sámi Curriculum – a Symbolic Obligation].” *Nordic Studies in Education* 37 (03–04): 150–165. doi:10.18261/issn.1891-5949-2017-03-04-03. ER.

Göransson, Kerstin, and Claes Nilholm. 2014. “Conceptual Diversities and Empirical Shortcomings–A Critical Analysis of Research on Inclusive Education.” *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 29 (3): 265–280.

Grande, Sandy. 2008. “Red Pedagogy.” In *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, edited by Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, 233–254. Los Angeles: Sage.

Haug, Peder. 2017. “Understanding Inclusive Education: Ideals and Reality.” *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research* 19 (3): 206–217.

Hausstätter, Rune Sarromaa. 2013. “In Support of Unfinished Inclusion.” *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research* 58 (4): 424–434. doi:10.1080/00313831.2013.773553.

Hausstätter, Rune, and Stine Vik. 2021. “Inclusion and Special Needs Education: A Theoretical Framework of an Overall Perspective of Inclusive Special Education.” In *Dialogues Between Northern and Eastern Europe on the Development of Inclusion: Theoretical and Practical Perspectives*, edited by Natallia Bahdanovich Hanssen, Sven-Erik Hansén, and Kristina Ström, 44–57. London: Routledge.

Hirvonen, Vuokko. 2004. *Samisk skole i plan og praksis: hvordan møte utfordringene i L97S?: Evaluering av reform 97* [Sámi School in Plan and Practice: How to Meet the Challenges in L97S?: Evaluation of Reform 97]. Kárášjohka: Sámi allaskuvla.

Hoëm, Anton. 1978. *Sosialisering: En teoretisk og empirisk modellutvikling [Socialization: A Theoretical and Empirical Model Development]*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

International Labour Conference [ILO]. 1989. “Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, C169.”

Keskitalo, Pigga, and Torjer Olsen. 2019. “Historical and Political Perspectives on Sámi and Inclusive School Systems in Norway.” In *Including the North: A Comparative Study of the Policies on Inclusion and Equity in the Circumpolar North*, edited by M. C. Beaton, D. B. Hirshberg, G. R. Maxwell, and J. Spratt, 109–124. Rovaniemi: University of Lapland.

Kiuppis, Florian, and Rune Sarromaa Hausstätter. 2014. “Inclusive Education for All, and Especially for Some?” In *Inclusive Education Twenty Years After Salamanca*, edited by Florian Kiuppis and Rune Hausstätter, 1–5. New York: Peter Lang.

Kolpus, Isalill. 2015. “What is a Sami? A Qualitative Study of Images of the Sami in Textbooks for the Subject Religion and Ethics.” Master’s thesis, University of Oslo.

Magnússon, Gunnlaugur. 2019. “An Amalgam of Ideals – Images of Inclusion in the Salamanca Statement.” *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 23 (7–8): 677–690. doi:10.1080/13603116.2019.1622805.

Maxwell, Gregor, and Jarle Bakke. 2019. “Schooling for Everyone: Norway’s Adapted Approach to Education for Everyone.” In *Including the North: A Comparative Study of the Policies on Inclusion and Equity in the Circumpolar North*, edited by M. C. Beaton, D. B. Hirshberg, G. R. Maxwell, and J. Spratt, 89–108. Rovaniemi: University of Lapland.

Messiou, Kyriaki. 2017. “Research in the Field of Inclusive Education: Time for a Rethink?” *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 21 (2): 146–159. doi:10.1080/13603116.2016.1223184.

Minde, Henry. 2005. “Assimilation of the Sami - Implementation and Consequences.” *Journal of Indigenous Peoples Rights* 3: 33.

Ministry of Education and Research. 2016a. “Regulations Relating to the Framework Plan for Primary and Lower Secondary Teacher Education for Years 1-7.” https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/c454dbe313c1438b9a965e84cec47364/forskrift-om-rammeplan-for-grunnskolelarerutdanning-for-trinn-1-7—engelsk-oversettelse-l1064431.pdf.
Ministry of Education and Research. 2016b. “Regulations Relating to the Framework Plan for Primary and Lower Secondary Teacher Education for Years 5–10.” https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/c454dbe313c1438b9a965e84cec47364/forskrift-om-rammeplan-for-grunnskolelarerutdanning-for-trinn-5-10—engelsk-oversettelse.pdf.
Ministry of Education and Research. 2017. *National Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion in Primary and Secondary Education and Training*. Oslo: Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training.
Mortensen-Buan, Anne-Beathe. 2016. “‘Dette er en same’, Visuelle framstillinger av samer i et utvalg lærebøker i samfunnsfag.” [‘This is a Sámi Person, Visual Presentations of Sámi People in Social Science Textbooks]. In *Folk uten land? Å gi stemme og status til urfolk og nasjonale minoriteter* [People Without Land? To Give voice and Status to Indigenous People and National Minorities], edited by N. Askeland and B. Aamotsbakken, 93–112. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
Nakata, Martin. 2006. “Australian Indigenous Studies: A Question of Discipline.” *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 17 (3): 265–275.
Nakata, Martin N. 2007. *Disciplining the Savages, Savaging the Disciplines*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
Nes, Kari. 2003. “Why Does Education for All Have to Be Inclusive Education?” In *Inclusion, Participation and Democracy: What Is the Purpose?* edited by Julie Allan, 67–80. Dordrecht: Springer.
Nes, Kari, Heidrun Demo, and Dario Ianes. 2018. “Inclusion at Risk? Push- and Pull-Out Phenomena in Inclusive School Systems: The Italian and Norwegian Experiences.” *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 22 (2): 111–129.
Nilholm, Claes, and Kerstin Göransson. 2017. “What Is Meant by Inclusion? An Analysis of European and North American Journal Articles with High Impact.” *European Journal of Special Needs Education* 32 (3): 437–451. doi:10.1080/08856257.2017.1295638.
Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. 2017. *Framework Plan for Kindergartens*. Oslo: Ministry of Education and Research.
Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. 2017. *Core Curriculum—Values and Principles for Primary and Secondary Education*. Oslo.
Olsen, Torjer A. 2019. “Sámi Issues in Norwegian Curricula: A Historical Overview.” In *Sámi Educational History in a Comparative International Perspective*, edited by Otso Kortekangas, Pigga Keskitalo, Jukka Nyyssönen, Andrej Kotljarchuk, Merja Paksuniemi, and David Sjögren, 125–141. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
Olsen, Torjer A. 2021. “Indigenizing Education in Sápmi/Norway: Rights, Interface and the Pedagogies of Discomfort and Hope.” In *Routledge Handbook of Indigenous Peoples in the Arctic*, edited by Timo Koivurova, Else Grete Broderstad, Dorothée Cambou, Dalee Dorough, and Florian Stammler, 28–39. London: Routledge.
Olsen, Torjer Andreas. 2017. “Colonial Conflicts: Absence, Inclusion, and Indigenization in Textbook Presentations of Indigenous Peoples.” In *Textbook Violence*, edited by James R. Lewis, Bengt-Ove Andreassen, and Suzanne Anett Thobro, 71–86. Sheffield, UK: Equinox eBooks Publishing.
Olsen, Torjer Andreas, and Bengt-Ove Andreassen. 2018. “‘Urfolk’ og ‘mangfold’ i skolens læreplaner.” [Indigenous Peoples and Diversity in School Curricula.] *FLEKS - Scandinavian Journal of Intercultural Theory and Practice* 5 (1): 17. doi:10.7577/fleks.2248.
Olsen, Torjer Andreas, Hilde Sollid, and Åse Mette Johansen. 2017. “Kunnskap om samiske forhold som integrert del av lærerutdanningene.” [Knowledge of Sámi Conditions as an Integral Part of Teacher Education.] *Acta Didactica* 11: 2.

Opertti, Renato, W. Zachary, and Yi Zhang. 2014. "Inclusive Education: From Targeting Groups and Schools to Achieving Quality Education as the Core of EFA." In *The SAGE Handbook of Special Education*, edited by Lani Florian, 149–169. London: Sage.

Pedersen, Steinar. 2021. ""Folk med gamle rettigheter på kolonisert jord 1751–1814" [People with old Rights on Colonized Land 1751–1814]." In *Samenes historie fra 1751 til 2010*, edited by Astri Andresen, Bjørg Evjen, and Teemu Ryymin, 79–115. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Rioux, Marcia. 2007. "Disability Rights in Education." In *The SAGE Handbook of Special Education*, edited by Lani Florian, 107–116. London, UK: SAGE.

Røthing, Åse. 2019. ""Ubehagets pedagogikk' – en inngang til kritisk refleksjon og inkluderende undervisning?" [Pedagogy of Discomfort – an Entry to Critical Reflection and Inclusive Education.] *FLEKS - Scandinavian Journal of Intercultural Theory and Practice* 6 (1): 40–57.

Skrefsrud, Thor-André. 2016. *The Intercultural Dialogue: Preparing Teachers for Diversity*. Münster: Waxmann Verlag.

Smith, Graham Hingangaroa. 2017. "Kaupapa Māori Theory: Indigenous Transforming of Education." In *Critical Conversations in Kaupapa Maori*, edited by T. Hoskins, and A. Jones, 70–81. New Zealand: Huia Publishers.

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

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai, Eve Tuck, and K. Wayne Yang. 2019. *Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education: Mapping the Long View*. New York: Routledge.

The Arctic University of Norway. 2021. "Master in Teacher Education for Primary and Lower Secondary Education for Grades 5-10." [Master i grunnskolelærerutdanning for trinn 5.-10.] https://uit.no/Content/729822/cache = 20222601171642/studieplan%205-10.pdf.

The Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences. 2021. "MGL2510 Teacher Education for Primary and Lower Secondary Education for Grades 5-10." [Grunnskolelærerutdanning for trinn 5-10.] https://ez.inn.no/studiehaandbok/studiehaandboeker/2021-2022-studiehaandbok/studier/lup-fakultet-for-laererutdanning-og-pedagogikk/master/mgl2510-grunnskolelaererutdanning-for-trinn-5-10.

Tuck, E., and K. W. Yang. 2012. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1 (1): 1–40.

UNESCO. 1994. "The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education: Adopted by the World Conference on Special Needs Education; Access and Quality." Salamanca, Spain, June 7–10, 1994. http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/SALAMA_E.PDF.

UNESCO. n.d. "Education for Indigeous Peoples." *UNESCO*. Accessed August 11, 2021. https://en.unesco.org/themes/inclusion-in-education/indigenous.

United Nations. 2014. "Thematic Paper on Education and Indigeous Peoples: Priorities for Inclusive Education." *The 2014 World Conference on Indigenous Peoples*, New York.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. 2018. "UNESCO Policy on Engaging with Indigenous Peoples."

World Education Forum. 2000. "The Dakar Framework for Action: Education for All." https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000121147.