

Exploring Shared Practices and Lessons Learned from Circumpolar Culturally-Relevant Teacher Training (CRTT)

Craig Peters

Cape Breton University

Abstract: *There has been a decline in language use because of a history of colonization and assimilation. This trend shows the need for restoring Indigenous language and culture through teacher education. Several authors have claimed that incorporating Indigenous ways of knowing into schools is the first step towards decolonization of education and self-determination. Norway and Canada, particularly in the context of Sami and Inuit peoples, are ideal to be used as case studies that can facilitate the shared challenges and lessons learned for implementing from Circumpolar Culturally-Relevant Teacher Training (CRTT) in Circumpolar Indigenous cultures. The author concludes this paper with recommendations to implement CRTT and provides justifications to enable self-determination of Indigenous education.*

Introduction

This paper maps the parallel development between Sámi and Inuit teacher education based on a shared but divergent history. Very little current literature could be found that considers the parallels between Inuit and Sámi educational systems. Sámi and Inuit are both relatively remote, isolated Circumpolar Indigenous cultures. Both cultural groups span large geographic areas that cross multiple political boundaries, and both have experienced culture and language disruption due to colonization and assimilation efforts. And as this article will discuss, formalized schooling has been one of the primary mechanisms for colonial disruption. Discussed together, the historical and current teacher education practices of Sámi and Inuit can provide a broader perspective on the impact of colonial efforts in the Arctic.

As Circumpolar Indigenous cultures such as Sámi in Norway and Inuit in Canada continue to revise public education systems to be more reflective of Indigenous cultures, the act of decolonizing post-secondary education, specifically teacher education, has been slower to follow (Eriksen & Svendsen, 2020; Pidgeon, 2016). As an example, the independent review of the Nunavut Teacher Education Program (NTEP) conducted by Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group, LLP (2017) reported that public education has been caught in a dynamic deadlock with teacher education programs, whereby not enough Inuit students have been graduating Grade 12 with competence in culture or language. Students also appeared to lack interest in becoming teachers due to their own educational experiences, leading to a shortage of language/culturally competent Inuit educators in schools. This in turn has led to a decline of role models and cultural and language competent teachers in schools, which further demotivates Inuit youth from considering further education.

Some authors have argued that the creation and implementation of culturally-relevant pedagogies are a step towards the revitalization of traditional language in education and by extension self-determination (McKechnie, 2015; Pratt et al., 2018). According to Ladson-Billings (1995), culturally relevant pedagogy focuses specifically on Indigenous learning and academic success. It is a means to develop students' cultural competence to enable the development of positive ethnic and social identities. These teaching practices also support students to be critical, raise questions, and recognize societal inequalities such as racist pedagogies through the

occurrence of ongoing assimilation. For all these reasons, culturally-relevant pedagogies enable Indigenous students to realize self-determination in education (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

By adopting the culturally-relevant teacher training (CRTT) framework of Azam and Goodnough (2018), in this article I conducted a literature review which examined the extent that Teacher Education programs in Norway and Canada have implemented CRTT in Sámi and Inuit teacher training respectively. I selected CRTT as the analytical frame because it has been shown to improve Indigenous student outcomes (Byrd, 2016; Golden, 2017; Gay, 2013). I attempted to answer the question: what are the resistors and enablers for implementing CRTT across Circumpolar cultures? Through my analysis, I found evidence of improvements with language regeneration through Indigenous teacher training institutions. However, this initial literature review also identified much more research is needed to investigate the role of CRTT in both the Norwegian and Canadian context.

Background and introduction to Sámi and Inuit

Sámi and Inuit are circumpolar cultures on opposite sides of the Arctic Circle as shown in Figure 1. Both cultures have dispersed populations that span multiple geographic boundaries, and they have many dialects that are unique to regions. When examining the history of Sámi and Inuit culture and language, it became apparent there has been a trend of language loss. Inuit and Sámi both face challenges for protecting their natural environments, preserving cultural identity, and maintaining political autonomy. Both Inuit and Sámi have been subjected to colonization and forced assimilation that has devastated their cultures and languages (Greaves, 2106).



Figure 1: The map shows Sámi and Inuit Circumpolar cultures on opposite sides of the Arctic Circle. The Sámi territory is shown in Norway and Inuit territory is shown in Canada. As shown, both cultures span multiple political borders; however, this study will focus on Sámi in Norway and Inuit in Canada. This map was obtained from Emelyanova (2015).

Traditional Sámi territory, culture, language, and education

The Sámi inhabit a geographical region called Sápmi that spans across northern Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the Kola Peninsula in Russia (Ojala, 2014). In 2001, there were estimated to be approximately 60,000 members of the Sámi population (Zmyvalova & Outakoski, 2019) and about 100,000 members in 2012 where only 40% were capable of speaking the traditional

language (Keskitalo et al., 2011; Keskitalo et al., 2012). In 2001, the majority of the Sámi population lived in Norway with approximately 35,000 individuals (Zmyvalova & Outakoski, 2019) and between 50,000–65,000 members currently live in Norway (Thingnes, 2020). In 2002, there were approximately 2,000 Sámi in Russia where about 25% spoke the traditional language (Kotijarchuk, 2019). In 2001, there were about 6,000 Sámi in Finland and 17,000 individuals lived in Sweden and these populations have remained relatively stable up until 2012 (Keskitalo, et al. 2012). There are three main languages Sámi speak: South, Central, and Eastern Sámi (Kotijarchuk, 2019). The use of Sámi languages has decreased ever since the 1950s throughout all of Sápmi, and all dialects are currently in danger of extinction (Svonni, 2001).

According to Keskitalo et al. (2011), the three main Sámi languages are broken down into nine dialects, and speakers of these languages cannot understand each other. South Sámi is spoken in Sweden and Norway by about 600–800 people. Central Sámi dialects are also spoken in Norway and Sweden by about 800–1,000 individuals and North Sámi, which is another Central language, is spoken by about 20,000 people in Sweden, Norway and Finland. Approximately 5,000–7,000 people have been identified as speaking North Sámi in Sweden, making it the most widely spoken Sámi language, spread across most of the Sápmi region. Lastly, the Eastern Sámi dialects are spoken by about 800–1,000 individuals in Finland and the Kola Peninsula in Russia; however, there exists no reliable statistics concerning the exact number of speakers in any of these regions (Keskitalo et al., 2011).

Jakobsen (2011) outlined that Sámi languages and dialects have not been restricted to a specific country since Sámi have been relocated throughout history, and because Sápmi spans multiple countries. Kylli (2019) reported that in Norway there are three Sámi dialects spoken, all of which are in danger of extinction. The Inari dialect of the Sámi language was only spoken within Finland's borders. In Sweden, a report by Svonni (2001) has shown that more than half the population of Sámi in Sweden did not speak the traditional language because there was an overwhelming shift to speak Swedish through the assimilation process. The Russian Sámi, also referred to as Kola Sámi, are divided into five groups according to dialect. The largest group are the Kildin Sámi; current estimates are that approximately 20–30 Elders speak this dialect in their everyday lives (Zmyvalova & Outakoski, 2019).

Traditional Inuit territory, culture, language, and education

The traditional territory of Inuit is called Inuit Nunangat. It spans multiple geographic borders in Canada including Nunavut and the northern coasts of the Northwest Territories, Québec, and Labrador in Canada (ITK, 2020). According to Statistics Canada (2016), there were more than 65,000 members of the Inuit population spread across 53 communities in four geographic regions of Canada (Kanatami, 2018; Snow et al., 2018). The traditional territory of Inuit in Canada includes Nunatsiavut (Labrador), Nunavik (Northern Québec), Nunavut, and Inuvialuit Settlement Region in the Northwest Territories, which is collectively referred to as Inuit Nunangat. Approximately 90% of Inuit live in Nunavut and Nunavik and over half of the Inuit population is located in 26 communities in Nunavut (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, 2020). Like the Sámi language, Inuktitut (the collective term to refer to Inuit languages/dialects) is also in danger. In 2019, Inuit adopted a standardized writing format that maintains the uniqueness of each of the regional dialects but makes reading across dialects easier as a means to combat language loss through the development of shared resources (Patrick et al., 2017; Patrick, 2019). Inuktitut represents a wide diversity of language: according to ITK (2020), there are 12 dialects of Inuktitut spoken across the 53 communities of Inuit Nunangat. Some dialects (depending on geographic region) are considered endangered, which implies there is a need to revitalize

language throughout Inuit Nunangat (Patrick et al., 2017). According to ITK (2017), Inuktitut was intended to be the primary language of instruction in early childhood education as well in K–12 education throughout Inuit Nunangat (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, 2017); however, currently many of the courses are taught in English in the form of a bilingual education (Aylward, 2010).

Literature review

The pressure to assimilate through residential schooling and federal initiatives has led to Indigenous peoples losing control and self-determination of their education systems (Kylli, 2019; Laugrand & Oosten, 2010; McGregor, 2011; McKechnie, 2015). Moreover, the presence of a postcolonial education system has created a lag in Indigenous access to positive, self-determined, and culturally responsive education (González & Colangelo, 2010). This is why it is important to implement CRTT to aid with decolonization of education and ensure self-determination. CRTT is important because of the need to restore language and culture, enable self-determination and student agency in education, as well as alleviate social and economic disparities (training students with marketable and practical skill-sets to be utilized when entering the labour market) (Krasnoff, 2016).

Parallel history of assimilation through education in Norway and Canada

The process of assimilation of both Sámi and Inuit cultures began with Christian missionary contact and the establishment of missionary schools (Kylli, 2019; Laugrand & Oosten, 2010). In describing Norway, Vine (2016) argued that Christian residential schooling was intended to make Indigenous children less Indigenous by teaching Eurocentric norms and Christian religion. Efforts to suppress the local culture and language through Christian-run boarding schools and assimilation into mainstream society was widespread in Sámi-inhabited regions (Kuokkanen, 2003). The process of Christianization occurred across all of Sápmi and assimilation efforts were intertwined with a nationalization process, which devastated traditional language and culture of Sámi in favour of Norwegian in Norway, for example. Assimilation through nationalization efforts across Norway, Sweden, and Russia, impacted Sámi, while Finland appeared to take a softer approach (Wilson & Selle, 2019).

The history of Sámi education has reflected the political development of the four Nordic countries which also comprise Sápmi. Therefore discussing the impacts on Sámi in Norway cannot be considered without looking at the neighbouring countries. They are unified by having developed centralized social welfare systems that emphasize universalism and integration (Olsen, 2019; van der Voet, 2019). However, the Kola Sámi in Russia do not share the same benefits as other Sámi because of limited political autonomy (Hicks & Somby, 2013). Much of the effort toward self-determination and educational self-governance in education for Sámi occurred during the late 1960s and 1970s; although Sámi in Norway, Sweden, Finland, and to a lesser extent in Russia began the unification process as early as 1956 through the establishment of the Sámi Council (Shchukina et al., 2018).

Sámi are politically connected by their respective Sámi Parliaments located in Norway, Sweden, and Finland (Josefsen, 2010). According to Wilson & Selle (2019), the creation of Sámediggi (Sámi Parliament) in 1989 was an important step towards self-determination in education. The Sámediggi is an independent political institution that was created by amendments to the Constitution of the Kingdom of Norway in 1988 and the Sámi Act of 1987. The Sámediggi is responsible for language management, lands, resources, education, and arts and culture restoration; it is also responsible for education in the Sámi language in primary and secondary schools (Wilson & Selle, 2019). According to the Sámediggi website, the Sámi Parliamentary

Council (SPC) was founded in 2000 and is the body responsible for Sámi parliaments in Norway, Finland, and Sweden (The Sámi Parliament, 2021). There is not an elected body in Russia, but all Russian Sámi organizations hold permanent positions in the SPC (Sámi Parliamentary Council, 2021). Norway today is responsible for the majority of Sámi teacher education across Sápmi (Norwegian Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion, 2009). According to Olsen (2019), most individuals speak North Sámi, and Norway has the largest population of Sámi. Norway is the only country to officially recognize Sámi as Indigenous through the ILO 169 convention and the Norwegian Sámi Parliament (responsible for administering Sámi schools and advising mainstream public schools about Sámi) has a strong presence in Norway (Olsen, 2019).

In Canada, according to McKechnie (2015), the combination of Christianization and Federal government forced settlements and relocations of traditional Inuit communities were deliberate acts designed to transform Inuit culture into mainstream society. These deliberate acts to transform Inuit into mainstream society parallel the situation from state authorities that partitioned Sápmi and pressured Sámi to become citizens of Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia (Lantto, 2010). For example, the Norwegianization policy was in effect from about 1850 to 1980 when Sámi were forcefully assimilated into Norwegian society (Minde, 2005). During the 1930s, the Federal Government in Canada commenced with the relocation of Inuit families to army bases in the Arctic to take advantage of the fox trade, and to the South in order to treat Inuit for tuberculosis. During the 1940s and 1950s, Inuit children continued to be relocated to residential schools and these top-down decisions by the federal government were made on the assumption that assimilation would be better than maintaining traditional language and culture for Inuit (McKechnie, 2015). Sámi were subjected to a similar form of paternalistic control from State authorities from the countries which they resided in (Gaski, 2021). The Canadian government attempted to rationalize assimilation efforts as aid in response to famine and sickness being felt by Inuit by claiming that permanent settlements would increase the health and well-being of Indigenous people (Anderson & Bonesteel, 2010; Bonesteel & Anderson, 2008). In contrast, Greaves (2016) and Minde (2005) outlined land and resource control and national sovereignty as the purpose of Canadian federal development efforts in the Arctic.

In 1947, through the Bureau of Northwest Territories and Yukon Affairs, the Canadian federal government assumed responsibility for Inuit education with the intention to provide Inuit the same form of schooling in the Arctic that was delivered in southern Canada (Anderson & Bonesteel, 2010). McGregor (2011) stated that when the Canadian federal government eventually took control of education in most Inuit inhabited regions after World War II, English was the language of instruction in schools, which ultimately made preserving Inuktitut (Inuit traditional language) and Inuit culture more challenging. Around the same time, both teachers and students assumed that speaking Sámi language was forbidden in schools and the use of Norwegian was encouraged instead (Sámi School History, 2013). According to Wiseman and Kreuger (2019), education in the form of Christian missionaries continued until the 1950s in Canada when the Federal government established the Federal day and residential school system in Nunavut (which as still part of the Northwest Territories at that time). The first residential school opened at Chesterfield Inlet in Nunavut/Northwest Territories in 1951 (Wiseman & Kreuger, 2019). In 1955, the Canadian federal government took full control of all schools in the Arctic, but delegated authority to the Christian church to administer the schools (Anderson & Bonesteel, 2010; White & Peters, 2009).

According to Daveluy (2009), from 1948 to 1962 the Canadian Federal Government took control of the health and wellness of Inuit, which ultimately created another barrier for Inuit self-determination by undermining the use of Inuit language, ties to the community (health services

were centralized in the South), as well as spirituality (because Westernized medicine was viewed as superior). The same forms of paternalistic control were documented in Sámi inhabited regions, where national governments superimposed on traditional Sámi territory the customs and values of Western civilization. For example, the Norwegianization policies in Norway were presented by authorities as being in the best interest for Sámi because it was assumed Sámi did not know any better (Minde, 2005). Because of Christianization and nationalization efforts in Canada and Norway as well as a push towards Indigenous students learning the language that was prescribed by Federal policy in each respective country, Indigenous language usage was fundamentally undercut which led to Indigenous peoples losing greater degrees of autonomy and self-determination.

Sámi and Inuit were subjected to targeted and overt assimilation up until the late 1960s and the 1970s (Keskitalo et al., 2012; McGregor, 2012). During the 1970s, both Sámi and Inuit began to speak out against and resist respective national agencies and government agendas. They demanded recognition, self-determination, and basic human rights afforded through mainstream society (Hernes, 2017; McGregor, 2012; Wilson & Selle, 2019). It was during this time that Indigenous peoples in Canada and Norway began to establish governance institutions that initiated processes of self-determination. Norwegian state policy towards Sámi significantly changed in the late 1970s when Sámi resisted the building of a hydroelectric power station on the Alta-Guovdageiadnu River in Norway. This led to the government establishing the Sámi Rights Commission in 1980 to propose solutions regarding Sámi rights to land, water, and other issues. The Norwegian Sámi Parliament was established in 1989 as a self-governed institution, responsible for preserving language and rights of Sámi (Todal, 2003). According to the Sámi Parliament website, Sámi in Finland had achieved self-governance institutions as early as 1973 (Sametinget, 2021). Sámi in Sweden joined the Sámi Parliament later in 1993. It was not until 2010 that the Kola Sámi formed the Kola Sámi Assembly in Russia (Artieva, 2014; Josefsen, 2010; Wilson & Selle, 2019).

Wilson and Selle (2019) highlighted that during the 1970s Canadian Inuit were inspired by developments taking place in other parts of the Circumpolar North, especially in regions such as northern Alaska and Greenland where Inuit peoples were acquiring greater autonomy from non-Indigenous governments. According to the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami website, it was during this time Inuit organizations were being established including the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (now referred to as Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami or ITK) that was formed in 1971 (ITK, 2021). ITK is the national body responsible for representing and advancing the rights of Inuit in Canada, but not Inuit in Alaska, Greenland, and Russia (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, 2018). McGregor (2012) reported Inuit self-determination and self-governance also began to significantly increase throughout the 1970s and 1980s through Inuit leadership in organizations such as the Northern Québec Inuit Association founded in 1971, the Labrador Inuit Association founded in 1973, and the Kitikmeot Inuit Association, the Kivalliq Inuit Association, and the Qikiqtani Inuit Association that were founded in the mid-1970s (Bonesteel, 2006).

Unlike the national education system of Norway, in Canada the responsibility and governance of Inuit education in Canadian provinces and territories has been tied to regional Inuit land claims agreements. For example, Wilson and Selle (2019) mentioned that after signing Inuvialuit Final Agreement in 1984, the Inuvialuit Settlement Region remained part of the Northwest Territories and education remained under the control of the Northwest Territories government. According to Wilson and Selle (2019), Nunavut took control of its education after partitioning from the Northwest Territories in 1999; however, Bentham (2017) argued non-Indigenous government still maintains control over Nunavut's education system. Wilson and

Selle (2019) stated that the vast majority of the population in Nunavut is Inuit and is currently an Inuit-controlled territory; Göcke (2011) claimed that Nunavut is the first territory in a modern nation completely governed and administered by Indigenous people. However, a significant proportion of representatives elected in government institutions are non-Indigenous which creates a barrier for self-determination in Nunavut (Ritsema et al., 2015). Nunavik constitutes an Inuit settlement region in the province of Québec where education is governed by the province of Québec (Wilson & Selle, 2019). Wilson and Selle (2019) discussed that in order to enable greater self-determination for education, Inuit established the Kativik Regional Government in Nunavik.

Wilson and Selle (2019) also described the functions of land claims agreements in Nunatsiavut, which grant the self-governed Nunatsiavut government jurisdiction to exercise control over education. According to the Nunatsiavut government website, Nunatsiavut is the only Inuit government in Canada that has full autonomy over education (Nunatsiavut Government, 2021). Within all the other regions of Inuit Nunangat, the federal and/or provincial government still controls education (Wilson & Selle, 2019). The four land claim agreements across Inuit Nunangat provided Inuit with varying degrees of responsibility over their educational systems and strengthened Inuit political, economic, and educational autonomy (Wilson & Selle, 2019). While there has been progress towards self-determination through the signing of land claim agreements, this is only one step in a complex process.

Theoretical framework

There is a need for culturally-appropriate education for the purpose of empowering communities and increasing Indigenous student and Indigenous intern teacher outcomes. CRTT can be a means to engage Indigenous students in a meaningful way with the intention of increasing student outcomes (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; O'Daniel, 2017). McKechnie (2015) and Pratt et al. (2018) argued the most feasible way to bring Indigenous ways of knowing into the classroom and enable self-determination in education with regard to social and economic well-being is shaping teacher education towards Indigenous ways of knowing. However, Kortekangas et al. (2019) and McGregor (2012) argued that incorporating Indigenous education is challenging because there has been a long history of assimilating Sámi and Inuit culture and traditions. As such, Indigenous students can lack trust for the education system because historically education has been a means to fulfil the goals and priorities of a Eurocentric society (Rudolph, 2011). The challenge is exacerbated because of the extent of traditional language loss, the lack of culturally-relevant teaching materials, as well as a shortage of qualified teachers that has occurred due to Indigenous ways of knowing being ignored in schools and abandoned through a long history of colonization and assimilation. As such, there needs to be an initiative to build up Indigenous human capital and resource capacity in education in order to ultimately address the issues of poor socioeconomic well-being and sustainable development in Indigenous communities. Regardless of the good intentions found in the framework of CRTT, the challenge of working in Westernized organizations and settings remains.

Recognizing the shortage of Sámi and Inuit educators, language speakers, and educational leadership, Pratt et al. (2018) and Keskitalo (2019) discussed CRTT that has the potential to redirect curriculum standards to the community-level currently being implemented top-down in jurisdictions. Redirecting curriculum standards aligns with Inuit and Sámi authors' work who claimed there needs to be independent institutions (self/shared-governed by a community) for preparing teachers in the unique way of the Sámi and Inuit culture, language, practices, norms, and values that is culturally-appropriate. Redirecting curriculum standards can help to ensure that Indigenous knowledge systems are not ignored or tokenized, and are not a copy of a westernized

or Eurocentric national or provincial curriculum (Pratt et al., 2018; Keskitalo, 2019). Redirecting curriculum standards through CRTT (Indigenizing curriculum outcomes that are culturally-appropriate for a specific community) is not only important to contribute to Indigenous self-determination in education, but also to restore trust for the school system and potentially mitigate the poor socio-economic circumstances for Indigenous students that are still prevalent today (National Collaborating Centre for Aboriginal Health, 2017; O'Daniel, 2017).

I adopted the theoretical frame of culturally-responsive teacher training (CRTT) of Azam and Goodnough (2018) to promote community/individual empowerment and help offset the power structures in education where curriculum is readily implemented in a top-down/paternalistic manner (Pinto-López et al., 2020). The framework of Azam and Goodnough (2018) outlines six characteristics of culturally-relevant teacher education that includes respect, responsiveness, responsibility, resourcefulness, reasonableness, and theory. As mentioned, culturally-responsive educators actively implement culturally-relevant teaching practices and the two terms are inextricably connected (Muñiz, 2019). These six characteristics of culturally-relevant teacher educators appear to overlap with Filback and Green's (2013) framework of teacher educators' asset-based approach to education (known as asset mindsets) that values Indigenous knowledge systems and encourages Indigenous ways of knowing be brought into the classroom (Filback & Green, 2013). The framework of Filback and Green (2013) has also been adopted as a framework for understanding the extent that teacher educators' incorporate Indigenous knowledge systems using an asset mindset. A limitation of the theoretical framework utilized in the study was Azam and Goodnough (2018) not referencing Lipman (1995) who also provided descriptions of culturally-responsive teachers, as well as work conducted by Jabbar and Hardaker (2013) specific to delivering CRTT in a higher education context.

Teacher educators who are culturally-responsive (actively implementing culturally-relevant teaching practices) must be able to promote the marginalized voices in the classroom (they are respectful), learn from the intern teachers through feedback (by being responsive), and encourage educational practices that serve and protect the interests of all the people (responsible for student outcomes) (Flynn, 2017; Roofe, 2015). Culturally-responsive teachers are resourceful and take into account the cultural backgrounds of intern teachers including their values, traditions, and language as well as the way intern teachers communicate, learn, and form relationships, which can differ depending on their individual background and culture (Rychly & Graves, 2012). In order to deliver culturally-responsive education, teacher educators must be resourceful and possess a solid understanding of theory of both Eurocentric and Indigenous knowledge systems to ensure the content taught in class is unbiased, differentiated, and engages the majority of students to increase student outcomes (Azam & Goodnough, 2018). Culturally-relevant teacher educators place equal value on and respect both Eurocentric and Indigenous knowledge systems. For teacher educators to have a solid understanding of both Eurocentric and Indigenous knowledge systems, some authors claim the most reasonable strategy is to deliver CRTT as a bilingual program (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2019).

Defining decolonization in education

Restoring, revitalizing, and decolonizing education is the process of creating educational programs that take into account Indigenous ways of knowing instead of being solely focused on Eurocentric teachings. This process called Indigenizing education (Kitchen & Raynor, 2013) ensures respect for all students and promotes well-being with the intention of increasing student engagement and outcomes (Hewitt, 2016). However, Buxton (2019) argued there is a need for deeper knowledge and understanding of histories, cultural practices as well as culturally-relevant

education in order to effectively restore Indigenous culture and language. Buxton (2019) further argued that through professional development activities, teacher educators can build confidence, increase expertise, and gain access to culturally-relevant resources in order to implement culturally-responsive education that can lead to decolonizing education.

Similarly, when teacher educators are properly trained in Indigenous ways of knowing and develop confidence to deliver culturally-relevant education, there is a greater chance to enable long-term restorative and decolonized education that can ultimately lead to increased intern teacher success in Indigenous communities (Buxton, 2019). Byrd (2016) highlighted that CRTT is effective for improving the outcomes of Indigenous intern teachers. As such, in order to obtain restorative education (and consequently decolonize education) by implementing Indigenous ways of knowing into the classroom, culturally-responsive teacher educators should be willing to attend and have sufficient access to professional development initiatives. Sharing stories and collaborating with Indigenous scholars and students can help to increase teacher educators' knowledge and understanding of Indigenous customs, norms, and languages to provide an inclusive learning environment for intern teachers (Azam & Goodnough, 2018). These types of relevant practices for fostering the development of teacher educators can be identified within the current CRTT programs available for Indigenous intern teachers.

Discussion and analysis

Since the creation of independent governance institutions in education (particularly in the 1970s) and the process towards self-determination, Indigenous peoples have established teacher education institutions that implement Indigenous ways of knowing. According to Wilson and Selle (2019), Indigenous self-determination in education in Canada is based upon self-governance (self-rule) whereas Indigenous self-determination in education in Norway is based upon shared-governance (shared-rule) (Wilson & Selle, 2019). The IBED program in Nunatsiavut is self-governed on a regional level (Nunatsiavut Government, 2021) whereas teacher education programs in Sápmi are based on shared-rule on a national level (Cochran-Smith et al., 2020). There are separate institutions for training Sámi intern teachers in Norway that deliver education in a culturally-appropriate manner. According to the Norwegian Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion (2009), individual municipalities are responsible for the basic preparation of Sámi educators in kindergartens. The Norwegian Directorate of Education is responsible for providing culturally-relevant materials for Sámi primary and secondary teacher preparation. The Norwegian Directorate of Education is also responsible for administering subsidies to the Sámi Parliament, which is accountable for developing curricula in primary, lower, and upper secondary education. The Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research works with the Sámi Parliament and is responsible for school regulations as well as supplying Sámi language resources to schools (Norwegian Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion, 2009). The Indigenous teacher education programs that are present in Sápmi and Inuit Nunangat are presented, respectively.

Indigenous teacher education programs in Sápmi

There are eight Indigenous teacher education programs tailored to Sámi throughout Sápmi:

- Sámi University of Applied Sciences in Norway
- Nord University in Norway
- UiT The Arctic University of Norway
- Giellagas Institute at the University of Oulu in Finland
- University of Lapland in Finland

- The Sámi Education Institute at Inari in Finland
- Umeå University in Sweden
- Luleå University of Technology in Sweden

According to Jakobsen (2011), a Sámi teacher preparation department was established in Northern Norway in 1974. However, it was not until the Sámi University of Applied Sciences was established in 1989 that authority to certify Sámi teachers was granted. The Sámi University of Applied Sciences provides teacher education for Sámi at its main campus located in Guovdageaidnu, Norway. Sámi students from Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia attend the Sámi University of Applied Sciences, and all teacher education is grounded in a Sámi perspective (Löfving et al., 2020). There is also a Sámi Research Group at Nord University in Norway that aids in the training of Sámi kindergarten teachers in Bodø. Nord University offers a bachelor program in Lule Sámi, as well as courses in Lule and South Sámi. There is a general teacher training program for Grades 1–7 in South Sámi and in Lule Sámi at Nord University (Löfving et al., 2020). The University of Tromsø, The Arctic University of Norway conducts research and education of Sámi that provides support for teachers taking Indigenous teacher programs. The University of Tromsø provides teacher training for Grades 8–13 in North Sámi, as well as courses in North Sámi language as part of teacher training at other levels (Löfving et al., 2020). Norway also has the support of Bodø University College as well as Northern Trønderlag University College that provide study programs in Sámi languages, but do not offer Indigenous teacher certification (Norwegian Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion, 2009).

In Finland, Sámi languages can be studied at the University of Helsinki, the University of Oulu, and the University of Lapland, but the Giellagas Institute at the University of Oulu and the Sámi Education Institute at Inari are solely responsible for educating Sámi teachers in Finland. The University of Lapland offers a teacher education program that focuses on Indigenous people, communities, and environment of the Arctic and offers courses in North Sámi for native speakers. These language courses can be supplemented with specific teacher training courses in Indigenous Pedagogy (IPED) at the University of Lapland, and non-Indigenous intern teachers can complete language courses in Sámi at the University's Language Centre. The Giellagas Institute has offered North Sámi as a major subject since 2001, and Sámi Culture since 2004. The Giellagas Institute provides a supportive role in order to train researchers, teachers, and other professionals to develop knowledge of Sámi cultures and languages (University of Oulu, 2020). Graduates in Sámi language at The Giellagas Institute are employed as teachers (Löfving et al., 2020). Lastly, the Sámi Education Institute is the only Indigenous people's institute to offer post-secondary teacher education in Finland. The Sámi Education Institute has three campuses in the homeland of the Finnish Sámi and educational programs, courses, and workshops are taught in Finnish and/or Sámi (The Sámi Education Institute, 2021).

In Sweden, Sámi languages can be taken at University of Umeå and the University of Uppsala; however, the government of Sweden tasked Umeå University and the Luleå University of Technology with developing Sámi teacher education. (Hammine, 2016). Umeå University offers courses in the Sámi languages including Southern, North and Lule, as well as lower to advanced Sámi cultural studies (Löfving et al., 2020). Luleå University of Technology offers the Arctic Inclusive Pedagogy course that has been developed and implemented in collaboration between the universities of Luleå, Oulu, Rovaniemi, Tromsø, and Umeå (referred to as the Arctic Five Universities) (Luleå University of Technology, 2019). Luleå University works within the framework of the Arctic Five Universities Teacher Education program that aims to advance and

share knowledge, and to promote education that aids in the development and sustainability of the Arctic (The University of the Arctic, 2021).

According to Siegl and Rießler (2015), there was only one school that offered compulsory teaching in Kildin Sámi in Lovozero, Russia. Siegl and Rießler (2015) mentioned that children had the option to learn Kildin Sámi as a second language in only one other school in Lovozero. There were both certified and non-certified Sámi language teachers in Russia who taught in schools located in the community of Lovozero on the Kola Peninsula. Siegl and Rießler (2015) argued there were limited teacher preparation opportunities for Kildin Sámi; however, through scholarships, Russian Sámi students could travel to areas of Scandinavia to learn North Sámi, which has become the most revitalized Sámi language. The lack of Sámi teachers and instructional materials, and the promotion of North Sámi over Kildin Sámi appeared to have created a threat to traditional Kola Sámi languages (Scheller, 2013).

Indigenous Teacher Education Programs in Inuit Nunangat

There are four teacher education programs tailored to Inuit within Inuit Nunangat:

- Kativik Ilisarniliriniq in Nunavik
- Nunavut Arctic College in Nunavut
- Inuit Bachelor of Education (IBED) in Labrador
- Aurora's teacher education program in Inuvialuit Settlement Region

In Nunavik, Kativik Ilisarniliriniq (School Board of Nunavik) is Inuit-controlled and responsible for teacher education (Branch, 2018). At a time when Québec was establishing provincial control over education as well as strict controls over languages of instruction and content of curriculum, the province granted Inuit extraordinary powers to design and administer education in their communities (Vick-Westgate, 2002). These arrangements strengthened the use of Inuktitut in education in Northern Québec (Daveluy, 2009). Currently, the Department of Integrated Studies in Education at McGill University works in partnership with Kativik Ilisarniliriniq to provide teacher certification (McGill University, 2021). Kativik Ilisarniliriniq developed programs and curriculum intended to preserve Inuit language, culture and identity (Watt, 2018). Many students enter Kativik Ilisarniliriniq teacher education programming via transitions or access programs designed in conjunction with schools (Summit, 2007). Both teacher education, and additional programs such as CÉGEP (public vocational colleges exclusive to Québec) are offered in English and French. The strength of the McGill - Kativik Ilisarniliriniq partnership for teacher education is that participants can complete all their studies in an Inuktitut immersion program, but there are also opportunities for Inuit students to take individual Inuktitut linguistics courses if full immersion is not desired (Daveluy, 2009; Summit, 2007). Although there are no provisions in the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement that specifically address language, there are specific clauses that guarantee Inuit self-govern their education programs, which has made it possible to have Inuktitut as the language of instruction in teacher education (Daveluy, 2009).

In Nunavut, Nunavut Arctic College is responsible for teacher preparation. This is one of the oldest running programs in Canada, which originally began as the Northwest Territories Teacher Education Program (Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group, LLP, 2017). According to Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group, LLP (2017), the Northwest Territories Teacher Education Program (NWTTEP) was established in Yellowknife (capital of Northwest Territories) in 1968. In 1974, the program was affiliated with the University of Saskatchewan and graduates of NWTTEP were able to obtain standing for the Bachelor of

Education program. In response to an identified need for a more culturally specific program in the Eastern Arctic, the Eastern Arctic Teacher Education Program (EATEP) was established in Iqaluit (which later became the capital of Nunavut) in 1979. EATEP students were granted full accreditation by McGill University and could qualify for a Northwest Territories Teaching Certificate. It was in 1987 that the responsibility of EATEP was transferred to the newly established Arctic College. In 2007, EATEP (now called Nunavut's Teacher Education Program) ended its relationship with McGill and began a partnership with the University of Regina, which ended in 2019 when Nunavut Arctic College formed a new partnership with Memorial University (Barney & Sorensen, 2019; Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group, LLP, 2017).

In 2014, the Nunatsiavut government signed a memorandum of understanding with Memorial University to establish a community-based Inuit Bachelor of Education (IBED) program in Goose Bay, Labrador (Moore, 2019). The IBED was a five-year pilot program that began as a partnership between the Nunatsiavut Government, the Labrador Institute of Memorial University, the Faculty of Education at Memorial University, and the College of the North Atlantic. The program focused on culturally-responsive teaching. While taught predominantly by non-Inuit, the goal of the program was to prepare Inuit teachers to teach in Labrador. Specifically, the goal was to incorporate Inuit language and culture into all aspects of the curriculum by utilizing the local community and resources (Moore et al., 2021). In Nunatsiavut, qualified teacher graduates are trained to teach in the combined ways of Eurocentric and Indigenous ways of knowing (Laugrand & Oosten, 2009).

Within the Inuvialuit Settlement Region there are course offerings at the Aurora College teacher education program for elementary school teachers, which is predominantly taught in a First Nations context, to reflect the population of the territory as a whole. The Aurora Research Institute provides support and conducts research that contributes to the social, cultural, and economic prosperity of Indigenous peoples in the Northwest Territories (Aurora Research Institute, 2021). As well, many Inuit teachers within the Inuvialuit Settlement Region become certified teachers and earn their B. Ed. degree through the University of Saskatchewan Indian Teacher Education Program in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan. Indigenous teacher education programs were first initiated in the Northwest Territories for the purpose of responding to the under-representation of Indigenous people in the teaching profession (Government of the Northwest Territories, 2021). There has been an effort to implement more culturally-appropriate education into schools, and educators are continuing their efforts to implement more Inuvialuit culture into the classroom (Berger et al., 2016). The self-governed Inuvialuit Regional Corporation established the Inuvialuit Cultural Centre (ICC) in 1998 that is responsible for the preservation and revitalization of the Inuvialuktun language (Inuit language). The ICC creates teaching resources for schools in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (Inuvialuit Regional Corporation, 2021).

Resistors and Enablers to Implement CRTT

From the literature review, it appeared that teacher education programs in both Norway/Scandinavia and Canada could be strengthened for Sámi and Inuit, respectively, to implement more Indigenous language and culture into schools and improve student outcomes. However, there is a need to find an optimal balance for delivering Eurocentric and Indigenous ways of knowing (Di Bitetti & Ferreras, 2017). On the one hand, both Sámi and Inuit continue to struggle for cultural restoration after hundreds of years of forced colonization and assimilative pressures that have devastated particular aspects of their cultures (Kingston, 2015). On the other hand, Gjerpe (2018) mentioned that New Zealand and Norwegian Indigenous students attended

mainstream (westernized) universities because of limited options available to obtain post-secondary education especially within educational institutions that are self-governed. The limited availability of Indigenous self-governed post-secondary institutions across Canada has also been highlighted by NCCAH (2017).

In Canada, many Indigenous educational institutions require partnerships with southern universities and colleges in order for students to become accredited and qualified teachers (Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group, LLP, 2017; Summit, 2007). In Norway, Indigenous self-determination and decolonization of education has not been fully achieved due to ongoing assimilative pressures from southern universities (Eriksen & Svendsen, 2020; Pratt et al., 2018). In this context, southern universities often deliver westernized content that may not be not culturally-appropriate for Indigenous peoples residing in the Arctic. Specifically, there remains a reliance on Eurocentric norms for Indigenous peoples (Fyhn et al., 2011; Keskitalo, 2014; Keskitalo, 2019; Thingnes, 2020). In turn, the formal education system remains dominated by Eurocentric/westernized universities and colleges that tends to marginalize Indigenous students (NCCAH, 2017). As such, students are forced to speak the country's dominant language for upgrading/certification as well as the pursuit of employment purposes so assimilative pressures are still prevalent (Daveluy, 2009; Keskitalo, 2019).

As well, many Indigenous students must choose to relocate to access post-secondary education and obtain the necessary teacher qualifications. For example, there are few opportunities for Inuit to obtain teaching qualifications in their home territory which necessitates moving to a southern university (that by default delivers predominantly westernized schooling) (Ting, 2011). As mentioned, this can be problematic because community and culture-based education has been considered to best meet the needs of Indigenous students to foster successful outcomes (Brayboy & Castagno, 2009). There are similar trends of relocating to receive teacher qualifications found throughout Sápmi (Norwegian Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion, 2009). Many Indigenous students have to plan to relocate from their communities to receive teacher education and obtain teacher qualifications (where education may not be delivered in a culturally-appropriate manner). CRTT can possibly mitigate the effects of Indigenous students relocating. Culturally-responsive education requires access to local community knowledge to bring Indigenous ways of knowing into the classroom (Government of the Northwest Territories, 2018). Culturally-responsive education encourages Indigenous culture, language, and the community to be embedded within the teacher preparation program (Government of the Northwest Territories, 2018).

However, the reliance on and adhering to dominant norms and values of a country makes delivering culturally-relevant education challenging (Keskitalo et al., 2012). Jokinen et al. (2016) argued that most careers in education and teaching require knowledge of the dominant language of a country (English and Norwegian, for example) other than knowledge of Indigenous languages especially when living in urban centers. Assimilating into the dominant society for career purposes is still prevalent in both cultures. As an example, most Sámi speak to each other in the majority language of the country they live in so justifying (and restoring) the use of traditional language and dialects becomes more challenging and requires more effort (Jokinen et al., 2016). The situation is similar in Canada where it remains advantageous to be able to speak French or English in Nunavik (Northern Québec) when Inuit students are seeking employment opportunities (Daveluy, 2009). This contributes to the ongoing impacts of assimilation and the need for a balanced CRTT program as discussed previously.

Conclusion

Sámi and Inuit share similarities and differences with regard to current political, economic, and educational systems that influence how CRTT is delivered. It is apparent that both cultures have struggled with social and economic hardships (Action Plan for Sámi Languages, 2009; Snow et al., 2018). Historically, there have been socioeconomic disparities in both cultures, for example, and a large proportion of Inuit and Sámi drop out of high school (Fredua-Kwarteng, 2016; Lieblein et al., 2018). The Sámi and Inuit are widely dispersed across multiple counties and many have relocated to urban centers (Keskitalo et al., 2012). Both cultures struggle with having the necessary supports and resources to reinvigorate and restore their educational systems through traditional culture and language (Czaykowska-Higgins et al., 2017). For example, there are shortages of qualified teachers that can speak the traditional language in both cultures (Keskitalo et al., 2011; Keskitalo et al., 2012; Linkola-Aikio, 2019) and there is a lack of culturally relevant educational practices in communities (Berger et al., 2019; Nutti, 2013). Moreover, there are cultural differences and variations in the longstanding impacts of assimilation so it might not be appropriate to apply CRTT in the same approach or style in all communities (Allen, 2007; Keskitalo et al., 2019).

Both Sámi and Inuit have taken steps towards overcoming a long legacy of colonization and assimilation in education. As such, I investigated the strengths and weaknesses of both cultures regarding decolonizing education through CRTT. I focused on the barriers for implementing CRTT such as a lack of qualified teachers, culturally-appropriate resources (including human resources), and the extent of language loss that has occurred in both cultures. I revealed there can be a need for CRTT to restore culture and language in education. I outlined the history of assimilation and justified why CRTT can be important for revitalizing language and enabling decolonization of education. I kept the focus on CRTT because authors have claimed that CRTT enables decolonization of Eurocentric education and is a first step towards Indigenous self-determination.

In turn, there have been efforts to restore Indigenous language and culture in education; however, assimilation pressures are still prevalent. Specifically, intern teachers are still pressured to learn the dominant language of the country in order to attend and succeed at (westernized) university as well as to gain meaningful employment. There remains an ongoing struggle to preserve language and culture while at the same time preparing intern teachers for citizenship and career prospects. Lastly, the majority of curricula remains standardized top-down across provinces and territories (which creates a lack of available space for incorporating Indigenous ways of knowing into the curriculum). There appears to be a lack of space being provided in schools for learning Inuit language, culture and customs, for example. Because English (and French) remains the most widely-spoken language in Canadian schools to teach about Inuit language and culture, Inuit practices can become tokenized and communities end up socially excluded from the decision-making processes. This inevitably leads to a lack of Inuit self-determination in education and creates a threat of Inuit languages becoming endangered (Pidgeon, 2016).

As mentioned, students need to find meaningful employment after graduation and most employment requires a command of the dominant language spoken in that country. This struggle between preserving traditional culture and language versus obtaining meaningful employment in mainstream society may help to explain the socio-economic issues of poverty and high dropout rates in Indigenous communities that are still prevalent today. Indigenous intern teachers may feel alienated and detached from the school system through a Eurocentric curriculum leading to poor student outcomes. Specifically, the history of Indigenous being forcefully aligned to

national agendas (assimilated) are still prevalent (albeit, covertly) and cause Indigenous intern teachers to lack trust for non-Indigenous teachers and Eurocentric or westernized school settings.

CRTT has been shown to increase and positively affect student outcomes, but Sámi and Inuit are still experiencing poor student outcomes, which may be due to ineffective teacher educator programs, ongoing assimilation pressures, language loss, and a lack of qualified teachers. It is also difficult to determine what balance is needed between Eurocentric and Indigenous ways of knowing with regard to implementing CRTT, and there also appears to be a lack of knowing how effective CRTT bilingual programs are. However, there is an opportunity to improve CRTT and to observe how CRTT is being delivered (Gay, 2013) by investigating how Inuit and Sámi teacher educators implement a combined curriculum of Eurocentric and Indigenous education. The similarities and differences between cultures demonstrate the need for CRTT to be applied in a context specific and flexible manner as highlighted by Flynn (2017) and Roofe (2015).

In summary, both Sámi and Inuit strive for self-determination with regard to education. Both cultures have exercised their right for autonomous and self-governed education and developed culturally-relevant teacher educator programs. Sámi and Inuit have developed culturally-relevant curricula that attempts to suit the needs of local Indigenous people; however, there is still a trend of socio-economic disparity in communities (Action Plan for Sámi Languages, 2009; Snow et al., 2018). There are still ongoing assimilation constraints due to intern teachers needing to relocate to obtain an education, as well as to learn the dominant language of a country. In order for CRTT to be effective, it appears there is a need to combine and balance Indigenous and Eurocentric ways of knowing. This balance (that can be epitomized through bilingual education) is important because Indigenous students still feel alienated, lack agency, and have mistrust for the mainstream educational system, as evidenced by a continued trend of high dropout rates of Indigenous students in schools.

References

- Norwegian Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion. (2009). *Action plan for Sámi languages*. https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/fad/vedlegg/Sámi/hp_2009_Sámisk_spraak_engelsk.pdf
- Allen, S. (2007). The future of Inuktitut in the face of majority languages: Bilingualism or language shift? *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 28, 515–536. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716407070282>
- Anderson, E., & Bonesteel, S. (2010). A brief history of federal Inuit policy development: Lessons in consultation and cultural competence. <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1374&context=aprci>
- Artieva, A. (2014). Sámi Parliament of Kola Peninsula: Fight for right to self-determination. *Barents Observer*. <https://barentsobserver.com/en/opinion/2014/11/Sámi-parliament-kola-peninsula-fight-right-self-determination-20-11>
- Aronson, B., & Laughter, J. (2016). The theory and practice of culturally relevant education: A synthesis of research across content areas. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(1), 163–206.
- Aurora Research Institute. (2021). *About us*. <https://nwtresearch.com/about-us>
- Aylward, M. L. (2010). The role of Inuit languages in Nunavut schooling: Nunavut teachers

- talk about bilingual education. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 33(2), 295–328.
- Azam, S., & Goodnough, K. (2018). Learning together about culturally relevant science teacher education: Indigenizing a science methods course. *International Journal of Innovation in Science and Mathematics Education*, 26, 74–88.
- Barney, M., & Sorensen, D. (2019, September 10). Re-focused Nunavut teacher education program to strengthen Inuit language and culture in schools.
<https://www.gov.nu.ca/education/news/re-focused-nunavut-teacher-education-program-strengthen-inuit-language-and-culture>
- Bentham, M. S. (2017). The changing tides of education in Nunavut: A non-Inuit perspective of Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit. (Master's thesis, University of Toronto).
<http://hdl.handle.net/1807/76931>
- Berger, P., Johnston, J., & Oskineegish, M. (2016). Culture in schooling in the Inuvialuit settlement region. *in education*, 22(1), 61–76.
- Berger, P., Inootik, K., Jones, R.S., & Kadjukiv, J. (2019). A hunger to teach: Recruiting Inuit teachers for Nunavut. *Études Inuit Studies*, 40(2), 47–69.
<https://www.erudit.org/en/journals/etudinit/2016-v40-n2-etudinit04225/1055431ar/>
- Bonesteel, S. (2006). *Canada's relationship with Inuit: A history of policy and program development*. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.
https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2010/aicn-inac/R3-82-2008-eng.pdf
- Bonesteel, S., & Anderson, E. (2008). *Canada's relationship with Inuit: A history of policy and program development*. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.
- Branch, Q. C. (2018). Mission of the Québec Ombudsman (Special Report).
<https://www.nunivaat.org/doc/publication/special-report-for-quality-educational-services-in-nunavik-that-the-respect-inuit-culture.pdf>
- Brayboy, B. M. J., & Castagno, A. E. (2009). Self-determination through self-education: Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous students in the USA. *Teaching Education*, 20(1), 31–53.
- Buxton, L. M. (2019). Professional development for teachers meeting cross-cultural challenges. *Journal for Multicultural Education*, 35(2), 19–32.
- Byrd, C. M. (2016). Does culturally relevant teaching work? An examination from student perspectives. *Sage Open*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016660744>
- Castagno, A. E., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2008). Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous youth: A review of the literature. *Review of educational research*, 78(4), 941–993.
- Chatwood, S., Bjerregaard, P., & Young, T. K. (2012). Global health—A circumpolar perspective. *American Journal of Public Health*, 102(7), 1246–1249.
- Coburn, E., Moreton-Robinson, A., Sefa Dei, G., & Stewart-Harawira, M. (2013). Unspeakable things: Indigenous research and social science. *Socio. La nouvelle revue des sciences sociales*, 2, 331–348.
- Coburn, E. (2015). A review of Indigenous statistics: A quantitative research methodology. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 4(2), 123–133.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Alexandersson, M., Ellis, V., Grudnoff, L., Hammerness, K., Oancea, A., & Toom, A. (2020). Transforming Norwegian teacher education: The final report of the international advisory panel for primary and lower secondary teacher education.
https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/315446/transforming_norwegian_teacher_education_2020.pdf?sequence=1

- Czaykowska-Higgins, E., Burton, S., McIvor, O., & Marinakis, A. (2017). *Supporting Indigenous language revitalisation through collaborative postsecondary proficiency-building curriculum*. <http://hdl.handle.net/1828/9372>
- Dallavis, C. (2011). “Because that’s who I am”: Extending theories of culturally responsive pedagogy to consider religious identity, belief, and practice. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 13(3). 138–144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2011.594375>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97–140.
- Daveluy, M. (2009). Inuit education in Alberta and Nunavik (Canada). *Études/Inuit/Studies*, 33(1-2), 173–190.
- Di Bitetti, M. S., & Ferreras, J. A. (2017). Publish (in English) or perish: The effect on citation rate of using languages other than English in scientific publications. *Ambio*, 46(1), 121–127.
- Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group, LLP. (2017). *Review of Nunavut Teacher Education Program (NTEP)*. <https://nunavutnews.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/NTEP-review-2017.pdf>
- Echeverria, E. (2012). *Culturally Relevant Education and Skill-Based Education for Sustainability: Moving towards an Integrated Theoretical and Methodological Framework*. [Master’s thesis, Dominican University of California]. ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED531064.pdf>
- Emelyanova, A. (2015). *Cross-regional analysis of population aging in the Arctic* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Oulu]. ResearchGate. [Cross-regional analysis of population aging in the Arctic \(oulu.fi\)](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309111111_Cross-regional_analysis_of_population_aging_in_the_Arctic)
- Eriksen, K. G., & Svendsen, S. H. B. (2020). Decolonial options in education—interrupting coloniality and inviting alternative conversations. *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education (NJCIE)*, 4(1), 1–9.
- Fickel, L. H., & Abbiss, J. (2019, November). Supporting secondary pre-service teacher identity development as culturally responsive and sustaining teachers. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education* 5(2), 138–158.
- Filback, R., & Green, A. (2013). *A framework of educator mindsets and consequences* [Table]. <https://rossier.usc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Educator-Mindsets-and-Consequences-Table-Filback-Green-2013.pdf>
- Flynn, J., James, R., Mathien, T., Mitchell, P., & Whalen, S. (2017). The overlooked context. Pedagogies for engagement and empowerment at the community college. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*, 19(1). 69–85.
- Fredua-Kwarteng, E. (2016). Inuit voices on quality education in Nunavut: Policy implications. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 2. 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ijem.2.1.31>.
- Fyhn, A. B., Sara Eira, E. J., & Sriraman, B. (2011). Perspectives on Sámi mathematics education. *Interchange*, 42(2), 185–203. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-011-9154-3>
- Fyhn, A., Meaney, T., Nystad, K., & Nutti, Y. (2017). *How Sámi teachers’ development of a teaching unit influences their self-determination*. CERME 10. HAL Open Science. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01937394/document>
- Garakani, T. (2016). The education of Inuit youth in Nunavik: Teachers’ and students’ perspectives. *études inuit studies*, 40(2), 25–46.
- Gardner-McTaggart, A. (2018). The promise of advantage: Englishness in IB international

- schools. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 22(4), 109–114.
- Gaski, H. (2021). *Sámi learning and education*. University of Texas.
<http://www.laits.utexas.edu/sami/diehtu/newera/learn-edu.htm>
- Gay, G. (2013). Teaching to and through cultural diversity. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 43(1), 48–70.
- Göcke, K. (2011). Inuit self-government in the Canadian North: the next step in the Nunavut project. *Zeitschrift für ausländisches öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht*, 71(1), 77–102.
- Gjerpe, K. K. (2018). From indigenous education to indigenising mainstream education. *FLEKS Scandinavian Journal of Intercultural Theory and Practice*, 5(1), 136–155.
- González, R. G., & Colangelo, P. (2010). The development of indigenous higher education: A comparative historical analysis between Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the US, 1880–2005. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 49(3), 3–23.
- Government of the Northwest Territories. (2018, August 31). *NWTJK–12 Indigenous languages & education (ILE) handbook: Our people, our land, our ways, our languages*.
https://www.ece.gov.nt.ca/sites/ece/files/resources/ile_handbook_draft_august_31_2018.pdf
- Government of the Northwest Territories. (2021). *Strategy for teacher education in the Northwest Territories 2005–2007*. Northwest Territories Education, Culture and Employment.
https://www.ece.gov.nt.ca/sites/ece/files/resources/strategy_for_teacher_education_in_the_nwt_-_2007-15.pdf
- Government of Norway. (2014). *Education for Development*. Report to the Storting [White Paper]. Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Meld. St. 25 (2013–2014).
<https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/118ab85ad919493699f9623aad5652fb/en-gb/pdfs/stm201320140025000engpdfs.pdf>
- Graham, L. M. (2010, November 2). *The right to education and the UN declaration on the rights of Indigenous peoples*. Legal studies research paper series (Research Paper 10-61). Suffolk University Law School.
https://www.afn.ca/uploads/files/education/28_2010_nov_lorie_graham_suffolk_law_school_education_and_undrip.pdf
- Greaves, W. (2016). Arctic (in)security and Indigenous peoples: Comparing Inuit in Canada and Sámi in Norway. *Security Dialogue*, 47(6), 461–480.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010616665957>
- Gustafsson, J. (2017). *Single case studies vs. multiple case studies: A comparative study*.
[https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1064378/FULLTEXT01.pdf%20\(10](https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1064378/FULLTEXT01.pdf%20(10)
- Hammine, M. (2016). *Sámi languages in education in Sweden and Finland*. ECMI (European Centre for Minority Issues) Working Paper.
- Hansen, K. L., Høgmo, A., & Lund, E. (2016). Value patterns in four dimensions among the Indigenous Sami population in Norway: A population-based survey. *Journal of Northern Studies*, 10(1), 39–66.
- Hayes, C., & Juárez, B. (2012). There is no culturally responsive teaching spoken here: A critical race perspective. *Democracy and Education*, 20(1), 1.
- Hermes, M., Bang, M., & Marin, A. (2012). Designing Indigenous language revitalization. *Harvard Educational Review*, 82(3), 381–402.
- Hernes, M. (2017). *Being Sámi enough—Increasing the Sámi stage of performance* [Master's Thesis, University of Oslo]. DUO.
<https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/57491/Being-Sámi-Enough.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

- Hewitt, J. G. (2016). Indigenous restorative justice: Approaches, meaning & possibility. *UNBLJ*, 67, 313.
- Hicks, C. J. B., & Somby, Á. (2013). 15| Sami responses to poverty in the Nordic countries. *Indigenous peoples and poverty: an international perspective*. <https://arctichealth.org/media/pubs/295960/Indigenous-Peoples-and-Poverty---An-International-Perspective.pdf>
- Høiskar, S. F. (2020). *An introduction to decolonization and how you can contribute*. SAIH. Norwegian Students' and Academics' International Assistance Fund. <https://saih.no/assets/docs/Avkolonisering/Avkolonisering-ENG.pdf>
- Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. (2007, October 5). *Post-secondary case studies in Inuit education: A discussion paper*. ITK. https://www.itk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Post-Secondary-Case-Studies-in-Inuit-Education_0.pdf
- Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. (2011). *First Canadians, Canadians first: National strategy on Inuit education 2011*. ITK. <https://itk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/National-Strategy-on-Inuit-Education-2011.pdf>
- Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. (2017). *National Inuit positions on federal legislation in relation to the Inuktitut language*. ITK. <https://www.itk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Inuktitut-position-paper.pdf>
- Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. (2017). *(re)Visioning success in Inuit education: A report of the 2017 Inuit Education Forum*. ITK. <https://www.itk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/inuitreport-web.pdf>
- Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. (2018). *Inuit statistical profile 2018*. ITK. <https://www.itk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Inuit-Statistical-Profile.pdf>
- Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. (2018). *National Inuit strategy on research*. ITK. <https://www.itk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/ITK-National-Inuit-Strategy-on-Research.pdf>
- Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. (2020). *About Canadian Inuit*. ITK. <https://www.itk.ca/about-canadian-inuit/>
- Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami. (2021). *Our history*. ITK. <https://www.itk.ca/national-voice-for-communities-in-the-canadian-arctic/>
- Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (2021). *Inuvialuit Cultural Centre Pitquhiit-Pitqusiit*. IRC. <https://irc.inuvialuit.com/service/inuvialuit-cultural-centre-pitquhiit-pitqusiit>
- Jakobsen, J. (2011). Education, Recognition and the Sámi people of Norway. In H. Niedrig & C. Ydesen (Eds.), *Writing postcolonial histories of intercultural education* (pp. 1–19). Peter Lang Publishing.
- Jabbar, A., & Hardaker, G. (2013). The role of culturally responsive teaching for supporting ethnic diversity in British University business schools. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(3), 272–284.
- Jokinen, K., Trong, T. N., & Hautamäki, V. (2016). Variation in spoken North Sámi language. *Interspeech 2016*, 3299–3303. <https://doi.org/10.21437/Interspeech.2016-1438>
- Josefsen, E. (2010). *The Saami and the national parliaments: Channels for political influence*. Inter Parliamentary Union (IPU) and UN Development Program (UNDP). <http://archive.ipu.org/splz-e/chiapas10/saami.pdf>
- Keskitalo, J. H. (2014). Chapter 6.4 Sámi education and development, between tradition and modernity. *Septentrio Conference Series*, 1(15). <https://doi.org/10.7557/5.3221>
- Keskitalo, P. (2019). Place and space in Sámi education. *Policy Futures in Education*, 17(4),

- 560–574. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210319848530>
- Keskitalo, P., Määttä, K., & Uusiautti, S. (2011). How to develop Indigenous peoples' education? Issues and solutions of Sámi education. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 34, 34.
- Keskitalo, P., Määttä, K., & Uusiautti, S. (2012). Re-thinking Sámi education. *Linguistics, Culture & Education*, 1(1), 12–41.
- Keskitalo, P., Uusiautti, S., & Maatta, K. (2012). How to make the small Indigenous cultures bloom? Special traits of Sámi education in Finland. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 15(1), 52–63.
- Kingston, L. (2015). The destruction of identity: Cultural genocide and Indigenous peoples. *Journal of Human Rights*, 14(1), 63–83.
- Kitchen, J., & Raynor, M. (2013). Indigenizing teacher education: An action research project. *The Canadian Journal of Action Research*, 14(3), 40–58.
- Kortekangas, O. (2019). Conclusion: Promising Prospects—Reflections on Research on Sámi Education Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow. In Kortekangas, O., Keskitalo, P., Nyssönen, J., Kotljarchuk, A., Paksuniemi, M., & Sjögren, D. (Eds.), *Sámi educational history in a comparative international perspective* (pp. 317–325). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kortekangas, O., Keskitalo, P., Nyssönen, J., Kotljarchuk, A., Paksuniemi, M., & Sjögren, D. (Eds.). (2019). *Sámi Educational History in a Comparative International Perspective*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kotljarchuk, A. (2019). Indigenous people, Vulnerability and the security dilemma: Sámi school education on the Kola Peninsula, 1917–1991. In Kortekangas, O., Keskitalo, P., Nyssönen, J., Kotljarchuk, A., Paksuniemi, M., & Sjögren, D. (Eds.), *Sámi Educational History in a comparative international perspective* (pp. 63–82). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Krakouer, J. (2015). *Literature review relating to the current context and discourse on Indigenous cultural awareness in the teaching space: Critical pedagogies and improving Indigenous learning outcomes through cultural responsiveness*. Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). https://research.acer.edu.au/indigenous_education/42/
- Krasnoff, B. (2016). *Culturally responsive teaching: A guide to evidence-based practices for teaching all students equitably*. Region X Equity Assistance Center Education Northwest.
- Krupnik, I., Rubis, J., & Nakashima, D. (2018). Epilogue. In D. Nakashima, I. Krupnik, & J. T. Rubis (Eds.), *Indigenous knowledge for climate change assessment and adaptation. Local and indigenous knowledge 2*. (pp. 280–290). Cambridge University Press and UNESCO.
- Kuokkanen, R. (2003). "Survivance" in Sámi and First Nations Boarding School Narratives: Reading Novels by Kerttu Vuolab and Shirley Sterling. *The American Indian Quarterly*, 27, 697–726. <https://doi.org/10.1353/aiq.2004.0080>.
- Kylli, R. (2019). Out of the "Pagan Darkness": Christian education in Finnish Lapland. In *Sámi Educational History in a Comparative International Perspective* (pp. 27–45). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.
- Lantto, P. (2010). Borders, citizenship and change: The case of the Sami people, 1751–2008. *Citizenship Studies*, 14(5), 543–556.
- Laugrand, F. B., & Oosten, J. G. (2010). *Inuit shamanism and Christianity: Transitions and transformations in the twentieth century* (Vol. 58). McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Laugrand, F., & Oosten, J. (2009). Education and transmission of Inuit knowledge in Canada. *Études/Inuit/Studies*, 33(1/2), 21–34.

- Lee, T. S. (2015). The significance of self-determination in socially, culturally, and linguistically responsive (SCLR) education in Indigenous contexts. *Journal of American Indian Education, 54*(1), 10–32.
- Lieblein, V. S. D., Warne, M., Huot, S., Laliberte Rudman, D., & Raanaas, R. K. (2018). A photovoice study of school belongingness among high school students in Norway. *International Journal of Circumpolar Health, 77*(1), 1421369.
- Lipman, P. (1995). “Bringing out the best in them”: The contribution of culturally relevant teachers to educational reform. *Theory Into Practice, 34*(3), 202–208.
- Löfving, L., Smed Olsen, L., Bjørn Grelck, J., & Paavola, J. M. (2020). *Sámi youth perspectives, education and the labour market*. Nordgriegio Report 2020:5.
<http://norden.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1445179/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Lin, M., & Bates, A. (2014). Who is in my classroom? Teachers preparing to work with culturally diverse students. *International Research in Early Childhood Education, 5*(1), 27–42.
- Linkola-Aikio, I. A. (2019). The history of the Sámi upper secondary school in Guovdageaidnu: Language policy development. In *Sámi Educational History in a Comparative International Perspective* (pp. 143–160). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Luleå University of Technology. (2019, December 21). *Arctic inclusive pedagogy*.
<https://www.ltu.se/edu/course/B70/B7002P/B7002P-Inkluderande-utbildning-i-en-arktisk-kontext-1.194668?l=en>
- Mader, R. (2021, August 19). International decade of Indigenous languages. Planeta.
<https://www.planeta.com/un-indigenous-languages-decade/>
- Martin, F., Pirbhai-Illich, F., & Pete, S. (2017). Beyond culturally responsive pedagogy: Decolonizing teacher education. In F. Pirbhai-Illich, S. Pete, & F. Martin (Eds.), *Culturally responsive pedagogy* (pp. 235–256). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martinez, S. (2020). *Barely scratching the surface: A study of culturally responsive teaching practices in teacher preparation programs* [Doctoral dissertation, Johnson & Wales University]. ScholarsArchive.
<https://scholarsarchive.jwu.edu/dissertations/AAI27958113/>
- McCarty, T., & Lee, T. (2014). Critical culturally sustaining/revitalizing pedagogy and Indigenous education sovereignty. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 101–124.
- McGee Jr., H. (2021). Mi'kmaq. In *The Canadian Encyclopedia*.
<https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/micmac-mikmaq>
- McGill University. (2021). *Partners*. Department of Integrated Studies in Education.
<https://www.mcgill.ca/dise/ofnie/partner>
- McGregor, H. E. (2011). *Inuit education and schools in the Eastern Arctic*. UBC Press.
- McGregor, H. E. (2012). Nunavut’s education act: education, legislation and change in the Arctic. *Northern Review, 36*, 27–52.
- McKechnie, J. (2015). Education as reconciliation: resorting Inuit Nunangat. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching, 4*(1)m, 56–67. <https://doi.org/10.5430/jct.v4n1p56>
- McMillan, B. (2015). Educating for cultural survival in Nunavut: Why haven’t we learned from the past? *Paideusis, 22*(2), 24–37.
- Mensah, F. M. (2021). Culturally relevant and culturally responsive. *Science and Children, 58*(4). https://digitalcommons.csp.edu/cup_commons_grad_edd/82/
- Mette, I. M., Nieuwenhuizen, L., & Hvidston, D. J. (2016). Teachers' perceptions of culturally responsive pedagogy and the impact on leadership preparation: Lessons for future reform efforts. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 11*(1), n1.

- Minde, H. (2005). Assimilation of the Sámi—implementation and consequences. *Journal of Indigenous peoples rights*, 3, 6–31
- Moore, S. (2019). Language and identity in an Indigenous teacher education program. *International Journal of Circumpolar Health*, 78(2), 1506213.
- Moore, S., Yeoman, E., & Flood, K. (2021). A history of preparing teachers for Northern Labrador. *The Morning Watch: Educational and Social Analysis*, 47(1-Spring), 105–121.
- Muñiz, J. (2019). *Culturally responsive teaching: A 50-state survey of teaching standards*. New America. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED594599.pdf>
- Murphy, M. (2014). Self-determination as a collective capability: The case of Indigenous peoples. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 15(4), 320–334.
- Nathani Wane, N. (2009). Indigenous education and cultural resistance: A decolonizing project. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 39(1), 159–178.
- National Collaborating Centre for Aboriginal Health (NCCAHA). (2017). *Education as a social determinant of First Nations, Inuit and Metis health*. <https://www.ccnsa-nccah.ca/docs/determinants/FS-Education-SDOH-2017-EN.pdf>
- Nelson, H. J., Cox-White, T. L., & Ziefflie, B. A. (2019). Indigenous student: Barrier and success strategies-A review of existing literature. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, 9(3), 70–77.
- Neri, R. C., Lozano, M., & Gomez, L. M. (2019). (Re)framing resistance to culturally relevant education as a multilevel learning problem. *Review of Research in Education*, 43(1), 197–226.
- Norwegian Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion. (2009). *Regjeringen. Action plan for Sámi languages*. https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/fad/vedlegg/Sámi/hp_2009_Sámisk_spraak_engelsk.pdf
- Nunatsiavut Government. (2021). *About Nunatsiavut Government a leader for the Inuit people*. <https://www.nunatsiavut.com/government/about-nunatsiavut-government/>
- Nutti, Y. J. (2013). Sámi teachers' experiences of Indigenous school transformation: Culturally based preschool and school mathematics lessons. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 9(1), 16–29.
- O'Daniel, K. (2017). *Student reactions to culturally relevant pedagogy designed to build trust and mutual respect* [Master's thesis, Hamline University]. DigitalCommons@Hamline. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/230713804.pdf>
- Ojala, C. G. (2014). East and west, north and south in Sápmi—Networks and boundaries in Sámi archaeology in Sweden. In J. Ikäheimo, A. Salmi, & T. Äikäs (Eds.), *Sounds Like Theory. XII Nordic Theoretical Archaeology Group Meeting in Oulu 25.–28.4. 2012* (pp. 173–185). The Archaeological Society of Finland.
- Oloo, J. A., & Kiramba, L. K. (2019). A narrative inquiry into experiences of Indigenous teachers during and after teacher preparation. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 1–20.
- Olsen, T. A. (2019). Sámi issues in Norwegian curricula: A historical overview. In O. Kortekangas, P. Keskitalo, J. Nyyssönen, A. Kotljarchuk, M. Paksuniemi, & D. Sjögren (Eds.), *Educational History in a Comparative International Perspective* (pp. 125–141). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ontario Ministry of Education. (2019). *The Ontario curriculum, Grades 9 to 12: First Nations, Métis, and Inuit studies, 2019*. <http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/First-nations-metis-inuit-studies-grades-9-12.pdf>

- Paksuniemi, M., & Keskitalo, P. (2019). Christian morality and enlightenment to the natural child: Third-Sector education in a children's home in Northern Finland (1907–1947). In O. Kortekangas, P. Keskitalo, J. Nyssönen, A. Kotljarchuk, M. Paksuniemi, & D. Sjögren (Eds.), *Sámi educational history in a comparative international perspective* (pp. 161–185). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-24112-4_10
- Patrick, D., Murasugi, K., & Palluq-Cloutier, J. (2017). Standardization of Inuit languages in Canada. In P. Lane, J. Costa, & H. De Korne (Eds.), *Standardizing Minority Languages (Open Access)* (pp. 135–153). Routledge.
- Patrick, D. (2019). Arctic languages in Canada in the age of globalization. In G. Hogan-Brun & B. O'Rourke (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Minority Languages and Communities* (pp. 257–284). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Patton, W., Lee Hong, A., Lampert, J., Burnett, B., & Anderson, J. (2012). *Report into the retention and graduation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students enrolled in initial teacher education*. University of South Australia. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/10916421.pdf>
- Pidgeon, M. (2014). Moving beyond good intentions: Indigenizing higher education in British Columbia universities through institutional responsibility and accountability. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 7–28.
- Pidgeon, M. (2016). More than a checklist: Meaningful Indigenous inclusion in higher education. *Social Inclusion*, 4(1), 77–91.
- Pinto-López, I. N., Montaudon-Tomas, C. M., Muñoz-Ortiz, M., & Montaudon-Tomas, I. M. (2020). Culturally responsive teaching to empower indigenous student communities. In L. Tripp & R. Collier (Eds.), *Culturally Responsive Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* (pp. 1–30). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-9989-0.ch001>
- Pratt, Y. P., Louie, D. W., Hanson, A. J., & Ottmann, J. (2018). Indigenous education and decolonization. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.240>
- Ravna, Ø. (2020). The duty to consult the Sámi in Norwegian law. *Arctic Review on Law and Politics*, 11, 233–255. <https://arcticreview.no/index.php/arctic/article/view/2582/4816>
- Ray, L., Wabano, M., & Bannerman, D. (2019). Getting a quality education: Indigenising post secondary institutions in Northern Ontario through the Indigenous quality assurance project. *Junctures: The Journal for Thematic Dialogue*, 20, 55–70.
- Ritsema, R., Dawson, J., Jorgensen, M., & Macdougall, B. (2015). “Steering our own ship?” An assessment of self-determination and self-governance for community development in Nunavut. *Northern Review*, 41, 157–180.
- Rowe, L. (2021). *Overcoming the void: Obstacles to authentic culturally relevant teaching* [Master's thesis, Dominican University of California]. PlumX. <https://scholar.dominican.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1032&context=education-masters-theses>
- Rudolph, S. (2011). Rethinking Indigenous educational disadvantage: A critical analysis of race and whiteness in Australian education policy [Master's thesis, University of Melbourne]. Minerva. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/162209817.pdf>
- Rychly, L., & Graves, E. (2012). Teacher characteristics for culturally responsive pedagogy. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 14(1), 44–49.
- Sámi Parliamentary Council. (2021). *Sámi Parliamentary Council*. <https://www.samediggi.fi/sami-parliamentary-council/?lang=en>
- Sámi School History. (2013). *Newspaper articles on Sami school history*.

- <http://skuvla.info/index-e.htm>
- Sametinget. (2021). *Background: The state and the Sami Parliament*.
<https://www.sametinget.se/9688>
- Scheller, E. (2013). *Kola Sámi language revitalisation - opportunities and challenges*.
<https://munin.uit.no/bitstream/handle/10037/5669/article.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Shchukina, O., Zadorin, M., Savelev, I., Ershova, I., & Konopleva, T. (2018). Norwegian policy on Sámi language learning and preservation. *Polish Journal of Educational Studies*, 71(1), 185–194.
- Sidorova, E. (2019). Circumpolar Indigeneity in Canada, Russia, and the United States (Alaska). *Arctic*, 72(1), 71–81.
- Siegl, F., & Rießler, M. (2015). Uneven Steps to Literacy. In H. F. Marten, M. Rießler, J. Saarikivi, & R. Toivanen (Eds.), *Cultural and Linguistic Minorities in the Russian Federation and the European Union* (pp. 189–230). Springer.
- Simonds, V. W., & Christopher, S. (2013). Adapting Western research methods to Indigenous ways of knowing. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(12), 2185–2192.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Phillipson, R., & Dunbar, R. (2019). *Is Nunavut education criminally inadequate? An analysis of current policies for Inuktitut and English in education, international and national law, linguistic and cultural genocide and crimes against humanity*. Nunavut Tunngavik.
<https://www.tunngavik.com/files/2019/04/NuLinguicideReportFINAL.pdf>
- Sleeter, C. E. (2008). 32 Preparing White teachers for diverse students. *Handbook of research on teacher education*, 559–582.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. *Urban Education*, 47(3), 562–584.
- Smith, L. T. (2021). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed Books.
<https://nycstandswithstandingrock.files.wordpress.com/2016/10/linda-tuhiwai-smith-decolonizing-methodologies-research-and-indigenous-peoples.pdf>
- Snow, K., Tulloch, S., Ochalski, H., & O’Gorman, M. (2018). Reconciliation, resilience and resistance in Inuit teachers' professional development and practices. *Education in the North*, 25(1-2), 108–134. <https://doi.org/10.26203/zm8m-wa24>
- Snow, K., Miller, T., & O’Gorman, M. (2020). Strategies for culturally responsive assessment adopted by educators in Inuit Nunangat. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 15(1), 61–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15595692.2020.1786366>
- Snyder, T. L. (2017). *Perceptions and experiences of White Teachers teaching African American students in K-5 rural midwest schools* [Doctoral dissertation, Concordia University – Portland]. DigitalCommons.
https://digitalcommons.csp.edu/cup_commons_grad_edd/82/
- Statistics Canada. 2016. *National census data*.
<https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/as-sa/98-200-x/2016022/98-200-x2016022-eng.cfm>
- Stephens, S. (2001). *Handbook for culturally responsive science curriculum*. Alaska Science Consortium and the Alaska Rural Systemic Initiative.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED451986.pdf>
- The Sámi Parliament. (2021). *The Sámi Parliament of Norway*.
https://sametinget.no/_f/p1/i76216562-1cc9-4bc4-8aab-dda60387c0b4/sametinget-generell-brosjyre_eng_web-1.pdf
- Svonni, M. (2001). *The Sámi language in education in Sweden*. Mercator-Education.

- https://www.mercatorresearch.eu/fileadmin/mercator/documents/regional_dossiers/saami_in_sweden.pdf
- Szilvási, Z. (2016). The Learning of and in Sámi in the Norwegian School Education. *Lingwistyka Stosowana*, 17(2), 81–91.
- Taylor, R. W. (2010). The role of teacher education programs in creating culturally competent teachers: A moral imperative for ensuring the academic success of diverse student populations. *Multicultural Education*, 17(3), 24–28.
- Te Ava, A., & Page, A. (2020). Culturally responsive pedagogy for sustainable quality education in the Cook Islands setting. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 25, 31–41.
- The Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. (2008). *All inclusive, inclusive education in Norway – Policy, practice, experience and challenges*. The Development of Education National Report of Norway.
http://www.ibe.unesco.org/National_Reports/ICE_2008/norway_NR08.pdf
- The Sámi Education Institute (2021). *Programs and course offerings*.
<https://www.sogsakk.fi/en>
- The University of the Arctic (2021). *Thematic network on teacher education for social justice and diversity in education*.
<https://www.uarctic.org/organization/thematic-networks/teacher-education-for-social-justice-and-diversity-in-education/>
- Thingnes, J. S. (2020). Making linguistic choices at a Sámi University: negotiating visions and demands. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 21(2), 153–174.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2019.1671712>
- Ting, J. (2011). *Barriers to post secondary education facing Aboriginal peoples in the North: Spotting the knowledge gaps*. [Master's thesis, University of Victoria]. DSpace.
https://dspace.library.uvic.ca/bitstream/handle/1828/3799/Tian_Jing_MPA_2012.pdf?sequence=3
- Todal, J. (2003). The Sami school system in Norway and international cooperation. *Comparative Education*, 39(2), 185–192.
- Trimmer, K., Ward, R., & Wondunna-Foley, L. (2018). Retention of Indigenous pre-service teachers enrolled in an Australian regional university. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 76, 58–67.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015). *Honouring the truth, reconciling for the future: Summary of the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.
<https://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/9.800288/publication.html>
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Truth and reconciliation commission of Canada: Calls to action*. Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.
https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/british-columbians-our-governments/indigenous-people/aboriginal-peoples-documents/calls_to_action_english2.pdf
- UNESCO (2021, March 22). *UNESCO launches the Global Task Force for making a decade of action for Indigenous languages*.
<https://en.unesco.org/news/unesco-launches-global-task-force-making-decade-action-indigenous-languages>
- United Nations (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- University of Oulu (2020, August 27). Giellagas institute degree programmes Saami Language.
<https://www oulu.fi/giellagasinstitute/studying>

- Vallée, J. (2018). *Eurocentrism in the curriculum: A barrier to Indigenous student success*. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/156871586.pdf>
- van der Voet, P. (2019). *Revitalisation through Sámi language education. A critical discourse analysis of the curricula from kindergarten to upper secondary school in Norway* [Master's thesis, UiT Norges arktiske universitet].
- Vick-Westagte, A. (2002). *Nunavik: Inuit-Controlled education in Arctic Quebec*. University of Calgary Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv6gqqw8>
- Vine, T. E. (2016). *The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada and Crown-Aboriginal relations*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Western Ontario]. EDT. <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/4407/>
- Watt, R. (2018, May 29). Reconciliation and education where are we at in Nunavik? *Education Canada*. <https://www.edcan.ca/articles/reconciliation-and-education/>
- White, J. P., & Peters, J. (2009). *A short history of Aboriginal education in Canada*. Aboriginal Policy Research Consortium International.
- Wilson, G. N., & Selle, P. (2019). Indigenous self-determination in Northern Canada and Norway. *IRPP Study*, 69, 1.
- Wiseman, D. & Kreuger, J. (2019). *Science education in Nunavut: Being led by Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit*. In C. D. Tippett & T. M. Milford (Eds.), *Science education in Canada: Consistencies, commonalities, and distinctions*. Springer.
- Zmyvalova, E., & Outakoski, H. (2019). The Development of Sámi Children's Right to Learn Sámi in the Russian School Context. In O. Kortekangas, P. Keskitalo, J. Nyssönen, A. Kotljarchuk, M. Paksuniemi, & D. Sjögren (Eds.), *Sámi educational history in a comparative international perspective* (pp. 105–123). Palgrave Macmillan.