Education in the North

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

ARTICLE

Authority and authoring knowledge, how to make space for Sámi voice in research

Sandra Lund, Sandra.Lund@miun.se
Mid Sweden University, Sweden
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4209-0406

Murat Öztok, murat.oztok@abdn.ac.uk
University of Aberdeen, Scotland
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8767-0856

DOI Number: https://doi.org/10.26203/c74x-xw66

Copyright: © 2025 Lund *et al.*

To cite this article: Lund, S. and Öztok, M., (2025). "Authority and authoring knowledge, how to make space for Sámi voice in research. *Education in the North*, **32**(1) pp.37-52.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-commercial License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Sandra: I was born in a big city near the capital city [Stockholm] and had no education or experience of the Swedish indigenous population but moved to Sápmie at the age of twenty. Even here, I did not receive any information about the Sami population. During the teacher training program, there was no content about the Swedish indigenous population. It was my first encounter with Sámi pupils as a trained teacher that I started to learn about Sámi traditions and the Sámi language. The pupils had to teach me. In each class there were one or possibly two pupils of Sami origin, so they were in a clear minority and nothing in the teaching was directed towards the other pupils gaining more knowledge about Sami traditions or language. I was very unsure how to approach this, and my fellow teachers, who were also immigrants, had no strategies. This aroused my curiosity. As a researcher, I have long been interested in rural education and minorities in education. This contributes to the arguments in favour of making room for Sami issues in research and education.

Murat: I have always seen myself as a nomad, leaving home at 18 in pursuit of new experiences and perspectives. My Turkish roots positioned me as an outsider in Western circles, yet my ability to pass as white taught me how power, knowledge, capital, and voice often hinge on surface-level traits. This tension – of being insider and outsider, of belonging and strangeness, of questioning myself and being questioned – guides me as a person and a researcher, reminding me of the colonising dangers any inquiry can carry. I have learnt that genuine understanding emerges when we recognise and honour difference, rather than flatten it in the name of science. My journey, both personal and academic, is one of remaining vigilant about whose voices are amplified and how we construct what we call knowledge.

Authority and authoring knowledge, how to make space for Sámi voice in research

Sandra Lund, Sandra.Lund@miun.se

Mid Sweden University, Sweden

Murat Öztok, murat.oztok@abdn.ac.uk

University of Aberdeen, Scotland

Abstract

This paper explores the dynamics of voice and authority in research, particularly focusing on the inclusion of Sámi perspectives. It critiques conventional knowledge production, which often marginalizes Indigenous voices, and advocates for a more equitable approach. Through ethnographic examples, the authors highlight the challenges and responsibilities of researchers working within Indigenous contexts. The paper calls for a decolonization of research practices, emphasizing the need for genuine collaboration and the amplification of marginalized voices to foster a more inclusive academic discourse. This approach aims to transform the processes of knowledge creation and dissemination, ensuring all voices are valued.

Keywords: Indigenous education, Sámi voices, postcolonial

Introduction

In this paper, we examine the complexities and responsibilities inherent in conducting research as an outsider; for instance, when a non-Indigenous scholar investigates Indigenous issues. As ethnographic researchers who have previously navigated unfamiliar academic terrains - be it a male academic exploring women's university experiences or a scholar from an urban centre studying rural schooling - we remain committed to finding ethical, respectful, and considerate methods for co-creating data and analyses. We acknowledge that this research was conducted on the traditional lands of Sámi people (Åre, Sweden) and from a place where Indigenous people were dispossessed (Aberdeen, Scotland). This act of dispossession was part of a broader pattern of displacement of Indigenous peoples, languages, and cultures globally. In this text we recognize Indigenous peoples´ enduring connection to this land and express our gratitude for the opportunity to work here. Within Indigenous research, the prevailing stance often emphasises that Indigenous peoples should themselves articulate the key research questions and shape the direction of inquiry. Yet when local interest in academic research is limited, their voices risk being overlooked, or worse, silenced. This tension underscores the importance of engaging with communities in ways that are both ethically sound and substantively meaningful.

The voice in research

The concept of voice in research is anything but straightforward. It involves a delicate interplay of interpretation, where both researchers and participants contribute to meaning-making (Simpson and Lewis, 2007). However, longstanding asymmetries of power can lead to discrepancies between participants' intended meanings and how their contributions are ultimately understood or represented (Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis, 2002). Traditional knowledge production has often privileged certain voices, such as typically those aligned with dominant paradigms at the expense of others (Ashcroft et al., 2006; Battiste, 2013; Lyotard, 1984). This marginalisation is no accident; it is rooted in colonial legacies and structural inequities that continue to shape the academic landscape (Smith, 2021). As a result, certain perspectives are amplified, while others are dismissed, distorting not only our understanding of social phenomena but also the very parameters of what counts as legitimate knowledge. To address this, one must question who wields interpretative authority, which voices are foregrounded, and how these dynamics influence both the findings of research and their reception in scholarly circles. Only by doing so can we begin to transform the processes through which knowledge is constructed and disseminated.

Recognition of these power imbalances is increasing, yet the notion of voice remains insufficiently theorised. Voice is not merely a faithful representation of researchers and participants; rather, it shapes the trajectory of inquiry, documents the evolving researcher-participant relationship, interprets actions and utterances, and ultimately constructs the final narrative (Facca et al., 2020). Understanding voice also means understanding silence: whose experiences are never captured, whose insights remain concealed, and whose stories go untold or undervalued (Mazzei, 2008; Simpson and Lewis, 2007). Historically, marginalised communities have been sidelined in academic discourse, leaving us with partial or impoverished understandings of the issues at hand. To rectify this, we must do more than simply "include" these communities. We must actively challenge dominant academic conventions,

recognising that legitimacy can be conferred or withheld by entrenched scholarly norms. In this paper, we adopt a broader conceptualisation of voice. Rather than limiting ourselves to a narrow phonocentric view, we regard voice as a conceptual 'space' in which one can be genuinely heard, acknowledged, and respected (St. Pierre, 2008).

This paper aspires to dismantle monolithic representations of knowledge in education research and foster a more harmonious 'choir' of academic voices. Our particular focus is on Sámi community, although the implications extend beyond any single group. We aim to encourage decolonising research practices that uphold scholarly rigour while maintaining human connection, reciprocity, and respect. By engaging in this critical rethinking, both of our research processes and the narratives they produce, we hope to ensure that all voices are not only included but also truly valued within academic discourse.

Researchers' responsibility to give, take, and make voices and search for silenced voices in academia

Concepts such as 'the self as a research tool' and 'insider/outsider' have long addressed issues of positionality and reflexivity in qualitative inquiry. Yet these notions often lack the analytical traction to unravel the complex power relations that shape how voices emerge or vanish between researchers and participants (Hammersley, 2006). In contrast, postcolonial theories provide critical frameworks for understanding how enduring colonial histories continue to influence contemporary knowledge production, particularly in contexts such as Saepmie, the ancestral homeland of Sámi people located in the Northern Nordic countries. Postcolonial scholarship reveals the persistent overshadowing of Indigenous voices by Western academic discourses, thus perpetuating the marginalisation of non-Indigenous knowledge systems.

The interplay of voice and silence in academia is by no means novel. Mazzei (2008) for instance, illuminates how white teacher-education students remain silent on issues of race, either because they fail to recognise racism as a problem or because they fear saying the 'wrong' thing from their position of privilege. Whether intentional or not, such silences serve to marginalise minority perspectives. Recognising one's own privilege entails actively countering such silences. Voice, moreover, is not confined to the spoken word; it emerges from a network of material and discursive elements. Voice can be understood as 'a voice without organs', a configuration in which past, present, and future entangle. This expanded notion transcends mere vocalisation, embracing the complexity of how voices take shape and resonate in different contexts (Mazzei, 2013; Mazzei and Jackson, 2017; Mazzei, 2016).

Engaging with these complexities also requires confronting the cultural tensions woven into insider–outsider dynamics. Drawing upon Said's concept of Orientalism (Bierman, 1979; Said, 1978), and the subsequent counterarguments for Occidentalism (e.g. Carrier, 1995), we are reminded that the lenses through which we represent others are never neutral. Nordic contexts provide a salient example. Despite their common reputation as egalitarian and perhaps peripheral to colonial axes of power, these regions still bear the imprints of coloniality and Indigenous marginalisation (Olsen and Shadian, 2020). For example, studies on Sámi communities illustrate that even when external researchers work 'in the field' in Northern areas, their understandings remain entangled with broader histories of dispossession

and epistemic dominance (Kuokkanen, 2011; Keskitalo and Määttä, 2011). In their ethnographic study, Keskitalo and Määttä (2011) explore the intersection of Sámi culture and school culture in order to discuss the challenges faced by Sámi schools, focusing on how these two cultural frameworks interact within the educational system. This study highlights the need for educational reforms that respect and incorporate Indigenous knowledge and practices to better serve Sámi students. Kuokkanen (2011) concludes that universities must fundamentally reassess their structures and practices to create more equitable and inclusive educational institutions. This involves recognizing and valuing Indigenous knowledge systems, such as traditional ecological knowledge and community-based learning practices. For instance, the use of controlled burns by Indigenous communities to manage forest ecosystems exemplifies a deep understanding of environmental stewardship. By integrating such knowledge, universities can foster a more holistic and responsible approach to education and research. Researchers are neither completely embedded insiders nor detached outsiders; instead, boundaries shift and blur under the pressure of historical, social, and epistemic forces (Hammersley, 2010).

Acknowledging these unstable positionalities compels us to accept knowledge as contingent, contested, and fluid. This perspective dismantles any illusion of singular authority, encouraging us to recognise that understanding emerges from a polyphony of voices – Indigenous and non-Indigenous, local and global, insider and outsider – each navigating its own power-laden terrain. Embracing such complexity can help reconfigure how knowledge is produced and circulated. As Spivak (1991) stresses, academia demands a decolonising move that rebuilds knowledge rather than simply adding to a colonial repository.

One vivid illustration of how colonial frameworks hinder Indigenous perspectives can be found in Sámi contexts. Over time, legal structures have shifted Sámi society from relational, responsibility-based notions of identity toward more rights-based frameworks, reflecting a colonial logic of ownership rather than reciprocal stewardship (Nilsson, 2020). This rights-based discourse is also a colonial mindset of ownership instead of sharing. When non-Sámi people claimed the rights to hunt and fish in the area that was left when settlers started to take ownership of land, the conflicts started to grow, and Sámi people started to mark borders. Recently the conflicts in Saepmie have escalated between Sámi people and non-Sámi people due to increased interest in landmarks, in terms of natural resources and tourism, the contradictions between Sámi and non-Sámi have also increased (Kløcker Larsen et al., 2020; Ojala and Nordin, 2015). Examples of such conflicts are the mining industry (Ojala and Nordin, 2015) hydropower in the county of Lappland, and tourism in the county of Jämtland. The foundation for these conflicts is an economic driven society together with a lack of knowledge (Kløcker Larsen et al., 2022; Kløcker Larsen and Raitio, 2023). This shift mirrors the broader issue of marginalising Indigenous perspectives, as these legal frameworks often fail to recognise the complexities of Sámi governance and customary membership practices such as hunting, fishing, and collecting material to handcraft in nature. By failing to recognise the relational and communal dimensions of Sámi governance, research perpetuates an incomplete and biased understanding, reinforcing epistemic injustice.

Ethnographic encounters and the fluidity of positionalities

As ethnographers of education, our own encounters reflect these issues, even if we have not explicitly studied Indigenous schooling. For example, in Öztok's research, working with marginalised participants in Western universities, the boundary between insider and outsider becomes a site of productive tension. Although he enters academic spaces with cultural, scholarly, and professional 'baggage', his participants do not simply treat him as an aloof observer. Instead, they choose to share experiences of alienation (both online and offline) that challenge institutional narratives of inclusivity. In these ethnographic encounters, the researcher is not a mere conduit of information. Instead, his positionality and the participants' perceptions of it co-produce a form of relational knowledge that cannot be reduced to simple hierarchies of 'expert' and 'subject'. This fluid negotiation underscores that what counts as legitimate knowledge emerges through a dynamic interplay of voices, grounded in trust, openness, and reflexivity.

In this ethnographic approach, the subtle interplay between our respective positionalities is highlighted. Participants´ willingness to confide in the researcher is not simply a function of rapport-building or methodological rigor; it is also shaped by the way the researcher positions himself in relation to them. By acknowledging that the researchers' interpretations are partial and contextually rooted, researchers can make room for voices to be more than mere data points. Different perspectives, articulated through the dialogues, co-produce knowledge that does not rest comfortably in traditional hierarchies of 'expert' and 'subject'. Instead, the insights forge together and remain open-ended, contingent, and profoundly relational. Though the focus of Öztok´s ethnographic research may be on the experiences of those in Western academic settings, these reflections are readily transferable to other socio-cultural landscapes, including Nordic contexts, where questions of power, place, and belonging persist. The fluidity of insider/outsider identities, and the transformative potential found in their negotiation, emerges as a crucial dynamic: it compels us to reconsider whose knowledge counts, how it is generated, and how we may strive to represent it with greater responsibility, humility, and integrity.

Another example is Lund´s ethnographic research, where she, as a researcher from a metropolitan university, tries to learn about rural education. She experiences the importance of being close, curious, and ready to learn. As a researcher with metropolitan benefits, you cannot understand how it is to live in a deep valley or an island with its isolation and dependency on the community (Lund, 2023). But if we as the research community neglect this educational context, just because we do not understand it, it will not be represented in research. To become a researcher, you have to be rather close to a university and the universities are in cities. In the making of Lund (2023), and Lund and Karlberg-Granlund (2023), there was a reflection from teachers and principals in rural education that they were never represented in research, and that they always had to adapt the research to their specific context in rural areas. Through the ethnographic study in deep respect to the field Lund did not give them a voice, they already had a very strong voice. She did get them space to express their voice in the research field, where before they did not have a sense of belonging.

In the fieldwork of rural education Lund also experienced the silence of Sámi education. The rural schools she visited were located in Saepmie and there were Sámi children in the schools with a rigorous

knowledge of the Sámi culture, but the teachers never spoke spontaneously about this, not with the children nor with the researcher. When the teachers were explicitly asked to describe how they worked it was more of a defender's speech than an ownership of the teaching in Sámi culture. They had the Sámi flag somewhere in the school, and the Sámi children had time to learn Sámi languages at the same time as the other children learned a third language, like it was something foreign. In conversation with the teachers, they explain a fear of being respectless concerning Sámi cultures, as they know too little and cannot do it right. Since we do not have the experience of research within Indigenous perspectives we could only speculate, and search for evidence in other studies.

In these same rural schools, however, Sámi education remained conspicuously silent. Although Sámi children attended these schools, teachers rarely mentioned Sámi culture without prompting. Their reluctance stemmed from insecurity – fearful that they might appear disrespectful due to a lack of knowledge – leading to a hesitant and defensive stance. Without direct experience in Indigenous research, we can only surmise how entrenched fears and gaps in understanding shape such silences. Yet studies do confirm that Sámi perspectives in education are routinely marginalised. For example, Walsh-Knarvik (2024) shows how little space the Sámi education gets in everyday teaching in Norway, and even if the goal is to get to know Sámi cultures the teachers do not prepare pupils for this. Walsh-Knarvik (2024) also states that Sámi narratives have to influence educational settings, not only through a happening once a year, but often. This implies that the narrative has to be told by the teacher and in that way the teacher makes a Sámi voice in the classroom, even if s/he is a non-Sámi. This gives a specific demand on teacher education and Keskitalo (2024) states that teacher education must develop Sámi perspectives within teachers' preservice. This is similar to the arguing of silent voices of race as Mazzei (2008) describes. Therefore, a non-topic of Sámi-perspectives in teacher education can be understood as a silenced voice. As Jones et al. (2025) argue this is not mentioned in the policy documents for the National Principal Training Program nor the regulation of the National Teacher Training Program in Sweden.

Comparable patterns emerge in research at large. Available evidence suggests that Sámi perspectives receive limited scholarly attention. In Sweden, higher education attainment is lower in Saepmie than in other regions (Eriksson, 2010). According to a recent study from the Public Health Agency of Sweden (2023), Sámi women are underrepresented in higher education, and Sámi men have even lower rates of postgraduate participation than the Swedish male average. This influences the representation of Sámi perspectives in discourses in educational practices. Another piece of evidence is that one of the largest funders of research in Sweden, the *Vetenskapsrådet* (Swedish Research Council) has only two funded research projects that mention Sámi issues concerning education. One project from 2015-2017 about art, agency, and social mobility: *Sámi culture transference in family, school, and community*; and one project from 2012-2014 about *Literacy in Sápmi*. This paucity of research further marginalises Sámi perspectives, ensuring that Indigenous voices struggle to shape educational policy and practice.

According to this evidence of Sámi silence in education; low attendance to higher education; and the funding of Sámi research projects, there is reason to believe that Sámi voices are not heard. The Sámi

voices have limited space in research, even if they do have a voice. Voice has different sounds and resonance in different contexts. It is always adapted to its context:

> Theorizing voice includes acknowledging voice as always already relational, that voice has no authentic or fixed point of origin, which means that voice should be treated and accounted for, as it is in critical qualitative research practices, as a complex construction where meanings are always situated and open to multiple interpretations. (Facca et.al., 2020, p.9)

To situate spaces for Sámi voices in academia, the researcher communities have the responsibility to prepare spaces and raise relevant questions. Researchers, by their authority, risk perpetuating epistemic injustice – a concept explored by Spivak (1999) – wherein the knowledge systems of marginalised groups are ignored or co-opted. A particularly harmful form of this injustice is epistemic violence, which occurs when Western ways of knowing are imposed as the universal standard, thereby erasing or invalidating Indigenous knowledge systems. This form of violence is, for example, evident in the historical and ongoing marginalisation of Indigenous Ecological Knowledge (IEK), often dismissed as unscientific or irrelevant in global climate change discussions (Maweu, 2011; Woodley, 1991).

To challenge these patterns, researchers must strive to cultivate spaces in which silenced voices can emerge and resonate. This includes foregrounding Indigenous narratives within education systems, integrating Sámi perspectives into teacher training and curricula, and fostering conditions where Indigenous researchers can thrive. It requires actively dismantling the hierarchies that define who counts as an expert and whose knowledge is deemed credible. By doing so, we do not merely 'add' Indigenous voices to an established academic canon; rather, we engage in a process of decolonising knowledge production itself – reconfiguring what it means to know, to learn, and to share understanding within the academy and beyond.

Make spaces for voices

Despite the authority researchers command within academic arenas, they bear an ethical obligation to counter the injustices born of Indigenous underrepresentation. Historically, voices from marginalised communities have not merely fallen by the wayside; they have been actively dismissed as lacking the legitimacy needed to shape scholarly narratives (e.g. Woodley, 1991; Doran, 2024; Eriksen et al., 2023). This exclusion rests upon deep-seated power structures that valorise mainstream knowledge traditions while sidelining alternative epistemologies. Such systemic marginalisation transcends incidental gaps in scholarly literature. It is both deliberate and consistent, rooted in historical hierarchies that continue to shape the intellectual landscape and silence Indigenous contributions.

Illuminating the discursive regimes and power dynamics that preserve these hierarchies calls for a critical awareness of how authority is wielded in academic knowledge production (Foucault, 1982). Certain voices – often linked to established Western paradigms – are amplified, while Indigenous and other non-dominant voices are quietened, if not entirely omitted. To redress this imbalance, researchers must adopt transformative methodologies that not only include Indigenous communities but centre their agencies. Community-led and participatory research can reconfigure the balance of power, ensuring that Indigenous leaders shape research questions, co-define agendas, and determine what counts as

valuable knowledge. Research reminds us that (Beckman et al., 2022) Indigenous communities hold what may be termed 'constituent power': an intrinsic ability to co-author the legal, social, and intellectual frameworks that govern their participation in public life. Negotiations of equality must therefore be a primary principle, securing Indigenous knowledge as a co-equal partner in scholarly discourse.

In the Saepmie region and beyond, a decolonising research ethos can help subvert longstanding asymmetries. This approach involves more than adding Indigenous concerns to pre-existing research agendas. Instead, it requires recalibrating the entire infrastructure of inquiry. By co-designing studies with Indigenous leaders, we ensure that their values, knowledge systems, and priorities become guiding principles rather than late-stage supplements. Such genuine collaboration can dismantle some of the colonial legacies that have overshadowed Arctic scholarship and reduce the risk that Indigenous insights are translated into an easily overlooked footnote.

Nevertheless, decolonising methodologies must also confront the potential for what is sometimes termed 'lateral violence' within Indigenous communities. External pressures and historical injustices can produce internal frictions, with community members contesting whose voice is most authentic or authoritative. When external recognition, funding, or academic credit become involved, internal tensions may sharpen, making it imperative that researchers do not reintroduce hierarchies simply by another name. Rather than aiming for a singular Indigenous voice—an impossible ideal—researchers should acknowledge the diversity of experiences and perspectives within Indigenous communities themselves. In so doing, they can help foster a healthier environment where multiple community voices coexist and shape the research narrative.

Incorporating a plurality of voices in Arctic research is essential not only for creating comprehensive knowledge but also for ensuring an equitable research process. As Marker (2000) asserts, "[the quality of research] is improved by a more detailed analysis that includes the perspectives and location of both Natives and non-Natives" (p.31). By incorporating Indigenous epistemologies, the resulting analyses become richer, more nuanced, and more reflective of the complexities that define the Arctic and other Indigenous landscapes. This inclusion not only questions dominant narratives but through more sustainable and contextually attuned lenses generates alternate frameworks for addressing critical socio-ecological issues – from climate adaptation to resource stewardship.

Bhabha's (1994) concept of hybrid spaces offers a useful metaphor for this complexity. Within these spaces, academic and Indigenous knowledge systems do not merely co-exist; they engage in a mutual exchange, generating new intellectual formations. These hybrid environments challenge entrenched hierarchies, fostering collaboration and trust. The outcome is not the appropriation of Indigenous views into a Western canon, but rather the co-creation of fresh insights that honour multiple epistemological traditions and respond more thoroughly to local realities. In this sense, the idea of a "choir" of voices becomes apposite: academia can become a stage on which voices blend, harmonise, and sometimes clash, ultimately producing resonant understandings that cannot emerge from any single tradition alone.

However, collaborative initiatives are not immune to the persistence of unequal power relations. Without deliberate efforts to redistribute authority, non-Sámi researchers may still dominate the interpretative

process, translating Indigenous knowledge into frameworks that align with Western disciplinary norms. True transformation necessitates a willingness to relinquish some of the privileges and prerogatives that have long defined academic authority. Indigenous knowledge must be welcomed on its own terms, resisting the impulse to filter or subordinate it to established categories. This means embracing new criteria for validity, new modes of dissemination, and new notions of what constitutes a legitimate research outcome.

Scholars and institutions must therefore ask themselves: do we, as holders of institutional privilege, have an epistemological responsibility to highlight and elevate Indigenous knowledge systems? If so, how might we enact this responsibility in meaningful and transformative ways? The shift required is not a matter of token inclusion, but of structural change, inviting Indigenous scholars, knowledge-keepers, and community members into dialogues as equal partners, reforming curricula to reflect a plurality of knowledges, and funding projects that are community-led, not just community-based. Only by taking such far-reaching steps can research begin to reflect the fullness and diversity of the human experience. In the end, it is through these concerted and conscientious efforts that we can ensure research outcomes truly represent the complexities of a region like Saepmie and secure equitable participation for all stakeholders, Indigenous and non-Indigenous alike.

Conclusion

By integrating postcolonial perspectives with a critical understanding of voice, this paper challenges entrenched academic practices in educational research. It calls attention to the colonised foundations of existing epistemologies and methodologies and advocates for creating spaces in which Indigenous voices can be expressed, understood, and respected. Achieving such an ethical reorientation entail moving beyond perfunctory inclusions and acknowledging the deep responsibilities that researchers, especially those operating from positions of power and privilege, bear in shaping the scholarly landscape.

Ethical research requires an unwavering commitment to ensuring that marginalised voices are more than mere tokens. Instead, their perspectives should co-inform the entire research process, from the formulation of questions to the interpretation and dissemination of results. For non-Sámi scholars, this may involve stepping back from long-privileged narratives to make room for knowledge systems that have historically been overshadowed. Recognising that fear of misrepresentation can itself serve as a pretext for silence, researchers should lean into the complexities of cross-cultural engagement, acknowledging mistakes and forging meaningful dialogue rather than retreating into inaction.

These undertakings will be neither simple nor swift, as institutional barriers such as academic gatekeeping, publishing norms, and funding biases continue to restrict the scope of whose knowledge counts. Overcoming these systemic impediments demands structural reforms. Academic institutions must broaden their criteria for what constitutes rigorous scholarship, support greater representation of Indigenous scholars and educators in decision-making roles, and provide equitable access to research resources that foster co-creation with marginalised communities. By doing so, the academy can begin to reflect a more genuinely pluralistic intellectual landscape, one that is enriched by a multiplicity of

voices, each contributing to a richer, more equitable understanding of human knowledge and experience.

Before turning to our concluding remarks, we wish to restate our intent in developing this paper. Grounded in a reflexive perspective, we set out to question the hegemony of Western epistemologies and to imagine spaces where non-dominant perspectives can be meaningfully acknowledged. Our approach is rooted in the conviction that merely inserting marginalised voices into existing academic structures does not suffice. Informed by our own experiences of displacement - Sandra moving to the land of the Sámi peoples, Saepmie, and Murat's nomadic journeys - we developed our own lens to examine our identities, privileges, and uncertainties, striving for openness, honesty, and a critical awareness of how power shapes knowledge. We also view reflexivity as an ongoing commitment, requiring us to continually challenge assumptions and remain alert to voices at the margins. In doing so, we hope to stimulate shifts in scholarly discourse, inviting more nuanced ways of thinking, researching, and collaborating that truly reflect the breadth of human experience.

As researchers, it is our responsibility to challenge prevailing norms and take minority perspectives into account when designing studies. Although in academia we wrestle with economic discourses and funding models that favour majority areas, we have an ethical and moral responsibility to make room for minority voices. Indigenous peoples are today in the minority and as privileged people we need to humble ourselves to the fact that our epistemological and perhaps even our ontological foundations are based on a revised norm. We wish to continue this work of scrutinising our research and educational practices to bring more nuances to the picture of educational knowledge.

References

ASHCROFT, B., GRIFFITHS, G., and TIFFIN, H., (2006). *The post-colonial studies reader*. London: Taylor and Francis.

BATTISTE, M., (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit.* Saskatchewan: Purich Publishing.

BECKMAN, L., GOVER, K., and MÖRKENSTAM, U., (2022). The popular sovereignty of Indigenous peoples: a challenge in multi-people states. *Citizenship Studies,* **26**(1)**,** pp.1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2021.2011142

BHABHA, H.K., (1994). *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.

BIERMAN, I.A., (1979). Edward Said, Orientalism. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978. *Review of Middle East Studies,* **13**, pp.68–68.

CARRIER, J.G., (1995). *Occidentalism: Images of the West: Images of the West*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

DORAN, L.E., (2024). 'For Their Own Good': Examining 'Gentle' Colonialism and Finnish Exceptionalism Within Narratives of Finland's Indigenous Residential Schools. *Scandinavian Journal of History,* **49**(2), pp.172–195. https://doi.org/10.1080/03468755.2023.2261446

ERIKSEN, K.G., AAMAAS, Å., and BJERKNES, A.L., (2023). Engaging with Indigenous perspectives in mainstream Norwegian teacher education: Collaborative autoethnography as a path toward decolonial indigenization. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, **18**(2), pp.135–148. https://doi.org/10.1080/15595692.2023.2173168

ERIKSSON, M., (2010). "People in Stockholm are smarter than countryside folks"–Reproducing urban and rural imaginaries in film and life. *Journal of Rural Studies,* **26**(2)**,** pp.95–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2009.09.005

FACCA, D., GLADSTONE, B., and TEACHMAN, G., (2020). Working the limits of "giving voice" to children: A critical conceptual review. *International journal of qualitative methods,* **19.** https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920933391

FOUCAULT, M., (1982). The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry,* **8**(4)**,** pp.777–795. https://doi.org/10.1086/448181

HAMMERSLEY, M., (2006). Ethnography: problems and prospects. *Ethnography and education,* **1**(1)**,** pp.3–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/17457820500512697

HAMMERSLEY, M., (2010). Ethnography. In: P.L. PETERSON, E. BAKER and B. MCGAW, eds., *International Encyclopedia of Education*, Oxford: Elsevier Science. pp.386-391. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-044894-7.01533-5

KESKITALO, P., (2024). Indigenizing pre-teacher education: reflections on utilizing traditional storytelling to gather language data from Sámi children. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples***.** https://doi.org/10.1177/11771801241291238

KESKITALO, P., and MÄÄTTÄ, K., (2011). How do the Sámi culture and school culture converge - or do they? *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education,* **40**(1)**,** pp.112–119. https://doi.org/10.1375/ajie.40.112

KLØCKER LARSEN, R., BOSTRÖM, M., MUONIO REINDEER HERDING DISTRICT, VILHELMINA SÖDRA REINDEER HERDING DISTRICT, VOERNESE REINDEER HERDING DISTRICT, and WIK-KARLSSON, J., (2022). The impacts of mining on Sámi lands: A knowledge synthesis from three reindeer herding districts. *The Extractive Industries and Society,* **9.** https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2022.101051

KLØCKER LARSEN, R., and RAITIO, K., (2023). Protected areas and Indigenous rights in Sápmi: an agonistic reading of conflict and collaboration in land use planning. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning,* **25**(3)**,** pp.342–354. https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2022.2137483

KLØCKER LARSEN, R., SKARIN, A., STINNERBOM, M., VANNAR, J., ALAM, M., KUHMUNEN, M., LAWRENCE, R., NYGÅRD, J., RAITIO, K., and SANDSTRÖM, P., (2020). Omtvistade landskap: Navigering mellan konkurrerande markanvändning och kumulativa effekter. Naturvårdsverket Rapport 6908.

KUOKKANEN, R., (2011). *Reshaping the university: Responsibility, Indigenous epistemes, and the logic of the gift*. Vancouver: UBC Press

LAWRENCE-LIGHTFOOT, S., and DAVIS, J. H., (2002). *The art and science of portraiture*. San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.

LUND, S., (2022). The geographic periphery as architecture for leadership practice with Swedish primary school principals: a peripatetic leading practice. *International Journal of Leadership in Education***,** pp.1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2022.2027526

LUND, S., (2023). *Ledarskap och professionellt lärande i geografiskt perifera grundskolor: en etnografisk studie av relationen mellan praktiker samt deras arrangemang.* Sundsvail: Mid Sweden University.

LUND, S., and KARLBERG-GRANLUND, G., (2023). Making Rural Areas Attractive for Teachers and Principals:Putting Rural Educational Settings on the Agenda. *Nordic Studies in Education,* **43**(2)**,** pp.181–196. https://doi.org/10.23865/nse.v43.3983

LYOTARD, J.-F., (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press.

MARKER, M., (2000). Lummi identity and white racism: When location is a real place. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education,* **13**(4), pp.401–414. https://doi.org/10.1080/095183900413359

MAWEU, J.M., (2011). Indigenous ecological knowledge and modern western ecological knowledge: Complementary, not contradictory. *Thought and Practice,* **3**(2), pp.35–47.

MAZZEI, L.A., (2008). Silence speaks: Whiteness revealed in the absence of voice. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* **24**(5), pp.1125–1136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.02.009

MAZZEI, L.A., (2013). A voice without organs: interviewing in posthumanist research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education,* **26**(6), pp.732–740. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2013.788761

MAZZEI, L.A., (2016). Voice without a subject. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies,* **16**(5)**,** pp.151–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708616636893

MAZZEI, L.A. and JACKSON, A.Y., (2017). Voice in the agentic assemblage. *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* **49**(11)**,** pp.1090–1098. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2016.1159176

NILSSON, R., (2020). The consequences of Swedish national law on Sámi self-constitution—The shift from a relational understanding of who is Sámi toward a rights-based understanding. *Ethnopolitics,* **19**(3)**,** pp.292–310. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2019.1644779

OJALA, C.-G., and NORDIN, J.M., (2015). Mining Sápmi: Colonial histories, Sámi archaeology, and the exploitation of natural resources in northern Sweden. Arctic Anthropology, 52(2), pp.6–21. https://doi.org/10.3368/aa.52.2.6

OLSEN, T., and SHADIAN, J.S., (2020). Introduction: Global arctic dialogues—Indigenous rights and resource governance. *The Northern Review,* **51,** pp.1–6.

SAID, E.W., (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

SIMPSON, R., and LEWIS, P., (2007). *Voice, Visibility and the Gendering of Organizations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian.

SMITH, L.T., (2021). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

SPIVAK, G.C., (1991). Feminism in decolonization. *Differences,* **3**(3)**,** pp.139–170. https://doi.org/10.1215/10407391-3-3-139

SPIVAK, G.C., (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjsf541

ST PIERRE, E.A., (2008). Decentering Voice in Qualitative Inquiry. *International Review of Qualitative Research,* **1**(3)**,** pp.319–336. https://doi.org/10.1525/irqr.2008.1.3.319

SWEDEN, P.H.A.O., (2023). *Hur mår Samer?* [How is the health of Sami people] [Online]. Available: https://www.folkhalsomyndigheten.se/contentassets/c5f23f317c4040e5adef075d7d4a0c26/hur-mar-samer-sverige.pdf

WALSH-KNARVIK, K., (2024). The Sámi Pathfinders: Addressing the Knowledge Gap in Norwegian Mainstream Education. *Genealogy,* **8**(3)**,** 86. https://doi.org/10.3390/genealogy8030086

WOODLEY, E., (1991). Indigenous ecological knowledge systems and development. *Agriculture and Human Values,* **8,** pp.173–178. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01579672

Responses

The importance of voice in research cannot be understated. Lund and Öztok rightly suggest that "understanding emerges from a polyphony of voices"; this is aligned with McLeod, Graham, and Cross's discussion about the hesitation to distil and narrowly define the purpose and alchemy of Galgael. The richness of voices delving deeply into a topic of shared importance does in fact exemplify decolonizing methodologies and critical pedagogies. As Lund and Öztok describe the multi-vocal, power-sharing landscape of research, they assert that "Embracing such complexity can help reconfigure how knowledge is produced and circulated" (Lund and Öztok). Disrupting re-colonizing, hegemonic traditions in the academy is much needed.

Further, the call at the end of the article for researchers to engage marginalized voices from the onset to co-inform the work, is one that I live in my own research practices and would strongly encourage all researchers to consider including projects beyond community-based research partnerships. While these relational approaches take time, they significantly enhance the overall project and the potential impacts it may have for under-served populations.

Another call in the paper is for the academic institutions occupying and serving students in traditional Sámi territories to have Sámi-specific teacher education. This is similar to the mandatory Indigenous education courses that all pre-service teachers have had to take in institutions across Canada for the past ten-ish years. The Deans of education from across the country recognized the need for educators to be better prepared to teach Indigenous topics, histories, issues, and ways of knowing, as part of the nation's commitment to reconciliation. This move is not without its challenges and pitfalls, requiring Indigenous people to educate present generations about past wrongs in vulnerable and potentially re-traumatizing ways. Significantly, Ms. Mary shares her residential school experiences, again and again, as found in Archer Olsen and Jorgensen Hunt. Despite this, mandatory Indigenous education courses are certainly having a substantial impact on the educators' readiness to engage more knowledgably about and with Indigenous peoples. Sámi people deserve the same. Sámi education should be a mandatory part of teacher preparation in Sámi lands.

Jennifer