

Chapter 11

Educational Inclusion of Indigenous Students in the Russian Federation



Maria Kozlova , Andrey Kozlov, and Tatiana Vlasova 

Abstract Consideration of the challenges of education for indigenous peoples in the chapter requires attention both to the topic of preserving cultural heritage and languages and to the issues of accessibility of higher education for representatives of indigenous minorities. First, we will briefly talk about ethnic and cultural diversity in the Russian Federation, then we will present the key provisions of the Russian educational policy regarding indigenous peoples. In the final part, we present the results of our empirical study of the educational integration of indigenous students at the university.

Introduction

Higher education for indigenous peoples is problematised in the modern academic literature in two directions. First, it is considered in the context of programs for the preservation of cultural heritage and languages which are implemented in different regions of the world and requires taking into account not only their cultural and psychological, but also social, economic, and political effects (Vančo & Efremov, 2020).

The second focus of the researchers' interest is the issues of accessibility of higher education for representatives of indigenous minorities. For example, studies indicate

Chapter is prepared within the framework of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE University).

M. Kozlova (✉)

International Laboratory for Social Integration Research, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia
e-mail: makozlova@hse.ru

A. Kozlov · T. Vlasova

International Laboratory for Social Integration Research, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

A. Kozlov

D. Anuchin Institute and Museum of Anthropology, Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

representatives of indigenous peoples to be among the most disadvantaged groups in this regard (Bradley et al., 2008).

If the state legislation provides for the possibility of obtaining higher education in the native language of students, both directions reinforce each other. As a result, higher education for indigenous peoples is becoming a tool for reviving ethnic cultures and languages. But if higher education is available only in the state language, the adaptation of indigenous students at the university is realised through assimilation, which implies orientation to the culture of the majority, through the rejection of the mother language and culture, significantly reducing the chances of indigenous students for academic success (Dreamson et al., 2017; Gilbert & Tillman, 2017; Weuffen et al., 2017).

Thus, both directions are closely connected, strengthening each other under certain circumstances, and eliminating each other under other conditions. Accordingly, consideration of the challenges of education for representatives of indigenous peoples requires attention to each topic.

However, before presenting the key provisions of the Russian educational policy in relation to indigenous peoples, as well as the results of our own empirical research, we will give a brief background on ethnic and cultural diversity in the Russian Federation.

The Indigenous Population of the Russian Federation: A Brief Reference

One of the specific features of the Russian Federation is the ethnic mosaic of space. The natural consequence of this peculiarity was the formation of a territorialised discourse in the interpretation of the relations of ethnic groups, but due to a whole complex of historical and social reasons, politicised views on ethnicity were formed and strengthened in Russian, and then Soviet and post-Soviet societies. They expressed themselves, among other things, in the formation of a certain hierarchy of ethnic groups, which was embedded in their administrative status.

According to Article 68 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation (Russian Federation, 1993), the state-forming people of Russia are Russians, who make up 77.7% of the population of the state (Rosstat, 2011).¹ Representatives of the other 190 ethnic groups (which is almost 32 million people) are part of the “multinational union of equal peoples of the country” (Russian Federation, 1993). The territories of relatively compact residences of representatives of sufficiently large peoples have the status of republics and autonomous regions and districts, that is, ethnically territorial entities. Republics and districts whose names include the corresponding ethnonyms

¹ Here and further population data are provided based on the results of the 2010 census—the last one in which the respondent’s ethnic identity was taken into account.

have become centres of “attraction” for the titular peoples² (Manakov, 2022). The formation of national-territorial regions in the Russian Federation began in 1918–19. By 1926, there were already 19 national autonomies with different statuses in Russia. Their number gradually increased (Trifonova, 2008). Today, the territory of Russia includes 85 territorial-administrative entities, designated (in descending order of autonomy) as a republic, region, district, of which 26 have the status of national: 21 republics, 1 autonomous region and 4 autonomous districts.

According to the 2010 census, almost all republics had more than half of the total population of representatives of titular peoples living within the borders of Russia. At the same time, however, representatives of the titular peoples are not the predominant group in all territories, unlike the Chechens and Ingush, whose share in the population of “their” republics is 95.3 and 94.1%. Yakuts, on the other hand, with their extremely high concentration within Yakutia-Sakha, make up only 50% of the permanent population of this republic of the Federation; Komi and Udmurts in their “own” republics 23.7 and 28.0%, and ethnic Karelians—only 7.4% of the total population living in the Republic of Karelia (Manakov, 2022).

Formally, republics and autonomous districts are territories of historical residence of certain ethnic groups. However, the intensive industrial development of these territories in the second half of the twentieth century, and the influx of a large number of migrants from the European part of the USSR into them, led not only to a decrease in the share of the indigenous population, but also to a reduction in areas suitable for extensive farming. This was especially evident in the northern and Arctic regions, where traditional nature management was based on a combination of hunting, fishing and reindeer husbandry. With this type of management, the sustainable existence of small-numbered peoples is possible only with a nomadic or semi-sedentary lifestyle: the exploitation of a limited territory leads to an irreversible depletion of slowly renewable natural resources.

Attempts to find a compromise between the industrial development of territories and the support of the indigenous population engaged in traditional spheres of economy already in the 1920s led to important consequences. One of them is the formation of the “national districts” that we mentioned. The second is the approval of the “Temporary Regulations on the management of indigenous peoples and tribes of the northern suburbs”, which introduced the concept and list of “indigenous small peoples” (USSR, 1926). Today, the Unified List of Indigenous Peoples of the Russian Federation includes 40 peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East, 6 ethnic groups of the North-West of the Russian Federation, the Urals, the foothills of the Caucasus and 14 peoples of Dagestan (Government of the Russian Federation (GRF), 2000a). According to the policy documents, indigenous small-numbered peoples are allocated to a separate group for the purpose of special protection by the state, are given a special status and receive a number of legally fixed benefits: preferential use of natural resources, earlier retirement, replacement of military service by alternatives, the list of forms of which includes reindeer herding, exemption from land fees, etc.

² The concept of “titular people” was excluded from Russian legislation in 1999 (Federal Law No. 99-FL).

The issues of protection of the rights of national minorities are comprehensively regulated by Federal Laws “On Guarantees of the Rights of Indigenous Minorities of the Russian Federation” (GRF, 1999), “On General Principles of Organisation of Communities of Indigenous Minorities of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation” (GRF, 2000b), “On Territories of Traditional Nature Use of Communities of Indigenous minorities of The North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation” (GRF, 2001). However, since political programs, reflecting the views of different social groups of Russian society were opposed at different stages and in various spheres of the formation of the legislative framework, experts regard the current legal situation in the field of protection of the rights of minorities and indigenous peoples as extremely unsatisfactory (Slezkine, 1994; Sokolovsky, 1997, 2006).

Let’s turn to the history and current situation of the realisation of one of the basic human rights – the right to education, and we will present the key stages of the inclusion of representatives of the indigenous population in the Russian educational space. At the same time, we will pay special attention to the study of national languages and cultures, i.e. we will turn to the first of the identified challenging areas in the development of education for indigenous peoples.

History and Current State of Indigenous Education in the Russian Federation

The annexation of nearby territories by the Russian Empire, in the period from the beginning of the sixteenth century to the end of the nineteenth century, led to a significant increase in the diversity of the inhabiting ethnicities and required the creation of a legislative framework for building state national and educational policy. The first official document that defined the foundations of the ethnocultural policy of the Russian Empire was the Charter “On the Management of Aborigines” adopted in 1822 (Presidential Library, 1830), which united all non-Russian peoples under the name “aborigines”. However, representatives of ethnic groups significantly different in political, socio-cultural and economic characteristics and, accordingly, in the degree of formation of educational systems, lived in the annexed territories: peoples with an established system of both religious and secular education (Kazan Tatars, Bashkirs, Chuvash, annexed to Russia as a result of the conquest of the Kazan Khanate), peoples with a developed confessional and the emerging secular education (Crimean Tatars, a number of peoples of Dagestan and the North Caucasus, Buryats and Kalmyks), peoples, without their own writing and alphabet (some peoples of Dagestan and the North Caucasus, the peoples of Siberia, the North and the Far East).

The tasks of territorial expansion and retention of the peoples inhabiting the annexed territories within the borders of the Empire were solved through their systematic and rather successful assimilation, primarily through the formation of

a unified educational space. Thus, the educational policy pursued by Russia was of a colonialist nature. The focus on secular education was established in the first half of the nineteenth century, when the state authorities began to realise that in order to strengthen their positions not only among Christian but also among other peoples, it was necessary to form a stratum, brought up in Russian educational institutions on the traditions of Russian culture and in the Russian language. By the middle of the nineteenth century, regional education systems had completely lost their autonomy. However, the demands of the capitalist economy in the late 19th—early twentieth centuries required an increase in the variety of types expansion of the network of educational institutions, and diversification of education levels. This has led to some democratisation of the access of children of the underprivileged classes to lower and middle-level educational institutions, as well as to the teacher training system for lower and primary schools. As a result, by the beginning of the twentieth century, in the national regions of Russia, a system of secular education was being formed, including several stages: primary general, primary professional, classic and real secondary, secondary pedagogical and higher.

However, only a small number of teachers saw, in “aboriginal schools”, a potential tool for the development of cultures of the peoples inhabiting Russia and the introduction of children through native culture to Russian and world culture. In practice, the diversity of peoples inhabiting Russia about 150 different ethnicities was taken into account very poorly, the curricula almost did not differ from those for schools without the epithet “aboriginal”, the language of teaching in all schools was only Russian. The result of this kind of educational policy is not surprising: for the development of the child’s personality, it had a devastating effect—“children who differed in abilities before entering school, children with creative initiative, feel the abyss that separates them from their native hut and from the environment from which the teacher came, lose the ground under their feet” (Rusova, 1916, 23). The reaction of opposition to this educational policy is also predictable, both at the level of legislative initiatives of teachers participating in the 1913 First All-Russian Congress on Public Education, where the work of a special section was devoted to the issues of indigenous schools, and at the level of spontaneous protest actions of the population: “one Yakut trained his son to simulate deafness in order to save the child from having to attend school. The father’s training was so good that the police officer, the doctor and the teacher could not open the simulation, although they had heard about it from the side. Only a shrewd trustee, obviously well acquainted with the local conditions, launched into a trick:—Well, okay, he says, as if to himself:—we’ll take him and cure—we’ll check the hole in his ear with a gimlet and he will hear. The boy began to cry, began to beg...” (Zelenko, 1916, 12). The introduction of the challenges of indigenous schools into public discourse, for example, at the All-Russian Congress on Public Education most often led to stricter rules governing the activities of schools intended for the education of representatives of indigenous peoples.

After the October Revolution, the next stage in the development of native education covered the period from 1918 to 1958. Education was especially actively developed in the indigenous regions in the first decades of Soviet power due to the

adoption of a number of important laws and legislative acts aimed at the preservation and development of ethnic languages and cultures (Zamyatin, 2017). In the 1920s and 1930s, “native schools” (educational institutions that provided teaching in the native languages of students) were created. Education in them was conducted with full or partial use of the ethnic component aimed at preserving, developing and promoting the native language and native culture. More often than not, native schools were created to support the language and culture of the indigenous people, who were in danger of disappearing or losing their native language and culture. By 1960, in Soviet Russia (it consisted of 15 autonomous republics, 6 autonomous regions and 10 national districts), school education was conducted in 47 languages (Kairov, 1960). In 1949, in accordance with the Decree of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR, the Scientific Research Institute of Native Schools was established as part of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, which coordinated the work of scientists and teachers of the Russian Federation and trained scientific and pedagogical personnel for the national regions of the RSFSR (APS, 1949), later 12 regional branches and laboratories of the Institute were opened. During this period, other measures were taken to support ethnic cultures: cultural centers were opened, scientific understanding of the phenomenon of national culture and ethnic identity began.

A gradual departure from the strategy of active development of native education was outlined with the school reform in 1958 and the adoption of the Law “On strengthening the connection of schools with life and further development of the education system in the USSR” and continued until the 1990s. The reform created a mechanism for the mass translation of native schools into the Russian language of teaching with the lowering of the status of the native language to the level of an academic discipline, which was ideologically justified by the statement of the resolution of the “ethnic issue” and the complete overcoming of ethnic disunity. As a result, the basic principle of the native school “school in the native language”, implemented in the 1925–60s, was essentially replaced by another principle—“Russian school with the native language as an academic discipline”. As a result, by the end of the 1980s, only 18 ethnic groups in Russia had retained education in their native languages, 14 of them within the primary school. Since the 1990s, the term “native school” has ceased to be used in regulatory documents and academic literature, or is noted as a historical fact (Boziev, 2017).

The period of political restructuring that followed the adoption of the Declaration of Sovereignty of Russia on June 12, 1990, introduced a liberal idea into the development of native education. Despite the fact that, while adopted in 1992, the Law “On Education” has practically abolished the category of native schools (the designation “schools with native (non-Russian) and Russian (non-native) language of teaching” appeared in the by-laws of the Ministry of Education) (GRF, 1992), in the wake of separatist movements, different regions began to independently determine the ratio of the components of the content of education and new educational institutions with different languages of teaching were opened. As a result, the ethnic component in the curricula began to take a predominant position, especially in those parts of the Russian Federation (Tatarstan, the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia), etc.),

where republican elite groups were aiming to gain sovereignty. For a decade and a half, the federal authorities allowed this, especially since the Constitution of the RF enshrines the right of every person to study their native language and culture, to study in their native language (RF, 1993), along with compulsory study of native languages in the ethnic regions of the RF.

In the period from the mid-1990s to the end of the 2000s, a number of local initiatives were developed aimed at mastering the native language and culture by representatives of indigenous peoples, as well as strengthening the ties of indigenous children with the local community. Among these initiatives are the dissemination of the program utilising the “language nest” technique, which is regarded as an effective language maintenance mechanism, is grounded in childrens immersion in indigenous language, the formation of small ungraded schools in indigenous communities with 14 students per class to provide primary and, on rare occasion, secondary education, attempts to implement the model of ‘nomadic kindergarten-school’ to prepare children between the ages of three and six for entry into primary school through the use of the basics of indigenous pedagogy and indigenous language. It was assumed that such projects would grow into local cultural centers comprising kindergarten, school, study groups, library, first-aid posts and facilities for leisure activities, all under one roof. This would make it possible, by strengthening the ties between the school and the local indigenous community, among other things, to form a stable educational motivation among young indigenous representatives and, through the joint efforts of teachers, parents and the local community, to build a variety of educational trajectories, thereby ensuring both structural and relational aspects of the educational inclusion of indigenous peoples (Zamyatin, 2017).

However, in 2016, the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation adopted in 2012 (Putin, 2012) “On measures to implement state policy in the field of education and science” came into force, introducing the principle of normative per capita financing of schools, which dealt a serious blow to inclusive education in general and school education of indigenous peoples, abolishing small schools and classes. Then, on July 20, 2017, at a meeting of the Presidential Council on Interethnic Relations, Vladimir Putin stated that “Russian is the state language for us, and nothing can replace it; it is the natural spiritual framework of our entire multinational country” and “everyone should know it”. At the same time, he stressed: “The languages of the peoples of Russia are also an integral part of the original culture of Russia. However, forcing a person to learn a language that is not his native language is just as unacceptable as reducing the level and time of teaching Russian. I draw the special attention of the heads of the regions of the Russian Federation to this” (Council on Interethnic Relations, 2017). The President’s speech served as a signal for mass inspections of Tatarstan schools by the Prosecutor’s Office. Many teachers of the Tatar language were dismissed. During the same period, the State Duma began work on amendments to the Federal Law “On Education”. The adoption of the amendments was accompanied by protests of the population of ethnic republics: in some cases, as, for example, in Tatarstan, these protests were massive, in others, for example, in Udmurtia, they had local character, but tragic consequences (The scientist died..., 2019). However, the amendments were adopted. In accordance with the adopted amendments, the

choice of language as a discipline of study in secondary schools is the prerogative of the students parents. The choice is made by submitting a personal application before the child enters the 1st and 5th grades (GRF, 2012). The decision seems very democratic and balanced, if we do not take into account that, firstly, the range of choice is determined by the personnel and methodological capabilities of the school, which does not always have suitably qualified teachers and educational literature, and, secondly, that even if the school can provide children with the opportunity to learn languages other than Russian, the Federal State Educational Standard recommends allocating one hour per week for this (Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation, 2022). All preschool educational institutions provide education only in Russian. The low status of indigenous languages does not create incentives for their study and is detrimental to the educational motivation of indigenous students who do not feel the connection between the needs of local communities and the policies and practices of mainstream schooling. As a result, the level of education among the indigenous peoples is decreasing. At least 48% of indigenous youth have completed, or partially completed, only primary or secondary education, while 17% do not have even a primary education (Zamyatin, 2017). But experts are particularly concerned about the quality of school education available to indigenous peoples.

According to experts, school education, especially in the boarding school format, which is especially typical for regions where nomadic peoples live, breaks childrens ties with native cultures, rarely offering something in return: *“for them, the boarding school regime is not clear at all. Parents say that children return from boarding schools to the camps lazy. They don’t want anything, no initiative, that is, we don’t support the traditional culture in them. We kill everything we can in them [...] They would be good reindeer herders, hunters, fishermen. And they have forgotten all this, they stay in the villages, hang out, drink, they can’t apply themselves anywhere. That is, we are losing generation after generation”* (An interview with an employee of the Governor’s Office of the KhMAD (other information about the expert is not disclosed for informant’s security reasons). Field materials of the authors, 2022).

To assess the overall level of school preparation of indigenous students, let us turn to the results of a monitoring study, conducted by the Federal Service for Supervision of Education and Science (Rosobrnadzor) since 2019 (FSSES, 2022). Monitoring records, in particular, such indicators as achievement of the minimum level of training, achievement of the maximum level of training, educational equality (the ratio between 25% of schools with the highest and 25% of schools with the lowest indicators of student achievement). It should be noted that the ethnicity of students is not recorded during monitoring. However, studies show that the level of urbanisation and the proportion of the population with higher education in the regions are significant predictors of the choice of the academic trajectory by students after graduating from high school and the availability of educational resources in general (Zakharov & Adamovich, 2020). Since the proportion of people with higher education among the indigenous population of the Russian Federation is relatively small, and the level of urbanisation of the territories of compact residence of the indigenous population is lower than in the whole country, we can assume a low level of school preparation and a high level of educational inequality for the category of schoolchildren we

are interested in. Indeed, according to the all-Russian monitoring, according to all indicators, the regions of compact residence of the indigenous population are in the “orange” and “red” zones (with the results “bad” and “very bad”). The exception is Khanty-Mansi Autonomous District, which was in the zone of “good” indicators, but the share of the indigenous population here is about 2% (Khanty-1.3% of the population of the district, Mansi-0.8%) (Rosstat, 2011).

Thus, education in schools in the regions of compact residence of representatives of indigenous peoples does not contribute to the preservation of cultural traditions and language, but, at the same time, it does not provide a level of mastery of the curriculum and the development of educational motivation sufficient for admission to university on a general basis. In this regard, in a number of universities, both in regions of compact residence and in central cities, quotas are being formed for teaching students from among representatives of indigenous peoples, as well as individual educational institutions or faculties, which partially increases the accessibility of higher education for representatives of indigenous peoples (Sitnikova et al., 2018).

Accessibility of Higher Education for Indigenous Peoples

The introduction of quotas for representatives of indigenous peoples and the formation of specialised faculties in universities facilitate admission to higher education and thus contribute to increasing the accessibility of higher education for indigenous peoples, as one of the three most disadvantaged groups in this regard, along with students from remote administrative centres and hard-to-reach settlements, and students from families with low socio-economic status (Bradley et al., 2008). However, as the results of studies in different countries show, if an applicant from a family with a low socio-economic status is enrolled in a university, then his/her academic performance is generally comparable with the academic performance of students who do not belong to socially vulnerable categories, unlike indigenous students who have lower academic performances and a higher “dropout rate” (CSHE, 2008). This acutely raises the issues of creating an educational environment in schools and universities that is friendly to students from ethnic and cultural minorities, forming a positive educational experience for them and maintaining a high level of educational motivation (Tang & Tsui, 2018).

The data of our previous studies have demonstrated a high level of stressful pressure of the urban environment, which indigenous students are forced to resist. It was revealed that the majority (60%) of the surveyed students from among the indigenous population of the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous District (Western Siberia), have a low estimate of their social status, feel dissatisfaction with their surroundings (family and peers) and the work they do, have an increased level of personal anxiety and ideas about the surrounding world as unstable. Since the psychological manifestations of stress are caused by a complex of endocrine changes, the correlation of cortisol excretion with the degree of urbanisation found during the study is also natural: the content of cortisol in saliva samples is lower in Khanty and Mansi living

in national settlements and engaged in hunting and fishing than in students in the city. The revealed trends coincide with the patterns described in groups of other representatives of the indigenous population of Siberia (Kozlov et al., 2007; Pikovskaya et al., 1997). Russians in the north have a different cortisol content: a high level of hormone production is typical for Russians living in villages, and the lowest level of cortisol excretion characterises Russian university students in Khanty-Mansiysk (Kozlov et al., 2012). Thus, the research demonstrates the stressful potential of the inclusion of young Northerners in the life of a modern city associated with the need for higher education.

However, Komi-Permyak students, studying at a pedagogical university in another large Russian city, Perm (Northern Urals), showed exactly the opposite results when comparing stress indicators (anxiety and cortisol concentration) with Russian students of the same university who lived in rural areas and in Perm before entering the university (Table 11.1) (the organisation and methods of the study are presented in detail in Kozlova et al., 2022).

The data presented in Table 11.1 indicate that there are no significant differences in cortisol levels between samples of Russian students who lived before entering the university in the villages of the Perm Region ($n = 62$) and in Perm ($n = 140$) ($p = 0.539$). At the same time, the level of situational (Mann–Whitney (195) = 3497.5; $p < 0.01$) and personal anxiety (Mann–Whitney (195) = 3486; $p < 0.01$) and median cortisol concentration levels in Komi-Permyaks are significantly lower ($p < 0.0001$) compared with Russian students.

Of course, the atypical nature of the situation prompted us to take a closer look at the case of Komi-Permyak students, paying special attention to subjective assessments of students' educational experience, explicated as a result of semi-structured biographical interviews ($N = 10$).³

Of course, moving from villages located on the territory of the Komi-Permyak district to a large city is a non-trivial event for our informants, associated with strong, often negative, experiences and anxiety: *“when you come to this big city, you feel that you are completely alone... here everyone is a complete stranger, it is difficult to get used to. I still often go home, every month”* (fourth year). At the same time, as a strong motivator for continuing education and living in this “alien” big city, informants call the immersion in their native culture and language. Their understanding at a new, theoretically-based level is described by informants as a discovery or exciting adventure, which is perceived as a valuable cultural resource: *“It turned out to be very interesting! There are still a lot of mysteries in the Komi-Permyak language”* (fifth year). The informants' assessment of contacts with students of other departments and universities also focuses on language and culture: *“they thought I was Russian, and they were surprised that, next to them is a person of another ethnicity who knows another language and can speak it”* (third year).

³ Female students acted as informants: at the time of the interview—2020—only girls were studying at the Department of Komi-Permyak language and Literature of the Perm State Humanitarian Pedagogical University. In total, 50 people studied at the department (10 people per course), two students from each course took part in the interview.

Table 11.1 Salivary cortisol and anxiety in Komi-Permyaks and Russians with different places of residence before entering the university

Variables	Place of residence before university	n	Salivary cortisol (nmol/L)					State anxiety		Trait anxiety	
			Min	Q25	Me	Q75	Max	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Komi-Permyaks Russians	Countryside	66	2.484	8.004	12.398	17.800	75.900	38.747	8.054	41.027	8.781
	Countryside	62	5.100	13.550	18.750	32.150	67.600	42.190	9.818	44.885	8.801
	City	140	6.300	14.400	18.800	25.300	61.700	40.365	8.516	43.604	8.591

In the course of their educational activities, students of the Department of Komi-Permyak language and literature mainly interact within the department, meeting with students of other departments only at lectures: *“at a lecture you listened and left, you won’t communicate much”* (first year). In the students hostel, Komi-Permyaks also live together. The informants told about two types of settlement in the hostel: in one case, they lived together with girls from the same village, who had arrived at the same time as them, former classmates; in the second case, in the first or second year, they lived with students of the Komi-Permyak Department of older courses, who became “guides” for them in the new cultural and social conditions: *“At first, in the 1st and 2nd years, I lived with girls also from the Komi-Permyak Department, they were studying in their 4th year, we communicated with them in Komi-Permyak completely, they showed me everything in the hostel, in the university and in the city. In the 3rd-4th years, we lived together with a girl who entered that year”* (fifth year). After the older students graduate from the university and left the hostel, the newly admitted students move into the room, and the informant herself becomes a “guide” for the first-year students.

Thus, the students of the Komi-Permyak Department in everyday life find themselves in a kind of cultural isolation. However, this isolation is not forced, on the contrary, students perceive the attempts of some teachers to “break” the spontaneously established cultural framework as a kind of pressure: *“let’s say, the break, our group is all Komi-Permyak, of course, we communicate with each other in our language during our break, it happens if the teacher sits with us, he asked to speak Russian. Well, here is another teacher, he has been teaching his discipline to the Komi-Permyak Department for many years, it was quite easy to speak Komi-Permyak in his presence, and he was loyal to this, while others, on the contrary, asked to speak Russian”* (third year). The teachers who teach courses related to the Komi-Permyak language and culture, the Komi-Permyaks themselves, who were once graduates of the same department, on the contrary, act as a kind of guardians of the peace and well-being of the students: *“our teachers are very concerned about us”* (fifth year).

The described practices of organising everyday life, of course, cannot be defined as gettisation—the “gate” remains open. The informants are happy to talk about their participation in university-wide cultural events and the volunteer movement, which has an inter-university character: At the same time, they pay special attention to cases of fixation on cultural features, which, within the framework of inter-faculty and inter-university interaction of students, are certainly positively emotionally colored: *“we have creative festivals, a volunteer center, and I went to several events with the guys from this center and we communicate a lot. They were interested, they were very surprised, and now, here are some of my friends from the volunteer center, who know a few phrases in Komi-Permyak”* (third year). In part, the positive emotional color of such interactions is due, of course, to the exceptional—festive, solemn—nature of the events in which they take place. However, when talking about such cases, informants, being outside of this festive context, evaluate them as supporting their own ethno-cultural identity and encouraging cross-cultural interaction: *“Russians are very interested! They are very surprised and ask where our ethnic group lives, and are interested in culture, some ask to translate certain phrases...”* (fifth year).

The “openness” of cultural boundaries gives students, first, the opportunity to vary the degree of inclusion in the dominant culture, and secondly, contributes to their self-determination in the field of intercultural interaction, as a decision-making subject, capable of regulating the degree of proximity-distance, in relation to both the mother and the dominant culture. This experience of combining and regulating the comfort of “their” space and the challenges of the “big world” of new opportunities, supported by the “trump card”, which has an unconditional (from the point of view of both the informants themselves and their parent families) instrumental value—higher education, gives the informants a sense of self-efficacy in coping with the stressful conditions of the multicultural environment of a big city, confidence in successful social mobility during the study period and after its completion, regardless of the place of residence. The result of creating a comfortable learning environment is a high proportion of indigenous students who have successfully completed their studies at the university: *“There were ten of us when we entered, we all finish our studies together”* (fifth year). At our request, the dean’s office of the Department of Komi-Permyak Language and Literature provided information on the number of graduates of the department for different years and the number of students studying now (Table 11.2).

The data presented in Table 11.2 indicate a very low drop-out rate of the department’s students, i.e. overcoming the main obstacle to the presence of indigenous students in the university’s educational environment.

Note that the described case is expressive, but not unique. In the universities of the Udmurt Republic (Ural-Volga region), the authors recorded similar learning conditions (relative homogeneity of study groups—a “closed world” in the words of informants, combined with the presence of multiple channels of intergroup interaction) and effects: optimism of Udmurt students regarding careers, low dropout rate of students in the learning process, positive ethnic and linguistic identity (in more detail, the methodology and results of the study are presented in Vlasova &

Table 11.2 Data on the number of students of the educational program “Komi-Permyak language and literature”

Year of admission to the university	Number of students	Year of graduation	Number of graduates
2012–2013	13	2016–2017	13
2013–2014	13	2017–2018	13
2014–2015	15	2018–2019	11
2015–2016	15	2019–2020	15
2016–2017	10	2020–2021	10
Year of admission to the university	Number of students	Year of graduation	Number of students
2017–2018	10	2021–2022	9
2018–2019	9	2022–2023	9
2019–2020	13	2023–2024	13
2020–2021	11	2024–2025	11

Agafonova, 2017). The analysis of the case of the Institute of Udmurt Philology, Finno-Ugric Studies and Journalism allowed us to identify an additional trajectory of educational integration of representatives of the indigenous population—the experience of interaction in a linguistically relatively homogeneous, but socially heterogeneous environment. Such experience becomes the effect of the academic mobility of students to universities where representatives of other Finno-Ugric peoples of Russia (the Republic of Mordovia, Mari El, Komi), Hungary, Finland and Estonia are trained. According to the estimates of informants-professors, internships and other forms of mobility not only have an impact on the practical results of language acquisition, but also allow students to form a positive experience of awareness of ethnic identity: “*Internships affect the manifestation of themselves as Udmurts. The students felt their Udmurt identity there. They begin to love themselves as Udmurts*” (f, 55 years old, professor).

The involvement in the “closed world” of not only current students, but also graduates, makes the social context of education even more heterogeneous, and thus, contributes to the strengthening and development of professional ties. Mutual consultations, exchange of resources and methodological assistance are possible in the community of graduates of the Faculty-Institute of Udmurt Philology, who have now become teachers, employees of leading educational and cultural institutions, employees of the administrative apparatus.

Based on the results of the study, we will try to answer the key question about the optimal organisation of the educational process in higher education for indigenous people. We record a relatively weak stress response of the indigenous students, whose educational content involves additional immersion in their native linguistic and cultural environment, combined with a low intensity of contacts with representatives of other cultural groups, including the dominant population. These results are consistent with the data of numerous studies of correlations between aspects of intercultural attitudes and psychological well-being. Although the preference for integration, as a strategy of intergroup interaction is considered, as a reliable predictor of well-being, security and adaptability of representatives of different ethno-cultural groups (Abu-Rayya & Sam, 2017; Berry & Hou, 2016), a number of studies have shown that, in certain socio-cultural and political contexts, the strategy of separation may be more advantageous, in terms of well-being indicators than integration (Berry & Hou, 2016; Koja et al., 2019). For the students in the cases discussed in this chapter, the social environment provides the necessary and sufficient (according to the estimates of the informants themselves) level of acceptance and support. At first glance, this environment looks as monocultural, however, the interviews with the students demonstrated their vision of the wide possibilities of various social contacts with representatives of other socio-cultural groups. In other words, cultural “closeness” in the learning process is not actually closeness, but is an environment that is malleable for individual manipulations. Thus, conditions are created that allow the individual to independently vary the degree of closeness-openness, inclusion–exclusion. When this opportunity is successfully realised, conditions are created for the

development of communicative self-efficacy and sustainable attitudes towards integration into the dominant society, combined with a sense of resource support from the mother culture.

Thus, among the factors of maintaining the social and emotional well-being of indigenous students, we can emphasise, firstly, the inclusion of indigenous students in both culturally homogeneous and culturally heterogeneous interest groups. The second condition presented in this chapter is determined by the role of the intra-group academic mentoring and cooperation, which affects the sense of belonging and identity of indigenous students, and is highly appreciated by other researchers (Masika & Jones, 2016): in such conditions, students feel like significant members of the research group, form a deeper understanding of the role of science and education in solving socially significant problems (Carter et al., 2018; McMahon et al., 2018). The third condition is the inclusion in the curriculum of special academic courses, in particular on indigenous history, language and culture.

In the cases we have considered, the presence of the Department of the Komi-Permyak/Udmurt languages and literature expands the possibilities for integrating culture sensitive aspects both in the content of professional training and in the organisation of the educational process. However, such opportunities can be opened and are already being used in universities in Australia, the United States, Canada, and Northern Europe: for training managers taking into account regional and ethno-cultural contexts, economists considering traditional forms of environmental management, lawyers taking into account customary law, physicians taking into account traditional knowledge and environmental conditions of regions where indigenous peoples live compactly, designers and engineers integrating elements of indigenous cultures into the modern technological process (Sitnikova et al., 2018).

Described soft inclusion strategies reduce the risk of “forced happiness” of representatives of ethnic and cultural minorities on the part of the majority, allowing each student to realise the desired degree of integration and choose relevant communication strategies, i.e., by accepting the role of the subject of interaction, to engage in a conscious intercultural dialogue. Dialogue then becomes a form of recognition, a key to avoiding unintended negative consequences for members of minorities, and a mechanism for participation. For representatives of the majority, the possibility of such a dialogue becomes the key to successfully solving the tasks for modern educational institutions: introducing all the actors to the idea of diversity, demonstrating flexibility and creativity in working, preventing any risk of discrimination, and encouraging cooperation between all participants of the educational process (Council of Europe, 2011).

Conclusion

Representatives of the indigenous peoples of the Russian Federation in access to quality education, on the one hand, face problems typical of indigenous peoples in different regions of the world (Council of Interethnic Relations, 2017), on the other

hand, they are forced to overcome barriers caused by the inconsistency of the internal Russian policy in the field of ethno-cultural diversity.

Issues of equality and rights of indigenous peoples are central to most policy debates with direct implications on social justice issues, human rights, and education in general. Indigenous peoples' right to education is recognised in Article 14 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UN, 2016). It emphasises the responsibility of states to adequately provide access to education for Indigenous people, particularly children, and when possible, for education to take place within their own culture and to be delivered in their own language.

Russian policy in relation to the indigenous population has been oriented towards linguistic assimilation throughout Russian history, but the idea of homogenisation of the country's cultural space has been significantly strengthened in political discourse in recent years (Putin, 2022). However government policy that causes the assimilation of indigenous peoples into the dominant national culture is interpreted today using the term indigenous genocide (Jacob et al., 2015) to the decay of specific cultures, histories, and identities. In this regard, it is essential that federal and local authorities both promote native languages and expand the indigenous component in the curriculum, and diversify the ways of access to education for representatives of indigenous peoples.

As the results presented in this chapter show, the participation of representatives of indigenous culture in the planning of the curriculum and the organisation of classes phase for ownership, buy-in, and self-determination. However, at the level of preschool and general education indigenous peoples are not fully involved or even excluded from the curriculum development decision-making process. In Russia, as in many countries, national curricula have little relevance to indigenous peoples, therefore it is essential to know how to design a relevant indigenous education curriculum and ensure that indigenous peoples participate in the curriculum development. Simultaneously, it is necessary to utilise local human resources to participate in the process of teaching and school administration.

It is crucial for both government and indigenous communities to collaborate together in order to provide innovative and relevant approaches which can help protect and promote indigenous languages, cultures, and identities. For this purpose it is very important to minimise the using of boarding schools for nomadic indigenous children and to diversify the available learning formats in the form of small and nomadic school. Indigenous parents need to be made aware of their right to request the inclusion of indigenous languages and other ethnocultural subject-matter into curriculum and be involved in the role of educators in the educational process. The State should facilitate the upgrading of small rural schools into centres of local cultural life, where indigenous peoples' languages and traditions are maintained, and should facilitate the development of networking among such schools for the exchange and dissemination of the best educational practices and professional development of teachers in the field of culture sensitive education.

The Story (I)

Social Activism in Support of Culture Sensitive Education



The story of Maryam Aliyeva, a human rights activist, a blogger and a writer

Maryam is an author of a book on domestic violence in Caucasus based on the real stories of other women, and many articles and interviews social media about the violations of human rights. Being a young Muslim woman representing an ethnic minority in Russia, she is brave enough to support girls and women, their freedom of choice, and the right for education. This story shows how the patriarchal order can be challenged by a collective effort initiated by a courageous woman.

The story of Maryam Aliyeva, a human rights activist, a blogger and a writer, demonstrates by the example of cases with a ban on wearing the hijab by Muslim female students, how attracting public attention to the problem through social networks can transform the situation and ensure equal access to education for representatives of groups subject to multiple discrimination.

In Defense of the Right to Wear a Hijab by the Muslim Female Students

My name is Maryam Aliyeva, I am a human rights activist. I defend the rights of women and children and am involved in charity work. In January 2023, five female

students were expelled from Novocherkassk⁴ Medical College for wearing hijabs. They studied well, they had no conflicts with other students. They were denied education only because of head hijabs... Lawyers from the National Association of Lawyers of Russia came to their aid, but the girls also turned to me, asking me to tell them more about this challenge. Then I decided to create a petition on Change.org and enlist the support of platform users.

It was all pretty simple—I scribbled a short text, indicated the recipients, picked up a picture and clicked publish. Then I distributed the link to the petition wherever I could. Here is the text of the petition addressed to the President of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin, the Minister of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation V. N. Falkov and the Minister of Education of the Russian Federation S. S. Kravtsov:

«The pedagogical Council of the medical college in Novocherkassk expelled five female students for wearing hijabs, earlier it was reported about similar punitive methods at the Astrakhan Medical Academy, as well as in schools throughout Russia. Article 28 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation establishes freedom of conscience and religion for citizens and states: “Everyone is guaranteed freedom of conscience, freedom of religion, including the right to profess individually or jointly with others any religion or not to profess any, freely choose, have and disseminate religious and other beliefs and act in accordance with them”.

Hijab is a sacred duty of every Muslim woman. To forbid schoolgirls and female students to wear it means to deprive them of their education! The consequences of such bans can be the most terrible not only for Muslim women, but also for a country with more than 40 million Muslims. The ban on wearing the hijab contradicts the laws of the Russian Federation, is nothing more than an insult to the feelings of believers and infringement of rights on religious grounds. In the modern world, in a legal society, such prohibitions cannot exist!

They violate the rights, infringe on a huge group of people, literally squeezing Muslim women out of social life, depriving them of basic rights and freedoms. All this will affect not only the emergence of new national and religious conflicts, but will also have a detrimental impact on the socio-economic life of the country.

We demand:

- to cancel the order on the expulsion of 5 female students from the medical college in Novocherkassk;
- stop the harassment of Muslim girls in schools and universities by the heads of educational institutions;
- prohibit the introduction of such rules in the charters of educational institutions that offend the feelings of believers, infringe on the rights and freedoms on religious grounds, violate the Constitutional rights of people».

⁴ Novocherkassk is a city in Rostov Oblast in South of Russia, located near the Don River. Novocherkassk is best known as the cultural capital of the Don Cossacks. Population is approximately 200,000.

The results: 11,275 people supported my appeal, mass media wrote about it, and the link was reposted by many communities on social networks. Thanks to the resonance that this story and the petition created, the Human Rights Commissioner in Chechnya⁵ commented on the topic. And then the Ministry of Education got involved—the students were not only reinstated in their studies, but also allowed to wear the hijab in medical college. Everything was resolved without a trial, and as the lawyers emphasise, publicity played a decisive role.

This is a huge contribution to the fight against discrimination and violation of women's rights. Such a precedent gives hope to all Muslim girls to get education. But complaints about such discrimination on religious grounds continue. In another rural school in Dagestan, a teacher, on the contrary, forbade girls to wear headscarves. Moreover, he could not completely ban them, and he mocked them in every possible way, kicked them out of lessons. We have involved law enforcement agencies. I do not know if he was fired or not, but the problem was solved, and he did not do this anymore, although he had been doing this for several years before.

There were also reverse cases when girls were not allowed to study if they were without a hijab. In September 2021, a resonant video appeared on social networks about how the head teacher at the school in the village of Majalis of the Kaitag district of Dagestan⁶ lets only those girls enter the school who came in headscarves into classes. The actions of the head teacher caused the indignation of the parents of the students. Officials of the Ministry of Education of Dagestan explained that even if the hijab is part of the school uniform, its absence cannot be grounds for suspension from classes.

The requirement to wear hijabs at school, as well as the requirement to take them off, is an obvious violation of girls' rights to education. And I want to emphasise that in the fight for justice and against discrimination, it is worth using all available tools. The petition is one of them. As my story shows, the petition creates resonance and publicity, and ultimately these factors can solve a difficult situation. So, if you encounter a problem, try to create a petition and find supporters on the platform. This could be the beginning of your winning story.

References

- Abu-Rayya, H. M., & Sam, D. L. (2017). Is integration the best way to acculturate? A re-examination of the bicultural-adaptation relationship in the ICSEY-data set using the bilinear method. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 48(3), 287–293. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116685846>
- Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the USSR. (1949). State Archive of the Russian Federation. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the RSFSR (APN RSFSR) (1943–1966) <http://guides.rusarchives.ru/node/25004>

⁵ Chechnya is a republic of Russian Federation situated in the North Caucasus, close to the Caspian Sea.

⁶ Dagestan is a republic of Russian Federation situated in the North Caucasus, along the Caspian Sea.

- Anonymous. (July 20, 2018). A series of single pickets were held across Russia against the law on voluntary study of native languages. Business online, July 20, 2018 <https://www.business-gazeta.ru/news/389343>
- Berry, J. W., & Hou, F. (2016). Acculturation and wellbeing among immigrants to Canada. *Canadian Psychology: Special Issue on Immigrants and Refugees in Canada*, 57, 254–264. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cap0000064>
- Boziev, R. (2017). Methodology of the study of education in the national regions of Russia. *Science and School*, 1, 52–63.
- Bradley, D., Noonan, P., Nugent, H., & Scales, B. (2008). *Review of Australian higher education: Final report*. Australian Government, Canberra.
- Carter, J., Hollinsworth, D., Raciti, M., & Gilbey, K. (2018). Academic place-making: Fostering attachment, belonging and identity for Indigenous students in Australian universities. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23(2), 243–260.
- Council of Europe. (2011). *Intercultural competencies in social services. Constructing an inclusive institutional culture: Methodological guide*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Council of Interethnic Relations. (2017). Meeting of the council on interethnic relations. Yoshkar-Ola, July 20, 2017. Transcript. <http://www.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/55109>
- CSHE. (2008). *Participation and equity. A review of the participation in higher education of people from low socioeconomic backgrounds and Indigenous people*. Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne.
- Dreamson, N., Thomas, G., Hong, A. L., & Kim, S. (2017). Policies on and practices of cultural inclusivity in learning management systems: Perspectives of Indigenous holistic pedagogies. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 36(5), 947–961. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.126383012>
- FIEQA. Federal Institute for Education Quality Assessment. (2022). *Indicators of the regions of the Russian Federation according to the results of 2021*. Available at: <https://maps-oko.fioco.ru/>
- Gilbert, S., & Tillman, G. (2017). Teaching practise utilising embedded indigenous cultural standards. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 46(2), 173–181. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2017.4>
- Government of the Russian Federation. (1992). FL-3266 (1992) The law of the Russian Federation on education dated July 10, 1992 N 3266-1 (latest edition) https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_1888/
- Government of the Russian Federation. (1999). FL-82 (1999) Federal law of the Russian Federation on guarantees of the rights of indigenous small-numbered peoples of the Russian Federation dated April 30, 1999 N 82-FZ <https://fzrf.su/zakon/o-garantiyah-prav-korennyh-malochislennyh-narodov-82-fz/>
- Government of the Russian Federation. (2000a). FL-104 (2000a) Federal law on the general principles of the organization of communities of indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation dated July 20, 2000 N 104-FZ https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_27908/
- Government of the Russian Federation. (2000b). Unified list of indigenous small-numbered peoples of the Russian Federation (approved by the decree of the government of the Russian Federation of march 24, 2000 N 255). With amendments and additions dated October 13, 2008, May 18, June 17, September 2, 2010, December 26, 2011, August 25, 2015, December 18, 2021. <https://base.garant.ru/181870/#friends>
- Government of the Russian Federation. (2001). FL-49 (2001) Federal law on the territories of traditional nature use of indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East of the Russian Federation dated May 7, 2001 N 49-FZ (latest edition) https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_31497/
- Government of the Russian Federation. (2012). FL-273, (2012/2022) Federal Law No. 273-FZ of 29.12.2012 (as amended on September 24, 2022) On education in the Russian Federation <https://www.zakonrf.info/zakon-ob-obrazovanii-v-rf/>

- Jacob, W. J., Liu, J., & Lee, C.-W. (2015). Policy debates and indigenous education: The trialectic of language, culture, and identity. In W. J. Jacob, S. Y. Cheng, & M. K. Porter (Eds.), *Indigenous education: Language, culture, and identity*, (pp. 39–61) Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9355-1_2
- Kairov, I. A. (Ed.). (1960). *Pedagogical Dictionary*. Academy of Pedagogical Sciences RSFSR.
- Koja, E., Lebedeva, N., Galyapina, V., et al. (2019). Cross-cultural relations in the Russian Crimea: An empirical test of three hypotheses. *Psychology. Journal of the Higher School of Economics*, 16(2), 250–268. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1813-8918-2019-2-250-268>
- Kozlov, A., Vershubskaya, G., Kozlova, M., & Schmidt, L. (2002). *Modernization stress in the indigenous population of the North of Western Siberia*. IL ArctAn-S, A series of technical reports 01–2002 (preprint). Moscow.
- Kozlov, A., Kozlova, M., Vershubskaya, G., & Shilov, A. (2012). *Health of the indigenous population of the North of the Russian Federation: On the verge of centuries and cultures*. PSHPU (in Russia).
- Kozlov, A., Vershubsky, G., & Kozlova, M. (2007). Indigenous peoples of Northern Russia: Anthropology and health. *Circumpolar Health Supplements*, 1, 1–184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22423982.2007.11864604>
- Kozlova, M., Kozlov, A., & Kornienko, D. (2022). Inclusion against stress: Higher education for indigenous peoples. *Bulletin of Tomsk State University*, 474, 144–152.
- Manakov, A. (2022). Titular peoples of the Republics of Russia: Ethnodemographic trends since 1939. *Pskov Regionological Journal*, 2, 43–64.
- Masika, R., & Jones, J. (2016). Building student belonging and engagement: Insights into higher education students experiences of participating and learning together. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 21(2), 138–150.
- McMahon, T. R., Griese, E. R., & Kenyon, D. B. (2018). Cultivating Native American scientists: An application of an Indigenous model to an undergraduate research experience. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 1–34.
- Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation. (2022). Approximate basic educational program of primary general education (approved by the decision of the Federal educational and methodological association for general education, Protocol No. 1/22 of March 18, 2022) fgosreestr.ru/uploads/files/a37866524e7032cb1b42c3811e8b8ea8.pdf
- Pikovskaya, N. B., Oteva, E. A., Osipova, L. P., & Shterental, I. S. (1997). Features of endocrine regulation in the indigenous and alien population of the North. *Human Physiology*, 23(5), 93–96. (in Russ.).
- Presidential Library. (1830). The complete collection of laws of the Russian empire (1830). Collection 1-E. T. (pp. 1–45). St. Petersburg. https://rusneb.ru/collections/1194_psz_1/
- Putin, V. (2012). Decree of the President of the Russian Federation No. 599 dated May 7, 2012 *On measures to implement state policy in the field of education and science*. https://lomonholding.ru/articles/detail/?catalogue_id=11&item_id=4291
- Putin, V. (2022). Decree of the President of the Russian Federation No. 809 dated November 9, 2022 *On the approval of the foundations of state policy for the preservation and strengthening of traditional Russian spiritual and moral values*. <http://publication.pravo.gov.ru/Document/View/0001202211090019?index=0&rangeSize=1>
- Rosstat. (2011). Federal state statistics service. Information materials on the final results of the all-Russian population census of 2010. <https://rosstat.gov.ru/>
- Russian Federation (1993). The Constitution of the Russian Federation. Adopted by popular vote on December 12, 1993 with amendments approved during the all-Russian vote on July 1, 2020 <http://kremlin.ru/acts/constitution/item#chapter3>
- Rusova, S. (1916). The foreign school and its requests. In Tumim, G. G., Zelenko, V. A. (ed.), *Collection of works and materials on the issues of the foreign school* (p. 23).
- Sitnikova, A., Pimenova, N., & Filko, A. (2018). Pedagogical approaches to teaching and adaptation of indigenous minority peoples of the North in higher educational institutions. *Science for Education Today*, 8(4), 26–45.

- Slezkine, Y. (1994). *Arctic Mirrors: Russia and the Small Peoples of the North*. Cornell University Press.
- Sokolovsky, S. (1997). *Minority rights: Anthropological, sociological and international legal aspects*. Moscow Public Scientific Foundation.
- Sokolovsky, S. (2006). *Protection of the rights of minorities and indigenous peoples*. Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Tang, H. H., & Tsui, C. G. (2018). Democratizing higher education through internationalization: The case of HKU SPACE. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 7(1), 26–41. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-12-2016-0095>
- The scientist died after self-immolation, protesting against the Russification of Udmurtia (September 10, 2019). https://ru.wikinews.org/wiki/Учёный_погиб_после_самоожжения,_протестуя_против_русификации_Удмуртии
- Trifonova, Z. (2008). Settlement of ethnic groups in Russia (1926–2002), *Bulletin of the Moscow University. Series 5: Geography*, 2, 62–67.
- United Nations. (2016). *Indigenous peoples right to education—A transformative force for empowerment*. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/statements/2016/08/indigenous-peoples-right-education-transformative-force-empowerment>
- United Nations. (2017). *State of the World's Indigenous Peoples, Volume III: Education*. <https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/publications/state-of-the-worlds-indigenous-peoples.html>
- USSR. (1926). Decree of the central executive committee, council of people's commissars of the RSFSR of October 25, 1926. *On approval of the provisional regulations on the management of indigenous peoples and tribes of the Northern outskirts of the RSFSR*. <http://bsk.nios.ru/content/dekret-vcik-snk-rsfsr-ot-25-10-1926-goda-ob-utverzhenii-vremennogo-polozheniya-ob>
- Vančo, I., & Efremov, D. (2020). Revitalizing Saami through education in Finland. *Yearbook of Finno-Ugric Studies*, 4, 617–627.
- Vlasova, T., & Agafonova, A. (2017). Features of translations Ethnic traditions within the university training if Udmurt language teachers. *Collaboration between universities and public organizations in regional social projects implementations (Russian and American experiences)*, (pp. 23–25). UDSU Press.
- Vorontsova, I. P., & Vitkovskaya, L. K. (2016). Investing into Siberian human potential development: Investment into export professionals or growth of local human capital assets? *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities and Social Sciences*, 9(11), 2697–2705. <https://doi.org/10.17516/1997-1370-2016-9-11-2697-270526>
- Weuffen, S. L., Cahir, F., & Pickford, A. M. (2017). The centrality of Aboriginal cultural workshops and experiential learning in a pre-service teacher education course: A regional Victorian university case study. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 36(4), 838–851. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1242557>
- Zakharov, A., & Adamovich, K. (2020). Regional differences in access to educational resources, academic results and students trajectories in Russia. *Journal of Economic Sociology*, 21(1), 60–80. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1726-3247-2020-1-60-80>
- Zamyatin, K. (2017). Indigenous peoples and education in the Russian Federation: Education. *State of the World's Indigenous Peoples*, 3, 187–209. <https://doi.org/10.18356/8e301ac2-en>
- Zelenko, V. (1916). What is a foreign school, a foreign school. In Tumim, G. G., Zelenko, V. A. (Ed.), *Collection of works and materials on the issues of the foreign school*, (pp. 7–18)