

Curricular L1 Disciplinarity: Between Norwegianness and Internationality

Sigmund Ongstad

1. Introduction

1.1. Research and hypotheses

The history of nations' prime school subject, L1, have been frequently studied both in English-speaking countries (Applebee 1974, Michael 1987, Doyle 1989, Elbow 1990, Goodson & Marsh 1996, Scholes 1998, Sawyer 2007) and in Scandinavia (Thavenius 1981, Madssen 1999, Krogh 2005, Sjøstedt 2013). These studies have all problematised nationalism, such as Englishness (Doyle 1989) and *norskhet* (Eng. *Norwegianness*). However, few have been concerned with external or foreign impact, at least regarding L1 curricula. The study therefore aims at investigating Norwegian L1 curricula in a historical perspective, with a specific focus on how disciplinarity may shift over time, caused by internationality.

Disciplinarity in relation to national curricula has recently been studied and problematised, among others in curriculum studies (Short 1990, Pinar 2007, Deng & Luke, 2007, Kelly et al. 2008) and in communication theory and literacy studies (COE 2009, Christie & Maton 2011, Langer 2011, Muller 2011, Osborne 2015). Further, there exists a theoretical interest in searching overarching regimes, patterns, and paradigms to explain curricular shifts, both in general (Karseth & Sivesind 2010, Slagstad 2018, Aasen 2007) and of major L1 changes (Yates et al, 2019, Sawyer & Ven 2006, Ven 2007, Green 2018, Nystrand et al 1993, Ongstad 2002).

What will be studied is shifting *disciplinarity* (Scholes 1998, Ven 2005, Ongstad 2015). In this chapter, the disciplinary focus is on tensions of inner and external L1 forces, of *Norwegianness* as a constitutional element of L1's disciplinarity in contrast to a dynamic force, here termed *internationality*. Further, new policies stressing skills, competences, and comparative, national and international testing, seem to influence *general* curricular thinking and design in many countries (COE 2009, OECD 2005, UF 2006, Sjøstedt 2013). In Norway, general impact has been studied as political educational *regime shifts*, and more specifically as *knowledge regimes* and their impact on curricula (Aasen 2007, Slagstad 2018.) The chapter thus aims at tracing possible international sources for particular changes in L1 curricula. A hypothesis is that main theories of language, text, and communication with a certain delay may occur as paradigmatic patterns in L1 curricula, and that such new ideas may provoke homely, established ones (Ongstad 2002, 2014a).

1.2. On structure, data, and method

Implications of the hypotheses have consequences for how the chapter is organised. In this part, the introduction, I start out clarifying concepts, focusing terms that might differ in Norwegian and English. I mainly stick to compulsory education, inspecting all seven *national* L1 curricula from 1939 onwards, by doing simple semantic analyses and interpretations. Data consists thus of 116 pages made up by all the seven national L1 curricula (see Table 1). I describe shifts in main L1 elements in these texts over time and end by summarising key aspects of L1's curricular 'disciplinarity'.

In part two, I focus on impact on the seven curricula, over time, from the perspective of theories of language, text, and communication. I end this part with a micro-study of the use of verbs and nouns in competence objectives, so-called bullet points, in the L1 2020 curriculum, since their relationship seems crucial for the question of the disciplinarity of school subjects in general. In part three, I lean on two Norwegian studies of different knowledge regimes in curricula and contrast the concepts *regime* and *paradigm*. In part four, I reflect on patterns I have found relevant for my research questions: Which forces seem to have influenced disciplinarity in L1 curricula over the years, and what are the consequences for Norwegianness?

1.3. Excursion on Norwegianness as imported. Or, nationality as internationality

Norwegianness tends to be perceived as a stable and well-defined phenomenon (Seland 2011). However, just by checking ‘Norway’ in Wikipedia (2019a), readers are left with a picture of Norwegianness rather as imported otherness: Once ‘Norway’ just meant the way north. For thousands of years there was no state Norway, there was no ‘Norwegian’ language, there was no Norwegian school. People arrived from elsewhere. Over 2000 years’ impact from foreign sources formed spoken language. It only slowly went from a version of Indo-European, through Germanic, to old Norse, to medieval Norwegian, to different Norwegian dialects. Still there is not *a* Norwegian spoken language. Written old Norse was rather old Icelandic. A significant transformation of spoken and written language from 1200 to 1500 was mostly due to Germanic/German and Danish influence. Even as late as the turn of the 19th century, the official written language was Danish. Etc.

As a contrast, a general impression emerging by a quick surface-reading of Norwegian L1 curricula from between 1939 to 2020 is that Norwegianness seems monolithic, with few traces of otherness. A main intention behind this study, then, is to search under the surface to trace foreign and global impact on the L1 curriculum as possible cracks in this seemingly monolithic entity.

1.4. Clarifying concepts

1.4.1 Norwegianness and internationality

L1 in Norway can be seen as one of the State’s most important tools for balancing conservation and development of its language, literature, culture, and history. To consider which elements in L1 curricula are ‘foreign’, though, is a risky enterprise. Whatever they are, they will be characterised as *international*. Wiktionary (2019) notify two nouns for the adjective *international* (involving two or more nations), ‘internationalness’ and ‘internationality’. Dictionary.com (2019) gives the example *the internationality of science* and Vocabulary.com (2019) *the internationality of scientific terminology*, in other words – *the quality of being international in scope*.

While *national* may concern what is characteristic for a country, such as *Norwegianness* or *Englishness*, *international* tries to catch what is typical for what is between countries or above *a* country. *Internationality* may therefore refer to values, trends, forces, and ideologies that are non-national. Ree (1992:9) has made the point, much in the same way as Kristeva has proposed, that “(...) individual texts can function only within a field of general intertextuality, *so individual nations arise only within a field of general internationality*; or, in other words, that the logic of internationality precedes the formation of nations (SO’s cursives)”.

Internationality, then, is coined to work as an analytical concept, meaning what concerns any international, global, and over-national phenomena and issues relative to a specific country. *Internationality* concerns over- or non-national phenomena caused by processes such as

Anglification, migration, standardisation, international cooperation, etc. More concretely, this study focuses impact sources, such as *theories* of language, text, and communication, and of teaching and learning as well as international educational *policies*, formed by agencies, such as UNESCO, OECD, EU, and COE. I have left out *processes*, such as immigration and multiculturalism, Anglification of scientific languages, ‘literacyfication’ of disciplinarity, and digitalisation, as they seem to have less direct impact on these L1 curricula, and partly due to space.

The dilemma of defining nationhood leads to the core of the scope for this chapter. Searching for imported elements in a country’s national curricula faces us with the fuzzy logic of two phenomena, A and B, as partly coinciding and at the same time being concepts defined or seen as opposites. Hence, in this study, curricular Norwegianness and internationality are seen as interrelated. In a synchronic perspective they are contrasted phenomena, opposed. In a diachronic perspective they might *share* aspects. Both are necessary for defining what is what.

1.4.2. What is L1?

L1 is short for a person’s first language. For a state it is its prime school-subject. There are more than 200 sovereign states in the world, some of them federated states. According to Wikipedia, there are in all 440 such states (variously referred to as a state, a province, a canton, a Land, etc.), that is, territorial and constitutional communities forming part of a federation (Wikipedia 2019b). Further, there are *nation-states*, cultural and linguistic homogeneous countries such as Iceland and Albania, with a strong concurrence between the *term* for the country, the *name* for the main spoken (native) language, and the *name* of the L1 curriculum. In Norway these are respectively: *Norway*, *Norwegian*, and *Norwegian*. In a global perspective, such a high degree of homogeneity is the exception rather than the rule. In times of globalisation, internationalisation, and immigration, such national homogeneity is at risk. Few other school-subjects seem more effected than L1s, not the least in Norway.

The idea that there should exist *a* homogeneous, worldwide, definable phenomenon named L1, is problematic. Seen in an ethnocentric perspective, the concurrence of *norsk* (Eng. *Norwegian*), denoting a language, a school subject, and the nationality of a person from Norway, may seem ‘natural’. Historically, though, that has not always been the case. Johnsen (no date) found a flora of more than 20 different terms in the 19th century for spoken and written versions of the different varieties of the main languages used in Norway.

The international L1 research group IMEN tried to describe mother tongue *education* (L1) as a field:

The field deals with the teaching and/or learning within an educational system of the so-called mother tongue, be it a standard language of a nation state that statutorily accepts it as such, the language of education or the language of primary socialisation (a child's first own and/or home language) (Ongstad 2003: 77).

L1, or in Norway *norsk* (Eng. *Norwegian*), is therefore a *skolefag* (Eng. a school subject) in primary, secondary, and upper secondary education, or in teacher education, *norsk* and/or *norskdidaktikk* (Eng. didactics of Norwegian). At universities, *norsk* is a *universitetsfag* (Eng. university discipline) and is often termed *nordisk språk og litteratur* or *nordistikk* (Eng. Nordic language and literature, or Scandinavian Studies).

1.4.3. ‘Fag’ versus ‘subject’ and ‘discipline’. On disciplinarity

In Norwegian and Danish, *fag* (in German, *fach*) is a body of conceptualised knowledge and/or skills *both* in schools (Norw. *skolefag*) and higher education (Norw. *utdanningsfag*), as

well as a term for branches in business (Norw. *yrkesfag*). To translate it as *discipline* may restrict its epistemological implications. Consequently *faglig* (Eng. disciplinary) is an expected norm for knowledge for all forms of formal education. *Faglighet*, translated as *disciplinarity*, includes the disciplinarity of school-subjects. Hence, *fag* in Norway is a broad concept, since it is associated with concepts such as field, profession, academic disciplines, and school subjects (NFR 2004). Still, a school subject is a relatively precise phenomenon, regulated by law. The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training (Norw. Utdanningsdirektoratet) has responsibility for the disciplinarity of school curricula, while curricula in higher education are surveyed by the Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education, (NOKUT).

Over time, a body of knowledge splits up, grows, changes, consolidates, amalgamates, dissolves, drifts (NFR 2004, Ongstad 2012b). Establishing, specialising, extending, and merging of subjects and disciplines are basic features of a competitive and competence-oriented society. In the long run, changes may threaten not only subjects and disciplines, but even disciplinarity as such, symptomatically visible in frequent notions such as *modules*, *sub-subjects*, *disciplinary elements*, *subject-groups* and in prefixes, such as *cross-*, *inter-*, *multi-*, *trans-*, *de-*, *anti-*, *in-*, *meta-* and *post-* (Osborne 2015).

1.4.4. Plan versus curriculum

Scandinavian terms such as *normalplan*, *rammeplan*, *mønsterplan*, *læreplan*, *læseplan*, and *fagplan* have over time been used for the official text genre and the legal documents regulating official schooling. From a Norwegian perspective, *curriculum* is problematic, but has nevertheless become a norm (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2019b). Curriculum is a far richer concept than plan (Gundem 1998), moreover. In this chapter, curriculum refers, simplified, to the written document curriculum.

1.4.5. Other 'Norwegian' curricular concepts and their translation into English

Some special words used in L1 are hard to translate into English (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2019b). As seen, two of the key concepts used in the title, *disciplinarity* (for Norw. *faglig*) and *curriculum* (for Norw. *plan*), are problematic. These, and other important terms, will be explained when necessary. Occasionally I deliberately mention Norwegian notions first to make aware that the actual concept may have a touch of *Norwegianness*, not easy to translate. Translations of concepts are normally my own, but I often stick to translations used by Utdanningsdirektoratet (2019b).

1.5. Overview over Norway's national L1 curricula (for compulsory education)

1.5.1. Contextual information

The formal structure and the key concepts and content of the curricula are presented in Tables 1 and 2. The curricula have at each time been part of a larger unit or entity, in Norway now called *læreplanverk* (Eng. National Curriculum), mostly different after each reform. There are normally three textual levels, a law, a general curriculum, and curricula for each school subject. For the 2020 reform, all levels are reformed more or less at once, which even implies the making of a new national object clause (Norw. *formålsparagraf*) defining the value base from which both the general curriculum and the specific-subject curricula shall depart. I have omitted most of these texts, because they seem to have minor *direct* influence on the interpretation of the given texts' *disciplinarity*.

Main L1 curriculum headings from 1939 to 2020

From when	School Text years	Main curriculum length	Main curriculum textual headings
1939	1-7	18	Aim, minimum requirement, guidance, annual work plans.
1974	1-9	20	Aim, subject matter, guiding annual plans, working methods, teaching aids, evaluation.
1987	1-9	19	Aim, subject matter and progression, working methods, main topics and sub-topics.
1997	1-10	20	Introduction with the subject and educational aims, approaches to the study of Norwegian, the structure of the subject. Objectives and main elements with subject-related objectives and main subject elements for the years 1-4, 5-7, and 8-10.
2006	1-13	15	Objective for the subject, main subject areas, teaching hours, basic skills in the subject, competence objectives for the subject, evaluation in the subject.
2013	1-13	14	Objective, main subject areas, teaching hours, competence objectives, assessment.
2020*	1-13	10	1) About the subject: The subject's relevance and central values, Core elements, Cross-disciplinary topic topics, Basic skills, Competence objectives and assessment, Assessment scheme (Norw. vurderingsordning)

Table 1. Main text elements in seven national L1 curricula between 1939 and 2020. Translations are mainly based on the Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training's dictionary at www.udir.no/verktøy/ordbok

Subject elements in L1 from 1939 to 2020

1939	Reading, essay writing, grammar, delimiters, grammar terms
1974	Listening and looking, oral use of language, reading, written use of language, language knowledge, <i>sidemål</i> (compulsory second-choice of written Norwegian)
1987	Basic education in reading and writing, oral use of (the) language, literature, written use of (the) language, hand writing, knowledge og language, <i>sidemål</i> , media and electronic data processing
1997	Listening and speaking, reading and writing, knowledge of language and culture
2006	Oral texts, written texts, composite texts, language and culture
2013	Oral communication, written communication, language, literature, and culture
2020*	<u>Core elements</u> : Text in context, Critical approach to text, Oral communication, Generating written texts (Norw. <i>tekstskaping</i>), Language as system and possibility, Linguistic diversity. <u>Cross-disciplinary themes</u> : Public health and coping with life, Democracy and citizenship, Sustainable development. <u>Basic skills</u> : Oral skills, Be able to write, Be able to read, Digital skills). [* Proposed, not yet adopted. Version per September 2019]

Table 2. C L1's main content elements 1939 – 2020

1.5.2. Clarifying domains and aspects of L1 disciplinarity

Simplified, L1 disciplinarity can be related to three domains, to teacher education (Norw. lærerfaglighet), pupils (Norw. elevfaglighet), and written curricula, respectively. There is not yet coined a concept for curricular disciplinarity. In a historical perspective a set of curricular key elements, what I have tagged as ‘doing/s’, describing L1 activities, have been mixed, shifted, focused, left out, and turned around. Sawyer (2007:77) has sampled some activities or doings for English as L1. Based on his overview, which departed from the concept *language*, I have added “text, communication and literature” at the top in the table. These are the three historical key L1 elements we find in table 2 above. In addition, I have added ‘doings and activities’ to the left.

L1 elements and curricular disciplinarity

		<i>L1 historical key elements: Language, text, communication, and Literature as</i>		
		<i>written</i>	<i>spoken</i>	<i>visual</i>
<i>Doings and</i>	<i>Responding</i>	Reading	Listening	Viewing
<i>activities</i>	<i>Composing</i>	Writing	Speaking	Representing

Table 3. Wayne Sawyer’s overview over systemic relationships between three modes of language and positions as receivers and senders of forms of language (Sawyer 2007:77. Additions by SO).

Table 1 and Table 2 contain all these six doings, and in addition there are what I have termed *knowings*, with regard to language, literature, media, IT, and culture. My careful interpretation of the balancing or shifts of elements of doings and knowings is that, up to 2013, the former seemingly has had a precedence over the latter. The latter seems in a way *added*. Also, the elements in the ‘added’ part shift over time. However, with the introduction of the 2020 reform, this pattern is broken. There are now thirteen content elements, six under what is called *core* elements, three under what is called cross-disciplinary themes, and four under what is called basic skills. The last four were introduced with the 2006 reform. The other nine are in a sense ‘new’, and so are the two main categories they are part of.

2. L1 curricula and impact from theories of linguistics and communication

Both Nystrand et al (1993) and Ongstad (2002) found epistemological systemic connections between development of paradigmatic linguistic theories on the nature of language and communication during the 20th century, on the one hand, and practices of writing in schools (in the US and Norway, respectively), on the other hand. The inspection of the seven L1 curricula draws on these findings, searching key concepts or ‘paradigms’ that can throw light over particular major shifts in L1’s curricular disciplinarity.

2.1. 1939. Formalism?

L1 in the 1939 curriculum (KU 1940) is partly inspired by reform pedagogues, such as Dewey and Kerschensteiner. It is practice-oriented and has a simple formal and, to some extent, functional view on language and language learning. It stresses explicitly students' ability to *speak, read, retell, and write*, mirroring dominating ideologies of linguistic theories developed between the two world wars (Nystrand et al. 1993, Ongstad 2002). Regarding disciplinarity, the curriculum is child-oriented. Students are in focus and teachers shall *teach*. Another striking pattern is its use of adjectives underlining form as value: The goal is to teach children to speak their mother tongue *naturally, straightforward, and clearly* – without major phonetic or grammatical mistakes, to read with *distinct* pronunciation and *fairly correct* accent, and to write *straightforward, naturally, and fairly correct* (KU 1940: 48). In short – a national aesthetics.

In the 1930s, schools, teacher education, and university studies were under influence of national philologistic perceptions of language. Language was taken for granted, as simply *Norwegian*. Important L1 sub-disciplines in teacher education and at universities were grammar, language history, Old Norse, Norwegian dialects, and Norwegian literature. Students' language should, as seen, be aesthetically well-formed. Form was seemingly more important than content. Such a paradigm can be termed *formalism*, prioritising structure, correctness, and aesthetics (Nystrand et al 1993, Ongstad 2002). The 1939 curriculum is not explicitly nationalistic, but at least implicitly 'national'. The guidance chapter for instance holds that: "The mother tongue is a living expression for a people's culture. Through introduction to spoken Norwegian and Norwegian literature (Norw. *bokheim*) the students get to know Norwegian spirit and art and our culture at large" (KU 1940: 51). Seen from a didactic, that is, a teaching/learning perspective, disciplinarity concerns the triad of student, content, and teacher (Gundem 1998). In this L1 curriculum, students and teachers are given an explicit role. Later we shall see that, from 2006 onwards, these two cornerstones are removed.

2.2. 1974. Semanticism?

Regarding literature and reading, the words *fond of* (Norw. *glad i*) is mentioned several times: *fond of their mother tongue, fond of reading, and fond of literature* (KUD 1974: 96). Antagonists found this twist somewhat romantic (Moslet 1981). A thought behind the ambition was probably a disciplinary, didactic priority – to learn to learn, based on the learner's interests, rather than being taught. Regarding language, things are different. It is underlined that it is important to "(...) *extend the student's knowledge of words and vocabulary, (...) to use oral and written language objectively and correct. One should therefore aim at training students' ability to logical thinking, enabling them to shape their thoughts clearly and simply*" (KUD 1974:109).

In the 1950s and 1960s, *semanticism* silently challenged formalism (Stenning 1989). The commercial world expanded rapidly. Industry and mass media produced and spread new commodities, and hence new words. Quizzes and tests of encyclopedic knowledge were commonplace, within and outside schools. Semantic preciseness, inspired by the Tarski/Carnap tradition, became influential in Norwegian university studies (Næss 1961), and also in teacher education and schools (Svortdal 1964). An ideological basis was rationality, and for many teachers of Norwegian, Svortdal's book probably worked as a kind of writing methodology.

In addition, the semantic ideology silently smuggled in a *non-national* idea – that thinking, using the child's own language, is more universal than 'national'. This tendency was backed up by the introduction of New Criticism in literary studies, focusing "the meaning of meaning" (Ogden & Richards 1923). In Norway, New Criticism opposed a strong historical-biographical, quite national tradition. The first signs in schools appeared in the early 1960s where upper-secondary students in exams were supposed to analyse poetry (Norw. *diktanalyse*) (Johnsen 1994). Although poems were by Norwegian poets, a seed to a general, non-national, *textual* understanding of language was planted. Traditional Norwegian philology was about to lose a double stronghold, both regarding preferred theories of language and of literary studies.

The 1960s and early 1970s could be seen as a time of modern enlightenment, searching encyclopedic knowledge – to know much was important. Rhetorically, to be educated was to be knowledgeable. *Danning* (Eng. Bildung) was symptomatically exchanged with *allmenndanning* (Eng. General education). Hence, pedagogical views on writing in the 1960s and early 1970s were less oriented toward aesthetics and more toward epistemology and

essentialism, in short, content (Johnsen 1994, Ongstad 2002). Academic disciplines, such as pedagogy and psychology, took a significant cognitive turn inspired by the work of Piaget, and linguistics (grammar) became more semantically oriented (Nerlich & Clarke 2000). Focus should be on preciseness of meaning, explicitness, logic, understanding, knowledge, logic of sentences, content in writing and literature; in other words, the paradigmatic perspective was *essentialist* (Sawyer & Ven 2006).

In terms of disciplinarity, the students now seem less important than their language, and formalities seem less important than meaning. In spite of phrases about being ‘fond’ of literature, the development tends to move towards analysis and understanding, rather than experience and involvement. In my own investigation of M74 published in 1981, I found that L1 goals were directed towards liberal education (Norw. *allmenndanning*) and study skills (Norw. *studieteknikk*) (Ongstad 1981:34). These patterns point toward a curricular L1 as a set of tools, rather than as an independent school-subject in its own right.

2.3. 1987. Functionalism: from language to communication

The most extensive L1 project in the 1960s and 1970s, Norwegian in non-segregated classes (NISK), developed new material, texts and approaches for secondary schools in the late 1960s and early 1970s. More than 30000 pupils participated (FR 1976). Research recommendations came too late to affect M74. Yet, it eventually contributed to a broader, more open L1, as project ideas influenced teachers, consultants and, not the least, the 1987 curriculum, M87 (Madssen 1999).

New features were stronger child- and text-orientation and new media. Most significantly, the L1 curriculum in M87 took a long step from language towards communication by prioritising a *functional* perspective. The very first words are: “Language is a means to orient oneself in the world, to take contact with others, and for personal development” (KUD 1987: 129). Further down, it says: “Norwegian is a communicational school subject, an aesthetic subject, and a central subject for carrying culture and traditions” (KUD 1987: 129). A key topic is *knowledge of language*, underlining that “(...) development of language has a functional purpose” (KUD 1987): 131). In addition to more traditional topics, such as oral use of language, grammar, and language history, we now find *Text, Language situations* and *Media and data language* (KUD 1987: 142-143). Besides, *genres* (and not only literary ones) are given a central place. In general, *Norwegian* and *language* no longer seem to be adequate terms for L1 and its content. ‘Norwegianness’ had become secondary, and *language* rather an aspect subordinated to communication.

Functionalism is a perspective that considers action, use, function, doing, and process, as the prime aspects of language and communication. Philosophically and linguistically, the concept has several sources, such as American pragmatism and ideas in Europe stemming from scholars such as Wittgenstein, Austin, Searle, Habermas, and Halliday. Functional approaches in linguistics and education tend to downsize semantics and form (Ongstad 2002). The functional orientation arrived early to Norwegian schools and curricula. Teachers and textbook-writers picked up ideas from books like *Language in Use* (Doughty et al 1971) and *Sproget i funksjon* (Eng. ‘Language in function’) (Schiødt 1970). *Funksjonsanalyse* (Eng. ‘functional analysis’) was commonplace in upper-secondary education in the mid-1970s, and partly at the secondary level. ~~Nordic~~ Scandinavian studies had only just started to discover pragmatics. Functionalism was of course crucial for many new perceptions of language, but even the literary L1 field was hit by the pragmatic wave, both in the sense that much literature turned political and in the sense that even literary texts now were seen as speech acts.

Norwegianness was threatened, but not many seemed aware of this challenge, at least at this stage.

As with philology elsewhere, disciplinarity associated with national values gave in gradually for the non-national, the general, the universal (Scholes 1998), or in my term, *internationality*. While 'Norwegianness' more easily could be pointed out in form and content, *use*, and thus pragmatics, opened for 'over-national', generalised perspectives on language. Simplified, one could say that this development implied a weaker national philology and a stronger general pragmatism. Implicitly, this increased L1's potential to become a kind of *meta-discipline*, a theoretical means for other subjects, especially if language aspects could become *skills* in other school subjects, as happened with the introduction of the 2006 reform. Traditional disciplinarity was on the move (Ongstad 2006, 2007).

2.4. 1997 (L97). Interaction and communication

Paradigmatic changes of curricular L1 did not end in 1987. M87's list of key topics in L1 is the longest of all Norwegian L1 curricula. The dramatic extension of L1's content led to search for *wholeness* in the L97 reform. The extended text-concept seemed promising as common ground for language, literature, and new media. However, from a literary perspective, communicational aspects now got the upper hand, both regarding volume and curricular importance. Gudmund Hernes, minister of education responsible for the 1997-reform, opened for restoration of fading national values (Trippstad 2009, Koritzinsky 2000).

In an international perspective, the general 1997 curriculum is quite unique, in several ways. It was published as a hardback both in Norwegian in 1996 and in English in 1999, in a picture-book format (KUF 1996, TRMERC A 1999). It was given an extraordinary aesthetic finish, with glossy paper, richly illustrated with photos of famous paintings. The overall curriculum for L97, written already in 1993, is actually still valid (KUF 1993). It will be set aside in 2020. All political parties have signed on it, and for more than 25 years it has survived a long row of governments of different political colours, three major educational reforms, and eleven ministers.

Even the L1 curriculum is special. Two features concern disciplinarity, in particular. The introduction (*The subject and educational aims*) describes the disciplinary nature of L1 in six parts, each defining a crucial disciplinary aspect of 'Norwegian' TRMERC A (1999: 111). The two first are termed *identity* and *experience*, which I interpret as focusing the learning *person*, a *self*. The third and fourth are *Bildung* ("becoming educated") and *culture*, focusing on the outside *world*, while the last two, *skills* and *communication*, are implicitly focusing on relations to *other* (Ongstad 2004). It was probably not realised that this triadic pattern partly resonated with two European classical traditions. One was the conceptualisation of *lifeworld* as interplay between person, world, and society, developed by German scholars (Habermas 1988, Luckmann 2009). The other was a striking compatibility with a more than century-long tradition of classical education in the 19th century as striving for *beauty*, *truth*, and *goodness* (Hertzberg 1898). The L1 intro thus resembles *Bildung* in a classical sense. This disciplinary consciousness did not survive, though. The 2006 curriculum changed the order, cut out aims, and dropped much of the text substantiating the choice of these six particular disciplinary aspects.

A second, more radical feature was the aim: [...] *to make pupils conscious participants in their own learning processes, provide them with insight into their own linguistic development, and enable them to use language as an instrument for increasing their insight and knowledge* (RMERC A 1999: 126). This aim represented a *didactisation*, and perhaps even an *auto-didactisation*, of L1 knowledge, since it aimed at transferring more responsibility for learning

to students, by which L1 got an *explicit* meta-epistemological purpose (Ongstad 1999). Even this passage disappeared from L1 with the next Curriculum. Its ambition nevertheless hinted a coming paradigmatic shift, the strong position that basic skills achieved in all school subjects in the coming 2006 Curriculum.

What role is literature given in L97? We meet 'literature' as a term connected to 'experience'. The word in the Norwegian version is 'opplevelse' (not 'erfaring'), although they both translate as 'experience'. While *erfaring* in Norwegian is more related to the exterior, *opplevelse* is more related to the inner. A critical interpretation here could be that the disciplinary role for literature is to create inner experience, and that this motivation for literature seems somewhat similar to an ambition I pointed to in the 1974 Curriculum, i.e. to become "fond of literature".

Besides, returning to Tables 1, 2, and 3, we find that the main elements now are "listening and speaking, reading and writing, and knowledge of language and culture". It is mainly under "reading" that we may find 'literature'. Compared to, for instance the 1939 Curriculum, 'literature' has lost a curricular stronghold, since the very term has disappeared as a key concept of disciplinary elements. It seems clear that the extended text-concept is the cocoon in the nest, diminishing literature's traditionally central disciplinary position.

2.5. Kunnskapsløftet (LK06). From disciplinarity to disciplinaries

The general curriculum, LK06, called *Kunnskapsløftet* (Eng. 'Knowledge Promotion') covered for the first time, primary, lower, and upper secondary education (Years 1-13, ages 6-19) (UF 2006). This meant that main school subjects could, or should, be organised with a 13-year perspective, whereby *cohesion* across levels became disciplinary important. To specify each year, as in L97, was now considered too detailed. Aims were therefore given for five stages, after Year 2, 4, 7, 10 and 13. *Competence* (Weinert 2001) was nailed as the key curricular concept for all school subjects. Utdanningsdirektoratet describes competence as being able to acquire and apply knowledge and skills to cope with challenges and solve tasks in known and unknown contexts and situations. Competence involves understanding and ability for reflection and critical thinking (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2019d).

The lists for the specific five control-years were packed with almost 200 aims, making the L1 2006 curriculum more aim-dominated than any other L1 curriculum in Norwegian curriculum history (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2006). At first glance, the aims' structure seem similar to aims in former curricula. However, they are now more 'trimmed' semantically so as to be more easily testable. I return to this important development, discussing the bullet-point design.

The text that described L1 as a subject in L97 was now subtracted, shortened, concentrated, reduced, and rearranged: *Norwegian is a central subject for cultural understanding, communication, Bildung and development of identity* (UF 2006: 37). *Experience* and *skills* are out. Students' experience is less visible. Skills, however, were lifted to a general level, *above* and also *for* all school subjects. A radical grip introduced five skills that all school subjects had to integrate and take responsibility for: being able to express oneself orally and in writing, to read, to do mathematics (calculate), and to use digital tools. This meant that three traditional 'L1' topics – orality, writing, and reading – in a sense were exported to *all* other school subjects. By the same token, L1 had to incorporate calculating and digital skills.

L1 in 2006 consisted of four content areas, which in Table 2 are called elements: *oral texts*, *written texts*, *composite texts*, and finally *language and culture*. Semiotics, although never used as a term, therefore challenged language, as students were expected to work with and

analyse *composite* texts (Norw. *sammensatte tekster*). *Form, content, function, and communication* had, respectively, been disciplinary or paradigmatic stages in the four L1 curricula from 1939 and 1997, mirroring disciplinary developments in language and communication theories in the same period. The 2006 Curriculum tried to bridge gaps between language and literature *indirectly*, by making *text* explicitly the overarching concept. Text linguistics had improved its position since 1997, and seemed to be a curricular winner. Still, the use of terms such as *oral texts* and *composite* texts indicated that relationships between language and communication were still unclear.

Regarding the question of disciplinarity, the development had so far led to increased complexity. Several simplifying grip were now installed. Text was given an overall position, each bullet-point became slimmer, and content elements were organised less hierarchically. Further, focus was on content and outcome, not students or teachers. The curricular L1 disciplinarity in the 2006 reform therefore in a sense gave the upper hand to *basisfaget* (Eng. the basic discipline(s) taught at universities), disregarding the didactic dimension. It should be said that this priority was not the situation in schools, teacher education, and research, where *norskdidaktikk* had become increasingly important. Although text-theory was imported, some changes could be related to domestic processes and Norwegian scholarship. The outcome-orientation and bullet-point design were nevertheless international, not to say global, phenomena (Ongstad 2015).

2.6. 2013. Back to communication

The 2006 introduction describing L1 was kept when changes were made in 2013 (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2013). L1 was thus still a central subject for cultural understanding, communication, *Bildung*, and development of identity. As shown in Table 2, L1 now consisted of three main elements: *Oral communication, Written communication, and Language, literature, and culture*. Text was no longer adequate as the over-arching key concept. *Communication* again became the covering umbrella, under which language and literature were mentioned separately. The two key elements from 1939 could therefore now be seen as reduced *parts*.

The changes in the 2013 Curriculum were called a revision. Still, it implied a clear shift in disciplinarity. As mentioned, the absent concept here is *semiotics*. *Social semiotics* had been successful in introducing communicational thinking in L1 in Norway. L1 is now an *amalgamation* of communication, language, literature, and culture. The epistemological nature of this blurring seems only partly conceived and understood by gatekeepers of the curricula. Semiotics is probably also in a sense *alien*, since it threatens the hegemony of the written word. Semiotics is in principle *sign-based*, but no theories of sign has yet been taken up and generally spread in the L1 community. It also opens Pandora's Box, inviting in the huge world of *new* media, whereby 'old² literature' and even 'language' could risk losing positions.

2.7. Curriculum 2020

The overall Curriculum has several new patterns (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2019a). Here I mention just one, which has a direct impact on L1's disciplinarity. In Table 2 three new cross-curricular themes are outlined, which all school subjects must integrate and take responsibility for: *Public health and life mastery, Sustainable development, and Democracy and citizenship*. Four of the five basic skills from Kunnskapsløftet (UF 2006) are kept, as to *calculate* is left out for language subjects. This means that, in principle seven (three plus four elements) will

be integrated in L1. What we see here is a new emphasis on ‘cross-disciplinarity’, since core elements in some subjects are implanted in another school subject.

L1 itself has now six elements, now termed subject core-elements: *Text in context*, *Critical approach to text*, *Oral communication*, *To generate written texts*, *Language as system and potential*, and *Linguistic diversity* (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2019c). Although communication is still used, text is the dominating overarching concept. *Text in context* marks a possible new level of theoretical consciousness, with the adjective *critical* signaling distance and awareness. The verb *generate* and the noun *potentially* mirror a will to move from just knowing to doing (applying). The term *diversity* provokes a monolingual perception and opens for contrastive learning, and can work as a stepping-stone toward multiculturalism within L1. Norwegian literature has now a much weaker position, since the text concept allows for many other text-types than literary ones.

Further, *Om faget* (Eng. about the subject) is now a main headline for several elements. The first of these is *The subject’s relevance* (Norw. fagets relevans). In this very short text of just five lines, the consistent use of *norskfaget* from 2013 has gone. The notion is used just *once* and is worth quoting: “The subject Norwegian prepares students for a modern work-life that requires varied competence in reading, writing and oral communication” (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2019c: 1). As it stands, it is now seemingly *the main function* that L1 is supposed to have. It is reduced to competence *for* something, as promoted by OECD and EU, proposed by the Norwegian government and will probably pass the Parliament.

In 2012, I problematised L1’s and other school subjects’ knowledge *borders* (Ongstad 2012c). I noted that the overload of topics in L1 had been a constant discussion the last 40-50 years. The subject had for a long time been criticised for having unclear borders. Eventually, in the 2020 Curriculum one has challenged the problem, by introducing a *core*. Border and core are of course intimately connected. By using *core*, and defining it as certain key elements, one indirectly might allow borders to remain fluffy. What will matter in the future is what will be tested, and that is likely to be the core, as realised in the fixed, reduced set of bullet-points.

The turn to *core* and *work-life* can be contrasted with the idea of *Bildung* (Aase 2005). *Above* the general curriculum we find the level of law. As part of the 2020 reform, a new national object clause (Norw. *formålsparagraf*) was developed. Since it contained more than 30 ideals, it was necessary to make a more restricted set of values that could guide the development of both a general curriculum and subject curricula. These are: *Human dignity*, *Identity and cultural diversity*, *Critical thinking and ethical awareness*, *Creator joy, dedication and explorer-urge*, *Respect for nature and environmental awareness*, and *Democracy and participation*. In a sense, these values could be seen as ideals for *Bildung*. It is hard to find solid anchorage for these in L1’s core, though. The introduction in the L1 curriculum seemingly *hints* some ideals. Yet, generally these do not seem sufficiently backed up in the bullet-point sections. I return to this design in the next section. *Skills*, *competence* and *knowledge about* are highlighted, and hence winners. *Bildung* is backgrounded and hence a loser.

2.8. 80 years of changing disciplinarity

2.8.1. Growing awareness of L1 as a disciplinary phenomenon

The 1939 Curriculum did not mention L1’s function as a *fag*, and L1 in the M74 did not really address the issue either. (KUD 1974: 96). In M87, L1 has become aware its role as a school subject, with its own disciplinarity. The first section has no headline. Yet, it consciously

outlines what kind of *fag* Norwegian is. It is for communication, aesthetics, and culture and traditions. Moreover, it is both an instrumental subject and an attitudinal subject. This characterisation anticipates the well-structured set of six disciplinary elements described in L97.

In L97, the descriptions have got the following headline, under Introduction. In the Norwegian edition, the headline is “The subject’s place in school”. In the official English version, the headline is “The subject and educational aims”. In 2006 the corresponding headline is changed to *Formål med faget* (Eng. purpose for the subject), which in 2013 again is reduced to just *Purpose* (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2006 and 2013), by which its dependency, its role as a means is underlined. The 2013 curriculum uses the notion *norskfaget* (Eng. The Norwegian-subject) consistently and repeatedly. It is no doubt that we here meet a self-conscious disciplinarity. In 2020 the concept is gone again. I think these shifts rather stem from unawareness.

2.8.2. Bullet-point design: disciplinarity as verb versus noun

Already in the 1990s, Norwegian schools were “managed by objectives”. Curricula had been pinpointed and specified by use of bullet-points. Ever since, there existed silent tensions between knowings and doings, and accordingly between verbs for skills and nouns for content. In the new millennium, this bullet-point regime has been sharpened. Valverde (2002) criticised national curricula – among them, Norwegian – for not being *focused* enough:

Focused curricula are the motor of a dynamic definition of curricular objectives. In most of the highest achieving countries, each new grade sees a new set of curricular goals receiving concentrated attention to prepare for and build toward mastering more challenging goals yet to come (Valverde 2002: no page).

OECD, with help from EU, successfully imposed the focused curricula ideology in many Western countries, including Norway (OECD 2005, EQF 2005, Arbeidsgruppen 2007, EU 2008, Sjøstedt 2013, Ongstad 2014a). Shorter curricular texts are supposed to be ‘clearer’. Objectives should be one-liners, ideally each with just one verb and one or two nouns, for the sake of simplification and clarity. Simplification and so-called precise concepts, describing outcomes, are in turn thought to increase and enhance measurability (Ongstad 2014b). OECD and the State, through the Ministry of Education (Norw. *Kunnskapsdepartementet*) and Utdanningsdirektoratet, thus standardised the semantic nature of the applied verbs (Sivesind 2013, Ongstad 2014a): The verbs were thought to be general and context-free, and hence *universal*. Nouns or content are left to the different professional fields and representatives in curriculum committees.

These one-liners are, in consequence, hidden speech acts. They establish a regime for assessment of student disciplinarity (Norw. *elevfaglighet*). The structure of each point is dominated by the verb-noun connection. The verbs shall have performative character. They shall be *doings*. The nouns will of course be disciplinary content sub-elements or *knowings*. Together they form competences. Within the set of competences or bullet-point lists there lures a potential tug of war between different forms or aspects of disciplinarity. To be concrete: what follows is a rough semantic grouping of *all* terms used to describe expected L1 competences after Year 10 in the Curriculum for 2020 (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2019c).

Curricular, competence verbs: Read, reflect, compare, interpret, explore, discuss, recognise, use, mark, show, consider, express, inform, tell, argue, write, master, experiment, make, justify.

Directly language-related nouns: Nonfiction, translation, content, genre patterns, means (linguistic), texts (other), appeals (rhetorical), citations, texts (own), media (digital), language, communication, language (for specific purposes), themes (disciplinary and cross-disciplinary, texts, orthography, inflection, meta-language, sentence-structure, text-structure, recrafting (own and other students' texts), genres, texts (composite), forms of expression, status (for Norwegian languages), variation (linguistic), diversity.

Other nouns: Context (historical), time (contemporary), life situation (the young's), sources, discussions, conversations, presentations (oral), experiences, ways (creative), conversation (on writing), background (historical).

Languages in Norway/kinds of Norwegian (nouns): Hovedmål, sidemål, bokmål, nynorsk, Sami, languages (other), orality [as discipline or skill across school subjects], 'written' [as discipline or skill across school subjects].

Nouns related to literature: Literature (belles-lettres), novels, interpretations.

Competences have here been 'de-textualized' and split into two parts of speech, verbs (what to do) and nouns (what to know). The above sampled vocabulary makes up the *total* curricular content of what learners of Norwegian (L1) are expected to demonstrate after ten years of compulsory schooling. From a disciplinary element perspective, it seems clear that *linguistic elements* dominate content-wise. Language is described more in structural than in functional terms. *Knowledge of text, genre, and rhetoric* are seen as important. The performative verbs take students' increased maturity into consideration (compared to other stages), but follow rather a strict (expected) taxonomy.

This L1 curriculum therefore comprises a possible dilemma for assessing disciplinarity: If doings (verbs) are seen as most important, then L1 is function- and competence-oriented. If knowings (nouns) are seen as most important, then it is content- and L1-oriented (Ongstad 2014a). Further, since verbs are less subject-specific and nouns more, to stress function and process will make L1 more of *a means*. To stress disciplinary content will make L1 knowledge more a goal in itself, an *end*.

When learning outcome is what counts, the floor is open for a possible tug of war between curricular verbs and specific L1 nouns. The challenge, both when making a curriculum, and put it into life in classrooms, is to balance the weight of the verbs and nouns over 13 years, based on the dilemma whether L1 is a skyscraper or a chained house (Bernstein 1990, Ongstad 2004). Nouns can simply be added, but verbs are, over the years of schooling, supposed to reach epistemologically deeper or higher. It is about disciplinary maturation. And what are students growing, maturing toward? The short official, empowered answer is competence, but the right answer should have been the national object clause (Norw. *formålsparagraf*). Norway no longer strives toward former national object clause related to beauty, truth and goodness, or to *gagns mennseske* (Eng. a 'beneficial' [for self and others] human being), but towards the mentioned six values – in other words, growth toward *Bildung*. Competence has bypassed *Bildung*, which is parked outside the *core*. *Bildung* must hope to exist somewhere in the non-prioritised land between the core and L1's borders.

3. Policies

3.1. International and national influence on curricular knowledge regimes

3.1.1. On knowledge regimes in Norwegian educational politics

To try to catch overarching patterns in a field of knowledge, different concepts such as *disciplinarity*, *epistemology*, *knowledge regime*, and *paradigm* have been coined. Slagstad (2018) defines a knowledge regime (Norw. *kunnskapsregime*) as an ideology or a school of thought (Norw. *tankeretning*) that defines power, authority, values, and knowledge in a particular way. Aasen (2007) holds that one can trace four different regimes that have had influence over the nation's education policy: *a social democratic* (SD), *societal criticism* (SC), *a cultural conservative* (CC), and *a market liberal* (ML). The degree of influence for each particular regime may vary between countries and from time to time. Although all these have been in play during the periods I have covered, I need for the sake of space to concentrate on the last two, since they have been particularly influential on the new curricular design I have problematised more in detail above.

In brief, Aasen (2007:29) claims that SD was dominant between World War I and II, when the comprehensive school was founded, pushed by the Norwegian Labour Party. Values were collectiveness, solidarity, and equal rights. The 1939-plan for L1 was in use during the heydays of this regime. The SD-regime was influential till the 1970s, when it was challenged by a SC bringing to the fore new buzz-words, such as ecology, conflict, consciousness, reflection, well-being, the local community, and self-development (Aasen 2007:32-35). The general 1987 Curriculum was marked by SCs critique as it opened for less detailed plans and central governing and wanted students to be more active and to participate. Relating the SC regime to L1, the 1974 L1-curriculum was criticised heavily from the new 'left' (Moslet 1981). Critics were in turn influential in the making of the new L1-curriculum in 1987, in which the individual learner became more visible.

The third orientation that influenced Norwegian educational politics was CC, prioritising high achievement, common content, national culture, collective consciousness, and "the national heritage" (Aasen, 2007:35-7). These goals resulted in more weight on detailed curricula and quality content. CC believed that common content could strengthen national community, and criticised student-oriented activity pedagogy. Teachers should have factual knowledge and one should refute epistemological relativism. CC wanted local autonomy, decentralisation combined with central goals, and control through thorough national evaluation. A shift from teachers' input to students' final output was seen as crucial. CC had influence on L97, although ironically it was implemented by a social democratic government. In L97's L1, cultural heritage and nationalism got a short Indian summer.

The fourth regime (ML), focused, according to Aasen (2007:37-39), on the individual's choice and society's competitiveness. Schools should help strengthening economic growth. Its discourse was characterised by concepts such as market, customer, user, incentive, learning outcome, and production. ML was partly influential on L97, but it was with *Kunnskapsløftet* (2006) that this policy had its major breakthrough. Aasen argues that aspects of the three latter regimes, SC, CC, and ML, can be found in KL 06, but that the ML dominates. Students' participation (SC) and competence-based goals (CC) are important. However, ML has, by turning the curricular vocabulary, strengthened *central* control over the final outcome, by which ML has given the key premises and frames for L1's curricular disciplinarity.

3.1.2. School policies and regimes in light of State ideologies

Aasen published his article in 2007. It is not given how he would have characterised the policies that influenced education in the following years. Slagstad, who has applied Aasen's regime concept, combines Aasen's four regimes with what he claims are historical types of schools or educational ideologies, based on three key characteristics of the Norwegian State

over the last 150 years, namely *the school-state*, *the welfare-state*, and *the competitive state* (Slagstad 2018). Here I will just focus on the competitive state (Norw. *konkurransesstaten*). Slagstad sees Minister Hernes' role during most part of the 1990s as underestimated. He sees the social democrat Hernes as an *ambiguous, transitional* character, installing a post-social-democratic regime with increasingly more visible neo-liberal patterns, whereby three patterns came to surface: *nation building*, *knowledge as competence*, and *management by objectives*. Regarding L1 in the L97 Curriculum, these three patterns fit well with traits I have pointed to earlier. Even more important, the L1 text is said to be written by Hernes personally.

3. 2. Political regimes versus disciplinary paradigms?

According to Slagstad (2018:9), the Directorate for Education and Skills in OECD and its director, Andreas Schleicher, have been extremely influential. Slagstad even sees the Norwegian Directorate of Education (Norw. Utdanningsdirektoratet) more or less as a Norwegian OECD's filial. National directorates work downward in a system. An inherent premise in the concept *knowledge regime*, described above, is a top-down perspective. With Bourdieu (1989), one could say that a regime will be *imposed* by power on hierarchical educational systems. A *paradigm* is in a sense a more 'neutral' concept, mainly describing what at a certain time is epistemologically dominant in a field of knowledge. Ven defines paradigm as "[...] a basis set of beliefs that guides action, whether of the everyday garden variety or action taken in connection with a disciplined inquiry" (Ven 2007: 236). Ven further holds that mte-paradigms (in my terms, L1-paradigms) have their own basic beliefs concerning language and literature, linguistics and literature studies, education, teaching and learning. A L1-paradigm is hence a set of "[...] *principles of language learning, concepts of standards language learning*, principles and concepts which of course also cover the domain of *literature teaching* (Ven 2007:11)". He outlines four historical mte-paradigms: the literary-grammatical (dominant before World War I), a developmental (strong up to 1960's), a communicative (influencing the 1970's), and a utilitarian (from the 1980's onwards).

Paradigm, as Ven uses it, and regime, as Aasen and Slagstad apply it, overlap as conceptual categories, but only partly. Mainly Ven's concept of paradigm is seen as a working ideology *within* L1 (mte), while Aasen's knowledge regime could be perceived more as an overall, strategic policy aiming at direct impact on education and reforms at large. However, they might meet, sometimes coincide, sometimes clash. The new 2020 Curriculum could hence be seen as an encounter of top-down and bottom-up forces. In the case of Ven's *utilitarian paradigm*, it could be said to coincide with Aasen's *neo-liberal knowledge regime* (Slagstad 2018). A new paradigm is not necessarily a direct result of a particular regime. A regime may not be able to persuade local agents and curricular committees. A regime may have to battle with an established disciplinary paradigm.

An illustrating example occurred in 2015. Two reports from the so-called Ludvigsen committee, NOU (2014:7) and NOU (2015:8) make up the main basis for the 2020 reform. The committee's mandate was mainly to renew the school disciplines (Norw. *fagfornyelsen*). As part of the committee's strategy, it proposed a radical *re-grouping* of school subjects. When the committee placed *Norwegian* (L1) in the cluster 'languages', it met strong disciplinary opposition (Nergård & Penne 2016). It was as if the L1-teachers and L1-scholars eventually discovered their own paradigm, when its epistemological base was politically challenged (Fodstad 2015:1):

In the worst case, the group-thinking can destroy a subject Norwegian that is finally beginning to take the shape of a literacy and competence subject in the broad sense.

Ironically, such a development runs counter to the overall thoughts of the Ludvigsen Committee, which indicates that one simply has not fully understood Norwegian as a subject.

However, the final outcome is not yet given. The Ministry will send all the subject curricula on a final hearing (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2019c).

4. Disciplinarity summarised

4.1. Disciplinarity as L1 disciplinarity – or ‘Norwegian’ as forever amalgamated?

L1 disciplinarity should be seen as disciplinarity. There are several crucial delineating lines, originally (in 1739) between reading and writing (Madssen 1999), in Academia for more than hundred years between language and literature (Bull 1991), and in the seven inspected curricula between elements of knowing and activities of doings (skills and competences). There are others, less visible, but important divisions in curricula, such as between composing/producing and responding/reproducing (Sawyer 2007), and between Nordic studies (at universities) and *norskdidaktikk* (in teacher education) (Ongstad 2004). The line I have researched is of course between Norwegianness and internationality, or in a more general perspective between nationalism and internationalism. I have tried to put most of these differentiations into Table 4 further down.

The one that is least visible in these curricula is a divide between knowledge of basic disciplines such as language, literature, culture, and media, on the one hand, and educational, pedagogical, and didactic knowledge and skills being implemented in L1 bachelor and master studies in teacher education, on the other hand. In Norwegian terms, this is ‘norsk’ versus ‘norskdidaktikk’ as name for L1 teacher students’ study. Didactisation of L1 has been a significant, major disciplinary transition over the last 40 years (Ongstad 2012a, 2017). To claim that a curriculum should be more *faglig* (Eng. disciplinary) is hence highly ambiguous.

While what one could call explicit didactic awareness was traceable in bits in different curricula up till 1997, as indicated, the introduction of The Knowledge Promotion in 2006 wiped out disciplinary didactics, simply by removing the student and the teacher as terms in the text. Hence, processes of learning and teaching were banned. Disciplinary didactics has traditional lines to *Bildung*, not the least in L1 (Aase 2005). Being left out in the curriculum process and in the text, *Bildung* has therefore become secondary and even a non-issue. The strive for so-called curricular clarity and focus on outcome as competence were probably rooted in a deep political distrust. *Bildung* was hardly measurable, too farfetched, and too difficult to control politically. The freedom of the past gave teachers the upper hand over the curriculum (Goodlad et al 1979). Now teachers have control over means and methods when forming students, but this freedom is reduced to the shaping of their competences. *Bildung* as aim is for teachers who dare to search off the beaten track.

Hence, in this study, several disciplinary tensions and divisions of curricular L1 are brought to surface. They can be formulated as dilemmas and questions, to which there can be answers or new questions:

- Language versus literature? Tried unified or bridged both by communication and ‘text’.
- Writing versus reading? Tried unified or bridged by ‘text’.
- Language versus communication? Extending L1 toward semiotics without using the term.
- Language as system versus language in use? Adding functionalism.
- Text as system versus text in context? Combining text linguistics with sociolinguistics.

- Knowledge versus application for teachers? Applying means communication and didactics.
- Knowings versus doings for pupils? Tension is removed by shifting focus to competence.
- Core versus rest? Will core sharpen L1's disciplinarity or enhance L1-teachers' leeway?
- L1 versus cross-disciplinary topics? Will topics be added or integrated or rejected?
- L1 versus literacy? Should literacy be integrated in L1 or be kept separate?
- Literacy and competence versus Bildung? Are the three compatible?

4.2. Norwegianness versus internationality?

A main conclusion is that, over the years, Norwegianness and internationality have been in a tacit tug of war within most parts of the inspected curricula. Several external forces have increased international influence. Classical philology and the element literature have lost a solid foothold. The cuckoo eggs in the L1 nest as alternative to the concept 'language' are text, communication, and new media. Further, a powerful international curricular knowledge regime has been able to convince ever new Norwegian governments and ministers of education that management-by-objectives and competence-based curricula are the best medicine for the future. The new design has polarised L1.

I started out with the headline *Curricular L1 Disciplinarity between Norwegianness and Internationality*. The inspection has given enough credit to the following conclusion: *disciplinarity in L1 curricula have moved from Norwegianness to internationality*. However, under the surface of this rather simple claim, there are nuances. After all, much historical Norwegianness appear to be former import. The awareness of this disciplinary history tends to vanish. Confronted with new reforms, teachers of Norwegian will probably consider the L1 they are used to as homely, and hence 'Norwegian'. With the reduction of space for literature and philologically based knowledge of Norwegian, a new national consciousness has come to surface (Gaare 2019). Such dissatisfaction runs together with a more general scepticism toward imported, imposed curricular design.

4.3. Summarising – overview and final comments

Progress Formation Integration Growth Maturation	Knowing/s of L1 elements: Language, literature, text, communication, culture, media as ...	written	spoken	visual				
	Doing/s	reading writing	listening speaking	viewing representing				
	Having Achieving	competence literacy	competence literatecy	competence literacy				
	Becoming		Identity as adjective	Identity as noun	Identity as a national goal			
			Norwegian International	Norwegianness Internationality	Nationalism Internationalism			
	Becoming = B	I	L	D	U	N	G	?

Table 4. Main knowledge elements (knowing/s) used in L1 curricula between 1939 and 2019 and their ditto main skills (doing/s) seen as expected progress and growth toward competence, literacy or Bildung in the light of elements of Norwegianness as opposed to internationality found in seven Norwegian L1 curricula. Note that the columns in lower part of the table deliberately are moved somewhat to the right to prevent indentity-categories to be confused with the modalities written, spoken and visual. The lower part is nevertheless still seen as expected stages (marked by the length of the arrow.) Note also that the table builds on Sawyer (2007). See table 3.

Departing from Table 4, one could conclude that shifting disciplinarity connected to knowing of L1 main elements started from *language*. I pointed out three paradigms: formalism, semanticism, and functionalism. I further argued that this development led both to a shift to *communication* and later to *text* and back again. The stage by 2020 seems to be *text in context*. The other main elements, literature, media and culture, have been secondary, and defined in and out of the curriculum as *main* elements seemingly randomly. Regarding *literature*, two traits should be mentioned: firstly, that this element seemingly has suffered most by the drift away from the philology paradigm; secondly, only twice has literature over 80 years been mentioned as a *main* element of knowing. (I stress, however, that I have studied curricula for compulsory and not upper-secondary education, where the situation might have been different.)

Moving down from knowing to *doing*, one should keep in mind that the first two of the six activities and skills, reading and writing, were the core elements in 1739 that later fused into 'Norwegian'. Both were the backbones ever after. Over time, reading and writing have been rather even in importance, while the other four, listening, speaking, viewing, and representing, have been highlighted more recently, probably due to increased importance of other media and to new weight on oral rhetoric (to learn to present). It is likely that the long-lasting focus on reading have kept literature in the game, after all.

I have followed a rather over-simplified logic by moving from learning/knowing to doing/applying, as if these were different phenomena and opposed categories, which they are not, of course. Nevertheless, this has been the order that the Ministry forced upon all levels of formal learning in all subjects in Norway. This divide is still the rule for all curricula in *higher* education. All syllabi have to be spelled out in *kunnskaper* (Eng. knowledge/s) and *ferdigheter* (Eng. skills), which in turn should make up *generell kompetanse* (Eng. general competence). Astonishingly, this differentiation between knowledge and skills has silently disappeared in school curricula. The significance of *competence* has been strengthened, though. The reason why I have focused critically on verbs versus nouns, above, is of course that the three sets of concepts knowledge/skills, knowing/doing, and verbs/nouns are closely related. In other words, the strong opposition is still there, as well as its disciplinary implications and consequences.

Commenting normatively, the verb for competence should be to *have*. Internationally, literacy has followed competence and skills as a shadow over the last twenty years. Policies from OECD, UN, COE, and EU have deliberately blurred them, leading to the general impression that what one is talking about at the end of the day are by and large *skills*. However, can you *have* literacy? In Table 4 I have used the verb to *achieve*. As can be seen, I have arranged a set of verbs from knowing, via doing, having, achieving down to *becoming*. Following that logic, I end with the question of identity, which in turn leads back to one of my research questions – tensions between Norwegianness and internationality. What I have found, as indicated, is a loss of Norwegianness and an increase of internationality. If, or to what degree these tendencies effect L1 students identity in the long run is not an issue for this study.

However, Odd Gaare has recently written a short, critical article in *Norsklæreren* (a Norwegian-teachers' membership journal), where he argues roughly as follows. Ibsen's Peer Gynt 'deconstructs' himself as a onion, just to find that there is no core. A new established L1 curriculum core may end up in the same situation:

Common for all the international frameworks The Knowledge Promotion builds on, is that they are chemically cleansed for affiliation to a people, a nation, or a chosen

cultural context. In return they are glued to the global and the economical-technological worldview from Wall Street and Silicon Valley, Paris (OECD) and Brussel (Gaare 2019:67, SO's translation).

Gaare connects what he sees as a conscious removal of national culture with an intention of making students to individualistic cosmopolitans who can master a globalised world. My findings, i.e. increased imbalances, support his *premise*.

My last point, however, is to bring in the question of students' *identity* as a final stage for L1 disciplinarity. It is beyond doubt that the new value set for Norwegian education explicitly dwell with *identity*. Making formation of identity a main goal for L1 puts its traditional disciplinarity in squeeze. The slogans for the 2020 reform were increased disciplinarity and prioritising work-life. The ideals behind making a set of new values were, in my view, rather a step toward *Bildung*, less directed to specific disciplinarity and economy-technical future goals. Ironically, neither nationalism nor internationalism are among mentioned key values. Besides, L1s core curriculum for the last year in the compulsory school, Year 10, has put more weight on the school subject as such, and less on its relation to *life* and *identity*. There are, as far as I can see, no arguments given for how the 2020 curriculum's L1 core are supposed to *danne* (Eng. form) students toward the set of given values. Table 4 therefore ends symbolically with a question mark.

References

- Applebee, A. N. (1974). *Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History*. Urbana: NCTE.
- Arbeidsgruppen (2007). *Forslag til nasjonalt rammeverk for kvalifikasjoner i høyere utdanning*. [Proposals for a national framework for qualifications in higher education Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet.
- Aase, L. (2005). *Norskfagets danningspotensial i fortid og samtid*. [The subject Norwegian's potential for Bildung.] Bergen: Fagbokforlaget LNU.
- Aasen, P. (2007). Læringsplakatens utdanningspolitiske kontekst. [The political context of 'Læringsplakaten']. In Møller, J. & Sundli, L. (eds.) *Læringsplakaten. Skolens samfunnskontrakt*, pp 23-44. ['Læringsplakaten. School's social contract.] Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget. pp 23-44.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *Class, codes and control, vol. 4: The structuring of pedagogic discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Bull, T. (1991). Det ideologiske norskfaget og det faktiske norskfaget. [The ideological and the actual discipline Norwegian. Does Norwegian dissolve from with?]*Norsklæreren* 1, 5-13.
- Christie, F. & Maton, K. (Eds.) (2011). *Disciplinarity. Functional and Sociological Perspectives*. London og New York: Continuum.
- COE (2009). *Language(s) of Schooling*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe (COE). <https://www.coe.int/en/web/language-policy/platform>. Visited 30.03.2019.
- Deng, Z., & Luke, A. (2007). Subject matter: Defining and theorizing school subjects. In Connolly, M., He, M.F. & Phillion, J. (Eds.), *Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp 66-89). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dictionary.com (2019). *Internationality*. Visited 31.10.2019.
- Doughty, P. (1971). *Language in Use*. London: Arnold.
- Doyle, B. (1989). *English and Englishness*. London: Routledge.

- Elbow, P. (1990). *What is English?* New York and Urbana: MLA and NCTE.
- EQF (2005). *Towards a European Qualification Framework for Lifelong Learning*. Brussels: EU http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/consultation_eqf_en.pdf. Visited 31.03.2019.
- EU (2008). *The European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning (EQF)*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Fodstad, L. A. (2015). Norskfaget i fremtidens skole. *Dagsavisen*, 5. August. <https://www.dagsavisen.no/debatt/norskfaget-i-fremtidens-skole-1.460003> Visited 01.11.2019.
- FR (1976). *Norsk i sammenholdte klasser* [Norwegian in mixed ability classes]. Oslo: Forsøksrådet for skoleverket.
- Goodlad, J. I. et al (1979). *Curriculum Inquiry: The Study of Curriculum Practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Goodson, I. & Marsh, C. (1996). *Studying School Subjects. A guide*. London: Falmer Press.
- Green, B. (2018). *Engaging curriculum: bridging the curriculum theory and English education divide*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Gundem, B. B. (1998). *Understanding European didactics. An overview. Didactics (Didaktik, Didaktik(k), di-dactique)*. University of Oslo: Institute for Educational Research.
- Gaare, O. (2019) «Kommer ikke Kjærnen snart for en dag?» [«When will the core appear?»] *Norsklæreren* 3:67-71.
- Hertzberg, N. (1898). *Opdragelse og undervisning*. [Upbringing and teaching.] Christiania (Oslo): Grøndahl & Søns forlag.
- Habermas, J. (1988). *Kommunikativt handlande*. [Acting Communicatively.] Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Johnsen, E. B. (no year) [1992?]. *Omkring betydningen av ordet morsmål*. [On the meaning of the word mother tongue.] Unpublished manuscript.
- Johnsen, E. B. (1994). *Oppgavetekst og dannelse: Artiumsstilens emner, formuleringer og forvaltning 1880-1991* [Task-text and 'Bildung': The artiumsstil's topics, formulations, and management, 1880-1991]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oslo, Norway.
- Karseth, B. & Sivesind, K. (2010). Conceptualising curriculum knowledge within and beyond the national context. *European Journal of Education*, 45 (1), 103–120.
- Kelly, G. J., Luke, A. & Green, J. (2008). What counts as knowledge in educational settings: Disciplinary knowledge, assessment, and curriculum. *Review of Research in Education* 32(1), vii-x. <http://rre.sagepub.com/content/32/1/vii>.
- Koritzinsky, T. (2000). *Pedagogikk og politikk i L97*. [Pedagogy and politics in L97.]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- KU (1940). *Normalplan (Mønsterplan) for landsfolkeskolen*. ['Normal-plan' for rural primary education/schools.] Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Krogh, E. (2005). *Et fag i moderniteten: danskfagets didaktiske diskurser*. [A school subject in modernity.. Didactic discourses for Danish as a subject.] Doctoral dissertation, Dansk institut for gymnasiepædagogik, Syddansk Universitet.
- KUD (1974). *Mønsterplan for grunnskolen (M74)*. [Mønsterplan for elementary education (M74).] Oslo: Aschehoug.
- KUD (1987). *Mønsterplan for grunnskolen*. [General curriculum for primary education.] Oslo: Aschehoug.
- KUF (1993). *Læreplan for grunnskole, videregående opplæring, voksenopplæring - generell del*. [Curriculum for primary/secondary/upper secondary education and education for adult - general part.] Oslo: KUF.

- KUF (1996). *Læreplanverket for den 10-årige grunnskolen*. [The curriculum for the 10-year compulsory school in Norway.] Oslo: Kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet.
- Langer, J. A. (2011). *Envisioning Knowledge. Building Literacy in the Academic Disciplines*. New York and London: Teachers College Press.
- Luckmann, T. (2009). Observations on the structure and function of communicative genres. *Semiotica*, (173), 267–282.
- Madssen, K.-A. (1999). *Morsmålsfagets normtekster. Et skolefag blir til – norskfaget mellom tradisjon og politikk*. [MTE's norm-texts. The becoming of a school subject - Norwegian between tradition and politics.] Dr.polit. dissertation. Trondheim: NTNU.
- Michael, I. (1987). *The Teaching of English. From the sixteenth century to 1870*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (UK).
- Moslet, I. (Ed.) (1981). *Norskundervisninga og mønsterplanen*. [The Teaching of Norwegian and the Mønsterplan.] Oslo: LNU/Cappelen.
- Muller, J. (2011). Through Others' Eyes: The Fate of Disciplines. In Christie, F. & Maton, K. (Eds.) *Disciplinary. Functional and Sociological Perspectives*, (pp 13-34). London and New York: Continuum.
- Nerlich, B. & Clarke, D. D. (2000). Semantic fields and frames: Historical explorations of the interface between language, action, and cognition. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(2), 125-150.
- Nergård, M. E. & Penne, S. (2016). Fagene oppløses i framtidens skole. [School subjects dissolve in future school.] *Kirke og kultur*, 120(02), 112-129.
- NFR (2004). *Fagdidaktikk som forskningsfelt*. [Subject didactics as research field.] Oslo: Norges forskningsråd, KUPP.
- NOU (2014). *Elevenes læring i fremtidens skole. Et kunnskapsgrunnlag*. [Students' Learning in a School for Future. A knowledge base.] Norges offentlige utredninger, 2014:7. Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet.
- NOU (2015). *Fremtidens skole. Fornyelse av fag og kompetanser*. [A School for the Future. Innovation of disciplines and competencies.] Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet. (NOU 2015:8).
- Nystrand, M., Greene, S., & Wiemelt, J. (1993). Where did composition studies come from? Toward an intellectual history of composition studies. *Written Communication*, 10, 267-333.
- Næss, A. (1961/1940). *En del elementære logiske emner* [Some basic logical topics]. Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- OECD (2005). *The Definition and Selection of Key Competencies: Executive Summary* www.pisa.oecd.org/dataoecd/47/61/35070367.pdf [Visited 27.02.2013].
- Ogden, C. K. & Richards, I. A. (1923). *The Meaning of Meaning: A Study of the Influence of Language upon Thought and of the Science of Symbolism* (Vol. 29). K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Company, Limited.
- Ongstad, S. (1981). Mønsternorsk? ['Patterned Norwegian?'] In Moslet, I. (Ed.) *Norskundervisninga og mønsterplanen*. [The Teaching of Norwegian and the Mønsterplan.] Oslo: LNU/Cappelen, 18-35.
- Ongstad, S. (1999). *Sources of 'didaktization'*. In Hudson, B. et al (Eds.) *Didaktik/Fachdidaktik as Science(s) of the Teaching Profession? TNTEE Publications* 2(1), 173-187.
- Ongstad, S. (2002). Positioning Early Norwegian Research on Writing. *Written Communication*, 19(3), 345-381.
- Ongstad, S. (2003). Standard language education in transition. In J. Bourne & E. Reid (Eds.), *World yearbook of education 2003*. Language Education. London, UK: Kogan Page.
- Ongstad, S. (2004). *Språk, kommunikasjon og didaktikk*. [Language, communication and didactics]. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

- Ongstad, S. (2006). Fag i endring: Om didaktisering av kunnskap [Subjects in transformation: On the di-dactization of knowledge]. In S. Ongstad (Ed.), *Fag og didaktikk i lærerutdanning*. [Disciplines and didactics in teacher education.] Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget, 19-60.
- Ongstad, S. (2007). The Concepts of 'Language' and 'Discipline' in Transgression. In Martyniuk, W. (ed.) *Towards a Common European Framework of Reference for Language(s) of School Education?* (pp 117-130). Krakow: Universitas.
- Ongstad, S. (2012a). Morsmålsdidaktikk som fag og forskningsfelt i overnasjonalt perspektiv [Mother tongue didactics as subject and research field in a supranational perspective]. In S. Ongstad (Ed.), *Nordisk morsmålsdidaktikk. Forskning, felt og fag*. [Nordic mother tongue didactics. Research, field, and subject] (pp. 21-46). Oslo: Novus.
- Ongstad, S. (2012b). Før en sammenligner. Metaforer som amorf, sentripetal og sentrifugal for dynamikk i fag og fagdidaktisk forskning [Before comparing. Metaphors as amorphous, centripetal and centrifugal for dynamics in subjects and subject didactic research]. In S. Ongstad (Ed.). *Nordisk morsmålsdidaktikk. Forskning, felt og fag*. [Nordic mother tongue didactics. Research, field, and subject.] (pp. 311-329). Oslo, Norway: Novus.
- Ongstad, S. (2012c). Fra kunnskap, via kontekst, kjerne og komparasjon til kommunikasjon. En fagdidaktisk utviklingslinje?. *Nordidactica-Journal Of Humanities And Social Science Education*, (1), 1-25.
- Ongstad, S. (2014a). Om faglighet og språklighet i Nasjonalt kvalifikasjonsrammeverk [On disciplinarity and discursivity in NQR]. In Kleve, B., Penne, S. & Skaar, H. (Eds.) *Literacy og didaktikk i skole og lærerutdanning* [Literacy and didactics in school and teacher education], (pp 174-196). Oslo: Novus.
- Ongstad, S. (2014b). Driften i literacy-begrepet - en utfordring for lærerutdannings fagdidaktikk? [A drifting literacy-concept – a challenge for disciplinary didactics in teacher education?]. In Kleve, B., Penne, S. & Skaar, H. (Eds.) *Literacy og didaktikk i skole og lærerutdanning* [Literacy and didactics in school and teacher education], (pp 197-225). Oslo: Novus.
- Ongstad, S. (2015). Competing disciplinarity in curricular L1. A Norwegian case. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 15, 1-28.
- Ongstad, S. (2017). Pedagogisk + fagdidaktisk forskning = utdanningsforskning? [Pedagogical + disciplinary didactic research = educational research?] *Norsk pedagogisk tidsskrift*, 101(01), 68-79.
- Osborne, P. (2015). Problematizing disciplinarity, transdisciplinary problematics. *Theory, culture & society*, 32(5-6), 3-35.
- Pinar, W. F. (2007). *Intellectual advancement through disciplinarity: Verticality and horizontality in curriculum studies*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Ree, J. (1992). Internationality. *Radical Philosophy* 60 (Spring) <https://www.radicalphilosophy.com/article/internationality>
- Sawyer, W. (2007). English as Mother Tongue in Australia. *L1 – Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 7(1), 17-90.
- Sawyer, W. & van de Ven, P. H. (2006). Starting Points. Paradigms in Mother Tongue Education. *L1 Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 7(1), 5-20.
- Schiødt, H. J. (1970). *Sproget i funktion*. [Language in function.] (Vol. 46). Copenhagen: Berlingske forlag.
- Scholes, R. E. (1998). *The rise and fall of English: Reconstructing English as a discipline*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Seland, I. (2011). *Tilhørighet, rettighet, likhet. Nasjonal identitet og integrasjon i velferdsstaten gjennom grunnskolen 1970-2008*. [Belonging, right, equity. National

- identity and integration in the welfare state through primary and secondary education 1970-2008.] PhD-thesis in sociology University of Oslo.
- Short, E. C. (1990). Challenging the Trivialization of Curriculum. In Sears, J. T. & Marshall, D. J. (Eds.) *Teaching and Thinking about the Curriculum. Critical Inquiries* (pp. 197-210). New York and London: Teacher College Press.
- Sivesind, K. (2013). Mixed images and merging semantics in European curricula. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 45(1), 52- 66.
- Sjöstedt, B. (2013). *Ämneskonstruktioner i ekonomismens tid*. [Constructions of school subject in the time of economism.] Malmö: Malmö högskola, Fakulteten för lärande och samhälle. Phd.-thesis.
- Slagstad, R. (2018). Når OECD tar makten. [When OECD grabs the power.] *Bedre skole*. <https://www.utdanningsnytt.no/bedre-skole>. Visited 01.11.2019.
- Stenning, K. (1989). Methodical semanticism considered as a history of progress in cognitive science. In B. Hirst (Ed.), *The making of cognitive science: Essays in honor of George A. Miller*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Svordal, K. (1964). *Stilskrivning og logikk* [Stil-writing and logic]. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Trippestad, T. A. (2009). *Kommandohumanismen. En kritisk analyse av Gudmund Hernes' retorikk, sosiale ingeniørkunst og utdanningspolitikk*. [Command-humanism. A critical analysis of Gudmund Hernes' rhetoric, social engineering and education politics.] PhD. thesis at Bergen University.
- Thavenius, J. (1981). *Modersmål och fadersarv. Svenskämnets traditioner i historien och i nuet*. [Mother tongue and patrimony. Traditions of the subject Swedish historically and in presence.] Stockholm: Symposion.
- TRMERCIA (1999). *The Curriculum for the 10-year Compulsory School in Norway*. Oslo: The Royal Ministry of Education, Research and Church Affairs. (odin.dep.no/odinarkiv/norsk/dep/nedlagt/kuf/1999/eng/014005-990128/dok-bn.html).
- UF (2006). *Kunnskapsløftet*. [The knowledge promotion.]. Oslo: Utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet.
- Utdanningsdirektoratet (2006). *Læreplanverket for Kunnskapsløftet. Midlertidig utgave*. [Curriculum framework for The knowledge promotion. Temporary edition]. Oslo: Utdanningsdirektoratet.
- Utdanningsdirektoratet (2013). *Reviderte læreplaner. Læreplan i norsk*. [Revised curricula. Curriculum for Norwegian.] Oslo: Utdanningsdirektoratet. <https://www.udir.no/kl06/NOR1-05>.
- Utdanningsdirektoratet (2019a). *Læreplanverket – overordnet del*. Oslo: Utdanningsdirektoratet. [The curriculum - The overall part.] <https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/lareplanverket/overordnet-del/>.
- Utdanningsdirektoratet (2019b). *Fagfornyelsen*. [The renewing of school subjects.] Oslo: The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training <https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/lareplanverket/fagfornyelsen/>.
- Utdanningsdirektoratet (2019c). *Nye læreplaner*. [New curricula.] <https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/lareplanverket/fagfornyelsen/hva-skjer-nar-i-fornyelsen-av-fagene/>
- Utdanningsdirektoratet (2019d) *Kompetanse*. [Competence.] <https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/lareplanverket/overordnet-del/prinsipper-for-laring-utvikling-og-danning/kompetanse-i-fagene/>
- Valverde, G. A. (2002). *International Curriculum - Authority and Function, Curriculum and Globalization, Curriculum and Learning*. <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1897/Curriculum-International.html>.

- Ven, P. H. v. d. (2005). Stabilities and changes in (mother tongue) education. In: Kiefer, S. & Salamaa, K. (eds.). *European identities in mother tongue education* (pp. 74-94) Linz: Universitätsverlag Rudolf Trauner.
- Ven, P. H. v. d. (2007) Understanding mother tongue education from a historical (-comparative) perspective. In Herrlitz, W., Ongstad, S., & van De Ven, P. H. (Eds.). *Research on mother tongue education in a comparative international perspective: Theoretical and methodological issues* (Vol. 20). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Vocabulary.com (2019). *Internationality*. Visited 31.10.2019.
- Weinert, F. E. (2001). Concept of Competence: A conceptual Clarification. In Rychen D., & Salganik L. H. (Eds.): *Defining and Selecting Key Competencies*, (pp 45–65). Seattle and Göttingen: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Wikipedia (2019a). *Norway*. Visited 31.10.2019.
- Wikipedia (2019b). *Federated State*. Visited 10.03.2019.
- Wiktionary (2019). *Internationality*. Visited 31.10.2019.
- Yates, L., Davies, L. M., Buzacott, L., Doecke, B., Mead, P., & Sawyer, W. (2019). School English, literature and the knowledge-base question. *The Curriculum Journal*, 30(1), 51-68.