

# COMPETING DISCIPLINARITIES IN CURRICULAR L1.

## A NORWEGIAN CASE

SIGMUND ONGSTAD \*

\* Oslo and Akershus University College

### Abstract

This article explores historical changes within curricular L1 in search for key mechanisms that can illuminate the role of kinds of *disciplinarity* in current educational reforms. The article investigates written curricula for Norwegian, or L1 in Norway, especially focusing this school subject's goals, content, and design following an idea of stages of curricular development. A first part, starting from 1739, describes how L1 *Norwegian* came into being in the first place, leaning mainly on meta-reading of former investigations. From 1939 onwards the article narrows the scope and studies L1's curricular goals more in detail, searching possible kinds of disciplinarity. What is studied is compulsory *curricular* Norwegian, meaning the school subject or the discipline textualised in national plans for L1 in Norway. The approach implies textual, content analyses of sets of reform documents, with special focus on changes over time, accompanied by theorising over how and why. The article explores to which degree historical changes within curricular L1 have altered or may alter perceptions of different L1's disciplinarity. In particular discursivities and genre patterns in L1 curricula in relation to L1 as a goal in itself and as a means for promoting competencies and/or *Bildung* are discussed. 'Findings' lead up to the formulation of a paradox – increased essentialist disciplinarity, believed to promote both competencies and *Bildung*, might be counter-productive.

Keywords: Disciplinarity, curricula, Norwegian, writing, communication, *Bildung*

Ongstad, S. (2015). *Competing disciplinarity in curricular L1. A Norwegian case. L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature. Special issue guest edited by S. Penne & E. Krogh, Paradoxes and negotiations in Scandinavian L1 research in languages, literatures and literacies, vol.nr 15, p. 1-28.*

Corresponding author: Sigmund Ongstad, Oslo and Akershus University College, Pb. 4 St. Olavs plass, N-0130, Oslo, Norway, email: Sigmund.ongstad@hioa.no

© 2015 International Association for the Improvement of Mother tongue Education.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 On disciplinarity

Under contemporary curricular and political conditions the very notion of *discipline* seems at stake. In the making of new educational reforms different opposing forces are at play, some searching a *core*, other opening disciplinary *borders*. A main aim of this article is to follow historical shifts in disciplinarity in a particular school subject, L1, up to our time, to make aware different *general* mechanisms and key elements that have been in play over time and discuss findings in relation to curriculum as a genre and Bildung as a political, curricular ambition for education.

The context is Norwegian, while the audience is international. The concept *disciplinarity*, here coined in the language English, and thus used internationally, does not necessarily cover an adequate meaning across borders. There are two main reasons for that. Firstly, the aspect of *disciplining* someone has become hinged to the concept through Foucault's strong influence (Foucault, 1972). Secondly, the notion *disciplinarity*, in its Anglophone origin, is generally often associated with *someone's* disciplinarity, in educational contexts the students' and teachers'. On the other hand the interrelated German *Fachlichkeit*, Danish *faglighed*, and Norwegian *faglighet*, are primarily related to content, to *something*, to knowledge and skills in a more abstract, purified sense (Vollmer, 2006). Hence, to use the term *disciplinarity* internationally for a Norwegian concept *faglighet* is somewhat risky. In Denmark this possible confusion has contributed to an interesting use of narrowed concepts, such as *elevfaglighed*, *fagfaglighed*, and *lærerfaglighed*. These terms link disciplinarity explicitly to the three parts in the didactic triad, respectively students, school subjects, and teachers. Internationally there is in addition an increased interest for an essentialist understanding of disciplinarity. Cf. use of terms such as *mathematicality* and *historicity*.

A seemingly different perspective on disciplinarity stems from communicational theory. This approach claims that disciplinarity/*faglighet* cannot exist outside communication (Habermas, 1987; Christie and Maton, 2011). Key aspects of utterances, texts, genres, and discourses will work as key aspects of disciplinarity, containing a structural component (form), an epistemological component (content), and a functional component (use). The adverb *seemingly* above signals that the didactic triad can be seen as a version of a communicational triad, *someone* will utter *something* to *someone*, by which one combines form, content, and use, *at once*, in any educational context. Contexts can in turn be seen as different kinds of genres and discourses (Ongstad, 2002). Studying curricular texts should therefore benefit from applying key aspects from both perspectives in content analyses.

While the above disciplinary categories at first glance appear delimitable and clear, this will turn out not be the case for the aspects, elements, contents, knowledges, topics, and skills a study of 275 years of L1 history may reveal (Madssen,

1999). They will compete. An aim for this article is therefore, not to create overall order of all curricular elements, but rather to search *main* (competing) tendencies. By choosing not to focus on L1 in practice, but on the State's (Norway's) official curricula, I expect to meet complex (im-) balances of disciplinary key aspects. They might be implicit and or appear structured and motivated.

The issue of disciplinarity in relation to national and international development of curricula is recently brought to surface from different positions, such as curriculum studies (Pinar, 2007; Deng and Luke, 2007; Kelly et al., 2008) and communication theory and literacy studies (Coe, 2009; Christie and Maton, 2011; Langer 2011). There are increased interests in the role of language and communication in establishing and enhance *disciplinarity* in school and higher education, a focus that will highlight a key role for L1 as a means.

'Danish', 'German', and 'Swedish', are examples of terms that simultaneously denote both a national language *and* a national school subject. In some countries such terms also function as names for a respective study in higher education. Within such studies and research fields relationships between disciplinarity and discursivities (in German *Fachlichkeit* and *Sprachlichkeit*) are investigated, partly critically (Vollmer, 2006; Ongstad, 2014; Det frie Forskningsråd, 2015). Further, new ideas about communicational skills and competences more often influence curricular policy in many countries (Coe, 2009; OECD, 2005; UF, 2006). However, to combine new disciplinarity with new curricular policies raises an epistemological, curricular dilemma: what is disciplinarity *within* school subject (and academic disciplines) as contrast to disciplinarity of school subjects as means, for instance in professions?

Disciplinarity can be studied from many perspectives, and different perceptions and definitions have developed within professions and in education over the last centuries. As mentioned, different national terms such as *discipline* (English), *fach* (German), *fag* (Danish and Norwegian) and *ämne* (Swedish) might refer to different aspects of disciplinarity (Madssen, 1999). This article will apply a simplified idea of (three) possible, developmental *stages* that a school subject might run through over time. A main *first stage* might be the transformation of specific knowledges into an educationally defined syllabus, a named school topic, or an academic discipline ('fag' or 'fach'). The transformation will delimit, define, and make legitimate a specific body of knowledge through a (national) state's democratic process.

A *second stage* could be related to *didactisation*, a process where knowledge and content elements are deliberately mixed with *pedagogical* concerns about content (Hertzberg, 1999). These might be amalgamated, and thus form new forms of disciplinarity, for example when 'Mathematics' for teacher education is changed to 'Mathematics Education' (or, in Norwegian, to 'matematikkdidaktikk'). However, the aspects might live side by side, mainly dis-integrated. Seen from a classroom perspective and from a teacher education position, that is, from a *didactic* perspective, such blurred disciplinarity are nevertheless crucial as new (integrated) *Fachlichkeit* and *faglighet*, or *disciplinarity* within the educational system.

Finally a possible *third stage* can be associated with specific curricular processes established politically by sovereign (national) states, where a certain *kind* of disciplinarity is made explicit by composing a structured mixture of concrete, disciplinary elements, obligatory for schools in a state or nation, often through major school reforms (Koritzinsky, 2000). Such compounds can vary in profile from fairly strict to rather open (Madssen, 2001:11-12).

### *1.2 The study and its empirical and methodological implications*

In this article I will search and problematise curricular shifts that might imply change disciplinarity within the school subject 'Norwegian' as L1 in Norway from its groping start in the 18th century, to a more strategic governmental policy over the last three decades. Although focusing Norway, I will, for the sake of terminological convenience, mostly refer to this school subject and educational discipline as L1. As a professional field L1 can be perceived of as follows:

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). It is concerned with learners' curricular enculturation to language, literature and culture, and focuses on the disciplinary teaching and/or learning of signs, texts, utterances and their contexts, in particular reading, speaking, writing and listening. Although research may tend to foreground language, the interdisciplinary and complex character of the field opens for collaboration across disciplines (AILA, 2006).

Methodologically the article can be seen as a historical description of curricular changes of the school subject called Norwegian leading up to the last national revision in 2013, and where a main scope is on shifting disciplinarity. I will mainly stick to compulsory schooling, for the time being 10 years. The 2006 curriculum for the school subject did include Norwegian in upper secondary schools, whereby L1 became one subject for all years from 1 to 13. Further, in 2006, an important chapter on basic skills in school subjects was integrated in the description of the school subjects. To deal with and integrate digital and oral skills, ability to read, write, and calculate, became obligatory for all school subjects. At least three of these five skills could be associated with key L1 elements. Accordingly, a key research question is whether L1 perceptions of 'disciplinarity' might be altered, since sub-disciplinary aspects are made over-, meta- or multi-disciplinary. These and other changes may twist basic perceptions of 'disciplinarity' not only within L1, but even in other school subjects. Integration of skills might alter L1, and I will investigate and discuss the disciplinary nature of possible changes.

Many forces contribute to the origin, rise, development, change, and decline of school subjects (Goodson and Marsh, 1996; Goodson, 2015). Some are active during reform processes, in the actual making of national or state curricula, whereby curricular changes appear as symptoms of forces at work. Many groups and agents influence curricular reform processes. Two significant parts are politicians and par-

ties representing the state on the one hand and school subject representatives and educational experts on the other hand (Koritzinsky, 2000). Politicians and parties, and even external agents, may have increased their influence over time. Therefore I will search for disciplinary changes within the curricula relevant for understanding power relations between the two parts.

Over the last 40 years Norway has changed the general curricula for compulsory education in 1974 (M74), 1987 (M87), 1997 (L97), 2006 (KL06), and 2013 (REV13). In all reforms L1 has been revised. The main curricular text aspects I will focus on within these L1 curricula are: Aims, Main [content] elements, and Competence goals, since it is supposedly in the dynamics of these three key aspects one may trace major shifts of disciplinarity. (For concrete texts, see appendices 1 and 2). This interest leads, in the main part, 3, up to three minor studies or investigations, first inspecting overall patterns over time, then comparing content concepts/categories and finally adding a critical analysis of the increased tendency to pinpoint goals and outcomes in so-called 'bullet points', and then summarising.

The approach is thus mainly historical and empirical, as the article is concerned with different changes in each new L1 curriculum. The design is mostly interpretative since the curricular texts are commented upon critically based on simple content analysis. In part 4 I aim at giving examples of possible external and internal reasons for observed shifts and changes. These two particular foci are motivated by two different hypotheses. Firstly, there are reasons to believe that curricula worldwide are explicitly targeted by a politically motivated trend called 'focused curricula'. The second hypothesis is linked to the historical role of process oriented writing pedagogy (POW) (especially within L1) in Norway. I ask: Did POW have significant impact on a shift from seeing L1 as a subject to seeing parts of it as a means? In part 5 I discuss possible future disciplinarity based on observed trends, and in part 6 I return to the issue of curricular gentrification (seeing curricular documents as gate kept genres and discourses). Here I problematise relations between a general curriculum and its possible Bildung ambition, and I focus different new genre patterns that seem to favour separate competences. Finally, in part 7, I summarise findings and claims.

## 2. CURRICULA - APPROACHES AND KINDS

### 2.1 Curriculum studies

Since I do not study L1 in a broad sense, but L1 in a *curricular* perspective, I start discussing some issues from the main research field, disciplinary curriculum studies. My theme positions this article methodologically in the realms of research in disciplinary didactics, especially L1 didactics, *as well as* in critical curriculum studies (Ongstad, 2012). Since curricula are studied both within pedagogy and disciplinary didactics, curriculum studies seemingly have become a more shared field. How-

ever, there is a lean tradition of referring to and discussing each other's studies and findings. In this study I tap from both sources.

Curriculum studies in Norway have increased considerably the last decades, partly due to extended use of reform evaluations, partly because didactics as a field has grown significantly in size and quality. In addition political parties in the Parliament have stressed the importance of curricula as tools for societal change and to enhance quality in education. The growth in number and quality of studies has contributed to a wider range of curricular theories and approaches, and of professions and disciplines doing research in the field (Gundem, 2008). Gundem points to an intimate relationship between curriculum research and curriculum development. A significant pattern the last decades is so-called *systemic reforms*, which she describes as innovations that are part of an educational and societal change concerning all parts of an educational system. Their enforced ambition is to create new coherence between former separate parts and of achieving set goals, implemented with an added strategy for relevant teacher education and evaluation systems (Gundem, 2008:130).

Hence both the 1997 and 2006 reform can be seen as important (historical) contexts for the current curricular situation. I will describe both general and specific aspects of these reforms that might have influenced the L1 curricula and the question of *disciplinarity*. As a symptom of the close relationship between such curricular levels Gundem refers to Monsen (1998). In an evaluation of L97 he found that teachers in several school subjects hesitated to respond to the curricular expectations due to, as they saw it, conflicting goals *within* the curriculum as a whole.

Gundem further points to a certain pattern within the research culture - a touch of normativity stemming from an earlier didactic tradition - which she suspects can lead to applying certain pre-conceptions, especially when it comes to such conceptions as *Bildung* and *education* (Gundem, 2008:139). Further, the concept *curriculum* is at stake when presenting research for an international audience. Hence, her book on curriculum studies ends by warning, with Short (1990), that streamlining curricula and striving for harmonic common ground may lead to "Trivialization of Curriculum". Fragmentation of knowledge, leaving out *controversial* issues, and simplification of content matters are some of the tendencies that should be traced critically. I will return to the issue of dilemmatic curricula, as it might affect the very disciplinarity of traditional school subjects.

According to Gundem Norway over time has had different kinds of general curricula (Gundem, 2008:40-41). Up to 1974, when the M74 curriculum was introduced, they were *minimum plans*, which implied that pupils had to fulfil a minimum to move to the next year or level. From the 1970s onwards model or pattern plans that gave *directions* can rather be seen as *maximum plans*. So-called 'framework plans' have also frequently been used for this kind of curriculum. The 1939 and 1974 curricula were seen as the norm and normal for all (KU, 1940; KUD 1974). The 1987 curriculum, M87, stressed the possibility for local and individual choice. The 1997 curriculum, L97, opposed this idea by giving rather specific and detailed sub-

ject content elements (KUD, 1987; KUF, 1996). The 2006 reform, called *Kunnskap-sløftet* [The knowledge promotion] (KL06) and the so-called revision in 2013 (REV13) curricula opened once again up for more local adjustment, but were still quite structured regarding modality and specific expectations about defined competencies (UF, 2006; Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2013). *Modality* refers to the discursive way, or the modes of genre a State may use to address the intended users when implementing a written curriculum.

Behind the curricular scene the latest curricula are backed up with a quite extensive use of international, national, and local tests, some of them in addition to traditional exams mentioned in the curricula. Thus, the power of using an extended test battery is not necessarily directly expressed in the curricula, but is a political reality. It is an implicit premise that all described knowledges, skills, and general competences specified in bullet points in the curricula are expected to be testable (KD, 2009, 2011; UF, 2004a, 2004b). The existence of a well developed test system *outside* the curricular texts, may influence the way power is expressed *within* the texts, and accordingly even their modality or genre. The State as a force is therefore *seemingly* not directly present in the texts, since there are no *imperatives*. Focus has been moved over from signalling expected *goals* to formulate a precise and measurable *outcome*.

The power the State has over curricula, and hence over forms of disciplinarity has become more investigated. The L97 for instance, has been analysed, discussed and criticised frequently over the years. The most extensive documentation of who were involved in processes of proposing, writing, commenting and deciding, having influence and power, is probably Koritzinsky (2000). Further, based on the solid work of Madssen (1999), studying L1 in the M87 plan, and Koritzinsky (2000), studying the whole L97 process, one may conclude that both these two final curricular texts could be seen as quite polyphonic texts, texts with many voices, to use two Bakhtinian terms, and that disciplinarity is an explicit and implicit object for tug of wars. Building on Pinar et al. (1998), understanding curriculum primarily as a (multifaceted) text, the curricular field can be comprehended as a discursive *arena* of power, and where texts are generated.

Such a 'text' perspective further leads to the question of using *discursive, communicative* approaches when studying disciplinarity, seeing curricular utterances as form, content, and use, and to consider texts as genres and discourses. (See 2.2.) However, it even excludes approaches that could have been possible. Studying curricula from a meta-perspective, Gundem (2008) argues, mainly based on Klein (1990), that a more traditional approach found in the works of classical forerunners is now frequently contested, for instance by neo-Marxists, conceptualists, post-structuralists, and other groups or researchers. Klein's conclusion is that curricular studies needs *eclecticism*, making it clear though that an approach should be chosen based on the particular theory's ability to clarify particular problems (Gundem, 2008: 34). For good and bad an eclectic attitude opens for catching sight of impact

on curricula from new, influential agents, interested in changing the very *design* of written curricula, or in other words, their discursive *genericity* as kinds of text types.

## 2.2 *Curricula as developing discourses and genres*

During 200 years of official schooling the State documents regulating education in Norway have developed particular *genre* patterns. The Anglophone notion *curriculum* is probably not accurate enough for understanding the development of the kind of text in question. There are many typologies of curricula. Wilson (2006), building on Olivia (1997) mentions 11 different types, and argues that curricula discursively can be seen as set of subjects, as content, as program of studies, as set of materials, as sequence of courses, as set of performance objectives, as course of study, and even as activities within schools (Wilson, 2006). In this article I will mainly focus on overt, explicit, written, official documents issued or authorised by a (national) ministry of education. These documents are in Norwegian language often termed *-plan*, (meaning a plan for) as in *læreplan*, *fagplan*, and *rammeplan* referring respectively to curriculum, school subject, and general frames. Since a purpose is to describe and problematise L1 Norwegian as a *curricular* phenomenon, I will not inspect other forms of texts usually implied in curricular reforms, although such elements obviously would represent a fuller version of curriculum in Goodladian sense, not to mention what L1 as a school subject in the broadest sense might be (Goodlad, et al., 1979).

The term *genrification* has been coined to describe both stereotyping and new developments of kinds of utterances and texts over time, for instance as part of *institutionalisation* of discourses, genres and text types such as media genres and State documents (Frow, 2006:137; Ongstad, 2010). As mentioned, I return to this issue at the end, lead by the hypothesis that the kind of text regime that written curricula constitute, may alter the very conceptualisation of disciplinarity.

## 3. DEVELOPMENTS IN NORWEGIAN (AS L1) FROM 1739 TO 2013

### 3.1 *Becoming a subject - Norwegian as L1 between 1739 and 1939*

The following description of early developments of L1 as a subject embryo builds on Madssen (1999). Earlier both Steinfeld (1986) and Aase (1988) had contributed to the subject's history in Norway, and in Sweden Thavenius (1981) in similar ways, and Madssen partly relates to their work. He connects early history of L1 with more current tendencies, focusing in particular the disciplinarity of the subject in squeeze "between tradition and politics". My point in sketching the early history is both to give non-Norwegian readers a brief historical context for understanding how the now more 'modern' L1 came into being in the first place, and to foreshadow early disciplinary conflicts and tensions that might be traced in contemporary curricula.



Norwegian as a school subject is younger than the Norwegian official school system, which can be dated to 1739. According to Madssen (1999), Reading, along with Christianity, were the first mentioning of something that could be seen as compulsory disciplines or school subjects in a school for all (which in Danish and Norwegian language at that time was called *Almueskole*). Writing and Calculation were voluntary and less important than the two former, and was not made compulsory before 1827. During the rest of the 18th century conceptions of (written) mother tongue, which then actually was Danish both in Denmark and Norway, became more significant, but in the first phase only in grammar schools. This development was fused by awakening nationalism, and led to a school subject eventually termed *Modersmaalet*, (the mother tongue). Madssen claims that the nationalisation of the subject throughout the 19th century was quite slow (Madssen, 1999:99).

In 1827 the first new school law since 1739 gave four content areas for countryside/rural schools for all, a) Reading, b) Religion and Bible history, c) Song, and d) Writing and Calculation. The split or lack of amalgamation of a firm L1 was probably first commented upon by Faye (1853:53/Madssen, 1999:104), who wanted to collect different elements under the concept *The Mother Tongue*. This idea did not materialise though at the national level before 1889. Ironically the perception of mother tongue as a school subject in its own right had its real break-through first after that the subject officially was termed Norwegian in 1889 (Madssen, 1999:214). Applying my suggested first stage of disciplinarity described in the introduction, it took 150 years for Norwegian to materialise from 'aspects' to an 'independent' school subject.

Madssen underlines that teachers though had wanted integration years before it materialised as a notion in official documents. Nevertheless, the elements, or sub-disciplines gathered under the curricular notion Norwegian kept much of their independence. Between the World Wars education in Norway in general, and Norwegian as L1 in particular, were influenced by reform pedagogy and child-centred teaching. The increased political will to give education to all under the same roof implicitly introduced 'child' as a competitor to 'nation'. Madssen summarises the development over these 200 years as follows:

The subject is initially not yet a subject, but connected to religious belief and behaviour. Later the subject is secularised and connected to the absolute monarchy's need for patriotic and capable writers and readers. Still later the skills are connected to democratic nation building, which again makes the subject to a central tool in a linguistic and cultural battle between centre and periphery. Our preliminary last stop has connected the subject with a psychology-oriented pedagogy that wants to develop the individual pupil's identity and creativity (Madssen, 1999:217/SO's translation).

Madssen's summary ends by pointing to a clear contest within the subject, between the primary school tradition believing in a practical, simple, and democratic schooling on the one hand and a more theoretical, academic or bookish *Bildung* in secondary and upper secondary education on the other hand. These tendencies

were supported, respectively, by teachers in teacher education colleges and teachers educated in Norwegian ("Nordic Studies") at the universities (Madssen, 1999:218). Hence, at the end of the 1930s L1 has finally formally become a more firm subject in a curricular sense, almost reaching the suggested second stage. However, under the surface there are still major tensions, between ideologies for primary and secondary education, between reading and writing, between the national and the non-national, and, not the least, between disciplinary parts and the idea of disciplinary wholeness.

### 3.2 Analysing overall shifts for L1 1940 – 2013

The L1 1939 curriculum (KU, 1940) was reform inspired, simplified, practice oriented, and had a simple (or simplistic) formal and, to some extent, functional view on language and language learning. It stressed explicitly the pupils' ability to *speak, read, retell, and write* (see Appendix A). It can be claimed that it mirrored previous dominating ideologies of linguistic theories developed between the two world wars (Nystrand et al., 1993; Ongstad, 2001). Regarding shift in disciplinarity, it represented a strong push towards stage two proposed in the introduction. L1 is more didacticised, the children are in focus and the teacher shall *teach* (see Appendix A). Due to the war and rebuilding efforts during the late 1940s and early 1950s, research on and knowledge about the use and the impact of this curriculum is scarce.

The next (fully finalised) general new curriculum was launched in 1974. Primary and lower secondary stages were amalgamated and reformed during the 1960s. A rather peculiar new goal for pupils was added to traditional language goals, namely to *love* their mother tongue and to read, and to *appreciate* good literature. These verbs presuppose *attitudes*, not necessarily just traditional 'disciplinary' knowledges and skills. Further, even *aesthetic* and *ethical* values (in poetry) were mentioned (Appendix A). One can also register a certain *functional* orientation ("...ability to **use** their mother tongue."). Thirteen years later, in the L1 curriculum from 1987 (M87), the functional ideology had become significant, stressing different abilities such as activity, creativity, mastering, and engaging. Regarding number of goals, L1 in 1940 had three goals, L1 in 1974 four and L1 in 1987 eight goals, a development reflecting a move towards more ambitious and varied curricula, (see Appendix A).

The 1997-reform established a major shift or break. There were no longer mentioning of teaching; the foci were the school subject and the pupils. It is no doubt that L97 also implied a more clarified *meta-understanding* of L1 as a school subject. The changes are even visible in the explicitly expressed description of L1's own disciplinarity. The 1987 curriculum had previously described Norwegian as a school subject in the following way: *Norwegian is a communicational subject, an aesthetic subject and a central subject for maintaining culture and tradition. It is further a basic tool subject in school [and] (...) an attitudinal subject* (KUD, 1987:129). This new pattern of *disciplinary self-awareness* is followed up, rearranged, and sharp-

ened in the 1997 plan, leaning on the former aims in M87. Over the first pages in L97 six significant aspects are described in detail in a high-flown prose, where each aim ending in a conclusive vision of Norwegian as L1:

The subject Norwegian, then, is about identity	[Norsk er eit identitetsfag]
The subject Norwegian, then, is about experience	[Norsk er eit opplevingsfag]
The subject Norwegian, then, is about becoming educated	[Norsk er eit danningsfag]
The subject Norwegian, then, is about culture	[Norsk er eit kulturfag]
The subject Norwegian, then, is about skills	[Norsk er eit dugleiksfag]
The subject Norwegian, then, is about communicatio	[Norsk er eit kommunikasjonsfag]

RMERCA (1999:121-123) [This is the official version in English language] and KUF (1996) [the official version in Norwegian language].

L1 in the 1997 curriculum can thus be said to have reached a third stage, hinted in the introduction, combining explicitly the pupils' interest (identity and experience), the school subject's domain (education and culture) and society's interest in able communicators (skills and communication). In a quite unexpected way this set of two times three key aspects echoes both a traditional pedagogical triad and a classical philosophical ideal, namely respectively Pestalozzi's heart, head, and hand, and Kant's aesthetics (the beauty), epistemology (the truth), and ethics (the good). In other words, the disciplinary profile for L1 in the 1997 curriculum can be interpreted as classical, integrated Bildung, not just as separate disciplinary aspects.

The L1 plan in the 2006 curriculum does not give a set of overall goals in bullet points in the introduction, as do all the former ones (see Appendix A). It rather uses particular, mostly active verbs to describe what this school subject (not the teacher!) is supposed to do: Norwegian...is a central subject..., ...establishes itself between..., ...relates to a broad spectre of texts..., ...shall help pupils to orient..., ...shall cater for...etc. In other words: Norwegian in this context is seen, not as much as a defined content (nouns), but rather just as much as an action (verbs) which is consistent with the given title for the chapter, Goals for the subject (UFD, 2005:37). This means that even the description of the school subject has moved from categorisation to action, from semantic 'languaging' to functional communicating (Jørgensen, 2004). This move implies a certain change of curricular L1 as a text genre.

The 2013 version (REV13) is claimed to be a revision, not a reform (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2013). The Ministry itself has summarised key changes (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2013): The text part called Aims (for the subject) is shortened and 'tightened' discursively from approximately 540 to 470 words. The subject's identity as a subject for both culture and skills is strengthened and within the part called Main subject areas the element Composite texts is removed, and the names of other areas are adjusted. There are now just three areas, Oral communication, written communication, and Language, literature, and culture (see Appendix B).

The text part called Basic skills describes implications of five skills and how they are developed. The particular responsibility Norwegian (L1) as a subject has for basic skills is sharpened. The wording of three of the five notions for basic skills are changed from Being able to express oneself orally to Oral skills, from Being able to express oneself in writing to Being able to write, and from Digital literacy to Digital skills. Besides, the fifth, Numeracy, has now been defined as "to interpret and understand composite texts containing numbers, quantities or geometric figures".

In the text part called Competence aims in the subject some aims are added or made clearer to ensure a good progression of basic skills. They concern, for instance, listening and listening competence, oral communication and rhetorical competence, writing competence, and language education. This means that there is no longer a one-to-one match between the terms for main subject elements and possible evaluation categories.

Trying to interpret possible overall lines of these shifts, my impression of the 1939 curriculum goals is that language is clearly seen as a closed, and thus, in a Saussurean sense, as a formal entity. Even if wordings of 1974 goals are slightly different, the two curricula in this respect seem to build on a similar ideological conceptualisation of language (as such). With the 1987 and 1997 curricula we are more over in communicational ideologies. The 1987 curriculum actually gives an explicit view on the functions of language. Pragmatics is important, but aspects appear still mostly separate: Language is a means to orient oneself in the world, to get contact with others and for personal development (KUD, 1987:129, SO's *cur-sive*). The implicit model is that communication is language plus its use, not a whole. Both continue to be seen as separate phenomena, although strongly related.

Nevertheless, L1 also implicitly seems to relate nicely to three 'Habermasian' lifeworld concepts, by trying to relate the individual pupil, the outer world's cultural content and the other as society in a pragmatic or functional way (Habermas, 1987). This is seemingly the first seeds of understanding language as more than 'just' a national phenomenon, since philological 'Norwegianness' primarily could be found in the form and content elements, while use (and thus pragmatics) opens for a more 'over-national' perspective. The development implies a weaker national philology and a stronger general pragmatism, a shift that increases the potential for this version of L1 to become a meta-discipline for other subjects, or in other words, a functional means. By imposing skills on other school subjects, disciplinarity, for good and bad, is at risk. This critical perspective is in some sense close to Basil Bernstein's earlier theories on knowledge and framing (Bernstein, 1990).

In the 2006 plan (KL06) several aspects that describe the subject have been subtracted, shortened, concentrated, reduced or rearranged: Norwegian is a central subject for cultural understanding, communication, Bildung and development of identity (UFD, 2005:37, SO's translation). Experience and skills are no longer said to be key elements for L1. Experience is downsized. Skills however, are lifted to a general level, above all disciplines/school subjects.

The lack of real change from 2006 to 2013 in key parts of the document is interesting given that the bullet points for competences are even more stressed in the 2013 version. Comparing the 1997 and the 2006 with the 2013 version regarding this section of the curriculum, it seems hard to find an argumentative, structural textual line or red thread developed in the two latter. Editing done in 2013 has not given a much clearer version of these aspects of the curriculum. Regarding disciplinarity it is no doubt that the Ministry of Education wants L1 to take more responsibility for cross-disciplinary issues such as reading and writing in all school subjects.

### 3.3 *Analysing shifts in L1 main, content elements*

In the introduction a possible *third* development of curricular disciplinarity was anticipated, namely a fixation of a set of specific combinations of disciplinary elements (curricular syllabi topics making a 'whole') that is supposed to delimit and define the school subject. (For a specific reference to these particular sets of registered elements, see Appendix B.) Regardless the claim in part 3.2. that a third stage is found in the 1997 curriculum for L1, other or later curricula may of course have *different* profiles/sets.

Further, the more than 100 years old exam categories in Norway, *oral* mode and *written* mode, are seemingly 'winners' in the shifts or 'competition' between main areas since the 1970s. The 'losers' are *Hand-writing, Listening, Looking, Bi-language, Basic education in reading and writing, Literature, Media and electronic data processing* and *Composite texts*. Not all of these, once important curricular elements, have disappeared of course. Some are placed under or together with other new main elements, a tendency which may imply a clearer *hierarchisation* of the subject over time.

A somewhat cynical interpretation is that Norway now seems to have gone back to basics since curricular Norwegian as a school subject once again contains early elements such as *Oralty, Writing, Language knowledge, Literature and Culture*. What endures seems to be the gravity of a strong tradition, the combination of philological components and schoolish exam categories. A less ideological view is that 'language' might have lost its dominant position to a broader concept first to text and later to *communication*, by which disciplinary integration of newer and older aspects may be politically easier to implement. It could be claimed that the overarching ideological concepts in L1 between 1940 and 2013 are, in chronological order, *language, text, and communication*, a pattern found both in North America and Scandinavia and both in linguistics and education (Nystrand et al, 1993; Ongstad, 2002).

The fact that there has been a reduction or simplification from eight to three main areas since 1987, can be interpreted as a will among politicians and scholars to simplify and prioritise. Curriculum development works like an accordion, after extension follows contraction. Motives and arguments for contraction should be

inspected though. Tendencies to text reduction and simplification will be analysed critically in part 4.1.

It is nevertheless too early to draw conclusions based on a brief summary of shifts in terms and concepts for main elements. The curricular design of curricular parts, when presented separately, appears at a first glance to be 'clear'. A more critical reading of the re-arranged introduction, the main elements, and the new adjusted sets of bullet points, leave the reader with a less orderly picture regarding *hierarchical* arrangements of activities, values, and content. Integration of basic skills in school subjects complicates the question of curricular taxonomy even more.

### 3.4 Analysing the 'bullet point pattern'- disciplinarity as a sum of disconnected points?

A significant pattern in newer curricula is increased use and strong generification of sets of bullet points specifying content elements, goals, targets, results, expected competencies, and criteria for marking. Their 'nature', form, and function have changed over time though. L1 in L97 had 188 bullet points arranged under three main curricular content elements. The sets were valid for each of the 10 compulsory years. KL06 had 111 points arranged under four main curricular elements, but were described only for periods of time, e.g. for goals after the years 2, 4, 7, and 10. In the 2013-version there are 104 points, and the number of main elements are reduced from four to three again. In 1997 quite a few bullet points contained fairly long utterances with several verbs and content elements in each. As a contrast each bullet point in the two latest versions is mostly a very short 'one-liner' focusing one goal or competence only and hence just one verb. The idea behind the simplified text pattern is said to enhance and enable 'precise' evaluation of defined learning outcomes (KD, 2009 and 2011).

It should be underlined that this is just the situation regarding national curricula. When developing *local* curricula this pattern might change, since teachers and schools are supposed to use even the national qualification framework (NQR) (KD, 2009 and 2011). Elsewhere I have made a critical analysis of the implicit logic of the discursive patterns of bullet points (Ongstad, 2014). A claim based on this study could be that the sentence construction of front verb plus a following noun seems to favour a shift to *categorial* thinking rather than a *relational* one. Note that the notion used is *categorial*, not categorical. A *categorial* type of thinking may favour specific knowledge elements (based on defined, explicit categories in texts) and concrete, isolated goals for learning and evaluation of these.

*Relational* thinking, by contrast, may favour connectedness, text-context relations, and cumulative learning intended in curricular texts. Prioritising the specific for the general and relational might in turn give strict taxonomically organised verbs the upper hand over nouns for disciplinary content elements. Accordingly the

general may be favoured at the expense of the specific and in the long turn help downplaying the role of traditional content oriented disciplinarity.

Another striking pattern is the lack of hierarchy markers between the points within each main curricular element as well as between all of the points as a whole. NQF has been introduced as a grip that supposedly should handle this challenge (KD, 2009). According to NQF, *knowledges, skills, and general competences* must be described separately. General competences can be seen as integrated and more final than the two former, which, in this case serve as *means* for achieving general competence. This perception confuses the intended independency for knowledge and skills. In the NQF there is further the expectation that the chosen performance verbs, that is, the verbal acts seen as epistemologically graded *capacities*, should appear in a certain taxonomic order or progress within courses and over years and educational levels. This taxonomy anticipates growth, development, improvement or increased maturity, that in a believed valid way can pave the way for fair marks and measuring progress. The expectation holds for *all* subjects and disciplines in the educational system.

### 3.5 Summing up L1 developments

Madssen problematized that Norwegian as L1 in the 1980s still was, for several reasons, a fairly permeable or open subject, in my words a somewhat weak disciplinary. It had relatively many teaching hours, and new elements were frequently and easily integrated or just added. Further, it had a tendency to be considered as a tool-kit for other disciplines. The subject was more often seen as a means, rather than as a subject in its own right. Voices from both within and outside criticised the 'floating borders' and the weak substantial content (Madssen, 1999:351-352).

In 2013 Norwegian as L1, *norsk*, is still *one* subject for all pupils between 6 and 19. (Note that upper secondary school is not compulsory). L1 is now discursively structured more as skyscraper around three main elements *Oral communication, Written communication, and Language, literature, and culture*. In the introduction to the 2013 curriculum it is said to be a *central subject for cultural understanding, communication, Bildung and development of identity*. When formulating local L1 curricular goals these four disciplinary key aspects have to be combined, both with the above three core main elements, and with the 'external' five basic skills, *Oral skills, Being able to read, Being able to write, Numeracy, and Digital skills* (REV, 13.) to be achieved at the end of year 10. What kind of disciplinarity this complex mixture will represent is an open question.

## 4. TWO STRONG IMPACT FORCES?

The above discursive key forces, factors, and frames make up the current curricular L1's main structure and patterns. However, at the end of the day the above descriptions of how they came about, is of course inadequate and limited as a basis

for deeper understanding. I will therefore inspect two less visible or obvious areas, namely possible dynamics of politics versus disciplinarity and the role of communicational and discursive ideologies stemming from process oriented writing (POW). The former can be seen as an external impact, the latter as an internal impact, *within* L1, since the dissemination of POW from 1985 onwards was dominated by L1 scholars and teachers. The two could therefore even be seen as examples of top-down and bottom-up impact. In 4.1. I give an example of contest between politics and profession, or between curricular design and subject content. The idea is to illustrate how external forces can initiate and generate new curricular trends that can affect disciplinarity of L1 and other school subjects. In 4.2. I look briefly at a particular source for possible 'inner' development that might have influenced the direction the 'new' L1 has taken. An aim is to problematise the relationship between L1 as an intended 'whole' and its shifting compounds.

#### 4.1 *Coming from outside - the idea of 'focused curricula' hits L1*

According to Valverde (no date) the TIMMS project (in mathematics) collected and evaluated different national curricula and found worrying variations of the importance of the conceptual understandings, procedural knowledge, and other academic objectives to be met by pupils. Terms for curricular programs in different countries revealed different functions and foci. Curriculum guides in Australia had titles such as *Course Advice*, in Japan *National Courses of Study*, and Norway *Curriculum Guidelines*. Valverde therefore wants curricula to be sharpened. He concludes:

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. (...) The consequence of lack of focus and coherence, and the static approach to defining what is basic, is that these types of curricula are undemanding compared to those of other countries (Valverde, no date).

A movement that started professionally in disciplines and school subjects such as mathematics and science and politically in OECD, later with good help from EU, has been successful in imposing this view in many Western countries (EQF, 2005; KD, 2009 and 2011; Sjöstedt, 2013; Ongstad, 2014) The ideas are invading all kinds of school subjects, and on different levels, mostly without questioning whether so-called focusing actually will work as intended. Some patterns, trends and tendencies are, as shown, already visible in curricular documents:

- Increased focus on staging, not seen as unpredictable growth, but rather as stated pre-programmed achievements with little support in empirical research
- Dismissing of teachers and teaching as relevant agents in curricular text by keeping a consequent one-eyed focus on learners and outcome
- Focus on products with reduced attention on processes that may lead up to the focused products



- Cutting down on textual parts (that could explain and motivate priorities) to make the curriculum simple and therefore supposedly 'clearer'
- Prioritising so-called precise concepts in goals/targets/outcomes to achieve better measurability, leaving out complex, rich, general, combined, integrated concepts
- Simplification of each separate goal, making them a category, preferably just one verb/learning outcome per point

Designs with these patterns are orchestrated by agents such as OECD and EU, copied and conducted by many national ministries, and performed (mostly) by teacher educators (Niss, 2003; OECD, 2005; Arbeidsgruppen, 2007; EU, 2008). In the hands of practicing school teachers, one could ask which aspects of the curriculum under such regimes will have influence on the outcome, the governmental framework or the professional content. Earlier research on top-down reforms indicate that the validity of focused, researched, and reported objects, depends on unpredictable contexts, and that mal-functions are commonplace. Madssen (1999) and Koritzinsky (2000) in Norway, and Sjöstedt (2013) in Sweden represent three substantive Scandinavian investigations of the intersection between curriculum making and politics. The titles translate respectively as *The Norm Texts of Mother Tongue Education. A school subject comes into being - Norwegian between tradition and politics* (Madssen), *Pedagogy and politics in L97. The content of the curriculum and the decision processes* (Koritzinsky), and *School subject constructions in the time of economism. On teaching and steering trajectories in mother tongue education in Swedish and Danish upper secondary schools* (Sjöstedt) (SO's translation). Madssen's and Sjöstedt's works are doctoral theses within the field of L1 didactics.

The three studies share important aspects relevant in this context. Firstly they all reveal the textual and contextual complexity of curricular reforms in a modern democracy. Secondly they problematise a simplified view of what-is-what regarding professionalism and ministerial policy in the making of a final curricular text. Thirdly they question the making of (curricular) *disciplinarity* through so-called *clear, focused, and harmonised* discursive writing.

#### 4.2 *From within - impacts from the writing movement?*

In Norway process oriented writing, POW, was introduced in 1985 (Moslet and Evensen, 1993). Key POW ideas were, as in many other countries, the importance of writing as a tool for learning, a socio-constructive attitude to learning, a dialogic view on texts, focus on children, pupils, students and learners rather than the L1 as such, more weight on language than on literature, and more weight on writing than reading (Smidt, 2012). This orientation implied a stronger *disciplinary didactics* at the dispense of strict disciplinary orientation to L1, both in school and teacher education. The tendency was related to a strong involvement in POW, its research and practice.

*Skribbib* is an archive that gives overview over writing studies in Nordic countries (Skribbib, 2015). It is a source for documentation of the research field. Hence,

between 1986 and 1996 there were published seven PhDs. dissertations within the field of writing in Norway. Hardly any have been submitted before that. Although seven are few, they still out-numbered PhD's in other L1 research fields during the 1990s. All these seven scholars had shortly after become professors with responsibilities for different language studies in higher education, especially within applied linguistics, disciplinary didactics and L1 in teacher education. In addition 11-12 others who held PhD's in a wider range of fields within the Humanities, turned to research in the field of writing. Hence, at the beginning of the century most researchers in this cohort had become professors with quite strong competencies in writing research. Around 2005 L1 therefore could muster 15-20 professors focusing writing, probably more than 2/3 of L1 professors in teacher education. From personal knowledge I know (overviews does not exist) that at least 7-8 were used as curricular experts in developing L1 curricula on different levels between 1991 and 2006, quite a few even as committee leaders. Since 1997 Skrivbib has registered 20 new dissertations.

By quantifying the strength of research in the subfield, I am not claiming that the POW-movement's possible impact on L1 curricula should be explained by numbers of scholars within the field. What I argue is that the implicit ideological shift on major perceptions of language and communication within the L1 profession of teachers and researchers moved *faster, clearer and broader*. Nystrand et al. (1993) claimed that literacy/English/rhetorical studies from the 1970s onwards ran through the following stages during the 20th century - formalism, social constructivism, constructionism, and dialogism (Nystrand et al., 1993, p. 302-303) , and that POW in the US from the 1980s onwards played a crucial role in the development of these ideologies.

My own, somewhat similar study (Ongstad, 2002), revealed a stable, inherited pattern regarding the relationship between L1 and the extreme strong professionalization of writing as a field within L1 as shown above. Simplified it could be argued that L1 has, since the 1930s moved from philological language/literature dualism, through a textual and functional oriented phase over towards an understanding of L1 and disciplinarity as broadly *communicational*, where communicational even might imply inclusion of former phases/ideologies. This last stage confronts us with a richer, but much more complex picture. A symptom of this linguistic dominance is that *literature*, as such, has lost its earlier *significant* place in L1 curricula (Penne, 2006).

##### 5. FUTURE L1 DISCIPLINARITIES?

Today many prefer to think about a discipline or a subject (Norwegian *fag*) as something that forms a *whole*, something coherent and united making key parts relevant and essential. As touched upon in the intro, the Norwegian and Danish word *fag* stems from old North Germanic *fach* and meant (originally) something that had been *separate*, but had become a *compound* (Madssen, 2001). The Swed-

ish concept *ämne* and the English concepts *subject* and *discipline* lack this connotation. The older meaning can help understand the nature of today's terms *fag*, *fach*, *subject*, *discipline*, and *ämne* when trying to grasp epistemologically what kind of phenomenon *fag* (discipline) is and how it originated, evolved or evaporated when inspected in a diachronic perspective. As pointed to in the historical introduction, the monolithic-like notion *The mother tongue*, confused and still confuses the fact that this seemingly holistic L1 originally was a *compound*.

Following a simple logic, a school subject, as for instance L1 in different countries at different historical times, can be expected to change both from *within* and *outside*. The inside-outside-perception reveals tensions, such as profession versus politics, school versus society, a *fag* versus an *other fag*, text versus context (or 'non-text'), L1 as school subject versus L1 as language and culture in a broad sense, and not the least, L1 as both a goal and a means. It can help to sort out *centripetal* and *centrifugal* forces that change subjects (Ongstad, 2012). Nevertheless, over time, it is often forgotten that what at a certain time is *within* a subject, could have been *outside* in the past and vice versa. Allowing for a both-and-view rather than a categorial either-or-view might over time can make the focused object more fluid, into something coincidentally constructed or negotiated in complex processes or accidentally amalgamated into something that can later dissolve, given new conditions (Sjöstedt, 2013).

In the future it is likely that the State will continue to use L1 as a key instrument to cater for language and culture. However, given symptoms touched upon, even other scenarios are possible:

- a) The very *concept* of a *fag* might in the long term be contested and could fade away. Symptoms of this perception is visible in NOU (2014), a governmental investigation of content in primary and secondary education.
- b) L1 becomes a *super-fag*, the discipline of disciplines, the subject of school subjects, invading other school subjects. Businesses in Norway and worldwide counterwork certain disciplinaries just as much as they crave particular others. L1 it is not given that, for example the latest L1version (REV, 2013), is what a future workforce will ask for.
- c) L1 can be reduced to a set of separate skills or competencies without having status as an own subject. L1 as a *super-discipline* is more than just a scenario in Norway, since it is a key deliverer of basic skills that other school subjects must take more responsibility for. If the international tendencies of strengthening non-specific disciplinary competencies continue, which is *the* present EU policy, even L1 may have a hard time surviving in the form it now has (EQF 2005, EU 2008).
- d) Knowledge, skills, and general competences being the new mega school subjects and L1 being reduced to a philological mini-subject. As part of such a development competences might be 'lifted' up to the level of a compulsory European subject, and traditional national oriented L1 might be reduced.

- e) English may gradually outsource some of L1's key functions in higher education with important boomerang effects 'down' on L1 for K-13. English takes over domain by domain in Norwegian education and business life. Major Norwegian international companies use English on a daily basis as working language, *in* Norway. In education *more* than half of all master and doctoral studies in Norway are taught in English and a majority of dissertations are written in English.

#### 6. GENRIFICATION OF NATIONAL CURRICULAR TEXTS AS SYMPTOM OF CHANGED DISCIPLINARITIES?

In Ongstad (2010) I have tried to problematise more at length functions of textual design in Norwegian curricula, especially focusing bulleting, text length reduction, weight, and syntactic structuring. I discussed whether curricular discourse is mainly categorial or mainly relational. I called ongoing processes of reshaping and 'typifying' form, content, and function of curricula for *genrification* following Frow (2005). The concept implies that curricular key texts in some sense serve as *prototypes*. They redistribute certain disciplinaries within a discursive framework, where the framework's cornerstones represent ministries' power over key processes. A written curricular genre therefore continues to look like itself over time although still constantly changing allowing for new forms, contents, and functions to be added to prototype. The capacity and power to make shifts in design, what I have termed *genrification*, is a subtle ideological tool for the State's power control over new curricular regimes, simply because the shifts are implicit and tacit.

While a bureaucratic, administrative, and pedagogical thinking mostly prefers strong similarity between the way each subject curriculum is textually shaped, L1 scholars have on some few occasions rebelled against a fixed (identical) overall scheme for all subjects. Madssen (1999:251-258) describes what was proposed by a working group in the 1980s initiated by *The national council for primary and secondary education* (GSR, 1982). This L1 group radically focused, not on one, but on *two* contesting curricular levels, an actual curricular text and an explicit, reflective *meta-perspective*. The group anticipated that ideological tensions and conflicts were unavoidable, and should not be 'harmonised' by silence. A curriculum should be open and discuss itself (GSR, 1982:31/Madssen, 1999:253). Madssen sees this claim as a crucial curricular *genre* break.

Such a genre shift could alter the power between teachers/experts on the one hand and the Ministry/politicians on the other hand. A 'discussing', dilemmatic curriculum would change the *modality* and hence the asymmetric power between teachers and politicians. However, the 1982-group's rather idealistic idea is not as far-fetched as it might look: The still valid general curriculum (from 1993) is structured around the discursive idea that education should be based on six basic aspects of human life, six *Bildung* elements, as it were, which should be integrated, metaphorised as the construction *The integrated human being* in a special chapter. This crucial chapter actually problematizes possible internal tensions between the

six elements. It begins with the words (here quoted from the official English version: *Education has a number of seemingly contra-dictionary aims: (...)* (TRMERCA, 1999:55). Then follow 17 possible examples of inescapable tensions ending with the claim: *Education must balance these dual aims* (TRMERCA, 1999:56). To exemplify: (...) *to furnish skills for work and the practical task of life - **and** provide room for emotional and character growth* (TRMERCA, 1999:56). The irony is of course that the current general curriculum not only admits that integration of different values will create major dilemmas. It in fact considers the balancing of competing aims and ambitions of curricular dilemmas as an educational, curricular, and didactic *core* point. By the same token it is thought-/provoking that Norway recently has made the NQF some sort of informal overall curriculum making *knowledge, skills, and general competence* the key concepts, while Norway in parallel has a legitimate, dilemmatic curriculum. The introduction ends:

In short, the aim of education is to expand the individual's capacity to perceive and to participate, to experience, to empathize and to excel. If education is to further these aims, a more careful examination of basic values, view of man and nurturing is necessary (TRMERCA, 1999: 21).

Whether one would agree or disagree with the above choice of words, it seems clear that the 1993 ambition is to verbalise a vision of an education for *Bildung* of some sort. On the other hand may the NQF design and the many genre patterns of new curricula tend to give priority to *competence as such*. In other words as ends, not means. This split will affect all school subjects and L1 in particular, since it has been, and probably will be, *the* main school subject for a strive for general *Bildung*. It possesses most of the main meta tools, not just to problematise educational texts, but even itself, in curricula. It is tempting for any school subject or academic discipline to be lifted to a general level, to become crucial tools for nationalisation, general *Bildung* or (internationally defined) skills or competences. The paradox for L1 though is that meta functions challenge 'independent' disciplinarity in basic ways L1 has not yet addressed.

#### 7. MAY COMPETING DISCIPLINARITIES NEUTRALISE BOTH COMPETENCE AND BILDUNG POLICIES?

During the 19th century curricular L1, *Norwegian*, from time to time called *The mother tongue*, became a separate school subject in its own right, reaching my anticipated *first* stage in a disciplinary process (Madssen, 1999). The curricular L1 we encounter much later, in the 1940 curriculum, *Norwegian* had become more *didacticised*, probably under the influence of *Reform pedagogy* in the 1920s and 1930s. Here one can find my anticipated *second* stage, a certain balance of both content elements and student orientation. However, in 1939 these major aspects still appear rather dis-integrated. Goals are described linguistically (formally) and are generally backed up with general principles of child centred education, activity, and progressivism (KU, 1940).

As an example of my *third*, more elevated stage, I dwelled with the quite classical structure of L1 in the 1997 curriculum (TRMERCA, 1999). Six crucial and integrated elements made up a well defined and a rather closed and integrated disciplinarity. The two later changes, the 2006 reform and the 2013 revision, made it nevertheless clear that the seemingly harmonic 1997 third stage profile, did not survive (UF, 2006; Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2013). A main reason could be found in a significant new pattern: Major aspects related to L1 were 'lifted' to work as overall means across school subjects. Accordingly L1 had to open itself for the skills *ICT skills* and *numeracy*. In part 4.2. above, about writing, I suggested that the development and professionalization of process oriented pedagogy (POW) played an important role in this shift.

A second reason could be found in the changes of curriculum as a genre, chasing ever more textual concentration, bullet points, and fewer, mainly separated major categories for learning and testing (Ongstad, 2014). I claimed that this strong tendency could be connected to international, political ideas about curriculum, and suggested that this genrification has altered or may alter disciplinarity in general, not only for L1 (Ongstad, 2010). The tendency reduces school subjects to skills and obstructs a broader, more integrated disciplinarity. In the Norwegian context it even contributes to a disconnection between school subjects and a general curriculum, and their joint role as means for intended *Bildung*.

From these perspectives a challenging paradox emerges - the more claims there are for increased essentialist *disciplinarity* (in a strict epistemological sense) the higher is the risk that this disciplinarity may resist strongly imposed competences in other school subjects, as well as possible intended curricular *Bildung* ambitions in a general curriculum. This paradox-like situation is probably the case, not only in Norway, and not only in L1. It seems relevant for other school subjects as well. As a timely apropos - while finishing this article a national committee has proposed necessary changes for "A School for the Future" (*Fremtidens skole*) (NOU, 2015). The short subtitle speaks for itself – *Innovation of disciplines and competencies*. A main message is that 'fag'as such is now at stake. In this perspective the article suggests that becoming aware of competing key disciplinary *aspects* described in their historical contexts is relevant for a much needed discussion of the paradox.

## REFERENCES

- Aase, L. (1988). *Stilskrivning og danning*. [School writing and Bildung.] Oslo: LNU/Cappelen.
- AILA (2006). *Standard Language Education*. International Association of Applied Linguistics (AILA). <http://www.aila.info/networks/ren/stle.html>. Read 15.04.2012.
- Arbeidsgruppe (2007). *Forslag til nasjonalt rammeverk for kvalifikasjoner i høyere utdanning*. [Proposals for a national framework for qualifications in higher education]. Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *Class, Codes and Control, Volume 4: The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- COE (2009). *Language(s) of Schooling*. Strasbourg: Europarådet (COE). [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Schoollang\\_en.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Schoollang_en.asp) Read 10.11.2013.
- Deng, Z., & Luke, A. (2007). Subject matter: Defining and theorizing school subjects. M. Connolly, M.F. He, & J. Phillion, J. (Eds.), *Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Det Frie Forskningsråd (2015). *Faglighed og skriftlighed*. [Disciplinarity and written literacy.] Research project. [www.sdu.dk/fos](http://www.sdu.dk/fos).
- EQF (2005). *Towards a European Qualification Framework for Lifelong Learning*. Brussels: EU [http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/consultation\\_eqf\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/2010/doc/consultation_eqf_en.pdf).
- EU (2008). *The European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning (EQF)*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Faye, A. (1853). *Almueskolen eller Vink til at opdrage og undervise Børn, samt ordne og styre en Almueskole*. [The Almueskole or hints to educate and teach children, as well as to establish and lead a Almueskole]. Christiania (= Oslo).
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Frow, J. (2006). *Genre*. London: Routledge.
- Goodlad, J. et al. (1979). *Curriculum inquiry. The study of curriculum practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodson, I. (2015). *Learning, Curriculum and Life Politics: the selected works of Ivor F. Goodson*. London: Routledge.
- Goodson, I. & Marsh, C. (1996). *Studying School Subjects: A Guide*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Grunnskolerådet (1982). *Norsk. Ei innstilling fra ei arbeidsgruppe*. [Norwegian. Report from a working group.] Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Gundem, B. B. (2008). *Perspektiv på læreplanen*. [Perspectives on the curriculum.] Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Volume 2. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hertzberg, F. (1999). Å didaktisere et fag - hva er det? [What does it mean to didacticise a discipline?]. C. Nystrøm, & M. Olsson (eds.): *Svenska i utveckling*. [Swedish in development.], 13, 31-40.
- Jørgensen, J. N. (2004). Languaging and languagers. *Languaging and Language Practices*. Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, 36, 5–23.
- KD (2009). *Fastsettelse av nasjonalt kvalifikasjonsrammeverk for høyere utdanning*. [Establishing a national framework for qualifications in higher education.] Oslo:Kunnskapsdepartementet.
- KD (2011). *Nasjonalt kvalifikasjonsrammeverk for livslang læring*. [A national framework for qualifications for lifelong learning.] Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet.
- Kelly, G.J., Luke, A. and Green, J. (2008). What counts as knowledge in educational settings: Disciplinary knowledge, assessment, and curriculum. *Review of Research in Education*, 32(1), p:vii <http://rre.sagepub.com/content/32/1/vii>.
- Klein, F. M. (1990). Approaches to Curriculum Theory and Practice. J.T. Sears, & D.J. Marshall (eds.), *Teaching and Thinking about the Curriculum. Critical Inquiries* [pp. 3-14]. New York and London: Teacher College Press.
- 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.

- Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet (1974). *Mønsterplan for grunnskolen (M74)*. [Mønsterplan for elementary education.] Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet (1987). *Mønsterplan for grunnskolen*. [General plan 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: Kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet.
- KUF (1996). *Læreplanverket for den 10-årige grunnskolen*. [The curriculum for the 10-year compulsory school in Norway.] Oslo: Kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet.
- KUF (1999a). *The curriculum for the 10-year compulsory school in Norway*. Norwegian (odin.dep.no/odinarkiv/norsk/dep/nedlagt/kuf/1999/eng/014005-990128/dok-bn.html).
- 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.-avhandling. Trondheim: NTNU.
- Madssen, K.-A. (2001). Fag. ['Fag'.] In Kulbrandstad, L. K. and Sjølie, G. (eds.): *På Hamar med norsk* [Norwegian at Hamar.] Hedmark University College, Report no. 12, p. 11-12.
- MER (2010). *Norwegian Subject Curriculum*. Oslo: Ministry of Education and Research.
- Monsen, L. (1998). *Evaluering av reform 94*. [Evaluation of reform 94.] Lillehammer: Høgskolen i Lillehammer.
- Moslet, I., & Evensen, L.S. (eds.) (1993). *Skrivepedagogisk fornying*. [Innovation in writing pedagogy.] Oslo: Ad Notam/Gyldendal.
- Niss, M. (2003). *Mathematical competencies and the learning of mathematics: The Danish KOM project*. Paper at the 3rd Mediterranean Conference on Mathematical Education, Athens, Greece.
- 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., and Wiemelt, J. (1993). Where did composition studies come from? Toward an intellectual history of composition studies. *Written Communication*, 10, p. 267-333.
- OECD (2005). *The Definition and Selection of Key Competencies: Executive Summary* [www.pisa.oecd.org/dataoecd/47/61/35070367.pdf](http://www.pisa.oecd.org/dataoecd/47/61/35070367.pdf) [Visited 27.02.2013].
- Oliva, P. (1997). *The curriculum: Theoretical dimensions*. New York: Longman.
- Ongstad, S. (2002). Positioning Early Norwegian Research on Writing. *Written Communication*, 19(3), p. 345-381.
- Ongstad, S. (2010). Synchronic-diachronic Perspectives on Genre Systemness: Exemplifying Genrification of Curricular Goals. S. Kvam, S., Knutsen, K. P., and Langemeyer, P. (eds.) *Genre and Cultural Competence: An Interdisciplinary Approach to the Study of Texts*. [p. 35–50.] Berlin: Waxmann.
- Ongstad, S. (ed.) (2012). *Nordisk morsmålsdidaktikk. Fag, felt og forskning*. [Nordic L1 didactics. Discipline, field, and research.] Oslo: Novus.
- Ongstad, S. (2014). Om faglighet og språklighet i Nasjonalt kvalifikasjonsrammeverk. [On disciplinarity and discursivity in National Qualification Framework.] B. Kleve, S. Penne, and H. Skaar (eds.), *Literacy and didaktikk i skole og lærerutdanning*. [Literacy and didactics in school and teacher education.] [p. 174-196] Oslo: Novus..
- Penne, S. (2006). *Profesjonsfaget norsk i endringstid*. [Norwegian as a professional discipline in a time of transition.] Ph.D. thesis. Oslo: Oslo University.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding Curriculum: An introduction to the Study of Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. F. (2007). *Intellectual advancement through disciplinarity: Verticality and horizontality in curriculum studies*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Short, E. C. (1990). Challenging the Trivialization of Curriculum. J.Y. Sears, & D.J. Marshall (eds.) *Teaching and Thinking about the Curriculum. Critical Inquiries*, p. 199-210. New York and London: Teacher College Press.



- 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.
- Skrivbib (2015). *A bibliography on Nordic writing research from 1980 onwards* [http://bibliografi.hive.no/skrivbib/nye\\_skrivbib/om\\_skrivbib.php](http://bibliografi.hive.no/skrivbib/nye_skrivbib/om_skrivbib.php).
- Smidt, J. (2012). Skrivepedagogikk – skriveforskning – skrivedidaktikk. Et tilbakeblikk på skolerettet skriveforskning i Norge fra 1980 til i dag. [Writing pedagogy - research on writing - writing didactics. A retrospective view on research on school writing in Norway from 1980 till today.] In Ongstad, S. (ed.) *Nordisk morsmålsdidaktikk. Fag, felt og forskning*. [Nordic MTE/L1 didactics. Discipline, field, and research.] Oslo: Novus.
- Steinfeld, T. (1986). *På skriftens vilkår: Et bidrag til morsmålsfagets historie* [In the terms of the script(ure): A contribution to the history of the mother tongue subject]. Oslo, Norway: LNU/Cappelen.
- 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.
- TRMERCA (1999). *The Curriculum for the 10-year Compulsory School in Norway*. Oslo: The Royal Ministry of Education, Research and Church Affairs.
- UF (2004a). *St.meld. nr. 30 (2003–2004) Kultur for læring*. [Culture for learning/whitepaper.] Oslo: Statens forvaltningstjeneste <http://odin.dep.no/ufd/norsk/publ/stmeld/045001-040013/dok-bn.html>.
- UF (2004b). *Kompetanse for utvikling*. [Competence for development.] Oslo: Utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet. <http://www.kunnskapsloftet.no/filer/strategiforkompetanseutvikling.pdf>.
- UF (2006). *Kunnskapsløftet*. [The knowledge promotion.]. Oslo: Utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet.
- UFD (2005). *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.
- Valverde, G. A. (No date). *International Curriculum - Authority and Function, Curriculum and Globalization, Curriculum and Learning*. <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1897/Curriculum-International.html>. [Read 02.01.15.]
- Vollmer, H. J. (2006). Fachlichkeit und Sprachlichkeit. [Disciplinarity and Discursivity/'languageness']. *Zeitschrift für Fremdsprachenforschung*, 17(2), 201-244.
- Wilson, L. (2006). *Beyond Bloom - A new Version of the Cognitive Taxonomy*. <http://www4.uwsp.edu/education/wilson/curric/newtaxonomy.htm> [Read 31.12.2014].

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A. GOALS IN NORWEGIAN, L1 CURRICULA

What follows is (translated) L1 goals quoted from the major four L1 curricula in Norway between 1940 and 1997. [The textual structuration of goals from 2006 and 2013 obstruct direct comparisons.]

*Norwegian (1940): The goal is to teach the children:*

- 1) to **speak** their mother tongue naturally, straightforward and clearly - without major phonetic or grammatical mistakes,
- 2) to **read** both *bokmål* and *nynorsk* [the two Norwegian written languages or language forms], with distinct pronunciation and fairly correct accent, to understand and **retell** what they read, and to be able to obtain knowledge by reading,
- 3) to **write** straightforward, naturally and fairly correct (and with fairly correct punctuation marks) about topic adequate for the field of experience and knowledge for this year level (KU,1940:48, SO's translation and added comments in [...]).

*Goals for the 1974 curriculum for Norwegian*

Teaching in Norwegian shall aim at

- developing pupils' ability **to use** their mother tongue in speech and in script
- developing pupils' knowledge of Norwegian language, *bokmål* and *nynorsk*, and teach pupils to love their mother tongue
- conserving and strengthening pupils' love of reading and developing their ability to apprehend and experience the aesthetic and ethical values conveyed in poetry, so that they even later will appreciate good literature
- training pupils in understanding spoken and written Danish and Swedish (KUD, 1974, SO's translation)

*Goals for 'Norwegian' in the 1987 curriculum (M87)*

The teaching of Norwegian shall aim at

- developing pupils' ability to listen, talk, read and write, so that they are able to understand others and self
- be able to express themselves confidently and varied
- giving pupils possibility to active and creative verbal cooperation, to communicate in different contexts and for different purposes
- giving pupils good knowledge of and skills in the main language, knowledge of the side language ['sidemål'] and dialects, and developing tolerant attitude to language and language use

- helping pupils to master rules and norms for language and to master linguistically practical and factual matters in work life, social life and cultural life
- creating engagement, making joy of reading and aesthetic experiences and to stimulate pupils' love of reading through reading and work with literary texts
- developing pupils' ability to perceive, experience and judge content and language in literature, other texts and media
- letting pupils work with literature in ways that strengthen the feeling of identity and open their minds for historical, social and cultural connections
- giving pupils a part in the Nordic culture and language community (KUD, 1987:129-130, SO's translation)

*Norwegian in the 1997 curriculum, L97*

General aims for the subject are

- to increase pupils' abilities in their mother tongue and teach them to avail themselves of the opportunities for interaction, which their first language provides both in speech and writing, so that they can acquire the knowledge and skills that will serve as a platform for further learning in and outside school, and also make them active participants in society
- to strengthen pupils' sense of cultural belonging by mediating experience in and knowledge of Norwegian language and literature, insight into other cultures, and understanding the significance of other cultures on the development of our own
- to strengthen pupils' sense of personal identity, their openness to experience, their creativity, and their belief in their own creative abilities
- 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 (KUF, 1999a)

APPENDIX B 2. SHIFTS IN L1'S MAIN *CONTENT* ELEMENTS 1974 – 2013

## M74

Listening and looking	(Norw. Lytte og se)
Oral use of language	(Norw. Muntlig bruk av språket)
Reading	(Norw. Lesning)
Written use of language	(Norw. Skriftlig bruk av språket)
Linguistics (or language knowledge)	(Norw. Språklære )
The 'bi-language' or 'side-language'	(Norw. Sidemålet)

## M87

Basic education in reading and writing	(Norw. Grunnleggende lese- og skrive-opplæring)
Oral use of (the) language	(Norw. Muntlig bruk av språket)
Literature	(Norw. Litteratur)
Written use of (the) language	(Norw. Skriftlig bruk av språket)
'Hand writing'	(Norw. Skriftforming)
Linguistics	(Norw. Språklære)
'The bi-language'	(Norw. Sidemålet)
Media and electronic data processing	(Norw. Medier og edb)

## L97

Listening and speaking	(Norw. Lytte og tale)
Reading and writing	(Norw. Lese og skrive)
Knowledge of language and culture	(Norw. Kunnskap om språk og kultur)

## KL06

Oral texts	(Norw. Muntlige tekster)
Written texts	(Norw. Skriftlige tekster)
Composite texts	(Norw. Sammensatte tekster)
Language and culture	(Norw. Språk og kultur)

## REV13

Oral communication	(Norw. Muntlig kommunikasjon)
Written communication	(Norw. Skriftlig kommunikasjon)
Language, literature, and culture	(Norw. Language, literature, and culture)