Chapter 8
Merging Traditions and Emerging Tensions

Nexuses Linking Education Policy and the Development of the Teaching Profession

Petter Aasen and Tine S. Prøitz

Abstract The development of teacher professionalism is contextualised in timely and spatial configurations. Historically educational policy and reforms have influenced the development of the teaching profession. In this chapter we discuss how educational policy and reforms in primary and secondary education and teacher education have influenced the construction of the teacher profession in Norway. We limit our examination of this policy—practice nexus starting from the end of the nineteenth century. In analysing policies and politics that have shaped developments of the teaching profession, we focus on three nexuses or connections crucial in any analysis of professional development: Policies influencing (1) the organization of arenas for professional development, (2) the steering, management and organisation of the professional field and occupational practice and (3) the professional knowledge, skills, and standards. We argue that different knowledge regimes in educational policy historically have influenced the construction of the teacher profession and laid foundations for new forms of differentiation within the teaching profession. To meet emerging tensions and new forms of differentiation, the challenge seems to be how teacher education can strengthen research-based and value-based professionalism and how teacher training can ensure that the profession is developing a coherent conceptual framework, a common language, a unified theory, an intellectual community, and a frame of reference for value-based and evidence-informed reflection and action.

P. Aasen · T. S. Prøitz (✉)
University of South-Eastern Norway, Vestfold, Norway
e-mail: Petter.aasen@usn.no; Tine.proitz@usn.no

T. S. Prøitz et al. (eds.), *From Education Policy to Education Practice*, Policy Implications of Research in Education 15,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36970-4_8

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to examine the construction, development and differentiation of the teaching profession serving public education in Norway from a historical and contemporary political perspective. The foundation for the public school in Norway was laid in 1739 through a royal decree introducing compulsory schooling for all children. Over the next 100 years, compulsory schooling for children of the peasantry and of the poor in the cities focused on reading instruction and religion. The church supervised the school, and church servants were teachers. In parallel, in the cities there were separate schools for children of civil servants and the bourgeoisie that went beyond religious instruction and prepared pupils for the professions of the bourgeoisie and for receiving a university education. In these schools, the teachers had their education in disciplines offered at the university, but they had no pedagogical training. Gradually over a relatively long period, the church and theological knowledge base lost the hegemony. The decisive defeat, however, did not come until the end of the nineteenth century when the Norwegian parliament passed laws stating that public schools were no longer just meant to prepare for Christian confirmation. To support the reforms, separate educational institutions for teacher training were established (Telhaug & Mediås, 2003; Telhaug et al., 2006; Aasen, 2008).

The chapter describes and discusses how educational policy and reforms in primary, secondary and teacher education have influenced the historical construction of the teacher profession. Nexus or connections linking policy and professional development and professional practice in the construction of the teacher profession is complex and addresses several issues, different stakeholders and historical and new forms of differentiation within the teaching profession. In analysing the developments of the teaching profession in Norway, we focus on three nexuses or connections that are crucial in any analysis of professional development: Policies influencing (1) organization of arenas for professional development, (2) steering, management and organisation of the professional field and occupational practice and (3) professional knowledge, skills and standards (Fig. 8.1).

We address the socio-historical construction of the teaching profession and forms of differentiation within the profession based on a conceptual and thematically oriented analysis rather than a chronological approach. The chapter draws on review of previous historical and contemporary studies of education policy and reforms in Norway and a re-analysis of the findings. The material includes data and findings from a broad set of studies based on different sources and methodological approaches, including surveys, interviews, sociodemographic data, and policy documents.[1]

Accordingly, the focus in this chapter is the nexuses or the links between policy and professional development and practice as a historical and contemporary basis

[1] Brekke (2000), Telhaug and Mediås (2003), Garm and Karlsen (2004), Karlsen (2006), Telhaug et al. (2006), Aasen (2008), Afdal (2013), Aasen et al. (2015), Mausethagen et al. (2017), Prøitz and Aasen (2016, 2017), Mølstad and Prøitz (2018), and Mølstad et al. (2020).

Fig. 8.1 Nexuses linking policy and professional development & practise

for the development of the teaching profession. In an historical and international perspective Norway early introduced compulsory education and a common school for all; a comprehensive educational system which recruited students from all social strata. Compulsory and comprehensive schooling has also been decisive for the development of the teaching profession in many other countries. The assumption is that historical perspective on the development of the teaching profession in Norway will shed light on the policy-professional development and practice-nexuses and make the connections between policy and the development of the teacher profession more visible and thus promote the general understanding of the profession's social position and professional practice today.

Differentiation from a Historical Perspective

Historically, the construction of and the differentiation in the teacher profession and teacher professionalisation have developed in different ways in different countries. The concept of knowledge regimes can enable us to gain a better understanding of the policy practice nexus in the construction of the teaching profession and forms of differentiation. A knowledge regime in education policy refers to the understanding and definitions of governance, manners of governing and curriculum issues; thus, it comprises the contents, structures and processes of

education policy and governance. Different forms of knowledge regimes underpinning modernisation have given rise to different forms of educational systems and teacher professionalisation in different countries—both structurally and ideologically. Historically, different knowledge regimes work simultaneously within a country. They are in principle not linked to formal political organizations or parties. Historically knowledge regimes also operate across political party lines. Thus, one finds e.g., traces of a social democratic knowledge regime both on the political left and on the political right, although historically the centre of gravity lies in the former. The same applies to a cultural-conservative knowledge regime, but here the centre of gravity historically has been on the political right (Prøitz & Aasen, 2017; Aasen et al., 2014).

In Norway, an active state has strongly regulated the educational system, including teacher education, since the mid-1700s. Until the middle of the nineteenth century, educational policy was dominated by a *cultural-conservative knowledge regime* characterised by religious pietism. The curriculum conveyed religious and moral enlightenment and a Christian-Latin European culture of unity (Telhaug & Mediås, 2003). In the political sphere, the hegemony of pietism and the notion that state authority had its legitimacy from God were gradually replaced by the ideals of liberal democracy. In the cultural sphere, the belief of progress as the will of God was gradually replaced by the belief in enlightenment and science. However, the cultural dimension also drew on impulses from Romantic idealism. The school was seen as a way to revive Norway's soul and Norwegian identity after being the junior partner in unions with Denmark and later Sweden for many centuries. During the nineteenth century, national awareness and cultural nation building became a major task for the school curriculum. Christian humility was soon supplemented by national self-esteem and pride (Telhaug & Mediås, 2003).

Regarding teaching methods, the cultural-conservative pietistic knowledge regime, with its immense emphasis on memorising and reproductive pupil activity, came under heavy criticism from the mid-nineteenth century. The ideal became the enthusiastic, charismatic teacher who, through communication, motivated the students and released them from social and cultural constraints. The curriculum was no longer to be catechism explanations but rather a broad academic approach based on enlightenment and an encyclopaedic tradition. At the same time, the school's content was to reflect a national culture where the children met Norwegian literature, the Norse heritage and Norwegian fairy tales and legends (Telhaug & Mediås, 2003; Telhaug et al., 2006).

Approaching the turn of the century, education policy was increasingly influenced by a *social-democratic knowledge regime* that emphasised the school's role in the pursuit of social equalisation and integration. Gradually, the formation and operationalisation of a public, comprehensive education system became an increasingly powerful tool for the realisation of broader social goals, such as nation building, economic growth and equal opportunities. A comprehensive school system was introduced in 1896 as primary education for all children from grades 1 to 5; this was organised in a common school for all pupils, replacing the different types of schools that had existed in parallel before (Telhaug & Mediås, 2003).

The social-democratic knowledge regime, with its emphasis on comprehensive schooling, strengthened its position throughout the twentieth century. In 1920, public comprehensive school was extended to grades 1–7. Later, new legislation in 1969 and in 1997 expanded the comprehensive, unstreamed school system to levels 1–9 and 1–10 (primary and lower secondary school), respectively. Education was considered to be an extension of the state's duty to provide equality of opportunity for all members of society. Consequently, there has been little room in the Norwegian egalitarian political philosophy for elite schools, with the result being that private schools have constituted an insignificant fraction of the total number of schools in Norway. As late as 1970, the number of pupils in private schools comprised no more than 0.5 of the total number of children of compulsory school age (Telhaug, 1994; Aasen, 2003, 2007).

Since the mid-1990s, the Norwegian educational model has been influenced by a *market-liberal knowledge regime*. The consequence has been a new political order that can be characterised as dialectic in the way it unites faith in a relatively strong state with a neo-liberal political philosophy characterised by a market-based, choice-driven, consumerist policy (Aasen, 2003). The vision of a good state that ensures social and individual justice goes hand in hand with confidence in local autonomy, market-based solutions, and individual choice. However, even today, more than 90% of pupils in primary schools and lower and upper secondary schools attend public institutions (Prøitz & Aasen, 2017; Dieudé, 2021).

Historically, the comprehensive structure has been supplemented by a common national curriculum that has been regularly revised in terms of both its content and level of detail. As late as the fall of 2020, a new national curriculum for compulsory education and upper secondary education was introduced. Until recently (2010), the general teacher-training programme qualifying for teaching all levels and subjects in primary and lower secondary schools was an important tool for creating a strong inclusive community within schools. Often, pupils stayed with the same teacher for all subjects throughout primary school. As we shall see below, after 2010, reforms in teacher education and national appointment regulations have changed the qualification requirements for teachers both in primary and lower secondary schools. In upper secondary schools, however, teachers have always been specialised subject teachers holding a university degree.

To enhance the quality and efficiency in public education, policy initiatives and reforms after 1990 influenced by the market-liberal knowledge regime and new public management have reinforced deregulation and pushed policy-making authority downwards in the education system. A cornerstone in these reforms has been the introduction of new forms of governing and managing schools leading to increased decentralisation and enlarged autonomy for school owners,[2] school leaders and the

[2] In Norway, the 'school owner' concept refers to municipalities and counties that have the responsibility for the provision and results of primary and secondary education. It is also used to refer to a small but growing number of independent schools managed by trusts. The concept was introduced in parallel with the introduction of a more decentralised and accountability-oriented education system in the early 2000s.

teaching profession in general. Simultaneously influenced by the globalisation of educational policy, the reforms mark a serious effort to introduce robust performance management into the education system. More weight has been placed on the schools and on teachers' accountability for student achievement. This rationale has also influenced basic and continuing teacher training. The decentralisation of public education has brought into focus the balance between political/national and professional/local power and control over education. In this chapter these developments are seen as/are argued to have been/is suggested to be preparing the groundwork of new forms of differentiation in the teacher profession.

Below, we present and discuss the most notable trends in the three nexuses linking policy and professional development and professional practice in the construction of the teaching profession. In the last section, we argue that educational policy has influenced the construction of the teacher profession and laid foundations for historical and new forms of tension and differentiation within the teaching profession. However, first, we give a short presentation of the contemporary Norwegian education system and teacher education as a point of departure for the analytical and historical perspectives on policies influencing the organization of arenas for professional development, the steering, management and organisation of the professional field and occupational practice, and professional knowledge, skills, and standards.

The Norwegian Education System and Teacher Education

Since 1997, Norwegian children have begun their formal schooling in the calendar year in which they reach the age of six. Compulsory education covers 10 years and comprises primary education (grades 1–7) and lower secondary education (grades 8–10). Primary and lower secondary education is founded on the principle of a comprehensive, unstreamed school system that provides equal and adapted education for all based on a single national curriculum. Upper secondary education lasts for 3 years; it consists of either general or vocational studies.

Kindergarten is voluntary, but all children from 1 to 5 years old are entitled to enrolment. Municipalities are responsible for ensuring that the right to kindergarten is fulfilled by public or private providers. Whereas compulsory and upper secondary schooling in Norway is a public responsibility, with only approximately 4% of pupils attending private primary/lower secondary schools and 8% attending private upper secondary schools, 50% of children attend privately owned kindergartens. However, nonmunicipal kindergartens are entitled to a grant that equals 100% of the public funding allocated to municipal kindergartens.

The Norwegian parliament (the *Storting*) and government in general define the goals and decide the budgetary frameworks for primary and secondary education. The Ministry of Education and Research is Norway's highest public administrative agency for educational matters and handles implementing national educational policy. A common standard is ensured through legislation, through a national curricula and a national quality assessment system for monitoring of the results and quality of

education. The municipalities are responsible for running primary and lower secondary schools, while county authorities are responsible for upper secondary schools. Within the framework of statutes and national curricula, municipalities/counties, schools, and teachers can decide what learning materials to use and what teaching methods to adopt.

Today, a differentiated provision of teacher education and training studies is offered across the 23 higher education institutions in Norway. There are four teacher-training programmes: two 5-year integrated *primary and lower secondary school (PLS)* master's programmes (PLS levels 1–7 and PLS levels 5–10), a five-year integrated 'lector' programme (levels 8–13) and a one-year 'practical' teacher programme grounded on a discipline-based master's degree (levels 5–13). Traditionally, university colleges have offered teacher education for primary and lower secondary schools, while the universities have provided a master's education for teachers for lower and upper secondary school. Today, this division has changed, and universities generally offer all programmes.

Organization of Arenas for Professional Development

In the nineteenth century and far into the twentieth century, Norwegian education reflected a class society where it was a sharp distinction between the social recruitment to primary and secondary schools. This differentiation in the school system was also reflected in the organisation teacher education and the development of the teaching profession. The teachers in lower and upper secondary schools (*den lærde skole, middelskolen* later *realskole and gymnas*) were generally the sons of civil servants and people in free professions. They were recruited from subject or discipline focused programmes at the university.[3] Teachers in primary schools (*allmueskoler*, later *folkeskoler*) were often recruited from gifted pupils from the peasantry who were trained at diocesan seminars and later, starting in the 1820s, at public teacher-training seminars[4] (Aasen, 2008).

The university's educational programmes were subject oriented and scientifically grounded. The candidates did not receive any practical pedagogical training. The seminars aimed at primary school and taught practice-based, vocation-oriented education. Access to further education was not an option. Without first having

[3] Until 1949, the **University of Oslo,** named **Royal Frederick University** until 1939, was the only university in Norway. The university was founded in 1811. Previously, Norwegian citizens went abroad for university education, primarily to Copenhagen. Norway currently has 10 universities, six university colleges and five scientific colleges owned by the state. Norway also has many private higher education institutions in the nonuniversity sector, 15 of which receive government support.

[4] By 1890, there were seven public seminars in Norway. During the twentieth century, the seminar tradition was continued and expanded through a number of teacher education institutions (*lærerskoler*, later *lærerhøgskoler*).

passed secondary education—the Exam Artium—there were no openings for university studies, which, in turn, could help individuals to professionally and socially advancement. The road to secondary education for seminarians was long and expensive. Hence, the teacher profession was divided academically, socially, and culturally (Hagemann, 1992; Aasen, 2008; Thue, 2017).

Primary school and lower and upper secondary school were initially subject to their respective authoritative institutions: The state church and the university. This was also reflected in teacher education. Until the end of the nineteenth century, the priests were the administrators at the public teachers' seminars, where they exercised strict control over all aspects of the lives of future teachers. Christianity maintained a strong grip on teacher education well into the twentieth century. The teacher seminars were basically 'total institutions', where the students' moral lives became subject to constant monitoring and control. The first seminars were often situated in the countryside, where students were minimally exposed to temptations. The timetable was tight, the work pressure was hard, and all teaching took place in classrooms according to the model of teaching in the primary school. Although this strict control regime was gradually softened, for a long time, the legacy of the seminars came to shape the culture and teaching methods of teacher education of primary school. On the other hand, in line with the German and Nordic university traditions, the education given to future teachers in secondary school was open. Students enjoyed extensive freedom and the absence of institutionalised social control; they were educated in an academic knowledge tradition, for a long time without pedagogical preparation for the teaching profession.

In the nineteenth century, Norway was an agricultural society. In 1875, 210,000 pupils attended rural primary schools, while 35,000 attended urban schools. For a long time, male teachers dominated the rural primary school. In 1875, 3272 male teachers and 54 female teachers were registered in the rural primary schools (SSB, 2000). The period leading up to the interwar period in the twentieth century was characterised by the rapid urbanisation and feminisation of the teaching profession. The two phenomena were connected. In 1890, women made up 62 of urban primary school's teaching staff, but only 11 of the staff members in rural schools. Although a large majority of the male teachers came from the countryside and the peasantry, the female teachers were primarily from the bourgeoisie or the middle class in the cities. From around the turn of the century, women began to dominate the teacher seminars. Thus, rural primary school also received an increasing proportion of female teachers. By the end of the century, women made up most primary school teachers. In 1985, 58% of teachers were women. In 2017, the proportion of women was 75%. It is worth emphasising, however, that the process of the urbanisation of the teacher profession in Norway was slow, in many ways slower than the general urbanisation and industrialisation of society would suggest. As recently as the 1950s, Norwegian teachers in primary school stood out in the European context with their relatively strong connection to the peasantry (Thue, 2017).

For a long time, men dominated higher education, even though women started to be admitted to the university from 1882. In 1962, the proportion of women was about 22%. Since then, the increase in student numbers in higher education has been

much greater for women than for men. In 1986, for the first time, there were more women than men in higher education. The recruitment pattern of teachers in secondary school reflects the recruitment to higher education. Today, most teachers in lower and upper secondary school are women.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, it was repeatedly suggested that the teachers in the secondary school/gymnasium should get a practical pedagogical introduction and pass a practical test before they could be certified to teach. However, the university authorities argued that a pedagogical education was a practical facility that was not university worthy. The parliament accepted this position. Nevertheless, the debate continued through the last part of the nineteenth century. In connection with the reorganisation of the university studies in 1905, when higher professional education programmes (medicine, theology, law, etc.) were supplemented with master's programmes in philology and science, it was once again proposed to introduce a one-year practical pedagogical education for qualifying university graduates as teachers. The proposed model included one semester in pedagogical theory given by a university seminar and one trial semester to test candidates by exercising the profession in the school. However, the university faculties were still sceptical of pedagogy as a university subject. Nevertheless, in 1907, a political compromise introduced one semester of practical pedagogical education (Grotnæss et al., 1982). Thus, in Norway, a pedagogical seminar at the university level to qualify teachers for secondary education was introduced rather late compared with other European countries. The University of Copenhagen established its pedagogical seminar for teachers in secondary school as early as 1799. At the University of Oslo, the seminar for teacher training was officially opened in the spring semester of 1908. Thus, the seminary tradition and practical side of the teaching profession gained a foothold in the universities' teacher education, even though it took many years before it became an integral, equal part of the university.

The educational reforms on the other hand introduced a gradual extension of a national comprehensive school system in the twentieth century, which, in 1997, culminated in a 10-year unstreamed school without structural differentiation, resulting in new disputes about the segregation and differentiation of teacher education. The radical extension of this comprehensive system was based on an economic objective and the assumption that there was a clear association between the level of education and economic growth. Supporters of the comprehensive system maintained that this form of school organisation was in a better position to unearth any hidden talent, more so than a system of parallel schools. A second and even more important motive for expanding the comprehensive system was to abolish the class-based society. The structure of the comprehensive school system with its unstreamed classes would lay the foundation for equal opportunities and a social community in which the strong aided the weak.

The proponents of the comprehensive school argued that this form of educational system required a comprehensive teaching profession. Despite resistance from secondary school teachers holding a university degree—who were afraid of the devaluation of academic standards and their professional status—the national political authorities decided to soften the dualism in teacher education. Historically, there

has been broad political agreement on both the expansion of the comprehensive, unstreamed public school and a comprehensive and more uniform teacher education.

In 1973, the old seminars (*lærerskoler*) were granted status as higher education in the nonuniversity sector by becoming university colleges (*lærerhøgskoler*). In the following decades, educational programmes for primary teacher education were gradually expanded. In the beginning of the twenty-first century, structural reforms in higher education and institutional merging processes included many of the teacher education institutions that had roots in the old seminar tradition in the university sector. As of 2017, certification of both primary and secondary school teachers requires master-level qualifications that can be taken at a university or university college.

Historically, the content in primary teacher education has been regulated by detailed national curricula. As of 2010 (teacher education for levels 1–7 and levels 5–10) and of 2012 (teacher education for levels 8–10 and the one-year 'practical' teacher programme grounded on a discipline-based master's degree) learning outcomes that apply to Norwegian teacher education programmes are coordinated by rather detailed and specified national regulations. As shown above, teacher education is offered as 5 years of integrated master's programmes or as subject-oriented master's education supplemented with a one-year practical pedagogical seminar. The integrated teacher education programmes are specialised and divided into programmes with a specialisation in school subjects. Thus, the seminar tradition of giving general teacher education has been abolished.

Consequently, in Norway, the historical dualism in teacher education and the differentiation of the arenas of professional development have been gradually replaced by an integrated and comprehensive professionalisation of teachers for primary and secondary schools. This historical development has provided a structural base for a more unified teaching profession. There are separate educational pathways for teacher qualifications for the vocational programmes in secondary education that are based on craft certificates or the equivalent, along with a minimum 2 years of relevant work experience. However, teacher education for vocational secondary education is now offered both at universities and at university colleges.

In addition to the developments of the formal structures of the provision of teacher education, teacher professional development initiatives supplementing the system of teacher education can also be found in Norway. The Norwegian government has a long tradition of in-service courses and nonaccredited informal training initiated and funded by the state; this has been linked to major educational reforms (Lloyd & Payne, 2012; Lyng & Blichfeldt, 2003). This tradition has been further developed and intensified with the *Knowledge Promotion Reform* (*Kunnskapsløftet*) in 2006 and has continued in the new *Subject Renewal Reform (Fagfornyelsen*) which introduced a new national curriculum for primary, lower secondary and upper secondary education starting from the school year 2020/21.

The development can be seen as reflecting the developments in many countries for more systematised approaches towards teachers continued professional development (CPD) (Kirsten, 2020; Czerniawski, 2013). More recent education reforms have raised a strong awareness and focus on teacher competence as a key factor for

quality in education, paralleling an emergent emphasis on raising student learning outcomes in schools (Mølstad & Prøitz, 2018; Prøitz, 2015). This is not only strongly stated in policy documents, but also followed up by concrete CPD measures. One example is how the introduction of the comprehensive reform in 2006 was coordinated with the national Strategy for Competence Development (2005–2008) of teachers and school leaders in both primary and secondary education (OECD, 2019). A decentralised scheme was designed to ensure that all municipalities implemented competence-raising measures by channelling state funds into the municipalities that define and prioritise what they needed with reference to national goals and in co-operation with universities and university colleges.

However, studies of large-scale CPD programmes for teachers have shown that such initiatives often face several challenges. The evaluation of the Norwegian Strategy for Competence Development (2005–2008) found that most of the funding was spent on courses for leaders at the municipal level rather than being given to the schools. According to the evaluators, teachers had not been involved in the processes of defining competence needs and the strategy was not grounded in teachers' perceived needs' (Hagen & Nyen, 2009, p. 8). In general research and evaluations repeatedly have shown that it is difficult to establish solid structures for CPD that involve teachers and meet their needs (Irgens, 2018). The CPD initiatives for teachers can be characterised as an arena for teacher professionalisation built on short-term perspectives to solve government needs for reform implementation or to make changes in existing practices related to international large-scale assessment results (ILSA) or other more acute policy needs. Furthermore, the great emphasis on the need for continued professional development has laid the foundation for new forms of teacher differentiation because the facilitation of professional development varies among counties, municipalities and schools. The individual teacher is also given greater responsibility for professional updates. Thus, new requirements open for regional and individual defined differentiation.

Professional Fields and Occupational Practice

Historically, the development of the teaching profession in Norway has been influenced by a strong innovative state that has constantly introduced new national reforms. Thus, powerful national steering and management of primary and secondary education, as well as teacher education, has regulated teachers' professional fields and occupational practice. From the beginning of the nineteenth century, the social-democratic knowledge regime introduced a highly state-regulated public teacher education as an important element in the formation and operationalisation of a comprehensive educational system that constitutes what—after World War II—has been referred to as the Nordic education model (Prøitz & Aasen, 2017); this model is intrinsically linked to the development of the welfare state in Scandinavia.

As we have seen above, in Norway, this model has its historical roots in the idea of a public comprehensive school system introduced and developed starting from

the mid-1800s. During the first decades after World War II, the compulsory school system was debated in many Western countries. However, a comprehensive system did not make any significant advances in countries such as Germany, France, the Netherlands or the UK. In Norway, on the other hand, a strong state and dominant social-democratic knowledge regime resulted in major advances in developing a comprehensive school system.

By the 1950s, Norway used a greater proportion of its GDP for public education than any other country in Europe. Teachers had a high status in society, both socially and financially, not only because of their idealism, but also because of the strong position of the teachers' unions and high standards of recruitment into the profession (Telhaug et al., 2006). The political circumstances in general and education policy favoured national standardisation within an egalitarian and comprehensive school system. The aim was a common school for all children and young people, extending as far up the education system as possible. Education was defined as a common good, and children and youth were regarded more as the state's responsibility than as parents' sole responsibility.

The particularly characteristic feature of classical social democracy was the transformation of a relatively passive bourgeois state into an active, strong authority engaged in national planning. This expansion of the state and public sector was based on the view that it was the responsibility of the state to promote the collective values and interests of society. The social-democratic welfare state model stresses the redistributive role of the state in promoting social inclusion, here with a special emphasis on equality of access and outcomes in education. The former addresses the responsibility of the state to provide equal opportunities to participate, while the latter is concerned with whether children from different social groups can take advantage of that access and are successful in doing so. From this perspective, simply providing the same opportunities is not enough because children with different economic, social, and cultural backgrounds will need different opportunities and support to be successful. However, working for equality in results does not imply that every child should reach the same level or receive identical results; instead, the goal is to reduce those differences children and youth possess when entering school. In this way, the pupil's merits should emerge, regardless of their social background. If children from different backgrounds are going to have similar chances in life, they need to be treated differently. Hence, education policy has introduced different provisions, ensuring actual participation/enrolment and a substantial degree of success across social and cultural groups. Differences in outcomes—attributable to differences in characteristics, such as geographical background, gender, wealth, income, power, or possessions—should be limited and disputed. In policy approaches, the social-democratic knowledge regime has stressed that to improve equity, which is defined as the equality of outcomes, the state must play a crucial role in ensuring that all citizens have real, not only formal, access to the required resources to compensate for the inequality of provisions and resources (Prøitz & Aasen, 2017).

Since the mid-1990s, under the influence of the market-liberal knowledge regime, values such as competition, choice, streaming, hierarchy, and managerial accountability have been introduced to strengthen national competitiveness in a

global knowledge-based economy. Thus, socially inclusive policies, comprehensiveness in education, democratic values, and a focus on community rather than on the individual have been delimited by the recent education policy of the last decades (Blossing et al., 2014). Even so, every individual's right to free public schooling, regardless of geographical location and learning conditions, is still deeply rooted in Norwegian and Nordic culture. Indeed, this image can be seen even clearer from the outside, where a comprehensive school for all is controversial under an increasingly market-oriented knowledge regime and possessive individualism (Aasen, 2003; Apple, 2006; Blossing et al., 2014; Prøitz & Aasen, 2017).

A prominent trend in Norway is the strengthening of the responsibilities for student learning at the local authority level. The central elements in this change are the introduction of a more results-oriented education system and systems for assessment and evaluation in combination with a stronger accountability script (Hatch, 2013; Aasen et al., 2012; Mausethagen, 2013). Today, the initial ideas of decentralisation and governing exclusively by goals and monitoring results have been disrupted by the policy initiatives of recentralisation, which have strengthened the control of the central state. Today's governing is characterised by the monitoring of results and outcomes and the provision of more supervision, various support systems and supplemental documents and guidelines for working with local curriculum, specifications of learning outcomes and assessment and a system of school inspection (Aasen et al., 2012, 2015; Prøitz, 2015). This tendency towards recentralisation has been observed in how the national authorities have developed and provided guidelines, tools and support materials directed at teachers' work in classrooms more than at local authorities and school leaders (Prøitz et al., 2019). This can be considered a break from the former ideas of governing by distance and decentralisation, for example, as reflected in the formal documents regulating Norwegian education and teacher education.

The Norwegian national curricula are legal documents and can be regarded as having two functions: first as a platform and tool for the national governing of education and schooling and, second, as a common platform and tool for the pedagogical work of teaching and learning in schools (Aasen et al., 2015). The national curriculum aims to govern and influence what is taught in the classrooms, providing a common ground for teaching, and learning the same knowledge, experiences and values to all students. This approach also provides a common ground that should be prioritised in teacher education. Likewise, for the national curriculum, there is the National Framework regulations for teacher education, which certify the teacher profession; Norwegian teacher education is regulated by several formal documents, forming a web of regulations and guidelines of varied regulative power and influences (Prøitz et al., 2017). The National Qualifications Framework (NQF) is the framework in which the study programme descriptions of all higher education are supposed to be written in accordance with. The Ministry of Education and Research has amended the NQF's regulations for professional courses, including for teacher education. National guidelines for each subject field and module level have been developed by Universities Norway (UHR), a cooperative body of 33 accredited universities and university colleges in Norway; these guidelines have supplemented the

National Framework and the NQF. The guidelines can be modified and adapted by the institutions, but studies have shown that this is seldom done and that the guidelines are copied or mimicked in teacher education (Prøitz & Aasen, 2017). The higher education institution study programme for teacher education builds on the National Framework's regulations and the guidelines but is developed by the higher education institution in accordance with the University and University Colleges Act, sections 1–5, on academic freedom.[5] The program plan presents the study programme in general descriptions regarding its purpose, structure and learning outcomes. Within the frame of the study programme plan, there is a module plan that presents the structure, teaching and learning activities, syllabus, learning outcomes and assessment scheme of the programme.

Professional education must normally demonstrate that it meets the standards requirements described by the regulator. However, examinations of Norwegian study programme plans have shown that the most transparent and easiest way to do this is to parrot the source documents' language in the institution's guidelines (Prøitz et al., 2017). In theory, this should lead to standardisation, with each institution producing similar programme documents. This similarity was clearly found in the study programme plans for teacher education programmes; here, a study observed how teacher education programmes and module plans copied the National Framework and the competence structure set by the NQF, as well as the national guidelines. Compared with teacher education in the UK, the Norwegian case showed that teacher education is strongly regulated and influenced from the national level but not so much at the education level, where the UK was more thoroughly governed. To what extent these governing attempts actually reach the teaching and learning of teacher education in Norway depends on the practices in teacher education (Prøitz et al., 2017).

In addition to more traditional ways of governing by regulations and resource allocation, successive Norwegian governments have lately introduced new requirements and heightened qualification standards to become a fully qualified teacher. One example is the introduction of new admission requirements for all forms of teacher education in Norway; this means that applicants must have a specified grade level in defined school subjects (e.g., Norwegian language and math) starting from upper secondary school to enter teacher education; another measure amended in

[5] Extract, Sections 1–5. Academic freedom and responsibility: (1) Universities and university colleges must promote and safeguard academic freedom. The institutions are responsible for ensuring that teaching, research and academic and artistic development work maintain a high professional level and are conducted in accordance with recognized scientific, artistic, educational and ethical principles. (2) In other respects, universities and university colleges are entitled to establish their own academic and value basis within the framework laid down in or pursuant to law. (3) Universities or university colleges may not be instructed regarding (a) the academic content of their teaching and the content of research or artistic or academic development work. (b) individual appointments. (4) Each person teaching at institutions subject to this Act has an independent academic responsibility for the contents and plan for the teaching within the framework that is determined by the institution or that follows from statutes or regulations pursuant to statutes. Retrieved 08.06.20 from https://lovdata.no/dokument/NLE/lov/2005-04-01-15

2015 requires all in-service teachers to have a defined minimum of relevant education to teach key subjects (30 ECTS in primary school and 60 ECTS in lower secondary school). The amendment requires a large number of Norwegian teachers to upgrade their competence in certain subjects (Norwegian language, Sami language, sign language, math and English language). Yet another example of governing by qualifications and competence can be seen in the introduction of most teacher education as a five-year master's education. This last change must be seen in relation to the general trend towards research-based teacher education, here with an ambition to educate research-informed practitioners who can critically reflect on various trends and developments in education. This also includes a focus on evidence and knowledge about what works. Another prevailing trend that can be seen in relation to recent changes is the preparation for a teacher role within an education landscape, which comes with clearer responsibilities and an accountability rationale (Helgøy & Homme, 2006, 2007). Governing by competence can also be seen in relation to the already mentioned intensified provision of CPD, which was initiated partly in relation to the introduction of new reforms in schools but also because of national ILSA results.

Several of the governing measures mentioned here parallel an increased focus on teachers and teacher education in Norwegian education policy. This is exemplified by the appointment of several national and international expert groups, national commissions, evaluations of teacher education, national recruitment campaigns and a five-year national strategy for teacher education and a government and stakeholder forum and advisory council for teacher education to follow up on the strategy *Teacher Education 2025*. At least partially, all these initiatives can be viewed as government responses to the new and growing availability of national student performance data, hence directing policy attention to the links between teacher competence and student learning outcomes. Norwegian policy documents also display a strong belief in teachers as change agents who have a high impact on students in school and in their future adult lives (Mølstad & Prøitz, 2018; Prøitz et al., 2019). This emphasis also reflects a policy concern for recruitment numbers and a future situation characterised by a lack of teachers in Norwegian schools.

Stronger national management of professionalisation strengthens the requirements for teachers' knowledge base and professional practice, but at the same time, it challenges professional autonomy. It creates tensions that feed new forms of differentiation that will be addressed in the final section, but first, we will look at the content of professionalisation.

Professional Knowledge, Skills and Standards

Upper secondary school is no longer a school for youth from privileged classes. Even though upper secondary school is not mandatory, today, just about everyone who leaves lower secondary school in Norway enters upper secondary education. Thus, over the past 50 years, upper secondary education has evolved from being a

school for the elite to a prerequisite for further one's career, be it academic or vocational. This is placing new demands on teachers and, thus, on teacher education. The requirement for enhanced pedagogical competence among teachers in upper secondary education has been emphasised. At the same time, recent educational reforms in primary and lower secondary school have underlined that the teachers need to acquire more solid subject-based knowledge. Hence, the prominence of a more solid education in subject matter in teacher education for primary and lower secondary schools has been strengthened. Reforms and certification requirements have reinforced the links between science, research-based pedagogy, and teacher professionalisation, both through basic teacher education and through teachers' access to CPD. All teacher education is currently at the master's level. The fundamental differentiation between the two teacher education traditions has been erased both by the new needs that result from changes in student recruitment into secondary education and the stricter academic requirements for teachers in primary education.

The renewal of education and teacher education is influenced by international political tendencies and powerful supranational trendsetting political agencies. For example, the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) was initiated by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 2000—and along with other international assessment regimes—has influenced both the content and national monitoring of schools' academic level and achievements, as well as the content in the professional programmes of teacher professionalisation. The introduction of the NQF for all higher education—based on the European Qualifications Framework (EQF)—has also influenced reforms in teacher education.

High on the agenda nationally and internationally is the requirement to bring research-based knowledge into the daily work of professionals. The literature has defined this as the theory–practice or research–practice gap (Nutley et al., 2003). A recent example illustrating this situation is the Norwegian reaction to the internationally debated work of Hattie (2009), which was based on evidence from research synthesis and meta-analysis. A range of actors in education, including politicians, educators, and researchers, participated in heated debates not only about the results, knowledge, and recommendations in Hattie's study, but also about what kind of evidence shaped the results and the basis of the systematic review studies.

The OECD project 'Evidence in Education. Linking Research and Policy' explained the expanded emphasis on evidence in education; it refers to a multitude of factors: a greater concern of student achievement outcomes; the explosion of available evidence because of a greater emphasis on testing and assessment; more explicit and vocal dissatisfaction with education systems nationally and locally; and the increased access to information via the Internet and other technologies (OECD, 2007).

In Norway and elsewhere, the implications of more evidence-based professionalism have been interpreted as both a reprofessionalisation and deprofessionalisation of teachers. Proponents have argued that research-based practice and specialisation imply a reprofessionalisation, making teachers' professionalism more in line with the need to keep up with the demands and requirements of a new era. Critics of the

evidence-based practice movement emphasise how contextual variations seem to be ignored and question whether evidence-based practice can be used within the field of education. Others have criticised the linear and top-down logic that underpins the evidence movement; the main arguments here are that education, teaching and learning take place in contexts characterised by unpredictability and complexity and by decision making grounded in professional judgement and normativity. A fundamental consensus is that evidence-based knowledge, which focuses on studies of 'what works', cannot meet the need for a broader focus in thinking about the relation among research, policy, and practice (Prøitz & Aasen, 2016).

In the Norwegian context, there are differences between the government and teachers' union concerning the aspects of teacher professionalism. The government emphasises teacher accountability based on evidence-based practice, whereas the teacher's union highlights research-informed practice and the teachers' responsibility for educational quality in a broader sense and for their own professional ethics (Mausethagen & Granlund, 2012).

Although devolution and autonomy have been underlined in national education reforms, the contemporary governing of teachers in schools also shows a strong interest in leading the way and guiding teachers in how to interpret curriculum and teach 'correctly'. Accordingly, a softer way of governing is embedded in contemporary policies and national initiatives. The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training—the executive agency for the Ministry of Education and Research that represents a strong normative force in shaping the content, methods, and assessments in Norwegian schools and in teacher professionalisation—handles the development of kindergarten and primary and secondary education.

Soft governance is carried out through a myriad of support structures, guidance materials and in-service training to help and guide teachers in their daily work. This development seems paradoxical regarding how the system has lengthened the formal education to secure a highly competent teacher workforce. As shown above, the national government has initiated large-scale CPD programmes for teachers as a supplement to the provision of formal teacher education; these programmes often relate more to the government wanting to implement a new reform with new concepts and working methods than to building on the needs of the municipalities for local governing or the needs expressed by teachers.

Emerging Tensions and New Forms of Differentiation

In this chapter we have described and discussed how educational policy and reforms have influenced the historical construction of the teacher profession and the interaction between historical and new forms of differentiation within the teaching profession in Norway. The more recent policy initiatives—characterised by a decentralisation of power/responsibility to local authorities, evidence-based practice, and accountability policies—have introduced new forms of differentiation. The policy initiatives have sharpened the tensions between national political

requirements/standardisation and local/institutional/professional independence. The teacher's union has criticized new public management and the detailed follow-up of goal management through a new and extensive test regime. Historically, Norwegian teachers have been licensed to manage their own affairs within the framework of the national curriculum. Both politicians and the parents have trusted teachers, accepting that they knew the best for their children. Since the beginning of the 1990s, this licensed autonomy has been questioned, and the state's modality of control has been changing.

Additionally, in the context of devolution and new accountability regimes, new forms of differentiation seem to be evolving. This includes tensions in the policy-making process and in the implementation of educational policy and reforms. Different ideologies or knowledge regimes work simultaneously and comprise different perspectives on knowledge and education: different understandings of schooling and the relation between education and society. Thus, because different knowledge regimes work simultaneously there are always contradictions and tensions embedded in education policy and reforms. Recent and ongoing political initiatives have created and continue to create new forms of differentiation (Møller et al., 2009; Aasen, 2013, 2017; Prøitz & Aasen, 2017).

We can observe tensions between national educational policies and regulations and local policy implementations and professional initiatives. We can also find tensions between expert power/steering and local professional power/autonomy. In *the governance dimension*, we can observe tensions between input- and output-based steering, between national steering authorities and locally elected political bodies' ability and willingness to act autonomously and between decentralisation in terms of delegation and decentralisation as devolution.

In *the systemic relation dimension*, there are tensions between central, detailed control and state steering at a distance by empowering local authorities. The central state's demands for extensive documentation are often interpreted as unwanted interference and a form of 'feeding the beast'. At the same time, local governments and schools ask for national intervention in form of support.

In *the social dimension*, we can see strains between education as an individual good and education as a common good, between equity as equality and equity as equivalence and between the importance of early intervention and a more patient approach towards learning. In *the knowledge base dimension*, there are tensions between evidence-based practice and practice-based evidence, between research-based solutions and experience-based reasoning, between efficient intervention and professional reflection and between knowledge directed at what works and knowledge focusing on when and whom it works for.

In the school content or *subject matter dimension*, there are tensions between knowledge and competence, between competence and skills and between focusing on learning processes and the demand for documented learning outcomes. Finally, in *the accountability dimension*, there are tensions between professional teachers, school leaders and managerialism and tensions between trust in professionals and an increased administrative technocracy.

Some of these tensions in education policy are also found within education practice, creating differentiation at the school and classroom levels and within the profession. The contradictions present challenges experienced by local authorities, school leaders and teachers in the classrooms. At the local and school levels, they can generate ambiguity, frustrations, and differentiation. Thus, in the educational disputes at the local and school levels, we can see the demands for a return to stronger and clearer hierarchical guidelines and clear, consistent mechanisms. On the other hand, we can also see more proactive and autonomous actions by school leaders and teachers. We can observe teachers as change agents, who are finding creative ways to occupy the openings and spaces created by these contradictions (Prøitz et al., 2019; Dieude & Prøitz, 2022; Stenersen, this volume; Wiig, this volume; Hontvedt et al., 2023).

Identifying the varied aspects of teacher professionalism in terms of the arenas, management and governing and content seems to bring forth an image of several measures that point at the same direction, potentially leading towards a more unified teacher profession. At the same time, a new form of differentiation can be identified because of the governing of both Norwegian education and teacher education. From a governance perspective, our analysis of merging traditions and emerging tensions and new forms of differentiation in teacher professionalisation illustrate how the Norwegian education system and teacher education are brought together by overlapping and supplementing policies in new nexuses of education policy and practice. Where there is a piece missing in one of the systems, the other is constructed to fill the gap, whether by strengthening the formal education system or through more short-term initiatives.

Teacher education develops teachers' professional judgement and discretion; this is grounded in research-based and experience-based knowledge and value-based assessments and priorities (Aasen & Prøitz, 2014). Hence, to meet the new forms of differentiation manifested through the differences between schools and classrooms, the challenge seems to be how teacher education can strengthen research-based and value-based professionalism and how teacher training can ensure that the profession is developing a coherent conceptual framework, a common language, a unified theory, an intellectual community, and a frame of reference for value-based and evidence-informed reflection and action.

References

Aasen, P. (2003). What happened to social-democratic progressivism in Scandinavia? Restructuring education in Sweden and Norway in the 1990s. In M. W. Apple, P. Aasen, & M. K. Cho (Eds.), *The state and the politics of knowledge* (pp. 109–147). Psychology Press.

Aasen, P. (2008). Lærerutdanningen ved universiteter og høgskoler. Utdanningspolitiske perspektiver [Teacher education in Norwegian universities]. In G. Knudsen & T. Evenshaug (Eds.), *Universitetet og lærerutdanningen. Historiske perspektiver*. Unipub AS.

Aasen, P. (2013). Accountability under ambiguity. Dilemmas and contradictions in education. In A.-L. Østern, K. Smith, T. Krüger, M.-B. Postholm, & T. Ryghaug (Eds.), *Teacher education research between national identity and global trends*. Akademika.

Aasen, P. (2017). Nothing is as political as education. In E. Nihlfors (Ed.), *Honorary doctors at the faculty of educational sciences 2011–2017* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis no 109). Uppsala University Library.

Aasen, P., & Prøitz, T. S. (2014). Lærerutdanning som høyere profesjonsutdanning [Teacher education as higher professional education]. In N. Frølich, E. Hovdhaugen, & L. I. Terum (Eds.), *Kvalitet, kapasitet og relevans. Utviklingstrekk i høyere utdanning*. Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Aasen, P., Møller, J., Rye, E., Ottesen, E., Prøitz, T. S., & Hertzberg, F. (2012). *Kunnskapsløftet som styringsreform – et løft eller et løfte? Forvaltningsnivåenes og institusjonenes rolle i implementeringen av reformen* (Rapport 20/2012). NIFU.

Aasen, P., Prøitz, T. S., & Sandberg, N. (2014). Knowledge regimes and contradictions in education reform. *Educational Policy, 28*(5), 718–738.

Aasen, P., Prøitz, T. S., & Rye, E. (2015). Nasjonal læreplan som utdanningspolitisk document. *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift, 6*, 417–433.

Afdal, H. W. (2013). Policymaking processes with respect to teacher education in Finland and Norway. *Higher Education, 65*(2), 167–180.

Apple, M. W. (2006). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, god, and inequality*. Taylor & Francis.

Blossing, U., Imsen, G., & Moos, L. (2014). *The Nordic education model*. Springer.

Brekke, M. (2000). *Lærerutdanning i nord: Et historisk kasus gjennom tre tidsperioder* [Teacher education in the north: A historic case through three periods of time] (Doctoral dissertation). Luleå Tekniska Universitet.

Czerniawski, G. (2013). Professional development for professional learners: Teachers' experiences in Norway, Germany and England. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 39*(4), 383–399. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2013.769339

Dieudé, A. (2021). Legitimizing private school policy within a political divide: The role of international references. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy, 7*(2), 78–90.

Dieudé, A., & Prøitz, T. S. (2022). Curriculum policy and instructional planning: Teachers' autonomy across various school contexts. *European Educational Research Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1177/14749041221075156

Garm, N., & Karlsen, G. E. (2004). Teacher education reform in Europe: The case of Norway; trends and tensions in a global perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*(7), 731–744.

Grotnæss, I., Sundet, O., & Øygarden, S. (1982). *Søkelys på praktisk lærerutdanning – Pedagogisk seminar i Oslo 75 år* [Searchlight on practical teacher education – Educational seminar in Oslo 75 years]. Universitetsforlaget.

Hagemann, G. (1992). *Skolefolk: Lærernes historie i Norge*. AdNotam Gyldendal.

Hagen, A., & Nyen, T. (2009). *Kompetanse—for hvem? Sluttrapport fra evalueringen av 'Kompetanse for utvikling. Strategi for kompetanseutvikling in grunnopplaeringen 2005–2008'* [Competence—For whom? Final report of the evaluation of 'competence for development. Strategy for skills development in grunnopplaeringen 2005–2008']. Fafo.

Hatch, T. (2013). Beneath the surface of accountability: Answerability, responsibility and capacity-building in recent education reforms in Norway. *Journal of Educational Change, 14*(2), 113–138.

Hattie, J. (2009). The contributions from teaching approaches – Part 1. In J. Hattie (Ed.), *Visible learning: A synthesis of over, 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement* (pp. 161–199). Routledge.

Helgøy, I., & Homme, A. (2006). Policy tools and institutional change comparing education policies in Norway, Sweden and England. *Journal of Public Policy, 26*, 141–165.

Helgøy, I., & Homme, A. (2007). Towards a new professionalism in school? A comparative study of teacher autonomy in Norway and Sweden. *European Educational Research Journal, 6*(3), 232–249.

Hontvedt, M., Prøitz, T. S., & Silseth, K. (2023). Collaborative display of competence: A case study of processoriented video-based assessment in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 121*, 103948.

Irgens, E. J. (2018). Historical amnesia: On improving Nordic schools from the outside and forgetting what we know. *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education (NJCIE), 2*(2–3), 25–38.

Karlsen, G. E. (2006). Styring av norsk lærerutdanning—et historisk perspektiv [Governing of Norwegian teacher education—A historic perspective]. *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift, 89*(06), 402–416.

Kirsten, N. (2020). *Kompetensutveckling som styrning: Om statliga insatser för lärares kompetensutveckling och hur de förhandlas i lärares lokala praktik* [Continued professional development programmes as governance: On government initiatives for teachers professional development and how they are negotiated in teachers local practices] (Doctoral dissertation). Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.

Lloyd, C., & Payne, J. (2012). Raising the quality of vocational teachers: Continuing professional development in England, Wales and Norway. *Research Papers in Education, 27*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2010.483524

Lyng, S. T., & Blichfeldt, J. F. (2003). *Norwegian country background report for the OECD project 'attracting, developing and retaining effective teachers*. Work Research Institute.

Mausethagen, S. (2013). *Reshaping teacher professionalism. An analysis of how teachers construct and negotiate professionalism under increasing accountability* (PhD dissertation). University of Oslo.

Mausethagen, S., & Granlund, L. (2012). Contested discourses of teacher professionalism: Current tensions between education policy and teachers' union. *Journal of Education Policy, 27*(6), 815–833. Høgskolen i Oslo og Akershus.

Mausethagen, S., Prøitz, T. S., & Skedsmo, G. (2017). Nye styringsformer og kunnskapskilder i (sam)spill. Eksempler fra skolefeltet [New ways of governing and varied sources of knowledge in play in education]. In S. Mausethagen & J.-C. Smeby (Eds.), *Kvalifisering til profesjonell yrkesutøvelse* [Qualifying for professional work]. Universitetsforlaget.

Møller, J., Prøitz, T. S., & Aasen, P. (2009). *Kunnskapsløftet – tung bær å bære? Underveisanalyse av styringsreformen i skjæringspunktet mellom politick, administrasjon og profesjon* [Knowledge promotion reform at the intersection of politics, administration and the profession]. (NIFU-STEP Rapport 42/2009).

Mølstad, C. E., & Prøitz, T. S. (2018). Teacher-chameleons: The glue in the alignment of teacher practices and learning in policy. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 51*, 1–17.

Mølstad, C. E., Prøitz, T. S., & Dieude, A. (2020). When assessment defines the content—Understanding goals in between teachers and policy. *The Curriculum Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1002/curj.74

Nutley, S., Walter, I., & Davies, H. T. (2003). From knowing to doing: A framework for understanding the evidence-into-practice agenda. *Evaluation, 9*(2), 125–148.

OECD. (2019). *Improving school quality in Norway: The new competence development model, implementing education policies*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/179d4ded-en

OECD Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI). (2007). Evidence in education: Linking research and policy.

Prøitz, T. S. (2015). Learning outcomes as a key concept in policy documents throughout policy changes. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 59*(3), 275–296.

Prøitz, T. S., & Aasen, P. (2016). Balancing evidence-based and experience-based knowledge in education. In S. Hallsén, W. Wermke, M. Elmgren, M. Folke-Fichtelius, & H. Román (Eds.), *Att ta utbildingens komplexitet på allvar*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.

Prøitz, T. S., & Aasen, P. (2017). Making and re-making the Nordic model of education. In P. Nedergaard & A. Wivel (Eds.), *Routledge handbook on Scandinavian politics*. Taylor & Francis/Routledge.

Prøitz, T. S., Havnes, A., Briggs, M., & Scott, I. (2017). Learning outcomes in professional contexts in higher education. *European Journal of Education, 52*(1), 31–43.

Prøitz, T. S., Rye, E., & Aasen, P. (2019). Nasjonal styring og lokal praksis—skoleledere og lærere som endringsagenter. In R. Jensen, B. Karseth, & E. Ottesen (Eds.), *Styring og ledelse i grunnopplæringen*. Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Stenersen, C. (this volume). Competing policy ideas in classroom practice: The case of student group work. In T. S. Prøitz, P. Aasen, & W. Wermke (Eds.), *From education policy to education practice*. Springer.

Telhaug, A. O. (1994). *Norsk skoleutvikling etter 1945* [The development of the Norwegian school after 1945]. Didaktika Norsk Forlag.

Telhaug, A. O., & Mediås, O. A. (2003). *Grunnskolen som nasjonsbygger* [School as nation builder]. Abstrakt.

Telhaug, A. O., Mediås, O. A., & Aasen, P. (2004). From collectivism to individualism? Education as nation building in a Scandinavian perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 48*(2), 141–158.

Telhaug, A. O., Mediås, O. A., & Aasen, P. (2006). The Nordic model in education: Education as part of the political system in the last 50 years. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 50*(3), 245–283.

Thue, F. (2017). Lærerrollen lag på lag – et skolehistorisk perspektiv. *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift, 101*(1), 92–116.

Wiig, C. A. (this volume). Tracing policy in practice. Exploring the interactional exercise of oral assessment. In T. S. Prøitz, P. Aasen, & W. Wermke (Eds.), *From education policy to education practice*. Springer.