Chapter 5
Norway: Centralisation and Decentralisation as Twin Reform Strategies

Jorunn Møller and Guri Skedsmo

5.1 The History of the Norwegian Education System

Equity, participation, and welfare state are recognised as the distinguishing features of the Norwegian education model, while social democracy, both as a political movement and as a broader ideology, has also had a crucial impact. There has been a strong ideological tradition in Norway for emphasising the role of educational institutions in the making of civic society. In addition to preparing children to become able employees, the schools should prepare children to play constructive roles in a democratic society. Throughout history, regional policies have been essential in shaping the education system, and decisions at the regional and municipal levels have played a strong role alongside a tradition of national policies (for more facts about the structure of the Norwegian education system, see Appendix.

In the late nineteenth century, Norway was a poor country, and, compared to Sweden and Denmark, it did not have traditional aristocracy and economic elites. A special form of popular resistance constituted by antielitist lay religious movements became important in the nineteenth century. People learned to argue against the rulers and stand up for their beliefs by participating in these movements, and it implied a broad public involvement in both economic and educational developments (Stugu 2001). In these movements the local teachers often became agents of the civic society. They had the cultural and social capital to act on a trans-local level and to mobilise people. The teacher was involved in a variety of activities. She/he managed the local youth club, sport activities, mission society and other charities.

Even though the role of teachers as tenets of civic society declined after the Second World War, the images of activist teachers continued to influence public expectations of teachers, particularly in the rural areas. So, as a basis for understanding the conceptualisation of teaching and school leadership within the education sector, one

J. Møller (✉) • G. Skedsmo
Department of Teacher Education and School Research, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
e-mail: jorunn.moller@ils.uio.no; guri.skedsmo@ils.uio.no

L. Moos (ed.), *Transnational Influences on Values and Practices in Nordic Educational Leadership: Is there a Nordic Model?*, Studies in Educational Leadership 19,
DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-6226-8_5,

has to know that the schools and their teachers played a crucial role in the processes of nation-building and in the shaping of national identities. Also, educational institutions have been, and still are, important for ensuring the vitality of the many small communities in a country where the population is widely dispersed.

Moreover, the development of the comprehensive school system in Norway may be seen in connection with the unique tradition of consensus-seeking politics in education. Both the right- and left-wing parties have sought compromises and agreements in educational reforms. This has its historical roots in the political mobilisation of, and the alliance between, farmers and workers. This has not led to an absence of conflicts, but traditionally there has been a political will in Norway to base decisions in education on consensus. The farmers organised themselves in the Liberal Party, and many took positions in the government. Their political involvement was based on social-liberal values and was also closely linked to the labour movement. The Social Democratic Party was not rooted in radical socialism, and after the Second World War the workers allied themselves with the growing white-collar middle class, and the state played a vital role, due to the expanding public sector.

The period from 1945 to about 1970 is often referred to as the *golden era* of social democracy (Telhaug et al. 2006). The cornerstones of this period were the citizens' equal rights, the responsibility of the state for the welfare of all citizens, and the struggles to narrow the gaps in income between classes and between men and women. This model was, and still is, supported by the labour market model, which includes collective bargaining and developing legislation with cooperation between governments and labour organisations. School access for children from all socioeconomic groups is considered very important. In addition, nurturing a national identity has played an important role in the construction of national curricula. However, the model includes some gaps. For instance, the concept of *nation-building* leads to the exclusion of ethnic minorities. The Sámi people and the Kvens, for example, have historically been excluded (Stugu 2001).

5.1.1 A Short Description of the Education System Today

The Norwegian education system is predominantly public, which means that most schools and universities are run by public authorities. More than 95% of Norwegian students are enrolled in ordinary classes in public schools, and education at all levels is free. The Education Act (1998, amended 2008, sec. 1-1) stipulates:

> Education and training shall be based on fundamental values in Christian and humanist heritage and traditions, such as respect for human dignity and nature, on intellectual freedom, charity, forgiveness, equality and solidarity, values that also appear in different religions and beliefs and are rooted in human rights. […] Education and training shall provide insight into cultural diversity and show respect for the individual's convictions. They are to promote democracy, equality and scientific thinking. […] The pupils and apprentices shall learn to think critically and act ethically and with environmental awareness. They shall have joint responsibility to participate. (Education Act of 1998, amended 2008, sec. 1-1)

The structure of the school system entails 10 years of compulsory primary and lower secondary education and 3 years of optional upper secondary education. Children start attending school at age 6, and 90% of all students stay in school until at least age 18. The educational policy has intended to create both equal and equitable life conditions for all social groups, regardless of social background, gender, ethnicity and geographical location. Findings based on a national representative survey, which included Norwegian headmasters' perceptions of student background and attainment, showed that the headmasters rated 78.1% of their students' socioeconomic backgrounds as medium (middle class) and noted that 69.5% had a supportive home educational environment. Only 9.1% of the students were characterised as having a low socioeconomic background (Møller et al. 2006).

The concept of *equity* in elementary Norwegian education has at least three meanings: The first is equal access to the education system; *fairness* is understood as the education system's ability to distribute financial and economic resources in order to meet the needs of all the users in a way that provides equal opportunities. The second aspect concerns equity at the individual level. This addresses the diversity of students and, therefore, the necessity for individualised treatment in order to meet individual learning abilities (e.g. greater resources for greater needs). The third aspect concerns equity at the group level. For instance, minority language students have the collective right to receive additional language instruction.

Due to recent migration, the student population in Norwegian schools is changing and becoming more multicultural and multilingual. The immigrant population is a heterogeneous group. Norway has had immigration from 208 different nations, and almost half of all immigrants come from Asia, Africa or Latin America. Primary reasons for immigration are work, family reunion or seeking refuge. In primary and lower secondary education, the term *students from language minorities* is used. This term refers to students who, for the short or long term, need personalised instruction in Norwegian in order to participate in regular classes.

The Knowledge Promotion is the latest reform in compulsory education in Norway, and it took effect in August 2006. In the Quality Framework, formulated in connection with this reform, democracy and diversity are important concepts:

> [C]lear value base and a broad understanding are fundamental elements of an inclusive social community and of a learning community where diversity is acknowledged and respected. Such a learning environment encourages cooperation, dialogue and differences in opinion. The pupils shall participate in democratic processes, thus developing their democratic ideals and understanding the importance of active and committed participation in a multicultural society. (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2006, 3)

This underscores that giving equal access to knowledge and education in schools through recognition of differences within the school community is crucial, as is the development and practice of a democratic spirit. Moreover, the policy documents stress that schools ought to reflect the students' cultural backgrounds. While democracy is seen in relation to Christian and humanistic values in the Core Curriculum and the Education Act, the Quality Framework emphasises human rights and the processual side of creating democracy. Since these documents are a basis for the governing of schools, this can be seen as a tension in the policy documents. The content of these

aims is a matter of continuous debate and may be interpreted differently from school to school and again lead to differences in discourses and practices (Johnson et al. 2011).

5.1.2 Centralisation and Decentralisation as Twin Reform Strategies

While central regulation was important in building up the comprehensive education system after the Second World War, decentralisation has been more dominant as a reform strategy in the public sector from the 1980s onwards and has been framed as a quality improvement strategy. At the same time, national curriculum reforms were used as a central strategy. This shows that the relationship between the state, the municipalities and the schools is rather complex. Historically, the national curriculum can be seen as a *contract* between the state and the teachers, which in practice means that the schools are still governed by the state (Gundem 1993). This contract implied a division of labour between curriculum making at the national level and local curriculum work, with regard to planning instruction practices. On the one hand, the teachers were responsible for following up decisions made by the state regarding national aims and the content formulated in the curriculum guidelines. On the other hand, within these national frames, teachers had considerable leeway to develop locally adapted teaching programmes based on their professional judgements (Sivesind 2008).

Some researchers have argued that despite attempts to decentralise tasks as well as the authority of the state, the municipalities' influence on schools has been rather limited (Askheim et al. 1993; Engeland 2000; Karlsen 1993). Others, including Karlsen (1993) and Weiler (1990), have emphasised that centralisation and decentralisation are interdependent processes occurring at the same time. As such, distributing tasks to the local level is often combined with state regulation, and decentralisation even seems to legitimise centralisation. For more information about primary and secondary education in Norway, see Appendix.

5.2 The Framing of School Leadership

Norway has a long history of framing school leadership as *first among equals*. The term has been used to refer to the most senior member of a group of equals (peers). It also indicates that the person so described is technically equal, but is looked upon as an authority of special importance by his peers. This has led not only to a flat hierarchy in schools but also to uniform teacher training, and little or no formal distinction exists among members of the teaching staff. For many years there was no specific training for school headmasters, only sporadic courses offered in in-service education. Therefore, school leadership was interpreted as dependent upon the inherent organisational talent of each individual headmaster. The choice of

candidates for leading positions in the education system was in general adjusted towards formal measurable criteria, such as the number of years in professional service. As a consequence, school headmasters have long regarded their administrative functions mostly as being an exact appliance of the rules and laws that were set down. Many headmasters continued to look upon themselves as teachers with some administrative duties in addition to teaching.

Since the early 1970s national and regional authorities have encouraged in-service training for headmasters. In the period from 1980 to 2000, broad national in-service programmes supported such efforts. During that period the dominant teacher unions strongly contested the need for formal, university-based preparation programmes for school leaders. According to the unions, earlier experience as a teacher was a sufficient and a substantial qualification for a position as headmaster. Furthermore, the unions argued for keeping this as a career path option for teachers. At the start of the new millennium, however, the situation changed completely, and the unions began to argue for formal education programmes in leadership and management. In addition, several universities and colleges began to offer master's programmes incorporating educational leadership (Møller and Ottesen 2011).

This change of view can be related to the role of transnational policy-making agencies and the impact of international assessment systems (e.g. PISA, PIRLS, TIMSS). Over the last decades, educational policy and reforms in the public sector in general have raised expectations of schools, especially concerning the output of the schools, and the headmasters are challenged to respond to these concerns. PISA findings have received huge attention in Norway, because of the relatively low international rankings in reading, science and mathematics seen in relation to the country's high financial investments in education. New national evaluation procedures have been introduced to produce data of the level of student performance. While teachers have long been trusted to do a good job, other stakeholders now want to define educational quality and ask for more external regulation of teachers' work. New strategies for reinventing government by establishing new public management (NPM) both at the central and the municipal levels have emerged. It is argued that introducing new public management has been motivated by concerns about reducing disparities in educational outcomes across different social groups. The strengthening of state responsibility in terms of monitoring is believed to offer an instrument for efficient service production, governed by a performance-oriented culture with a focus on results and efficiency (Olsen 2002). Both arguments are closely connected to the practice of holding schools accountable for outcomes that meet the predefined criteria, and this is why leadership has become a main focus in education policy recently. In 2009, the Norwegian Minister of Education and Research, influenced by the international OECD project Improving School Leadership, launched a national education programme for newly appointed school headmasters. However, the programme is not a mandatory requirement for any leadership qualification. The local municipalities have retained their right to choose among programmes offered by higher education institutions, and they play a key role in providing in-service training for teachers and school leaders (Møller and Ottesen 2011).

Hence, local municipalities and counties may have a strong role in school governance. Leadership responsibility at municipal and county levels is shared between professional administrators and elected politicians. Through this bond education is connected to broader community affairs. Today municipalities are portrayed as the *owners* of the majority of schools; they finance schools and employ teachers. In many municipalities teachers still enjoy considerable trust and autonomy and, in practice, relationships are not very hierarchical (Møller 2009).

The intention of the latest curriculum reform, called Knowledge Promotion and launched in 2006, is to strengthen the power and autonomy of municipalities and provide higher degrees of autonomy with appropriate support for headmasters and teachers. At the same time, there is an increased focus on measurement of achieved outcomes, and the state regulates the national quality assessment system.

5.3 The Use of Evaluation and Performance Data as Improvement Strategy

Until the launch of the second PISA findings in 2003, there was no focus on testing student performance and evaluating outcomes according to indicators of educational quality or standards. Instead, there was a qualification system that was based on the examination system and overall assessment grades. These tools served as a sorting mechanism for further education and working life (Hopmann 2003; Lundgren 1990; Werler and Sivesind 2007).

The introduction of the national quality assessment system, which was introduced in concert with the curriculum reform Knowledge Promotion, can be described as a shift in Norwegian educational policy from input-oriented policy instruments to a more output-oriented policy. This means that the national quality assessment system implies increased central regulation, since it can enable national authorities to retain some kind of control of the output through measuring and evaluating educational outcomes and, thereby, lay down premises for future improvement and development. As such, information provided by the national quality assessment system offers a foundation for policy development, coordination and management.

The way the overall aims of the national evaluation system is formulated, the main intention is to provide information for quality development and improvement at all levels of compulsory education (Skedsmo 2009, 2011). Furthermore, this information is meant to be used in ways that contribute to openness, transparency and dialogue about school practice. The system is, however, still in development, and several critical points have been put forward with respect to the overall system and the functions of individual tools included in the system. First, it has been pointed out that the dominant discourse of the national quality assessment system centres on the use of such information for further development and improvement. At the same time, monitoring aspects are concealed, and little attention is paid to the concrete processes of data gathering, interpretation and construction of meaning in order to come up with actions for improvement (Skedsmo 2009). Moreover, regarding the

stated purposes of the different tools, the system does not clearly differentiate between the needs of the individual student and the needs of the system in order to improve. The focus on comparisons of student performance across schools, municipalities, counties, education systems and country boundaries emphasises benchmarking as an important part of assessments of educational quality. The results of national tests are not discussed in relation to the competency aims in the national curriculum, although this has been an explicit aim since the discussion of the establishment of a national quality assessment system started in the early 1990s (Skedsmo 2009). Furthermore, the current national tests have been criticised for not providing results that can be compared over years.

5.3.1 Aligning Input Governing to Output Measures?

Although formally introduced, the national quality assessment system in Norway is, in many ways, still in the trial phase. With the latest Knowledge Promotion reform, input-oriented methods of governing schools seem to be aligned to the use of tools included in the national quality assessment system. Here the aims of the national curriculum were reformulated into aims of competencies. This reform was, however, also influenced by the results of PISA, TIMSS and PIRLS (Bergersen 2006). As a result of participation in all these international studies, the Knowledge Promotion contains all the important strategic areas, such as developing basic skills in literacy, writing, mathematics and the use of information communication technology (ICT). In addition, the focus on what type of knowledge the students are supposed to obtain has strengthened. The formulation of aims for competencies in the curriculum guidelines is also part of an international movement, according to the European qualification framework (Engelsen and Karseth 2007; Sivesind 2008).

The increased focus on educational outcomes in terms of student performance implies concepts of educational quality that, in form, seem to be defined by expectations about specific outcomes. This also indicates a belief that any divergence between the expected outcomes and the performance level can be identified. As such, performance measurement becomes a key part of the evaluation processes. Along with this development, schools are increasingly being perceived as the unit of measurement, and there is an emerging need to make such actors as headmasters and teachers accountable. Accountability can be seen as an aspect of the evaluation processes (Skedsmo 2009). This is due to the underlying idea that no change or improvement of practice can happen unless central actors are held accountable for the results achieved (Ranson 2003; Strathern 2000). However, compared to the ways in which accountability practices in relation to high-stake testing are implemented in other countries (e.g. England or the US), there is little pressure put on key actors in the Norwegian education context.

The use of test-based tools, however, represents a disruption of the traditional input-oriented education system in Norway, not to mention Norwegian comprehensive education as we know it (Hopmann 2007). On the whole, the results of such

testing are still seen as a limited indicator of the quality of education, which has to be embedded into a wider understanding of school programmes and contexts. After the third round of standardised testing, the role the results play in policy-making and school governance, both nationally and locally, is still developing. How the schools perceive and respond to the new expectations from the municipalities and the state differs. Case studies of schools and municipalities have shown that schools respond by planning and coordinating development projects and reporting on the local level, with nothing really at stake for the municipalities (Elstad 2009; Engeland et al. 2008). The current central government argues against a publication of test results in the media. However, the press has placed the spotlight on the schools that performed badly in the national tests. Based on public sources, each year the press constructs a *league table* of schools. And while national authorities try to prevent this information from reaching the public, some local municipalities do the opposite. Oslo, for instance, publishes school performance on a local web portal (Elstad 2009).

5.4 Future Trends

Recent developments must be viewed in relation to the larger picture, which is influenced by policies and recommendations made by international and transnational bodies such as the OECD, the EU and the UNESCO. These ideas are not just implemented in the national context as such; they are going through a process of adaptation influenced by culture and traditions and locally defined needs (see Ozga and Jones 2006). Although formally introduced, the national quality assessment system in Norway is, in many ways, still in the trial phase. It is uncertain how the different elements included in the system will be used. It is also uncertain how the assessment system, which includes state monitoring elements, will interact with more traditional policy instruments. Increased emphasis on national monitoring of educational outcomes as a part of the process of developing and securing educational quality will probably have consequences for all actors involved: key leaders in the municipalities, headmasters, teachers and students. It has been argued that new expectations are being posed on these different actors and schools are faced with increased accountability pressures (Elstad 2009; Møller 2009; Sivesind 2008). However, what kinds of forms these accountability pressures will take is also yet uncertain.

To sum up, we live in a time of evidence and data, and data may act as a powerful tool in education. It can be used for good or bad. Social media, Wikipedia and WikiLeaks are signs of a time when it is almost impossible to control how data are and will be used (Sahlberg 2011). In Norway, as in many other countries, school headmasters are increasingly experiencing a work environment in which benchmarking and test scores are taking centre stage. Their time is characterised by unpredictability, lots of uncertainty and deregulation, leading to an environment where economic interests or efficiency demands often overshadow collective interests. However, the current climate of managerial accountability does not seem to influence the Norwegian headmasters' work to a large degree. One reason for this

may be that the headmasters, so far, have had the *option* of paying little attention to managerial accountability, because they run no risk by adopting this approach (Møller 2012).

At the same time, it may be equally risky to continue to *let a thousand flowers bloom* or turn to micromanaging everything in detail. In many ways, we are at a turning point in history. Understanding educational change and what is at stake in our public education system seems crucial in developing our democracy (Hargreaves and Shirley 2009). The process of becoming a successful leader involves a constant reinvention of self while responding to external demands of accountability (Blackmore and Sachs 2007) as well as internal expectations. The way school headmasters respond to this shift in demands may be dependent on their capacity for professionalism. It is reasonable to assume that the less preparation headmasters have, the more likely they are to fall back on their lay theories of leadership, which are often informed by a narrow experiential base of prior experience as a teacher. Likewise, how school leaders locate themselves in relation to accountability will reflect both the socially sanctioned dominance of certain ideologies and the subjugation of others. It will be more important than ever to understand the legacies of past injustices and be realistic about the possibilities (Blackmore 2011), and it is important not to lose the aspects of leadership that maintain ethical practices and the capability of sustainable and deep-rooted change.

Appendix

The Norwegian education system is predominantly public, which means that most schools and universities are run by public authorities. Education at all levels is free. In the autumn 2010 there were 2,997 mainstream primary and lower secondary schools and 71 special schools. A total of 614,020 students were enrolled in compulsory education, and 1,881 students were registered in special schools. One hundred sixty schools were private, approved in accordance with the Private Education Act and, thereby, entitled to state funding. The number of private schools increased rapidly during the former conservative coalition government; however, since 2006 the increase has levelled off. Among the 437 upper secondary schools, 83 are private, and the average number of students is 443. Young people who have completed primary and lower secondary school or the equivalent have the right to 3 years of continuous upper secondary education and training.

The number of schools with less than 100 students has decreased during the last 5 years, and the number of schools with more than 300 students has increased. In the autumn 2010 31% of all schools had less than 100 students and 28% had more than 300 students; and in 2010–2011 54% of all students were enrolled in schools with more than 300 students, and less than 7% attended schools with less than 100 students. The same trend can be identified in upper secondary education. During the last 2 years, 58 mainstream compulsory schools and 60 upper secondary schools have been closed. Low enrolment, a poor municipal economy and a desire

to improve resource utilisation are listed as the main reasons why schools have closed. More often, it is a combination of a poor municipal economy and low enrolment (Utdanningsdirektoratet 2011).

Regarding the structure of the Norwegian education system, the National Assembly determines the basic pattern of education by legislating the aims and structure of the education system. The Ministry of Education and Research is in turn responsible for formulating the national educational policy. The main tasks of the National Directorate for Education and Training are to implement the national educational policy, to develop subject curricula and to ensure quality. The overall responsibility for the supervision of schools is delegated to the Regional Educational Offices, and one office is located in each county.

The 430 municipalities in Norway are responsible for the 10 years of compulsory education at the primary and lower secondary school levels. The municipalities vary in size as well as in the level of welfare. About 40% of the national budget goes to the municipalities, who in turn provide public services, comprising compulsory education, healthcare and social services. In educational policy documents published after 2004, the municipalities are defined as *school owners*. Their main responsibilities in the area of education are defined in terms of adapting the national curriculum to local needs, running in-service training for teachers and school leaders and ensuring the quality of schooling. The municipalities are required to establish a system for evaluating and following up on the results of the schools.

Norway has had immigration from 208 different nations, and almost half of all immigrants come from Asia, Africa or Latin America. There are 500,000 immigrants and 100,000 Norwegian-born persons with immigrant parents living in Norway. Together these two groups represent 12.2% of Norway's population. Oslo has the largest proportion at 28% of the population. Two in ten immigrants have lived in Norway for more than 20 years, and four in ten have lived here for 4 years or less (Statistics Norway 2011).

In primary and lower secondary education, the term *students from language minorities* is used to describe these immigrant populations. This term excludes the indigenous population of Norway, the Sámi and national minorities such as the Arctic Finns (an older West Finnish immigrant group) and the Roma. For the Sámi there is an adapted Sámi curriculum, and both the Sámi and the Arctic Finns have the right to tuition in the Sámi language or in Finnish. The Roma people have no such rights.

References

Askheim, O. P., Fauske, H., & Lesjø, J. H. (1993). Kommunen som aktør i utviklingen av skolen [The local authority as an agent in school development]. *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift, 77*(2), 83–96.

Bergersen, H. O. (2006). *Kampen om kunnskapsskolen* [The battle of the 'knowledge school']. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Blackmore, J. (2011). Lost in translation? Emotional intelligence, affective economies, leadership and organizational change. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 43*(3), 207–225.

Blackmore, J., & Sachs, J. (2007). *Performing and reforming leaders. Gender, educational restructuring, and organizational change*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Education Act. (1998). *Act relating to primary and secondary education (with amendments)*. http://www.regjeringen.no/en/doc/Laws/Acts/education-act.html?id=213315. Retrieved September 26, 2011.

Elstad, E. (2009). Schools which are named, shamed and blamed by the media: School accountability in Norway. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21*(2), 173–189.

Engeland, Ø. (2000). *Skolen i kommunalt eie – politisk styrt eller profesjonell ledet skoleutvikling?* [The municipality as 'school owners' – Political governing or professional guided school improvement]. Ph.D. thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Oslo.

Engeland, Ø., Langfeldt, G., & Roald, K. (2008). Kommunalt handlingsrom: Hvordan forholder norske kommuner seg til ansvarsstyring i skolen? [Autonomy and responsibility at muncipal level: How do Norwegian local authorities frame school accountability in practice?]. In G. Langfeldt, E. Elstad, & S. Hopmann (Eds.), *Ansvarlighet i skolen. Politiske spørsmål og pedagogiske svar* [Accountability in schools. Political issues and educational answers] (pp. 178–203). Fagernes: Cappelen Akademisk Forlag.

Engelsen, B. U., & Karseth, B. (2007). Læreplan for Kunnskapsløftet – et endret kunnskapssyn? [The knowledge promotion – A changed view on knowledge?]. *Norsk pedagogisk tidsskrift, 91*(5), 404–415.

Gundem, B. B. (1993). Rise, development and changing conceptions of curriculum administration and curriculum guidelines in Norway: The national-local dilemma. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 25*(3), 251–266.

Hargreaves, A., & Shirley, D. (2009). *The fourth way. The inspiring future for educational change*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.

Hopmann, S. (2003). On the evaluation of curriculum reforms. In P. Haug & T. A. Schwandt (Eds.), *Evaluating educational reforms. Scandinavian perspectives* (pp. 111–132). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Hopmann, S. (2007). Epilogue: No child, no school, no state left behind. Comparative research in the age of accountability. In S. T. Hopmann, G. Brinek, & M. Retzl (Eds.), *PISA according to PISA. Does PISA keep what it promises?* (pp. 363–415). Münster: LIT Verlag.

Johnson, L., Møller, J., Pashiardis, P., Vedøy, G., & Savvides, V. (2011). Culturally responsive practices. In R. Ylimaki & S. Jacobson (Eds.), *US and cross-national policies, practices, and preparation. Implications for successful instructional leadership, organizational learning, and culturally responsive practices* (pp. 75–101). New York: Springer.

Karlsen, G. E. (1993). *Desentralisert skoleutvikling. En utdanningspolitisk studie av norsk grunnskole med vekt på 70- og 80-tallet* [Decentralized school development. A study on the Norwegian compulsory schools in the 1979s and 1980s]. Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal.

Lundgren, U. P. (1990). Educational policy-making, decentralisation and evaluation. In M. Granheim, M. Kogan, & U. P. Lundgren (Eds.), *Evaluation as policymaking. Introducing evaluation into a national decentralised educational system* (pp. 23–41). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Møller, J. (2009). School leadership in an age of accountability: Tensions between managerial and professional accountability. *Journal of Educational Change, 10*(2), 37–46.

Møller, J. (2012). The construction of a public face as a school principal. *Journal of Educational Management, 26*(5), 452–460.

Møller, J., & Ottesen, E. (2011). Building leadership capacity: The Norwegian approach. In T. Townsend & J. MacBeath (Eds.), *International handbook of leadership for learning* (pp. 619–635). London: Springer.

Møller, J., Sivesind, K., Skedsmo, G., & Aas, M. (2006). *Skolelederundersøkelsen 2005. Om arbeidsforhold, evalueringspraksis og ledelse i skolen* [A survey of school principals 2005. Work conditions, practices of evaluation and leadership]. Acta Didactica, no. 1. Institutt for lærerutdanning og skoleutvikling, University of Oslo.

Olsen, J. P. (2002). *Towards a European administrative space?* (ARENA Working Papers WP 02/26). University of Oslo, ARENA Centre for European Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences.

Ozga, J., & Jones, R. (2006). Travelling and embedded policy: The case of knowledge transfer. *Journal of Education Policy, 21*(1), 1–17.

Ranson, S. (2003). Public accountability in the age of Neo-liberal governance. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(5), 459–480.

Sahlberg, P. (2011). The fourth way of Finland. *Journal of Educational Change, 12*(2), 173–185.

Sivesind, K. (2008). *Reformulating reform. Curriculum history revisited*. Thesis for the Doctor Philos grade, Faculty of Education, University of Oslo.

Skedsmo, G. (2009). *School governing in transition? Perspectives, purposes and perceptions of evaluation policy*. Ph.D. thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Oslo.

Skedsmo, G. (2011). Formulation and realisation of evaluation policy: Inconsistencies and problematic issues. *Journal of Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 23*(1), 5–20.

Statistics Norway. (2011). *Immigration and immigrants*. http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/00/00/10/innvandring_en/. Retrieved January 30, 2012

Strathern, M. (2000). The Tyranny of transparency. *British Educational Research Journal, 26*(3), 309–321.

Stugu, O. S. (2001). Educational ideals and nation building in Norway 1840–1900. In S. Ahonen & J. Rantala (Eds.), *Nordic lights: Education for nation and civic society in the Nordic countries, 1850–2000* (pp. 107–123). Helsinki: Studia Fennica, Historica 1.

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.

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2006). *The quality framework*. http://www.udir.no/Upload/larerplaner/Fastsatte_lareplaner_for_Kunnskapsloeftet/5/prinsipper_lk06_Eng.pdf?epslanguage=no. Retrieved February 22, 2010

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2011). *The education mirror: Analysis of primary and secondary education and training in Norway*. http://www.udir.no/Tilstand/Utdanningsspeilet/Education-Mirror/The-Education-Mirror-2011/. Retrieved January 30, 2012

Weiler, H. N. (1990). Decentralisation in educational governance. In M. Granheim, M. Kogan, & U. P. Lundgren (Eds.), *Evaluation as policymaking* (pp. 42–65). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Werler, T., & Sivesind, K. (2007). Norway. In H. Döbert, W. Hörner, B. von Kopp, & W. Mitter (Eds.), *The education system of Europe* (pp. 573–589). Dordrecht: Kluwer.