

Ingvild Digranes

Den Kulturelle Skulesekken

Narratives and Myths of Educational
Practice in DKS Projects within the
Subject Art and Crafts

P R A C T I C E

© Ingvild Digranes, 2009

ISSN 1502-217x
ISBN 978-82-547-0222-2

CON-TEXT
Avhandling nr. 38

Akademisk doktorgrads-
avhandling avgitt ved
Arkitektur- og
designhøgskolen i Oslo

UTGIVER:
Arkitektur- og designhøgskolen i Oslo (AHO)
Pb. 6768 St. Olavs plass
NO - 0130 Oslo
Telefon: +47 22 99 70 00
www.aho.no

BILDE OMSLAG:
Ola Erik Blæsterdalen

TRYKK:
Unipub AS, Oslo 2009

DESIGN AV BASISMAL:
BMR

Materialet er verna etter åndsverklova. Utan uttrykkeleg samtykke er eksemplarframstilling, som utskrift og anna kopiering, berre tillat dersom det har heimel i lov (kopiering til privat bruk, sitat o.l.) eller etter avtale med kopinor (www.kopinor.no).

Bruk i strid med lov eller avtale kan føre til erstatnings- og straffeansvar.

Acknowledgements

Throughout my period as a doctoral student several people have been indispensable in my process of articulating questions and thoughts into the final result. These people have through different approaches given me a chance to develop my own perspectives further. They have forced me to reconsider and reflect thoroughly on some of my preconceptions through discussions on theory, or by sharing knowledge built through years of educational practice.

First of all, I have to thank my supervisor Liv Merete Nielsen for the support. She has presented me with opportunities to challenge myself, and my research. She has been present as a positive force from the first word written in the proposal. I also have to thank Halina Dunin-Woyseth for the welcome I received at the Doctoral program at AHO. She was a willing listener and knowledgeable advisor throughout the doctoral education, and has also contributed with comments and support in the final phase of the thesis.

Professor Emeritus Brent Wilson from Penn State University has been generous with his time, and in addition to periodically functioning as a supervisor he made my period as a Visiting Scholar at Penn State University possible. Professor Marjory Wilson has provided me with valuable advice and corrections on the English language. I am grateful for their friendship, and all their support and hard work.

Dr. Monika Hestad and doctoral candidate Laila Belinda Fauske from my doctoral cohort have from the beginning of the doctoral education been important confidants and discussion partners. Laila B. Fauske has in addition provided valuable insights from day to day, while Monika Hestad has contributed comments and insights in the final stages of the text. Karen Brønne from Høgskolen i Volda has also been part of some of these discussions. The final result is in part due to having these knowledgeable women challenge me.

I also have to thank the Oslo University College for the chance to complete my doctoral education. They have provided me with funding, a stable working environment, and been supportive throughout my PhD-period.

In addition, I have to thank Agnar Olsen and Ola Erik Blæsterdalen. Ola Erik for the use of his photograph for my front page, and Agnar for uncountable cups of coffee and conversations. The support and laughter we have shared, kept me level throughout.

Last, but not least, I have to thank my family. I will always be grateful to my parents. They have for as long as I can remember encouraged me to ask questions, read, and be critical. With their long service as Classroom teachers and Headmasters, they have been important discussion partners. My sister Elin, my brother in law Nabil, and my lovely niece Yasmin have always been a great support.

“Thank you!”

Ingvild Digranes

*Til bestefar Øystein Frivik
(1915-1996)*

Summary

Den kulturelle skulesekken (DKS) is a program aiming to bring professional artists into schools. One of the areas is Visual art that corresponds to the subject Art and Crafts (A&C). Thus, the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ and artists and A&C teachers are brought together in an educational context where the different values and perspectives they bring to the collaboration are visible in narratives of justification of professional practice. These narratives exist at all levels in the DKS program, told by teachers and artists in the practice, but also exist at document level, in evaluations performed, official documents and in media coverage. The questions addressed in this thesis are:

What narratives of professional choices and justifications by teachers of Art & Crafts and artists within DKS collaborations are communicated to the public?

How and why can these narratives affect the collaborations and the professional jurisdiction in the Art & Crafts school subject and the DKS program?

The DKS program has set the stage for an interesting polarisation of interests. If the strongest arguments — predominantly those that are based in the constructed media stereotypes and myths— are accepted in place of the evaluation results, it would herald changes for the DKS program, but also for the A&C teachers and their jurisdiction of the A&C subject.

The media narratives, and the subsequent construction of stereotypes and myths reveal quite fundamental differences in how the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ view children, relevant content, quality and education, and also the positioning of the DKS program in relation to the school context. This has in turn influenced the professional boundaries within DKS, and the media stereotypes introduced to the public have contributed in substantiating a claim of ownership.

The future of the program, in terms of collaborative efforts rather than *myth* based work-division within the program, is discussed as an option, and questions of content and quality within an educational context and subject-matter learning aims are addressed.

Content

Acknowledgements	<i>i</i>
Summary	<i>iii</i>
Introduction	1
Laudable Intentions	2
The Structure of the Thesis	5
Researching DKS	7
DKS - Formal Organisation	7
Parallel Programmes Abroad	9
DKS — Meeting Ground or Battle Ground	10
An Insider and Outsider View of Educational Practice	11
Strategy	15
Sociology of Critique	15
Critique — From Inclusion to Exclusivity and Back Again?	16
Fact and Fairy — Research Positions in the Social Sciences	17
Actor Initiated Critique	19
Critique as Politics	21
Questions on Ontology	23
Practice and Conflict	23
The Case in Question	25
The Choice of Narrative Inquiry	26
Snap-shots of a Field of Practice	29
Gathering Narratives — Questions and Focus	30
Finding Documentation	34
Finding Narratives in the Case of DKS	36
First Source of Documentation: Regulations and Official Documents	37
Second Source of Documentation: Media Texts	37
Third Source of Documentation: Evaluations of DKS	38
Fourth Source of Documentation: Studies of Professional Practice	39
Generalisability and Ambiguity	43
Remarks on Selection of Documentation and Ethics	46

<i>The ‘School World’ and ‘Art World’</i>	48
Didactics or Didaktik	48
Subject-matter Didaktik	50
The ‘School World’ — Governing Thoughts	51
A Short History	52
The ‘Art World’ — Governing Thoughts	56
The Normative Approach — The ‘Charismatic Artist’	56
The Analytical Approach — The ‘Art World’ Institution	58
The Norwegian Art Scene	59
Knowledge & Charismatic Art	62
Two Views in Art and Design Education	66
<i>Agreement and Discord</i>	68
Teachers and Artists as Professionals	68
Professionalism as Ideology	69
Professionalism as Value Structures	69
The Work Practice as a Vital Factor	70
On Justification	72
Symbolic and Social Boundaries	73
The Common Good	74
A Higher Motive	76
The Common Worlds	78
Identifiers	79
The Higher Common Principle	80
The Six Worlds	81
Where Should We Look for Justification?	84
<i>The DKS Narratives</i>	87
Ambiguous Situations and Justification	88
Aims for the Program	89
Identifying Narratives	90
Media Narratives	91
From Justification to Stereotyping?	104
The Media Narrative of the Artist in DKS — the Hero	104
The Media Narrative of the A&C Teacher in DKS — the Obstacle	105
Media Stereotypes & Evaluation Results	105
The Boring A&C Teacher?	106
The Useful and Creative	107
Content and Learning	108
Collaboration and Knowledge Gain	109
Opposing Narratives?	112
Evaluation Narrative—the Balancing Act	114
Fusion and Confusion	115

<i>Shifting Boundaries</i>	117
Jurisdictional Boundaries	117
Bump Events	118
DKS and Jurisdiction	120
Changes in Central Tasks	120
The Outside Advisor	122
The Antagonist	123
DKS — A Bump Event?	131
The Professionals in DKS	132
Balancing or Falling Down?	135
<i>Establishing a Myth?</i>	139
Becoming a Professional	139
Becoming an Art and Crafts Teacher	139
Becoming an Artist	141
The Professional A&C Teacher and the Professional Artist in DKS	141
The Generic Teacher	142
The Singular Artist	143
Professionals in the 2007 DKS Documents	144
Work Division	145
Responsibility for Quality Control	147
Gullsekken	149
Jury Statements	150
Selected DKS project	152
<i>The Myth Exposed</i>	156
The Road Ahead	157
The Question of Quality and Content	158
The Question of Participating Artists and Quality	159
The Question of the Absence of the Critical Teacher and Quality	160
<i>Bibliography</i>	162

Introduction

In 1995, the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Education, Research and Church Affairs released a plan of action for aesthetical subjects and culture in compulsory education (Kulturdepartementet and KUF (Kirke- utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet) 1995). This outlined collaboration between the two ministries and professional fields was aimed towards the 1997 curriculum, L'97 (KUF 1996). The compulsory school subject Art and Crafts (A&C) was given the status as an area of further development (Vestøl 1996) in the new national curriculum. In addition, several local school pilot projects of different nature, involving culture institutions and artists in collaboration with schools, were launched throughout these years.¹ The first pilot projects were funded in 2001, and already 10 of the districts had development projects, while the 9 others were establishing plans, pilot projects and local development in relation to collaboration between what I have chosen to refer to as the 'school world' (Eisner 1998) and the 'art world' (Dickie 1984). I will return to a fuller description of these worlds at a later stage. The results were evaluated locally, but as a consequence of these local projects, resources were made available to develop a program that could be established nationwide.

In 2002, the Odelsting² ruled to change the law concerning state distributed lottery funds, to make the funding for Den Kulturelle Skulesekken³ (DKS) permanent. With financing from lottery funds, DKS was established with the approval of the Storting.⁴

” ... from the start of 2003 and onward, lottery money will be made specifically available for professional art education for children in compulsory school, and to develop an extended

¹ Some examples of this are: *Kulturnista* in Møre og Romsdal launched in 1998, *Skolepakka* in Hedmark launched in 1991, *Kulturformidling i Oppland* launched in 1999, *Sandeffjordmodellen* in Vestfold launched in 1997, *Kjøp en kunstner* in Østfold etc.

² The largest of the two divisions of the Norwegian Parliament.

³ The official English translation of Den Kulturelle Skulesekken is: “The Cultural Rucksack”. I choose to use the Norwegian name, as the English translation does not cover the meaning that the Norwegian name, in my view, is trying to project. The English word ‘Rucksack’ does not carry the images the Norwegian word exudes.

⁴ The Norwegian Parliament.

collaboration between schools and culture through DKS”
(KKD (Kultur- og kyrkjedepartementet) 2003:9).⁵

DKS is as such a permanent funding program aiming to bring professional artists into schools to collaborate with teachers, and by doing so, to strengthen the general education from 1st to 10th grade (6-16 years) within the arts. Visual arts, and the subject A&C is one of the areas within DKS. Artists and A&C teachers are given the opportunity to develop projects within the subject content. Thus the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ are brought together within one frame with a set of goals to fulfil.

LAUDABLE INTENTIONS

A question that intrigues me in light of this is if, in introducing a program that aims to bring together two very different worlds, the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’, have the challenges arising in such an extensive endeavour been recognised or ignored? One of the concerns voiced when the program was launched in 2003 was that the consequence of introducing a whole new professional field into the school subject had not been thoroughly thought through. A researcher in the field succinctly described the problem; “There are unexplored differences between pedagogs’ and artists’ arguments and perspectives” (Selmer-Olsen 2003:3).⁶ The evaluations from the schools’ point of view and from the artists’ point of view, and the media debate after the program was initiated show that this is an issue. A further concern was that if this question of opposing agendas were not addressed, the result would deviate from the intentions.

“Without a revised arsenal of knowledge and discussions of points of departure, a major art and culture distribution effort is launched in general education, Den kulturelle skolesekken (DKS). It is worrying that the need for projects and action precedes reflection, because it is in danger of ending up in traditionalism without aim and reason” (Selmer-Olsen 2003:3).⁷

An important aspect of DKS, in light of these possible opposing agendas, and an area in need of research is the collaboration between teachers and artists,

⁵ I will throughout this thesis provide the original Norwegian quotes in notes. This will be marked as Original Quote (OQ): “... frå og med 2003 og i åra framover vil det bli øyremerkte spelemidlar til profesjonell kulturformidling til born i grunnskulen og eit utvida samarbeid mellom skule og kultur gjennom Den Kulturelle Skulesekken”.

⁶ OQ: “Det finnes utforskede motsetninger mellom pedagogenes og kunstneres begrunnelser og perspektiv”.

⁷ OQ: “Uten et revidert kunnskapsarsenal og grunnsynsdiskusjoner har man satt i gang et stort kunst- og kulturformidlingstiltak knyttet til grunnskolen, *Den kulturelle skolesekken* (DKS). Det er bekymringsfullt at tiltaks- og aktivitetsbehovet går foran refleksjonen, fordi man da står i fare for ende opp i en tradisjonalisme uten mål og mening”.

schools and culture institutions and the difference in perspective they might bring to the table. The boundaries between the professions are activated in the arguments and choices that are made regarding the execution of work.

The collaboration is within the formal Norwegian documents concerning the program described as a case of equality between the professionals involved.

“To reach the aim, that children in compulsory school will get a cultural rucksack with a content of high quality, the school and the culture side must collaborate purposefully and effectively on all organisational levels. Open and good lines of connection and a constructive dialogue across sector borders will be decisive for success” (KKD 2003a:18).⁸

It is explicitly stated that DKS has to be conducted within the knowledge aims of the existing curriculum. The subject-matter aims and the core curriculum set the content frames for the program. As a result of this, the teachers and local schools are requested to conduct the “process of ordering”, i.e. be the party to define the subject-matter content they find relevant to the curriculum execution at the schools and as such want brought into the subjects through the collaboration with other professionals. It is stated that one of the main goals for DKS is to; “... contribute to develop a holistic inclusion of artistic and cultural expressions in the realisation of the schools’ curriculum aims” (KKD 2003a:17),⁹ and from this thought it follows that: “The schools’ competency of ordering must be improved, and the culture sector must be made capable of developing activities and proposals adapted to the needs of the school sector” (KKD 2003a:18).¹⁰

The ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ are in the official documents described as equally important for the success of the program. Within these points it can be argued that the ‘school world’ and ‘art world’ are supposed to work together in planning and execution (Digranes 2005). The teachers know their educational practice (Hargreaves 1996; 2000; Kvernbekk 2001) and the artists know their art practice (Aslaksen 1997; Bjørkås 1996; Mangset 2004). However, the different expectations, knowledge frames, and work values that guide the professional practice, will decide how they understand the goals and how to reach these. The ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ operate with different expectations of what is valuable in their own professional practice, even as they are requested to collaborate: “As Den kulturelle skulesekken is a

⁸ OQ: “For å nå målsetjingane om at born i grunnskulen skal få ein kulturell skulesekk med eit innhald av høg kvalitet, må skulesida og kultursida samarbeide målretta og effektivt på alle forvaltningsnivå. Opne og gode sambandslinjer og ein konstruktiv dialog på tvers av sektorgrenser vil vere avgjerande for å lukkast”.

⁹ OQ: “... medverke til å utvikle ei heilskapleg innlemming av kunstnarlege og kulturelle uttrykk i realiseringa av skulen sine læringsmål”.

¹⁰ OQ: “Skulen si tingingskompetanse må betrast, og kultursektoren må setjast i stand til å utvikle aktivitetar og tilbod som er tilpassa behov i skulsektoren”.

collaboration project between culture and school, including the school side in the planning is emphasised” (KKD 2003a:11).¹¹ Thus it becomes vital to discuss these ‘worlds’ and what transpires in the school anchored projects.

The questions posed regarding point of departure and perspectives when the DKS program was introduced has not diminished in importance as the program now is extended to cover the upper secondary education (16-18 years). It was launched at the start of the school year 2008/2009 (KKD 2007). Some districts already had trial programs under way, and a research report from the research centre Telemarkforskning¹² is impending regarding the execution and success of the expansion. I therefore find it relevant to ask what the challenges are that might surface within such collaborations. I have chosen to do so through the questions:

What narratives of professional choices and justifications by Teachers of Art & Crafts and Artists within DKS collaborations are communicated to the public?

How and why can these narratives affect the collaborations and the professional jurisdiction in the Art & Crafts school subject and the DKS program?

I will return to the concepts of *justification*, *narratives* and *professional jurisdiction* more comprehensively at later stages.

The questions posed are an avenue towards finding how the professional artists and professional A&C teachers are represented to the outside public through texts in the media. It will be a way to study how A&C teachers and their knowledge within the field in terms of quality, knowledge and competence is presented in concert or contrast with the artists within the DKS program. This distribution of depictions of professional artists and teachers, concerning the execution of DKS, of the A&C subject, and the practice of the A&C teacher to the public, will be reflected upon and discussed in relation to findings in the evaluations of the DKS practice, to see whether the media narratives and evaluation narratives of A&C teachers are concurrent. The focus is also on how the distribution of media narratives of professional practice and justifications might influence the future of the educational field, the A&C teacher, and the DKS program.

¹¹ OQ: “Sidan Den kulturelle skulesekken er eit samarbeidsprosjekt mellom kultur og skule, er det lagt vekt på å inkludere skulesida i planlegginga”.

¹² *Evaluering av forsøk med Den kulturelle skulesekken i videregående skole* □ Telemarkforskning-Bø, End report will be presented in August 2009: http://www.denkulturelleskulesekken.no/websider/ressurser/utredninger_forskningsrapporter.htm

THE STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

In this section I will briefly outline the contents of the different chapters.¹³

In the next chapter *Researching DKS* I will go on to describe more fully the funding and organisational aspects of the program Den Kulturelle Skulesekken (DKS). I do this to establish an understanding of the basis for the case in question. The ‘matters of concern’ within the execution of the professional practice and jurisdiction of the program will be a result of these frames. I reflect on the outsider and insider perspective I inhabit as a professional teacher of A&C, as well as researcher on the professional practice of A&C teachers.

The chapter *Strategy* is a discussion on my positioning within the Sociology of Critique theory base. This position calls for the qualified actor that can be seen to own his choices through his activated criticism in a situation, in this case the professional choices within Visual art in DKS projects. It also calls for the reflexive researcher that is aware of critique as a political project. The link from the theory base to my choice of narrative inquiry as a tool towards letting the actors through evaluations and the media declare their position regarding DKS practice is made and deliberated upon.

In the chapter *Finding Documentation* narrative sources are chosen. A theory of curriculum levels is used to organise the sources I have chosen to include in the study. The different levels presented, from the ideological to the operational is based on reflections regarding educational practice, and I find it relevant to consider in selecting sources in the case of DKS as well. The different sources are listed and described thoroughly, with a short reflection on selection and ethics at the end.

The Scandinavian subject-matter didaktik approach to educational research is discussed in relation to Anglo-Saxon concepts in the chapter *The School World and the Art World*. I present a short history of the A&C subject in Norway, and the Norwegian Art scene along with a reflection on how both traditions are visible in the school subject A&C today.

The professions are more thoroughly introduced through theories on professional practice and jurisdiction in the chapter *Agreement and Discord*. I also introduce the theory on justification of value systems. This theory is a tool towards discovering the views of what is good and desirable in the two worlds, and how this is presented in narratives of professional practice in

¹³ I have, as previously seen, chosen throughout the thesis to include the original Norwegian quotes in footnotes. To have continuous numbering of these throughout the text is as such not convenient. I will therefore restart the footnotes from 1 for each chapter.

DKS. Through the narratives on justification of choices, the professionals declare their set of values in regards to the program execution.

In the chapter *The DKS Narratives* the sources are analysed, and the value sets behind the professional justification is brought out. Several media narratives of professional practice is identified and named. These are then discussed in regard to the evaluations, where the professional justifications the A&C teachers present for their choices creates another narrative.

This leads to the discussion of what the consequences of the opposing narratives can have for jurisdictional boundaries within DKS in the chapter named *Shifting Boundaries*. The acceptance of certain narratives in the media by the public is discussed in regards to jurisdictional bump events and positioning for ownership of the DKS execution.

I will in the chapter *Establishing a Myth?* identify bump signs in the newer official documents regarding professional practice in DKS, and in regards to a national prize for the program, and how these can be seen to reflect a shift in professional jurisdiction within the program. I comment on consequences that might follow if the media narratives are accepted as legitimate, both in regards to the DKS program and the A&C school subject

In the end chapter *The Myth Exposed* I look toward the future development of DKS in terms of summing up the findings and commenting on new areas of research.

Researching DKS

The aims for and the formal organisation of DKS show how the two worlds, the ‘art world’ and ‘school world’ are both represented within this endeavour. As a basis for the problem area I have included a section describing the program organisation.

DKS - FORMAL ORGANISATION

The DKS program offers schools — from 1st to 10th grade (age 6-16) — collaboration projects between professional arts teachers and artists within the areas:

- Music
- Visual arts
- Theatre, Literature and library
- Museums, cultural heritage and science centres
- Film

DKS is not a mandatory program, but an offer to schools. The Norwegian program is similar to *Creative partnerships — Artists in schools* in the UK, *Artists-in-Residence* (AiR) in the US, and to an extent to the Swedish approach *Kultur i skolan*. As a program, DKS; “... has as its foremost goal to give children in compulsory school a cultural capital and cultural competence that will make them better suited to deal with the challenges of society” (KKD 2003a:9).¹⁴ It is aimed at working towards giving children in schools access to art of professional quality. It is an effort to facilitate the access to, experience with and positive relations to art and culture in all its forms. At the same time it is supposed to help develop a holistic inclusion of artistic and cultural expressions in the realisation of the schools learning aims.

In this thesis I will not cover all the areas in the DKS program, but focus on the area of *Visual art* within the program. Visual art covers *Fine art*, *Crafts*, *Architecture*, and *Design*, and correspond to the school subject *Art & Crafts* (*A&C*). Thus, as the Visual arts part is comprised of Fine art, Crafts,

¹⁴ OQ: “... har som sitt fremste mål å gje born i grunnskulen ein kulturell kapital og ein kulturell kompetanse som vil gjere dei betre i stand til å møte utfordringane i samfunnet”.

Architecture and Design, artists within the area Visual arts in DKS, will in addition to practitioners of fine art, include designers, craftsmen, and architects.¹⁵ Whenever I refer to artists in this thesis, it will also include designers and architects, although these are not as frequently represented as fine artists and craftsmen.

Organisationalwise, the responsibility for the execution of DKS at national level is placed within the Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs (MCCA), and the Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training — located within the Ministry of Education and Research (MER) — as a joint venture. A Board group is set down to author requirements and suggestions concerning the running of and intentions of the program. The Board group was initially supposed to draw upon the knowledge of and suggestions from a Reference group. The group consisted of representatives from the two 'worlds' — from the 'school world', and the 'art world'. However, this group was not evenly matched and consisted of 11 representatives from the 'art world' and just 3 from the 'school world' (Borgen and Brandt 2006). Of these three, two were headmasters and one a district director of education. As a consequence, no classroom teachers, subject-matter teachers or parents were represented. The reference group is now dissolved.

The Board group forwards suggestions to the departments. The funding is administered by the MCCA, thus excluding the educational sector — the Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training and MER — in the funding process at state level. The money is distributed as letters of finance to the regions and municipalities at local and regional level, and directly to several national organisations/actors within the 'art world'. Since the introduction of lottery funds in 2003, the amount has steadily increased (KKD 2007).

Tabell 1.1 (mill. kroner)

Fordeling av spelemidler til Den kulturelle skulesekken 2003-2007¹⁶

2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	
60	120	160	161	167	(KKD 2007)

The local and regional funding equals 80% of the total amount. These are distributed through the regional administration. One third of this is used to buy production/projects from professional artists or art production. One third is given to the municipalities and the remaining one third is distributed

¹⁵ Even as the DKS program opens up for collaborations with professional architects, after reviewing the DKS pages from the different districts <http://www.denkulturelleskulesekken.no/index.php?id=regionaltoglokalt> it seem as though these projects are few and far between. The architecture related projects seldom include architects. Designers are more involved in the DKS program, as are craft oriented professionals, but the most significant participant group are artists within the fine art traditions.

¹⁶ Distribution of funds given in NOK millions according to year.

however the region sees fit. The remaining 20% of the lottery money goes to the national art institutions. The responsibility for managing the money and organise the DKS program locally is left to fylkeskommunane — the regions (Kristiansen 2007). How they organise the program locally will differ from region to region. It is not mandatory to use the services offered. The municipalities can choose to use the DKS program or not, and the schools can decide to be independent. Some schools consciously choose to stay outside the programs i.e. develop their own strategies regarding culture in the education outside DKS, but will then receive no funding (Kristiansen 2007).

To handle the daily running of the DKS-program, there has been appointed a *Secretariat*. This administrative body is placed within *Statens senter for arkiv, bibliotek og museum* (ABM) — the State organisation for archive, library, and museum. They handle the reports and plans presented from the regions. This organisation has other primary tasks than managing the DKS-program — among them working for the betterment of their area of expertise, namely archive, library, and museum (Borgen and Brandt 2006). They will in this setting be referred to just as ABM Secretariat.¹⁷ There is no formal demand for any evaluation at local or regional level, however, several networks have been established at regional level to discuss and evaluate the results, to learn from each other. There are no set guidelines for how to report or evaluate the quality of the program, just the activities executed. This is sent from every region to the ABM Secretariat. As it is not mandatory to evaluate, this is dependent on regional or municipal initiative, and is not systematic. The organisation and routines for funding might seem confusing, as there are several levels that are involved in both. I will not enter into a more comprehensive description of organisational aspects. This has been done thoroughly in other studies (Borgen and Brandt 2006; Kristiansen 2007). I will focus on the collaborative aspects when artists and A&C teachers inhabit the same professional situation, and how the professional choices and justifications are initiated and are communicated to the public outside the program through narratives of the professional practice.

Parallel Programmes Abroad

Den Kulturelle Skulesekken is not the only programme of its kind. It has been claimed by artists and politicians (Skjelbred 2007) that it is a unique, and local, Norwegian phenomenon. However, in the US, the Artist-in-Residence program is highly similar to DKS both in organisation, administration and practice. It has existed in some form since the 60s, and has been formalised since the early 80s. Evaluations have been performed

¹⁷ The administration of the DKS program will be restructured, but as this process is still under hand at the present time I cannot address the changes.

(Bumgarner 1993). In Sweden Kultur i skolan (KiS) has similarities to the Norwegian DKS program, and studies and writings have been undertaken (Thavenius 2004; Thavenius and Aulin-Gråhamn 2003; Thavenius and Persson 2004). Creative partnerships — Artists in schools have been established in the UK (Orfali 2004).¹⁸ I have chosen to comment on the fact that these programs exist, to point out that the challenges facing the Norwegian endeavour are not only uniquely Norwegian. In light of the questions raised in the evaluations in these programs in terms of collaboration between the art world and the school world, some challenges can be seen to be more widespread. There are recognisably some questions in common to discuss, even though some parts will be local through the fact that the regulations and curricula that constitutes the subjects differ from country to country.

DKS — Meeting Ground or Battle Ground

The DKS program is, through its goals, located within the schools learning aims, as well as the core curriculum's epistemological orientation (KKD 2003a). The context in which the program operates is education, as stated earlier more specifically 1st to 10th grade compulsory school in Norway. It is stated in the National curriculum of 2006, *Kunnskapsløftet* (the Knowledge promotion), that;

“The subject Art and Crafts has an important position in developing general cultural education. It also prepares pupils for a number of further education, trades and occupations. Aesthetic competence is a source of development, on several levels from personal growth, to influence on personal surroundings, to creative innovations in a larger social perspective” (KD and Udir (Kunnskapsdepartementet and Utdanningsdirektoratet) 2006)

It can be argued that general education is the single largest culture institution in the country, as it is the one institution that everyone has to attend regularly. No matter one's background or location, the National curriculum provides a common knowledge base and recognition for traditions, culture and social values.

The execution of DKS requires actors from state to local school level. When the program was established it was decided that both the culture sector and the school sector should share the responsibility. “The relations between the school- art- and culture-sector within DKS, turns out to be variegated and

¹⁸ I have repeatedly tried to contact the program to gain information regarding any local evaluations. There has been no reply to these requests.

tension filled. The program's Achilles heel is the divided responsibility" (Borgen and Brandt 2006:9).¹⁹ These two sectors represent different values, and collaboration will prompt the 'school world' and 'art world' to display their values. As long as the explicitly stated mandate is to strengthen the education within the subject A&C, not to replace it or exist outside of it (KKD 2007; Skjelbred 2007), and the funding is located within the culture sector, while the practice is located within the school institution, it sometimes makes for an uneasy alliance. This is where some of the challenges lie. How do the field of art, the educational aims that exist as a given on a general level for schools, and subject-matter specific for the school subject A&C manage to coexist within the practice of DKS?

This dilemma exists at all levels of the collaboration, also with professions operating in the same space. The DKS project is a good case to explore the school subject in terms of professional struggle pertaining to content, quality and further development, and on the inclusion of art and design in a school that is increasingly knowledge focused. It will also unveil opposing claims of ownership within the DKS program over said knowledge and content choices. These claims of ownership, made both publicly and at institutional level will influence the work practice, and be of importance in the discussion not only of the execution of DKS, but of the recognition of the professional teacher.

An Insider and Outsider View of Educational Practice

As the DKS program in Visual art brings together professionals from two different worlds - the 'school world' and the 'art world', they bring their preconceptions and professional views into the work setting, and rationalize their choices from these. As a double practitioner in this, I am both an A&C teacher and an A&C education researcher. However, if I in my research am not constantly aware of this, it can also be a bias that influences the results (Larsson 2005). This forces me to consider my own role and preconceptions carefully before advancing any further with the study.

In terms of Art and design didaktik research — I will return to the concept didaktik fully later — to step away from the practice, and the pedagogical theory to assume a wider framework to accommodate all these parts can be valuable. It can be argued that it might not be entirely possible to free myself from the values and views gained from the professional field I was trained in, and placing myself within a qualitative research tradition focusing on 'matters of concern' rather than 'matters of fact' (Latour 2004), the

¹⁹ OQ: "Forholdet mellom skole- og kunst- og kultursektorene i Den kulturelle skolesekken viser seg å være mangfoldig men spenningsfylt. Ordningens akilleshæl er det delte ansvaret".

assumption that the world is seen through preconceptions is already present. However, to ensure quality in the research, being open about the bias is a way to let the reader critically reflect on some of the choices I have made (Larsson 2005).

Entering into this research, I come with my own preconceptions and traditions as a trained Classroom teacher with a Hovudfag i Forming — Master degree in Art and Design Education. I received my Classroom teacher training at the Bergen University College from 1995-98. Preceding this I studied at the University of Bergen, the mandatory preparatory courses in research methods, philosophy and theory of the sciences as well as a year of sociology. When I entered the teacher training, the education was influenced by the change in the national curriculum and the effect on the knowledge base and pedagogical approach. I was educated both within the curriculum of 1987 (KUD (Kyrkje- og undervisningsdepartementet) 1987) and the curriculum of 1997 (KUF 1996). In A&C education this can in short be said to represent a change from a stronger focus on the romantic child-centred view, towards a more knowledge and qualification influenced view of the subject (Digranes 2006b). At the same time I was able to see the parallel subject Design and Technology in the UK up close, through a three month Erasmus exchange stay at the Design and Technology teacher training at the University of Greenwich. This again was another tradition entirely, with more of a focus on the technical aspects, where fine art was placed in a subject and teacher training called Art and Design. I worked as a teacher from 4th to 7th grade in compulsory school after finishing my Classroom teacher degree. The experiences within the subject A&C, and my wish to develop it further induced me to attend the Master of Art and design education at the Oslo University College, where I later became a doctoral candidate, following the Doctoral program at the Oslo School of Architecture and Design. The doctoral education gave me the opportunity, through a four months stay in the US as an Invited Visiting Scholar at Penn State University at the Art Education program, to work within the American tradition of Art Education.

The respect for all these approaches that I have developed through my own training, teaching practice but also scholarly education has become my base both as an educator, and as a researcher within A&C education. As an A&C educator researching the professional practice, this epistemological base will be a part of what I bring to the study (Molander and Terum 2008). This is in short a respect for the child-centred view, but only combined with subject specific knowledge for qualification, and the *making* aspect of technical prowess. The combination of the existential; — the personal growth and development, and the functional; — the professional and subject specific

knowledge and work practice (Kvernbekk 2001) exist in constant play within my professional practice. I recognise that my view on what constitutes a successful collaboration, satisfying results in educational projects, and quality in A&C education is coloured by my preconceptions as a trained A&C teacher. I have throughout the work in this study consciously taken my own position into consideration, and been as honest as possible in my approach to the findings.

In research concerning professional practice, being trained in the profession that I study gives me an opportunity to use the professional knowledge and experience gained in training and work — the insider perspective (Molander and Terum 2008). Art and design education research is in the process of developing into a making discipline (Dunin-Woyseth and Nielsen 2003). The subject A&C is very much a subject focused on choices of action — the making of things. The making disciplines have as their common denominator the concept making — addressing the shaping of a broad spectrum of artefacts and the educations related to this. The making disciplines sample from several other traditions and disciplines that again hold several points of departure in the disciplinary framework (Dunin-Woyseth and Michl 2001). Research conducted in the making disciplines can be placed within natural sciences, social sciences and the humanities. The avenues of practice are many, as the theorising of the practice should reflect. The making disciplines have a dual entry to research, through theory or through the practice. I find myself considering my research from a making professional point of view as well as from a making discipline point of view. To have an inside perspective on the making profession can enrich the discipline in more than one capacity (Dunin-Woyseth and Nielsen 2003). The making disciplines do have this to offer — the capacity to act both as a researcher and reflect as a practitioner (Schön 1995). It is in that case important to be aware of my role as a researcher, and clarify my background. Doing this can enable me to step back for an outsider perspective on the ongoing professional practice (Molander and Terum 2008).

Research into ‘matters of concern’, rather than ‘matter of fact’ (Latour 2004), opens for the new approach to questions within research on professions suggested by Nolin (2008). He advocated a research on professions that instead of analysing at a distance to categorise professions or professional practice, actively participate in changing the professional practice that has a potential for increased quality for the betterment of society. Research within the education of professionals as well as by education professionals can be a way to offer tools for change, not only mapping problems of power, monopoly or diversity within the professions, but through being involved in a critique of the practice (Nolin 2008). Research can in this light be seen as a

way to alleviate the ‘matters of concern’ and change the practice and the role of the professions in society. The insider and outsider perspectives have forced me to consider whether I have executed any moral judgements in terms of categories or findings. However, in light of this new direction of professional research, I find instead that to discuss the professional practice within DKS in relation to the program context and stated aims invites a normative approach in terms of suggested changes and ethical concerns for a better professional, situated practice within A&C and Visual art projects in DKS.

End Comment

There are complicated collaboration and organisational factors guiding the DKS program. The inclusion of two professions in the same work practice will bring challenges in terms of different perspectives regarding the program in terms of aims and content. My own perspective is another factor that needs consideration on the research level, as it can be both enriching and limiting in regards to how preconceptions and bias developed throughout my own professional practice will be present as a factor throughout the case.

Strategy

This chapter will discuss my theoretical positioning, and how this resulted in the choice of narrative inquiry as a methodological approach. I will also outline the choices made concerning the case in my research. The focus of this study will be DKS collaborations, expressed aims, expectations and values connected to the factors governing the practice within the DKS case, as communicated through evaluations, and the media as narratives to the public. The DKS program was introduced as a national endeavour without any demand for ensuing evaluations or funds for research. This seems to suggest that to introduce an outside profession into an already established professional field, and to distribute funds exclusively to one side of this collaboration, in this case the outside profession, is unproblematic. I attempt to illuminate the problematic aspects of including two different worlds in a program without exploring in advance the avenues that might lead to conflict or success. I focus on the practicing professional — not on the isolated practice as such, but on the motivations and values guiding the professional choices from both the ‘school world’ and the ‘art world’. I also focus on how they choose to communicate the other world through portrayals that can function as a contrast.

I will start by outlining my orientation within the Sociology of Critique. I have chosen this position, because it calls for the qualified actor that through activated criticism in a situation can be seen to own the choices. The narratives of and in the practice of DKS that are presented in later chapters are introduced by critical professionals aware of their own power and limitations, both in the media and in the evaluations.

SOCIOLOGY OF CRITIQUE

In Latour’s words (2005), the Sociology of Critique is not to be confused with either pragmatic or critical sociology. The Sociology of Critique as such does not focus solely on describing the acclaimed moral reasons of the actors, or ascribing the reasons, but includes the larger structures and lets the actor criticise both the situation and their part in it. Foucault (Foucault 1984) claims that critique is the ‘child’ of Enlightenment. As such, the Sociology of

Critique can be seen as a new road towards the old goal, the goal to unravel the secrets of here and now and why we do what we do. “The critique is, in a sense, the handbook of reason that has grown up in the Enlightenment; and conversely, the Enlightenment is the age of critique” (Foucault 1984:38).

Critique — From Inclusion to Exclusivity and Back Again?

In his writings on critique, Foucault (1984) addresses Kant’s separation between public and private — where the public is the scene for activating critique. Critique in its desired form is, in this point of view, seen as a form of pure reasoning — an objective way of regarding the public system that would allow for an illumination of its workings. In light of the present understanding of public and private, his application seems antipodal from how the concepts now are usually applied. The private sphere is seen as analogous to being a part of society as a worker, or to have a function in the community — a positive to that which is the established. The public sphere, on the other hand, is when the actor reflects on what is and what should be — a critique of what is established. To retreat from the position in society and take a critical stance towards it — reflection in its pure form — free from the responsibility in the private sphere (Foucault 1984).

This can be seen as a contrast to how these concepts now are given a more inward and individual orientation. This narcissistic orientation can also be recognised in the education sector in Norway (Skarpenes 2004). The private has seemingly become the right to say and mean whatever you want to in the situations, while the public sphere is often seen as the scene for claiming your right from society. This orientation is criticised as a limiting approach to the understanding of democracy. It is focused on the individual’s rights — instead of the orientation towards a social democratic focus on both the individual’s rights within and obligations to a wider community (Nielsen and Digranes 2007a; 2007b). However, the goals have changed, so maybe enlightenment is somehow to be conceived differently now? The Norwegian national A&C curriculum has changed the orientation to once again focus on the individual in the local and universal community as a critical user and a responsible consumer. The social democratic orientation can be seen to re-enter the educational scene. Critique has once again been placed as a critical stance towards societal development in a general — not in a uniquely personal perspective (Nielsen and Digranes 2007a). The A&C subject is focused on the education of qualified actors, who can comment on sustainability in a local and global perspective, and is given the means and the opportunity to criticise.

Fact and Fairy — Research Positions in the Social Sciences

Latour calls for this re-entering of the qualified and critical actor in research that concerns human behaviour, as well as in other areas of actions. The French tradition of critical sociology has, according to Latour (2004; 2005) removed itself from the actors that are being criticised by giving all the power of criticism to the researchers. He describes and calls into question two main traditions in research — and sociology in particular — that he labels *realism* that has taken root in the social sciences. He calls them the *fairy position* and the *fact position* (2004). The *fairy position* is used to show people their naïve beliefs in fetishes — the researcher can show the actors what they believe in is just their own transference of faith (influenced by society, power, domination, etc) to an object, and as such the researcher is the only one who can save them from their misguided beliefs. The *fact position* comes from those treating actions as results of underlying forces. They see every action as bound by power relations such as i.e. gender, class, or race. Again the only enlightenment lies in the social scientist's ability to see it and tell the actors what motivates them.

The critical point is not whether the researcher claims to recognise the presence of either false beliefs or power relations, but rather that the researcher holds the total and absolute power over the research subjects. In both cases, according to Latour, critique is always advantageous for the researcher. As he is the only one seeing to the truth of the matter, how can he be wrong? The result of this is, unfortunately, an alienation of the public. They resist seeing themselves as powerless objects in a machine or puppets led by puppet masters they have never seen. Also, Latour says of this type of critique:

“The mistake would be to believe that we too have given a social explanation of scientific facts. No, even though it is true that at first we tried, like good critics trained in the good schools, to use the armaments handed to us by our betters and elders to crack open — one of their favourite expressions, meaning to destroy — religion, power, discourse, hegemony. But, fortunately (yes, fortunately!), one after the other, we witnessed that the black boxes of science remained closed and that it was rather the tools that lay in the dust of our workshop, disjointed and broken. Put simply, critique was useless against objects of some solidity” (Latour 2004:242).

He argued in his earlier works for “opening the black box” — to see what was going on in the construction of truths and phenomena. There would be an

unveiling of the processes by the scientist's ability to debunk. In later texts (Latour 2004; 2005), he changes his stance and claims that the critique needed now is not one of debunking or deconstruction. These roads lead to nothingness. Deconstruction can lead to nothingness because it is a way to tear down and annihilate the 'construct' and 'fetishism', and in the end it only serves the researcher. There is a need to focus on 'scenes' where the binding force is questioning and criticism, the events that can be studied, and that will lead the actors to activate justification of choices (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006), which in turn will reveal our point of departure for critique and questions.

In DKS the inclusion of two worlds within one professional practice is a situation where criticism is actively communicated in an effort to establish the 'ownership' of the area. It is not a deconstruction of a phenomenon, but rather a situation of inclusion and of assembling. It is an arena where actors gather and are regarded as critical participants. Even as the professionals involved are capable of communicating their views and values to the public, the researcher is still needed to give references to something more than the situation, as another blind spot might be discovered in the more absolute version of an Interpretive/Constructivist approach (Groat and Wang 2002). This perspective in its pure pragmatic form, though interesting, is restricting in its focus on individual interaction as the only basis for meaning. It does not allow for anything beyond the situation, and meaning exists only as situated meaning. Everything is constructed within that situation, and nothing new can be brought to the interpretation by the researcher. The challenge regarding the DKS program is to locate the narratives that are created by the criticism that is activated. Professionals justify their choices and practice, and substantiate their claims through criticism.

Bourdieu's theories have played an important part in Art Education research in commenting on cultural legitimacy and judgements of taste and status. However, I find that they can to some extent be read as an example of the *fact* position. I am aware that the Nordic context is quite different from the French context. However, I still choose to comment on some of the issues I see. Even as he provides several useful concepts, such as *illusio*, *doxa*, *habitus* and types of *capital* (Bourdieu 1995; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1995), the impression left is one of predetermination. As people are born into different classes, they have very little say in the matter of capital that they 'inherit' — or rather are given access to and, as such, come to possess knowledge of. Moving between the classes — to be given access to know other types of capital or values is seen as quite difficult to manage. If you do, you tend to overcompensate by insisting on a strict approach to what constitutes *cultural capital* (Bourdieu 1995). Bourdieu tries through his concept of cultural

capital to discuss different values concerning the quality of art, but at the same time he professes quite clearly that there is one ‘taste’ that is the legitimate, while all the others fall within kitsch and bad taste. He provides a judgement on quality that says that even though people put value in different traits, only some traits should be considered worthy of being prized by all — even if, in practice, they are not. Some classes will be unable to as they lack the currency. This is a stance of exclusion towards most people, as he claims that only a few are located within the *habitus* of high cultural capital and as such insight into what is good or worthwhile. The data presented can also be seen as far removed from the actors’ arguments, as they are referred to solely as statistics and diagrams. Comments on the actors’ choices on the basis of what they themselves see to be valuable in their own cultural scene, or *cultural habitus*, is left out. Would they agree with the researcher that they have poor taste, or that the choices they make are in bad taste or in opposition to what is good or useful, on the basis that they themselves don’t adhere to another group’s view of what is good or worthwhile?

The Norwegian perspective on who dictates legitimate good taste also seems to differ from the premises set by Bourdieu. The point of view that the cultural elite dictates the conception of good or bad taste, and uses it to create boundaries towards those of lower capital is questioned in a Norwegian research project. The results show that instead of elite culture as a medium to make class boundaries, a surprising upside down motion is present compared to Bourdieu’s theories. The movement mainly goes from the workingman, upwards to the middle class (Berg 2007; Skarpenes 2007). The common man’s popular culture dominates the supposedly elite groups legitimate taste. The social democratic views of equality also saturate the intellectual realm in a way that discourages criticism of tastes that differ from your own. To make quality judgements concerning your neighbour’s taste is what is seen as bad behaviour (Berg 2007; Skarpenes 2007). This becomes interesting in regards to the ‘art world’ within the educational realm as well. The social democratic based school system of inclusion of all tastes is asked to co-exist with the ‘art world’ where the genius is a measure for quality.

Actor Initiated Critique

The attitude of questioning the *fact* and *fairy position* is discussed, though not in the same words, by the sociologists Boltanski and Thévenot. They highlight that: “In order to accomplish a successful exploration, we have to follow the arguments and criticism of the actors, instead of doubling them with our own operations of calling into question” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:218). This does not exclude analysing the situation from the outside, or exclude, as Nolin (2008) calls for, pointing to areas of potential professional

change. It simply states that critique is useful if activated by the actors in the situation, not as something forced upon the situation as an afterthought. It is suggested that to dig for power relations everywhere can be limiting if that is the only perspective — actors are conscious of their choices and will give their opinion through their criticism. Latour and Law represent the Actor Network Theory (ANT) approach to research (Law 1992).²⁰ANT in its pure form will not be undertaken here, but the points concerning actor involvement are still of great importance and seen as valuable.

In addition to accepting that there are different ‘tastes’ or ‘quality judgements’ represented as power structures or underlying motives of groups, The Sociology of Critique has taken into consideration the pragmatic sociological stance that focuses on the actor. This makes for an interesting combination of actors and views on what is valuable and good. The actors give the criticism — the narratives — that the researcher then can theorize, and, in this theorizing, no value set is seen to be more legitimate than the others. It is recognised that choices considered good, useful or within ‘good taste’ in one value set will be considered differently if the value set and actors call for another interpretation. “Es war dementsprechend nötig, eine *kritische Soziologie*, die gegenüber den Werten, die die Akteure für sich in Anspruch nehmen, indifferent war, durch eine *Soziologie der Kritik* zu ersetzen” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2001:460). Power relations and mechanisms will manifest themselves through and in these opinions given in and of situations. To look solely for what the outside agent, the researcher, sees as hidden agendas and power struggles is problematic in the sense that the actor is deprived of any form of credibility (Latour 2005). He does not know any of the forces governing him, and will not know if not told. Boltanski and Thévenot oppose the actor-removed approach this offers, but also question the relativism represented in the fact that every actor represents a position and understanding separate from all others.

“It is, for that matter, a mistake to interpret the disquiet provoked within actors by the recognition of a diversity of evaluation principles as a validation of the reduction of interest to which the social sciences proceed, or the nihilist conception of the world that is often associated with this.” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:218).

It is not productive to believe in individual references to such a degree that all is fragmented. The middle ground lies in recognising that even though there is not one ‘great narrative’ of justification and value judgements, neither is

²⁰ Actor Network Theory in the form requested by Latour – thick descriptions of all relations, objects and actions – requires an enormous amount of data, and that the researcher can follow the case over a considerable length of time. This is not possible, or even desired in this study.

there one solution per human being as such. To argue for one's position demands that the argument is voiced through commonalities and differences — which presupposes a common understanding of a point of view, a generality separate from the person as such. It presupposes a reference to something outside of the person and immediate situation (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006).

In DKS the artists refer to their professional value sets, while the professional A&C teacher will refer to theirs. The actors will relate to something outside the situation, an idea apart from the current practice. The writings within the Sociology of Critique display a very clear pattern towards letting the actor be the spokesman for his own position. This is what will tell us of their point of departure, and it will be a something recognised by others because of its general access. “To criticize or to justify, the persons have to extract themselves from the immediate action and *rise to a level of generality*” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:213). What the actors present as arguments in their lived experiences, and in relation to DKS — their professional practice — is seen as the vital part. However, this view also calls for the consideration that ‘matters of concern’ are situated within a context that offers frames for discussions and the following suggested change (Nolin 2008).

Critique as Politics

There can be a danger in letting a theoretical position engulf every aspect of thinking. Critique is now present in all levels in society, and is also clearly present in the Norwegian National Curriculum (KD and Udir 2006). According to Latour the case with critique today is that critique now has become politics (Latour 2004; 2005). Critique and politics are at first glance two different undertakings, but now they both have political ramifications. Even ‘objective’ critique, will have political ramifications.²¹ However, what is different in these approaches is the purpose of the critique. Kant wanted critique to be a proof of the moral being — the belief that all people develop a sense of the ‘common good’. Foucault regards Enlightenment as the age of critique, in the fact that the sciences have adopted the critical stance to be of some use (Foucault 2000; Rabinow and Foucault 1984). On the other hand Latour fears that critique has become solely politics, where in pursuit of an agenda, claims or research that are disadvantageous to a cause can be critiqued regardless of the truth of the matter (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005; Latour 2004; 2005). As Erasmus Montanus succeeded in convincing his

²¹ All research is in view of this political. Even as the claim for objectivity is made for the form and content, the end result is that the research becomes a political statement, either through the validation, refutation or ignoring of results.

mother *Mor Nille er en sten!*,²² critique can be a tool for political positioning. For instance this can be seen in research in Art Education in the USA, where the Art agencies and organisations fund and present advocacy research that promotes their own work. This research informally has been dubbed *Advosearch* to highlight that it is problematic (I:Gee).²³ It can also be seen in some cases in the Norwegian culture sector where the MCCA has met critical voices for their treatment of disadvantageous research (Jenssen 2007; Stavrum 2006), also in relation to the DKS program.

Artistic critique that — in the view of Baudelaire and Kant — used to be the way to oppose the agenda setting economical and industrial interests, is now used in political agendas to further and justify the choices that oppose what it had previously tried to do (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005). The new *capitalistic argumentation* has incorporated the rhetoric of *enlightenment, freedom, and humanism*:

“... I wonder whether we may not envisage modernity rather as an attitude than as a period of history. And by “attitude,” I mean a mode of relating to contemporary reality; a voluntary choice made by certain people; in the end, a way of thinking and feeling; a way, too, of acting and behaving that at one and the same time marks a relation of belonging and presents itself as a task. A bit, no doubt, like what the Greeks called an *ethos*” (Foucault 1984:38).

In light of this, knowledge cannot be seen as absolute or finite — truth is in its own way historic. At the same time development and work is not disorganised — it is labelled by generality, systematicity, homogeneity and has stakes to it (Foucault 1984). I find it interesting to see how Foucault conceives of the concept of homogeneity: He claims that there exists a homogeneous domain of references — or worlds (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000) — which is not subconscious or self promoting, but present in how people perform their work. This then implies that actions in the professional practice are conscious choices on the level with voiced justification. Ambiguous situations in your practice will be justified not only through verbal reasoning, but also through the choosing of certain actions. It lets the actor show his argumentation not just through words, but also through his interaction with thing-beings as well as other human-beings (Latour 2005). Generalizations, as well as knowledge, are situated, and it is possible to be

²² In Holberg’s play Erasmus Montanus, the main character persuades his mother that she is a stone by claiming to use deduction as a method to activate his justification; Mother Nille is a stone. A stone cannot fly. Mother Nille cannot fly. Mother Nille is a stone! Critique is activated to persuade towards a goal. It is not necessarily what is there, but what is claimed to be there.

²³ This interview is included in the Sources of Documentation described in the chapter Finding Documentation.

both aware of this, and objective in the sense that you are preoccupied with the objects that make up this situatedness. Objectivism in this sense is unrelated to positivism (Latour 2005). Generality comes through how we deliberate on questions in a certain historical frame — past and present factors in how we relate to objects, rules and ourselves. “The homogeneity of these historico-critical analysis is thus ensured by this realm of practices, with their technological side and their strategic side” (Foucault 1984:48). Professional practice as action then becomes a narrative process on its own.

Questions on Ontology

There are some questions that can be addressed through an indefinite variation of research topics, the collaboration within DKS being one of them. Systematicity comes from the questions asked. These questions address the critical ontology of our selves (Foucault 1984). This ontology: “... has to be conceived as an attitude, an ethos, a philosophical life in which the critique of what we are is at one and the same time the historical analysis of the limits that are imposed on us and an experiment with the possibility of going beyond them” (Foucault 1984:50). In a way this can in school context be seen as the subject-matter consequence of the philosophy presented by the curriculum, subject traditions, or alternative value sets that are brought into the education. The ontology of the practice, what is, and what we would like to have happen in the future hinges on this. The subjects, as such, “... have their theoretical coherence in the definition of the historically unique forms in which the generalities of our relations to things, to others, to ourselves, have been problematized” (Foucault 1984:50). These questions are what the research within Art and Design didaktik focuses on. I will clarify the didaktik concept later. The Sociology of Critique, as such, is, in my view, a useful tool in working with specifically school situated professional practice in a subject-matter perspective.

PRACTICE AND CONFLICT

The purposes of the actors are expressed through value sets that guide choices and arguments. The vital factor in the approach chosen in this study, as opposed to, for example, a critical stance or an emancipatory stance, is that the actors’ own communicated criticism of the situation are the sources I will be using (Bénatouil 1999; Boltanski 1984; Boltanski and Chiapello 2001; Boltanski and Thévenot 1999; 2000; Thévenot 1984). Their expressed justification and values will be utilized, instead of explaining through underlying power structures or hidden agendas. That is not to say that these do not exist or will be commented on, especially in concern to the media’s choice of narrative focus, but the main focus is on the communicated

narratives. The actors give their own reasoning and motives, through their explanation of their purpose in their choices in both media, evaluations and studies of professional practice.

Depending on the nature of the question asked several qualitative strategies could be pursued. Surveys and archival analysis are mainly concerned with questions of how many and who, what, and where (Yin 2003). Experiments, history, and case study on the other hand are more interested in how or why. To choose from these three choices, other characteristics become conclusive. Experiments happen as controlled events, and if the plan is to study DKS as it unfolds, this is not an option. History studies past events, and as such will not be appropriate if the intention is to study how or why something is unfolding at present time (Yin 2003). The case study on the other hand, will offer the chance to watch how and why in present time, in depth and with the actors directly included through interview and observation in some of the sources included. A case study can be used as the basis for both a deductive process and an inductive process — testing an already existing idea or engendering a new idea. One of the strengths in doing a case study is that it is a strategy more than a set of methods for gathering data. “As a form of research, case study is defined by interest in individual cases, not by the methods of inquiry used” (Stake 2000:86). A case study does not necessarily require observation or other more ‘hands on’ methods in the case being studied, as according to Yin: “You could even do a valid and high quality case study without leaving the library and the telephone or Internet, depending on the topic being studied” (Yin 2003:11).

From what Yin and Stake argue, the following claim might then be made: if you manage to identify the case, the methodology will follow as a result of your focus, not of the fact that it is a case study as such, but what you would like to study about that specific case and in light of what theory. As such, the *DKS case* can be approached in several ways, but the discussions and questions will govern the choices of sources and methods of gathering these. “... the case study’s unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence — documents, artefacts, interviews, and observations — beyond what might be available in a conventional historical study” (Yin 2003:8). A case study gives the frame of context, when your question deals with how and why in the present, and allows for a deeper understanding of a specific area. In the case of narratives of A&C teachers’ professional practice, the *DKS case* as the frame of context provided signifies that I have a defined area where I can gather information through both written and spoken sources, from public and official channels. The *DKS case* provides a way to limit the data pool, and at the same time to enrich it through the introduction of the artists as a way to reflect the teachers’ qualities.

According to Yin, it is common to use case study as a strategy while dealing with public supported programs like DKS, to see whether the program performs as expected, or if discrepancies occur to create questions regarding the running of the program. The study of narratives of professional practice in DKS represents such possible discrepancies, and will demand several avenues of sources. As the case study opens for the possibility of in depth collection of multiple sources within a set focus (Østerud 1998) it is possible and desirable to do so to ensure the quality of the study, more so in a program involving two parties. The choice of how to analyse the gathered sources have, in extension, been made on the basis of the theoretical foundation.

The Case in Question

There are several avenues to follow towards answering the questions posed in this research, and I have identified DKS as a *case* where my study will be performed (Stake 2000). Even as the national DKS program is the larger case that provides the setting I have narrowed my focus to include only the program part named *Visual arts*. This choice was made on the basis of how the Visual arts in DKS correspond to the subject A&C in school, and the fact that the subject-matter didaktik in my research does not cover music, dance, drama or literature. It is a subject specific to A&C. Within these boundaries professionals from the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ are expected to work together. The introduction of a new set of professionals into the school institution constitutes a break from the normal school practice — whether the result can be said to be a success or a failure. It is not an every-day-occurrence and as it takes place the professional justification will be activated by the actors to ensure the result they see as the best for the goals they work towards. A case study will offer me the chance to watch how and why something unfolds in present time, uncontrolled and as thoroughly documented as possible (Yin 2003). It gives the frame to my questions.

When actors within the DKS program meet, there is a break from the normal work practice for both sides of the collaboration. The ‘art world’— artists or artist organisation — bring their artistic practice to the school context, while the ‘school world’ — teachers and school administration relinquish some of the educational responsibility to the artist. The collaboration has the potential to experience moments of disharmony and accusation, where the actors from the two professions encounter a problem. This experience could be treated uniquely at the language level. However, the semiotic perspective and focus on solely language and concept understanding has been subject to some study (Alvesson 1996; Cooke and Kothari 2001; Rehal 2004). What I find is omitted in this approach is a focus also on the content of, the objective of, and the professional choices of the practice happening rather than a singular

focus on its form (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999). Semiotics can be limiting when it comes to studying a practice. Semiotics deconstruct, while practice is very much a process of adding together, and a theory concerning a professional practice will profit from an approach that takes this into consideration (Abbott 1988).

THE CHOICE OF NARRATIVE INQUIRY

When choosing my theory base within the Sociology of Critique, I choose to utilise a strategy corresponding to the theory base to execute my research. Bénatouïl (1999) claims that: "... we hope to show that epistemology may have practical and empirical uses when it studies sociological paradigms as research strategies rather than as general and abstract theories..." (Bénatouïl 1999:379). The consequence of this thought would be to place the research within a specific theoretical framework, and let the theory offer not only an epistemological — philosophical — framework but also a more practical strategy to follow. The theory base I have chosen, both within the Sociology of Critique, and the main theory of *professional* jurisdiction (Abbott 1988), uses and recommends a narrative approach to the research topic presented in the DKS case. The theories will, in the process of gathering evidence, give guidance in relation to the evidence requested by the research question, toward the end goal of illuminating the case. "Case study is not a methodological choice, but a choice of object to be studied. We choose to study the case. We could study it in many ways!" (Stake 2000:86). What is the best strategy to follow to get the questions answered? The theoretical approach I have chosen is through the theories of *jurisdiction* and *symbolic boundaries* (Abbott 1988; 1995), *justification* and *worlds* (Boltanski and Chiapello 2001; Boltanski and Thévenot 1999; 2000; 2006), which I will discuss thoroughly in a later chapter. Boltanski and Thévenot use narratives to develop their polity theory model of how actors justify their choices in situations that break from the normal, where 'worlds' come into conflict. The narratives providing the worlds with their value sets take the form of well-known literary works within the theory of political philosophy, but are still deemed narratives in the sense that they describe situations and tell stories to illustrate. Boltanski and Thévenot used narratives to develop their polity theory, so I find narrative inquiry to be an equally valuable tool in discussions regarding the DKS case: "... we organize our experience and our memory of human happenings mainly in the form of narrative — stories, excuses, myths, reasons for doing and not doing, and so on" (Bruner 1991:4).

When professionals in the *making professions* make their practice choices, not all of them are articulated through language. Some choices are articulated through visual representations, and some through actions concerning the

productions of these, the selection of and presentation of products to the public. Along with the articulated argumentations, this tells a powerful narrative of what the actors understand to be important and hold valuable. In searching for the proper method to gather the information needed for mapping: *orders of worth, values, justification* — these concepts will be explicated in later chapters — and as such the *professional expectations and aims* of the teachers and artists involved in this study, I decided to consult the theory base.

I have chosen to do narrative research as a strategy to gather data, rather than as a theoretical perspective. Narratives (Geelan 2003) tend to have at their core situations of conflict, unrest or a break from the norm — i.e. the meeting of two worlds within DKS projects, the two professions meeting within one professional activity. Narratives are moral, tell of values and priorities, in light of how they strive to not only describe, but to justify the actions performed by the narrator. “For our task now is to sample the text, the narratives to see not what they are *about* but how the narrators *construct* themselves” (Bruner 2004:702). Narrative research rises from the assumption that people tell stories to organise their lives.²⁴ Organisational narrative inquiry can be used to gather tales of specific situations in a shorter timeframe. In the case of DKS, and the collaboration between professionals, a focus on narratives as a way to study organisational aspects will in my view prove fruitful for my questions. I have as such been able to “... decide on special foci of content or themes that you want to follow...” (Lieblich, Tuval-Mashiach, and Zilber 1998:63). In a way narratives are not only told, but also constructed. They are not given as a running dialogue when a conflict or situation is happening. It is always told afterwards, and as such it is bound to be self-edited, or in the case of the media enhanced by secondary narrators. Not only are narratives intriguing in the fact that they give the actors in the situations an outlet to express their views, they open for the possibility to consider that the professionals construct for public consumption narratives to justify their presence and choices in the practice in DKS. “Because the approach gives prominence to human agency and imagination, it is well suited of subjectivity and identity” (Riessman 1993:5). The actors are allowed to voice their choices, and the actor-initiated critique and justification can be accessed to identify the values the actors utilise to persuade.

²⁴ The phrase ‘giving voice to’ is often used in relation to narrative inquiry. It exists in the critical stance, but also has value within the pragmatic research – though more often in connection to psychology rather than the organisational angle. I have chosen not to adopt that particular phrase in my writing however, as it is a phrase used in the ‘art world’ as well – and not necessarily in the same sense as in narrative inquiry. As a result I will avoid it altogether, as I choose instead to talk of tales or narratives.

There are of course several other factors inducing me to choose this specific road. To highlight semiotics, or rhetoric structures in the communication within the collaboration could be a possibility, but: “Neither the dialectic, as logic of contradictions, nor semiotics, as the structure of communication, can account for the intrinsic intelligibility of conflicts” (Foucault 1984:56). The need to find a way to get to the professional reflections in conflicts where A&C teachers and artists are involved induces me to use narratives as a way to freeze a dynamic situation to get to the decisive factors in the situation.

“When a particular story is recorded and transcribed, we get a “text” that is like a single, frozen, still photography of the dynamically changing identity. We read the story as a text, and interpret it as a static product, as if it reflects *the* “inner”, existing identity, which is, in fact, constantly in flux” (Lieblich et al. 1998:8).

Even as the justifications and professional boundaries are constant challenges, there is a need to freeze some of the argumentation at a specific moment in time to locate the values that come into play. This way, the dynamic process of the professional project can be studied through snapshots of the practice.

Narrative research can be a tool for uncovering mini-narratives that are restricted to cases within an area of the actor’s activity, i.e. professional choices in a collaboration with representatives from other professions (Czarniawska 1998) and how they are communicated (Clandinin and Connelly 1996). The narratives are limited and focused, and might take the form of something other than worded accounts. “The narrative inquiry may note stories but more often record actions, doings, and happenings, all of which are narrative expressions” (Clandinin and Connelly 2000:79). This method of data gathering opens up for a snapshot of reality, *the ambiguous situation, transitory situation, the moment of conflict* (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999; 2000; 2006) frozen in time, and the narratives constructed of these moments can, in my view, depict the point of view and critical capacity of the subjects. It can be a valuable source of documentation in the manner advocated by Boltanski and Thévenot (1999; 2000). They claim that through arguments and placing critique where there is a value rupture in the interaction, the actors tell of their own values and chosen position. “We know or discover ourselves, and reveal ourselves to others, by the stories we tell” (Lieblich et al. 1998:7).

Narrative inquiry used as a tool in analysing organisations and networks are focused on the situations that change the course of action in a limited timeframe or organisational setting. The narrative inquiry that has its roots in

psychology, and is concerned with the individual focus of identity construction focus on more complete life stories where all the situations of unrest or conflict are interesting (Bruner 1991; 2004; Hatch and Wiesniewski 1995; Poirier and Ayres 1997). The life stories gathered in this tradition are the complete histories of individuals, with no time frame or specific topic or problem highlighted. I do not place myself within this tradition, as I am concerned with a specific case, with a frame of context and a timeframe. This tradition has however, developed some tools that have been introduced into more case-specific organisational studies that I choose to partake in here. Organisational narrative inquiry selects the smaller narratives of conflict for a certain case, here the DKS Visual art program, or theme in the actions that take place within the studied organisational boundaries (Czarniawska 1998; 2004; Elliott 2005; Geelan 2003; Lieblich et al. 1998; McVee 2004; Rhodes and Brown 2005; Riessman 1993). As I am studying the situation's impact on the case, and not a single actor's identity construction, I place myself within organisational narrative inquiry.

Snap-shots of a Field of Practice

Narratives concerning professional choices are more as snap-shots compared to the more extensive readings of theories of polity. However, snap-shot narratives are relevant as cases within a larger frame, such as the polity model. Educational research already uses narratives (Geelan 2003; McVee 2004) as a way to gain insight into the professional practice. Research has also shown how individuals within the professional collective use mini-narratives to construct everyday practice to handle the demands directed at them from other levels (Evetts 2003; Stronach et al. 2002). The new pragmatic sociology tries to map how actors make their lives 'smooth' through their actions. They strive towards harmony, and activate several strategies to reach this harmony. One of the strategies involved is in the action of telling stories. "Within their overall self-presentations, professionals offered mini-narratives of identification: unstable, shifting, sometimes contradictory or expressed as conflict" (Stronach et al. 2002:116). They tell critical tales to explain their position, and to justify their choices in a professional context. In these stories they depict the struggle to maintain a sense of equilibrium, of harmony in their practice. It is a way to stabilise the practice through a point of view and formulated expectations, values and motivations, "... through verbal accounts and stories presented by individual narrators about their lives and their experienced reality" (Lieblich et al. 1998:7). I have chosen to study how the professionals involved in the DKS program are portrayed to the public in the media, but also how their professional choices in the collaboration are given in narratives told in

evaluations. Both the A&C teacher, and the Artist in projects within the school frames all operate as educators, but are not seen or portrayed as inhabiting the same qualities (KKD 2003a). I have deliberated over this choice of focus several times, as studies into the pupils' knowledge gain, understanding, and appreciation are few at this stage. Still, the different narratives *presented* to the public of the professionals within the program — in this instance both the Artist and the Teacher — is vital to the continuation of DKS, in terms of *professional jurisdiction* and subject survival.

Gathering Narratives — Questions and Focus

According to Lieblich et al. narrative research is a way to access actors portrayal of a specific case: “It may be used for comparison among groups, to learn about a social phenomenon or historical period, or to explore a personality” (Lieblich et al. 1998:3). Narratives give themselves to the telling of phenomena. The phenomena, in this case the professional choices in DKS to justify the presence or absence of a professional field, become visible in relation to what is considered important, what are the values stated in relation to choices made, what is said or not. “We believe that stories are usually constructed around a core of facts or life events, yet allow a wide periphery for the freedom of individuality and creativity selection, addition to, emphasis on, and interpretation of these “remembered facts”” (Lieblich et al. 1998:8). The remembered facts are often the situations that break from the norm — the ambiguous situations where the professional boundaries come into play, and justification and value systems are activated. The situations where justification is introduced into a conflict of values and ideas provide pivotal points for narratives, as the actors will justify their professional choice in that moment. The sense of purpose and understanding of what is the desired good will be verbalised in the argumentation. “On the one hand, the diversity of the professions warrants a narrative presentation of contrasting cases. On the other, we must abstract from such cases and generate testable ideas” (Abbott 1988:20). This way of thinking, to go from theory, via the actual cases in a work situation, and then back to theory or theory as a tool for changing professional practice (Nolin 2008) is profitable in this case study. Narratives become important in recognising the actors' *position*, their world of values, in a conflict. To see the narratives through theory, can provide a basis for statements concerning further development of the theory and practice field.

This research project focuses on particular events, in the sense that it wishes to look at the problematic situations that give the narrative its storyline. “Narratives are about people acting in a setting, and the happenings that befall them must be relevant to their intentional states while so engaged — to

their beliefs, desires, theories, values, and so on” (Bruner 1991:7). These narratives will highlight the particular situations that mark a transition from the order that has previously been characteristic of the situation. This does not imply order in the sense that there was complete and utter peace in a setting, but order as in the normal, the known. In the case of DKS, this is not one order, but two — the artists’ art practice, and the A&C teachers’ educational practice. To get at the value sets that are engaged, and the particular situation, the normal, the known is of equal importance as a factor. “Particularity achieves its emblematic status by its embeddedness in a story that is in some sense generic” (Bruner 1991:7). Particular events — transitory situations — will only achieve the status as transitory because they represent a shift from the known to something new and unknown. The story is characterised by the particular events — and events get their importance as a break in the story as a whole. Wenger’s *community of practice* presents value sets as constructed through negotiation with different levels (Wenger 1998). This resounds in narrative theory, where all levels are seen as shaping the telling of a narrative:

“Each field of practice (including the practice of research) has, at any point in time, a series of stories in circulation. They are offered to newcomers as the means of introduction to a community, but they are also repeated in the presence of the very actors who participated in this event, thus consolidating a community feeling by reifying its history” (Czarniawska 2004:36).

As previously mentioned, the narratives existing in public space concerning the DKS program has increased drastically during the period 2004 — 2008. Media has distributed views and negotiation of the conflict in terms of both the ‘school world’ and the ‘art world’. Media communicated stories about DKS collaborations and projects can be found in the national newspapers. These narratives are a common ground for public opinion in regards to the program, and will be decisive in the setting up of jurisdictional boundaries (Abbott 1988; 1995). Narratives can be seen as stories of lived professional practice (Bruner 1991; 2004; Czarniawska 2004; Liebllich et al. 1998). The media plays a large part of our lives today, not only as individual articles released as single tales, but as a complete ongoing narrative, where the articles are all part of a larger narrative and constitute arguments in a justification of professional choices.

When the actors from the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ meet the DKS practice in school projects for the first time, they are not unfamiliar with it. They have extensive knowledge through the introduction narratives for the

general public that exist in the two different professional communities of the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’, as well as the introduction narratives provided through the media. Narratives can be a way to establish a set of justified arguments that suit the professional’s needs in a situation (Bruner 2004; Czarniawska 2004). “Lived tales, I would argue, are an overlay that our consciousness places on the chaos of the world in order to make it meaningful and understandable to us” (Geelan 2003:7). The stories of unrest — or experienced tales — as such, tell us then of choices, positioning, priorities, and through this, of the values that guide and constitute the professional’s practice and argumentation in different situations within the organisational boundaries. “But we are never the sole authors of our own narratives; in every conversation a *positioning* takes place (Davis and Harré, 1991) which is accepted, rejected, or improved upon by the partners in the conversation” (Czarniawska 2004:5). The actors narrate within their major value sets (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006) sometimes springing between the values, and sometimes in a contradictory way. In tales of professional situations, professional values and justification will be reflected in the critique that is launched to reach hegemony and harmony, how professional practice is professed through claims (Abbott 1988).

The narratives concerning the DKS case are a recount of what the actors’ best remembers — good, bad or sad. “Informants’ stories do not mirror a world “out there”. They are constructed, creatively authored, rhetorical, replete with assumptions, and interpretive” (Riessman 1993:5). This does not suggest that they are arbitrarily constructed. As professional knowledge, language and traditions come into play, the stories have commonalities of their own. They are situated in their telling in the fact that some frames, general and particular are present in the narration in a chosen context (Lave and Wenger 1991). As they strive towards a more harmonious state, the stories of situations of transition are a way to organise temporary instability, and to advocate a new position where their own point of view can take precedence over the unfamiliar.

End Comment

Narratives exist at all levels in the DKS program. In local collaboration projects narratives are told by teachers and artists, but also exist as more generic tales at document level, in the organisational structures, evaluations performed and documents behind DKS, but also with narratives made general from the media coverage. They choose to activate criticism to comment on their situation, and the field of practice is therefore saturated with narratives of professional justifications from both sides of the professional practice. Narrative inquiry, used as a tool towards locating criticism as professional

narratives within the organisational boundaries of the DKS case, will be a valuable tool in gathering evidence concerning how professional choices are justified by the participants, and how justification of the practice further is communicated by media and evaluations to the public.

Finding Documentation

I will in this chapter outline the basis for my selection of sources. I will describe the process of selection as well as the nature of the sources. The choices are made in relation to both theoretical stance and the narrative inquiry strategy. Goodlad's (1979) curriculum levels provides a point of departure in relation to educational research, and will also play a part in the selection process. In the end I will reflect on the choices made and ethical considerations.

One of the concerns has been: 'How do I find the values that guide choices and arguments concerning practice within DKS?' How and why do teachers and artists in the context of DKS activate their professionalism to justify their actions within the program (Stronach et al. 2002). The focus will remain on how and on what basis they, but also the media, communicate professional choices and positions — in and on this given context — rather than claiming to find a general truth to the matter that exists above or beyond the told narratives. This calls for the use of theories concerning both individual understanding of a situation, theories of more general understanding, or even what might be called common sense (Kvernbekk 2001) to illuminate how this understanding might be arrived at. To do this it is necessary to find sources of documentation in which these values and positioning narratives will be manifest. Yin designates the data 'sources of evidence' (Yin 2003), but this concept does not agree with my focus on narratives. I instead choose to refer to my data as sources of documentation. In this light, several sources of documentation are interesting for the study. I choose to study the narratives that are expressed to the public, and values that can be seen through them, to affect collaborations within DKS projects in schools. Goodlad's (1979) curriculum levels function mainly as a tool to help me identify sources of documentation to include in my study of the DKS case, and to organise my documentation.

DKS is placed within the school context, and as such a curriculum theory is one way of organising the documentation. I will discuss the findings through theories of justification and professional theory later on.

Goodlad claims that school subjects can be considered to exist at several levels as a value system. He organises this in five levels of analysis (Goodlad 1979).²⁵ The *Ideological level* exists in the political discussions and the values that infuse the entire educational discourse in a country. It can be seen in media coverage, debates and regulations that provide standards for the practice as well as in textbooks and teachers' guides. In my study of DKS, the media narratives are included to establish what is presented to the public as ideologically sound in the educational debate concerning DKS. Is it in concert with, or in contrast to, the *Formal level* that is supposed to regulate the practice? The formal level is the document — in this case the Norwegian National Curriculum: the Knowledge Promotion 2006 (KD and Udir 2006), but also the Report to the Storting nr 38. (KKD 2003a) and the subsequent Report to the Storting nr 8. (KKD 2007) concerning DKS. In my study I choose to see whether the ideological narratives presented to the public are reflected in the documents or constructed by another agenda. The *Perceived level* is what is read into the written guidelines of those using it in their practice. It is the interpretation of the formal document on the basis of their background and training,. I would argue that the perceived level, though hard to get to, will be at least partly expressed by the narratives used by the professionals within DKS to justify the operational level. The *Operational level* is the actual practice in the educational context — the day-to-day practice. It is what is chosen as activities, content and focus and then carried out. This is a reflection of all the above levels expressed as actions in the professional work. The *Perceived level* allows for individual variations and, on the basis of this, ideological differences can occur. The *Operational level* is where these can be seen. The *Experiential level* is what the school-child/pupil learns or understands. I have not included this level in my sources of documentation, as the focus is not on the pupil in this study (Goodlad 1979).

The challenge for all educators is to translate the ideological foundation that exists into an operational level where it can be recognised in the experiential. These levels are all connected, and research within education can, in my view, benefit from the tools these levels represent. In my view, this division offers three points of view in the practice field, the public's, the teachers' and the pupils'. All of these will come into play, but as I have chosen to concentrate on the educators in the situation and how they are portrayed outwards, not all levels need equal attention regarding documentation.

²⁵ Originally Goodlad uses the concept curriculum instead of levels. I have chosen to change this as the content of the Scandinavian and German *Lehrplan* concept is less document focused than the anglo-saxon concept curriculum (Westbury, Hopmann, and Riquarts 2000). I have chosen not to conduct a discussion into the differences, but still refer to levels instead of curriculum.

FINDING NARRATIVES IN THE CASE OF DKS

In DKS the educators can be seen to be both the *artist* and the *A&C teacher*. Even so, my main focus is on the professional A&C teachers. In view of Goodlad's levels, the DKS case displays narratives of different characteristics and at different value levels, and all these levels can be communicated to the public. It will be necessary to outline the sources chosen to identify the narratives in this study. I have concluded that the focus on collaboration difficulties is best seen in light of narratives at the first four levels of the model, with a focus on how the perceived level is communicated through the operational — the justification of professional choices within DKS projects. These will also reflect the ideological level, as this is revealed through the values existing as a base for the perceived level. The ideological levels will surface both in the media depictions and in discussions concerning how the perceived level influences the future and the current ideological and formal levels. How will the perceived level influence the operational, and will the ideological and formal influence the operational level in any degree? These narratives tell of the professional values and purposes that come into play in situations of conflict. They are the ideological battleground. Are the ideological and formal levels interpreted similarly by the two worlds? Can matching narratives as the basis for DKS, be recognised in the practice? Is the ideological level in transition, or is it stable?

My Empirical base will span:

- 1) regulations and political documents
- 2) media writings
- 3) evaluation documents
- 4) studies of professional practice

In addition I have chosen to add a school project as an illustrative case. The school project will not constitute a main source of documentation. The main data source will be the documents mentioned above. However, I find it useful to provide the first hand account of artists and teachers, as well as my own observations to the study. I have also included an interview with an American researcher within the Artist-in-Residence (AiR) program in the US as a comment to the problem as being international, resounding in other countries. As a result the sources will be gathered in the areas of the Ideological, Formal, Perceived, and Operational curriculum through *narratives* in the form of: *Documents*; formal documents, evaluations, research projects, and media coverage of DKS program. *Observation*; study of a DKS project in the lower secondary school involving A&C teachers and Artists — where research field notes from the case observation is included. *Interviews*; of

A&C teachers and artists in the observed DKS school project, and of a US researcher on the AiR program. As such my sources of documentation are multiple and substantive. I will continue by describing more comprehensively the source pool, and describe what the focus for the different sources will be.

First Source of Documentation: Regulations and Official Documents

The political documents regarding DKS represent a narrative that is a fusion of several points of view. Thus they appear ambiguous, and can be used as arguments for several worldviews. I have chosen not to include all documents that mention the subject A&C and DKS, but have made a selection. The selection will include the official Reports to the Storting (KD 2007; KKD 2003a; 2007) and the Propositions that are most vital to the DKS program (Familie- kultur- og administrasjonskomiteen 2003; Stortinget 2004), or represent the major trends. The National Curriculum for general education (KD and Udir 2006) is also included in this selection, as it is the given base for projects within DKS. These documents will show the background narrative for the DKS program, as well as any changes that might have occurred in this period.

Second Source of Documentation: Media Texts

The media has been telling an ongoing narrative concerning the execution of DKS and the actors involved. The discussion that has been presented in the media functions as a larger narrative, where the separate texts and comments can be analysed as parts of the whole. However, to present all the media texts that touch upon the question of DKS would be too extensive, and a selection of newspaper and journal texts that will highlight and represent this larger narrative has been chosen.

The search for the newspaper texts has been done through the search engine *A-tekst*, which is a 'library base' of newspaper articles in all the larger newspapers in Norway. I have chosen to include all the relevant hits from *A-tekst* that have been retrieved from the larger newspapers, that is to say, national and regional press. Local press is not well represented in *A-tekst*, and to search through and include all the local newspaper writings of DKS is an endeavour for later research. The texts included in my study span from 2002, when the launch of the nationwide program was planned, until 2008, well into the program running.

I will also include articles from the 'art world' journal *Billedkunst* and the 'school world' journal *Utdanning*. I have chosen the general education journal *Utdanning* over the specialised A&C journal *FORM*. The journal

FORM, though specialised in A&C education has a low number of subscribers, and I have instead included one special ‘art world’ and ‘school world’ collaborative issue by *ABM skrift* — the journal by the ABM centre where the Secretariat is located, and one by *Arabesk* — the journal by Kunst i skolen (Art in School) that address the issue of DKS. These journal articles and special journal editions are selected within the same time frame as the newspaper articles, namely 2002 — 2008. This selection of smaller narratives in the national public debate will function as illustrations of the larger newspaper narrative. All these texts that are the narratives communicated to the public will be seen in relation to the documents, evaluations and studies of the two professional fields, to see if they correspond.

Taken from national and regional newspapers, and from journals within the field of Education and Visual art, the chosen narratives are either general approaches to the DKS program or directed specifically at the Visual arts section. I chose not to include those specifically aimed at theatre, music, film or dance. These areas are not included in this research, as they have their own subject-matter didaktik research, and the findings might vary from field to field. Still, the text base is comprehensive, and as such offers a rich source of evidence.

Third Source of Documentation: Evaluations of DKS

Evaluations of projects within DKS in Norway exist on the local level as well as on the regional and national levels. The evaluations concerning the program in general and the Visual arts in particular hold narratives of both the ‘school world’ and the ‘art world’. These narratives will be studied in relation to the media narratives provided. Do they concur, or do they show a difference?

A selection of available local evaluations will be included in the study. These documents that have been made available outside the closed system of DKS or local authorities, regarding the DKS case on a general level, or specifically regarding Visual arts. A larger regional report as well as a recently published national evaluation will also be included. Some university theses directed at studies into the A&C subject and DKS are also seen as relevant. These written documents will be treated as narratives in their own right. I will also include an evaluation from a parallel program that has been running for decades in the US and a short report on a similar English program. These will unveil whether the narratives that are suggested in the Norwegian documents are also recognisable in an international perspective. I will underline that the studies or evaluations that concern specifically the other areas of the DKS program; theatre, music, film or literature, are not included in the evidence.

Fourth Source of Documentation: Studies of Professional Practice

As professional practice is one of the areas of discussion in this study, I have included studies of how artists and A&C teachers view themselves and their professional role. These studies will be used as a way to access professional narratives of and attitudes towards both the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’. In relation to artists the narratives will be of importance in understanding their approach to the educational system and the teaching profession — especially their view on art and education, and art in education. These factors will have an impact on the DKS narrative that they present to the public. The studies; *Many are called, but few are chosen: artists’ roles in transition* (Mangset 2004),²⁶ and *Young and promising. The 90ies’ young artists —experiences and work conditions* (Aslaksen 1997),²⁷ are thorough studies into the professional values and positioning of the Artist.

In addition to studies into the artist profession, I include two studies into the school subject Forming: *Pupil- and teacher perspectives on the subject Forming. Results from a study. Evaluation of the subject Forming in general education* (Carlsen and Streitlien 1995),²⁸ and *A&C; Art and Crafts in L97. New subject — new practice?* (Kjosavik et al. 2003).²⁹ These studies show how the A&C teachers view themselves and their professional role, as well as their thoughts on content, quality and learning in the subject. These studies also give insights into the A&C teachers’ narratives, how they view the required knowledge and their own proficiency in this regard. It highlights the essential concerns in relation to content and projects, and how they view their own competencies. It gives a necessary view into both the epistemology and ontology of A&C teachers’ professionalism. Alongside the studies of artists, the two selected studies will provide a backdrop for the research into the DKS collaborations.

Illustrative Case - DKS Project in School

In addition to all the documents, I have chosen to include a study of school practice — a DKS project running for a week. The data gathered includes interviews with A&C teachers and artists involved in the project, observation notes, analysis of video recordings and reflections to complement the interviews. The video footage is protected and will not be submitted, but was made to secure that the observation notes and selected quotes were correct. The narratives of the educators in the situation are the main find.

²⁶ *Mange er kalt, men få er utvalgt: kunstnerroller i endring.*

²⁷ *Ung og lovende. 90-tallets unge kunstnere - erfaringer og arbeidsvilkår.*

²⁸ *Elev- og lærerperspektiv på formingsfaget. Resultater fra en spørreundersøkelse, Evaluering av formingsfaget i grunnskolen.*

²⁹ *Kunst og håndverk i L97. Nytt fag - ny praksis?*

I followed a project within Visual art in DKS in A&C, 6th and 7th grade from start to finish. This particular project was set at a rural school, where the artists were invited by the municipal culture contact to do a project within design for 6th and 7th grades. The community and the school are small enough that the involved parties know each other to some extent prior to the project start. Because the artists were invited in by the municipality the planning had to a large degree been executed by the artists within the frames handed them from that source before meeting with the school representatives. They had then contacted the school to set up a meeting with the head master, the A&C teacher for the two grades and me, the researcher. The meeting functioned more or less as an information meeting, where I explaining my research agenda and strategy concerning the data retrieval, as well as related ethical questions.

After this information stage of the meeting ended, the artists presented their written proposal for the project.

The project ran for a week, with lessons planned by the artists spanning 4 days of the week of the project.

- Monday 12.00 - 14.00, 2 lessons (6th and 7th grade together)
- Tuesday 08.30 - 11.00, 2 ½ lessons (6th gr.)
- Thursday 11.30 - 14.00, 2 ½ lessons (7th gr.)
- Friday 08.30 - 11.00, 2 ½ lessons (6th and 7th gr. together)

It was also decided that an exhibition would be set up in the school's 'mediatech' Monday two weeks after project start. The teachers would be responsible for the exhibition, and the time frame would let the teachers deal with any late work or finishing touches. These were not included in the presented time estimate.

The artists presented a finished timetable and content description for the project, finalised with homework assignments and copied forms for the children to work with. The practical assignments and questions of materials and equipment were listed. The teachers expressed the desire for a three-dimensional result, as the school children responded well to working with materials and seeing a process finalised. The artists agreed to this, as they had already contemplated the idea. The meeting ended with the two parties setting the date for the first lesson. There was no further contact between the A&C teacher and the artists before the day of the project start.

When observing the project, I placed a video camera in the back of the classroom to cover the movement and interaction of the teachers and artists involved. The school children did not seem to notice this at all, and carried on working without any distraction. The camera was placed in a way that

captured all the interaction between the teachers and the artists. The Thursday of the project, I arrived 10 minutes after the start of the lesson. However, the teachers and artists had activated the video camera, so that the recording was complete. More important than the recordings, was the observation diary with field notes I kept. I wrote down all my impressions concerning the ongoing collaboration, the professional performances and projects execution. I coded these with the number on the tape running, and where on the tape in minutes and seconds the observation could be accessed and verified. I later performed a check to see if my notes were correct. At the day of the exhibition I chose not to keep any video footage, as an invitation to local media and other teachers had been issued. Several external actors were present and wanted to comment on my research agenda. It would have been enriching to include these in the research, but as I had not attained permission to include this, I chose instead to keep field notes concerning only the actors involved in the specific project.

The combination of notes, video and interviews provides an opportunity to identify the pivotal points in the narratives, and see where they were visible in the work situation as well as in the arguments and value statements made around the choices taken at these pivotal points. They also allowed me to see where the expressed narratives seemed at odds with the practice. This especially applied to the collaboration aspect of the project.

Narratives from Teachers and Artists

The two teachers that were involved in the project have different educational backgrounds. Teacher 1 (T1), the contact teacher is an Adjunkt with limited A&C courses in his education. Teacher 2 (T2) is an Adjunkt with a year of A&C in her Classroom teacher training. Both artists have degrees from the National Academy of the Arts.

Stories of the DKS case were gathered from the teachers on the Friday, the last day of the project week, and from the artists on the day of the exhibition. The artists wanted to do the telling together, to be able to complement each other's comments. I chose to let them do this, as I had experienced the good communication between them when they were explaining their choices during the process.

The teachers and artists were participating in a limited project within the DKS case, and the stories told have a focus on this particular limited situation, even as the whole case comes into play. As such the stories are open, but short. It "... presents a compromise between the wish to obtain free and rich self-narratives, on the one hand, and the need to limit allocated time and the amount of material per person, on the other" (Lieblich et al. 1998:25).

The A&C teachers and Artists that collaborated in the DKS project were asked to give their story of the particular project. They were asked to focus on how they understood the project and their own role in terms of quality standards, content and subject-matter competence.

The setting was chosen because of its familiarity for the actors. The teachers were encouraged to give their stories in their workspace at school, while the artists told their tale in their office. The aim was to make the situation as relaxed as possible, to allow the narrative to flow easily, while still being tied to their professional surroundings. The digital recorder was small and soundless.

I made an informal focus guide that consisted of a few points that I wanted the actors to comment on. No fixed questions were formulated, but the themes were brought into the stories as they surfaced. The first point I wanted to access was how they told the story of the particular collaboration project. How and when did it start, what happened in the process, and what was the result? I did not interfere with the telling, because the proceedings and their own experience of the collaboration was expressed in the narratives. The narratives centred on the parts of the projects the actors thought most important. The second point that I found it necessary to ask them to reflect on was what expert knowledge they themselves considered they possessed in relation to the project execution, and what expert knowledge the other profession brought in. I decided to include a follow up question to the second, as it seemed difficult, especially for the teachers, to make any claim to expert knowledge. The question I chose to ask concerned what they would change if they could do the project one more time. This was done to make them formulate their expert knowledge specifically, without calling it that. This created rich answers where they reflected on what they thought could have been better planned and executed — i.e. they activated their professional expert knowledge. I also included reflection into what the actors considered a knowledge gain they could bring with them from the project in terms of future use. I wanted to know if the professionals involved saw an increase in their own expert knowledge after meeting another profession.

Interview of an American researcher

The National Endowment for the Arts in The United States has run a program for artist visits in schools for almost 40 years. The AinR project is very similar to the Norwegian DKS, both in organisation and aims (Bumgarner 1993). In 1993, an evaluation of the project was done. The researcher behind

the evaluation, Constance Gee,³⁰ is a valuable source of information as her empirical data is extensive. Her background as a Fine Art Graduate student (Master in Arts), and PhD in Policy Studies in Art Education is a contrast to the researcher behind the Norwegian evaluation, who has her background within education. Through an interview conducted in Nashville at December 12. 2007 at 11.00 — 13.00, Constance Gee presents her narrative of the background for her own research and for the Artist-in-Residence program in the US, and the ensuing collaboration within this American equivalent of DKS. The interview was conducted as an academic conversation with no fixed interview guide. It might seem questionable to include an interview with an American researcher in my documentation, but even though the American school system differs greatly from the Norwegian school institution, the two programs regarding artists in schools are highly similar both in aims, organisation of funding, and in structure. As the program has a longer history in the US, the base to reflect upon such an endeavour is far greater than in the Norwegian case. Even though the information provided is not of direct impact, it provides several interesting reflections that correspond to Norwegian DKS evaluations. To illustrate that the issues that might surface in a collaborative effort between professionals of the ‘school world’ and the ‘art world’ is not restricted to the DKS case, I chose to include the interview in my discussion.

GENERALISABILITY AND AMBIGUITY

Boltanski and Thévenot (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999; 2000) claim that individual cases are general in the point of departure. Generalisability lies in the fact that there are not countless options for actions in a situated context. The context and situatedness of the actors will offer up some standards, patterns and language choices that are limited. These will prevail up to the point where there is a ‘violent’ break with conformity. Like research paradigms, human actions will follow some ground rules in the fact that values are not solely individually motivated. Humans move within relations — value domains — that will be recognisable. Local cases will therefore offer universal value. Yin (2003) also claims that one case study can offer generalisability. He distinguishes between two kinds of generalisations — ‘Statistical generalization’ and ‘Analytical generalization’. The first is most often reached by quantitative formulas and goes from data to theory. The second is of importance to case study research as it goes from theory, via the case study, and from that back to theory reflection and building. It will offer

³⁰ Constance Gee, former Constance Bumgarner, is an Associate Professor in Public Policy and Education, at the Department of Leadership, Policy, and Organizations at the Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, USA.

critical reflection both at the applied and theoretical level, and as such it can be said to hold ‘Analytical generalization’.

Latour (1998) argues that there has been a shift from science and certainty to research and room for uncertainty.³¹ He comments on the concept of objectivity. It has been a way to remove oneself from a situation where the researcher should rather get involved with the relations. He speaks of a new way to approach and maybe even embrace the concept for the social sciences.

“The word does not refer to the traditional sense of matter of fact — with their cold, disinterested claims to ‘objectivisation’ — but to the warm, interested, controversial building sites of objectivist style — even though no object is there to be seen — or by the presence of many *objectors* — even though there is no pretence for parodying the objectivist genre” (Latour 2005:125).

Latour warns against the critique that is being launched in the aftermath of the disclaiming of the ‘grand narrative’ in the social sciences. Social scientists of the post-modern persuasion that proclaim that narratives and discourses can only be interpreted through the individual, open up for the critical voices claiming that the narratives are fairytales and social science is redundant. Instead it is important to recognise that even if there is not one final answer as a universal ‘matter of fact’, there still might be several solutions to ‘matters of concern’.

“If the social is something that circulates in a certain way, and not a world beyond to be accessed by the disinterested gaze of some ultra-lucid scientist, then it may be *passed along* by many devices adapted to the task — *including* texts, reports, accounts, and tracers. It may or *it may not*. Textual accounts can fail like experiments often do” (Latour 2005:127).

A shift is desired where the focus is no longer on these so called ‘matters of fact,’ but rather on ‘matters of concern’ (Latour 2005). Alvesson (2002) has through his writings on post-modernism in research also highlighted the value of variations and ambiguity. In a situation where the view is that there exists no *one* ‘grand-narrative’, variation and ambiguity will be seen as just as valuable as generalisations. He still proclaims unease in relation to post modernism’s sometime total embrace of relativism. Latour makes a separation between relativism and relativity. Relativism in the form it is

³¹ According to Latour science is removed from society and research is not. Research is involved in society, and the new disciplines might therefore be said to be research disciplines rather than science disciplines. This has an impact on the demands for good research. If the disciplines involved with the society discard the ideals introduced through the concept of science they are free to reinvent themselves.

given by deconstruction, where denunciation of any kind of common ground is seen as the last result, is of no use to the research Latour holds vital. In his book *Reassembling the social* (2005) he highlights the need to see the common ground, to build on the associations between persons, objects and society. Relativity in the sense that ‘matters of concern’ replaces ‘matters of fact’ is rewarding, while relativism as deconstruction towards a ‘nothing-base’ is seen as its own worst enemy.

This problem is also present in educational theory. In an educational setting, to embrace relativism would contradict the existence of the profession of teaching, or the concept of profession at all, as it contradicts the existence of a knowledge base of certainties:

“First, any radical epistemological scepticism about the possibility of accessing truth through reason threatens to undermine the intelligibility of education, ordinarily understood as a matter of liberating minds from ignorance and irrationality; if there is really no such thing as objective truth to be had, even in principle, then education — is simply sophistry and delusion” (Carr 2000:119).

I find that there is a need to consider a new approach. There seems to be an opening for new and alternative approaches to both data and quality control when Latour (Latour 1998) talks of research as something differing from science. He claims that good research might not be considered science by some, but it will still be good research.

Larsson (2005) claims that in social science research, a way to ascertain if there is quality in a study, i.e. good scholarship, is in how well the theories, strategies and research questions relate. To choose a strategy that does not fit the theory, or a theory that cannot help in answering the question will hamper the study, and diminish the quality. In this manner my study has taken this into consideration by using narrative inquiry, both as a tool to ask the questions that I would like to answer, but also as an approach marked as suitable by the main theories ventured into in my inquiry (Abbott 1988; Boltanski and Thévenot 1999; 2006; Latour 2005). The research undertaken in this project strives throughout to be both as sound and good research-wise as it can be. I try to not let the selection or approach be coloured by my background as a Classroom teacher with an A&C education degree.

Remarks on Selection of Documentation and Ethics

Though I have strived to include most of the sources regarding the media texts as well as the evaluations and official documents that are the basis for my argumentation, not all could be presented in the analysis. They can, however, still be seen as a basis for the analysis performed. As all selections reflect the choice and the perspective applied by the researcher, I am aware that questions concerning my choices are appropriate. However, I have chosen to include the quotes that I interpret to be the most representative from all available sources, and have to the best of my abilities striven to give an account that can highlight the narratives in the media, the evaluations and official documents.

The selected DKS project functions as an illustrative case rather than as *the* main case. It might be claimed that one DKS school project is not enough for me to claim any kind of reliable findings. However, this school project is more of a showcase than a case. The value of the case lies in how it reflects or disallows the findings in the other sources of evidence that are chosen. The other sources are extensive and the analysis is thorough. The DKS project as such will therefore give a suggestion in regards to the question: Are the same narratives told on all levels of the DKS program? It allows me to recognise the findings in relation to how differences on the ideological level influence values, interpretations and the specific project. In the practice, all the other levels have their point of arrival. Not in a big spectacular confrontation, but in everyday statements and choice of words, contact between collaborators, assessment of results, and content and method choices. In this light, the one project will be a valuable indication through what it states.

The DKS school project observation and the interviews were all done in accordance to Norsk Samfunnsvitenskapelig Datatjeneste's ethical guidelines. The American researcher chose to let me divulge her name on the interview conducted, as she is one of the leading writers in this field in the US, and as such has no interest in hiding her stance. Any information gathered in the DKS school project and interviews conducted in relation to this are coded for anonymity.

End Comment

The research undertaken in my study will be a step towards exploring the 'matters of concern' in how teachers' and artists' professional practice in DKS is portrayed through arguments and the narratives that are communicated to the public. The selection of sources include several types of texts, and this will be a way to identify dominating public narratives of the

ongoing practice in DKS, through the media, evaluations, studies of professional practice, and official documents. Through this selection I will try to comment on why some narratives are distributed to the public in the media at the expense of others, if they correspond to the practice that is displayed in evaluations, and what consequences this might entail in terms of the official documents.

The ‘School World’ and ‘Art World’

This chapter will function as an introduction to the two worlds within which the collaboration of the program DKS is located. I do this to highlight the backdrop for discussions on the narratives of professional practice and choices presented to the public that will be discussed later on. I will give a short summary of the history of the school subject A&C, and the tradition and development of the A&C teaching profession. I will also outline the development and current situation of the professional art scene in Norway. I do this to establish a point of departure for my questions concerning narratives and professional boundaries later on. To be writing a Norwegian thesis in English also forces me to define some of my key concepts before I proceed. If I were to place my research within the Anglo Saxon — English and American — research field of Art Education, complications surrounding Scandinavian concepts that collide with the Anglo Saxon tradition could be avoided. I could opt to adopt the existing English terminology. I choose not to do this. The practice tradition of the school subject that is at the heart of my research is located within Scandinavian A&C didaktik. This is again rooted in the German didaktik tradition. It is within this tradition my research is carried out, and in my view it can offer a vital contribution to the Anglo Saxon Educational research (Westbury et al. 2000). Before venturing further into the two worlds, I will therefore establish and clarify the content of the didaktik concept.

DIDACTICS OR DIDAKTIK

The concept of didaktik — and here I use the German orthography of the word — originally from the German education tradition, has developed within the Scandinavian tradition. The concept, however, becomes problematic once applied in the English language without an explanation. The British and American traditions have an understanding of what is encompassed by *didactics* — and here I use the English orthography of the word — as pointing directly towards lecture/classroom methods. When the method is strongly a one-sided distribution of knowledge: “When the power, the right and tendency to lecture, impute becomes prominent the statement

leans towards the English understanding of didaktik (didactic) (Ongstad 2004:45).³² As a consequence the Anglo Saxon traditions seldom address didactics and have instead opted for the use of other concepts, and speak more broadly of educational theory and curriculum theory (Hopmann and Riquarts 2000). The Scandinavian countries have instead developed their educational research based on the German traditions with the areas didaktik and pedagogy (Hiim and Hippe 1998; Myhre 2001; Ongstad 2004). None of them are concurrent with either educational theory or curriculum theory, as they include both these research areas, as well as educational policy studies, but in different ways. Pedagogy with a longer research history than didaktik (Trier 1893), has at its roots the tradition of psychology and is a university discipline with a basis in previously performed experiments and studies. It's roots give the acknowledgement to produce theories more freely at present. In Norway pedagogy has been a major area of educational research within the universities. Even so, didaktik — and subject-matter didaktik — has existed alongside it. Courses are offered at the Oslo University at the *Institutt for lærerutdanning og skoleutvikling (The Department of Teacher Education and School Development)*. They provide the necessary competence to work within education practice, and research within this department has a focus on subject-matter didaktik.

Didaktik as a concept was revitalised by the reform pedagogy and its reaction to the more positivistic ideals of psychology and behaviourism within educational research. The development of a new direction within educational theory and research resulted in a new didaktik (Hopmann and Riquarts 2000). It did not gain a following in the Anglo-Saxon world, but in Germany and Scandinavia the old concept didaktik was adopted, and the use grew steadily (Hopmann and Riquarts 2000). In Norway the national curriculum for teacher training was altered to include didaktik (KD 2009). Today it is integrated at all levels of teacher training at the University Colleges³³ as an educational issue with its own theory base and practice (KUF 1992a; 1992b; 1999). However, my claim is that it is often misunderstood to be read as purely an ontological aspect rather than as the very important bridge between the ontology and epistemology of education. Thus as a discipline it is still in the process of establishing its field and gaining respect in the recognised scientific milieu of the university. Contributions from research within subject-matter didaktik to the field — in terms of subject survival — are not yet acknowledged widely, and recognition of didaktik as a valuable theory base in its own right, is still not reached.

³² OQ: "Når makten, retten og tendensen til å belære, pådytte, blir for fremtredende, tenderer ytringen mot den engelskspråklige forståelsen av didaktikk (didactic)".

³³ Universities in Norway are mainly disciplinary based, while University Colleges are based on education for specific professions.

Didaktik is developed to provide subject definition to a theory base that might otherwise get too comprehensive and narrow at the same time. The fact that pedagogy mainly focuses on *bildung* on a wider scale is what makes it both too narrow and too wide at the same time. This sounds like a paradox, but illuminates a situation where pedagogy offers a general theoretical approach to learning, which is necessary, but not enough when relating to subject-matter (Klafki 1997). Didaktik defined by the question: *What basic knowledge should the next generations have, why, and how best achieve it?* is more specific than pedagogy, but at the same time it covers more than methods of teaching or the written result in the curriculum (Klafki 1997).

Subject-matter Didaktik

Both general didaktik and the specialised didaktik of a specific subject, also named *fach-didaktik* or *subject-matter didaktik* (Hopmann and Riquarts 2000), has been strong in the Scandinavian countries (Hopmann 1997). Subject-matter didaktik is a further specification of the first question: *What basic knowledge in this subject-matter area should the next generations have, why, and how best achieve it?* It relates to the philosophy of education, philosophy of the subject at hand as well as knowledge of subject history, practice and theory (Aase et al. 1998). It addresses current needs in relation to development of the subject, signals a commitment to the future of the subject and the legitimisation of learning within the field. It tells of the search for a philosophical base, a knowledge base, and a teaching/ learning base i.e. professional knowledge (Klafki 2001). In Ongstad's words: "The moment a subject asks itself what it is or wants to be, the birth, not only of itself as a professional field of knowledge, but also its subject-matter didaktik, is a fact"³⁴ (Ongstad 2004:35).

Rooted in practice as well as theory, subject-matter didaktik is a valuable part of the field of Art and Design education. Even more so, the subject-matter didaktik allows us to work towards the subject areas through more than a general approach to learning (Digranes 2006b; Nielsen and Digranes 2007a). Knowledge of the teaching profession within the subject becomes an important part in relation to subject-matter didaktik discussions. In the subject A&C, as seen in LK06 — the Curriculum of 2006 (KD and Udir 2006), the themes *Fine art, Design, Architecture, and Visual communication* all warrant different approaches towards legitimisation, learning, teaching, motivations and aims (Nielsen and Digranes 2006). For instance, in teaching, on the grounds of the philosophy of art and the philosophy of design, to be able to actually separate the purpose of design from the purpose of art would

³⁴ OQ: "I det øyeblikk et fag spør seg hva det er eller ønsker å være, så fødes, ikke bare det selv som egentlig profesjonelt kunnskapsfelt, men også dets fagdidaktikk".

mean two separate solutions to educational questions and practice as well as legitimisation of the subject (Digranes 2006a). This is one of the areas where Art and Design subject-matter didaktik is focused at the moment. The inclusion, or rather clarification, of the different areas of expertise within the school subject A&C calls for reflections of theory base, practical knowledge and educational practice (Nielsen 2008). As a consequence of the several views of what the subject should be, several terms for subject-matter didaktik in the field of Visual arts linger. Art didaktik, Design didaktik, Art and Design didaktik, Art and Crafts didaktik, Art subjects didaktik, and Visual didaktik — all concepts covering the field or parts of the field of research that is occupied with learning and teaching within art, design and crafts (Ongstad 2004). Even though it might seem natural to pick A&C didaktik as my area of research, I have not done so. I will instead place myself within *Art and Design didaktik*. The reason for me to do so lies with the new categories within the 2006 National Curriculum *Kunnskapsløftet — the Knowledge promotion*.

DKS as a program established within the boundaries of the subject A&C, will as such be a subject-matter didaktik question, as the what, why and how of the program will have to be made in relation to the what, why and how of A&C. What should be the content, why and how to achieve a best possible result for school children — these are all questions located in the expert knowledge of the professional teachers of A&C. It is located within Art and Design didaktik. To discuss the involvement or exclusion of the teaching profession in this program is of utmost importance to the subject-matter didaktik that deals with the legitimisation of the subject, subject development and the concept of knowledge and quality that is needed.

THE 'SCHOOL WORLD' — GOVERNING THOUGHTS

To approach issues of collaborations within DKS, a history of the subject through the lens of subject-matter didaktik thinking will be presented. The questions of subject-matter didaktik in the present presuppose knowledge of the philosophy and the ontology of the A&C subject. This pertains to history and traditions, content, and change, as well as to hopes for the future and debate both within the subject area and the more general educational field. DKS is a part of this picture as a result of its placement within the 'school world'.

A Short History

A&C is mandatory from 1st to 10th grade in Norway. This can be seen as a result of how traditionally A&C subject-matter knowledge has been recognised as an invaluable contribution to every-day life, both in a political and educational perspective. With the introduction of the Norwegian National Curriculum *Læreplanverket for den 10-årige grunnskolen (L'97)* of 1997 (KUF 1996), the subject A&C was upheld as one of the largest mandatory subjects in compulsory school. With the National curriculum of 2006, it is currently the fifth largest in school (KD and Udir 2006). The subject has a long tradition in Norway. It has been (Trier 1892), and still is, among the most popular subjects with the school children (Carlsen and Streitlien 1995; Kjosavik et al. 2003). The subject-matter in A&C advocates both a practical, theoretical and critical approach to the subject. Here the creation of a product is highlighted, the actual production of the product, the ethical concerns and choices that are made in creating our environment, the comprehension of scales, elevation plans and work plans, and the unveiling of the manipulation of both facts and feelings (KD and Udir 2006).

As a subject area in general education in Norway, A&C has a history going back to 1889 (KSD 1924; KUD 1925). Art & Crafts has, throughout its history, from the time it was established as three separate subjects (KSD 1924; KUD 1925), until today, had a strong position within the curriculum. The subject area was established in 1889 as the separate school subjects: *Crafts for boys*, *Crafts for girls* and *Drawing*.³⁵ Teacher training followed the same division as the school subjects Crafts for boys, Crafts for girls and Drawing. The didaktik debate concerning the issue of the professional teaching practice preceded the implementation of the school subject. Books were written, and the arenas that gathered teachers together debated the form, content and who should be responsible for teaching it (Øde 1880:4). On the question of the professional A&C teacher it was said that: “He must be both Teacher and Craftsman — yes Craftsman in different Fields — in one and the same Person” (Øde 1880:4).³⁶ It was pointed out that the professional A&C teacher had to possess knowledge both on the ontological and epistemological level. Theories of learning, thoughts on how to choose the

³⁵ Originally Norway had separate curricula for urban schools (Byskolen) and rural schools (Landsfolkeskolen). The Curriculum for the rural school stated that as time was particularly valuable (logistic problems and teaching resources spread thin provided for a more restricted school offer than in the cities), any content the children might learn at home should not be taught in school. While drawing was mandatory for all from the start, Craft for boys and Craft for girls were as such regarded as not mandatory in the rural school where this was a part of every-day work. It was made mandatory for all in 1939 but the schools were given until July 1. 1942 to implement the change.

³⁶ OQ: “Han maa være baade Lærer og Haandværker – ja Haandverker i forskjellige Fag — i en og samme Person”.

relevant knowledge to create a useful subject-matter, break it down for teaching, and possess the practical skills to accomplish it all. The professional A&C teacher has from the very beginning been important to the subject's survival and development. The content has changed, as well it should, in concert with the changing ideas and material culture surrounding the school, but the position as a mandatory part of the curriculum has not been lost. The discussion within A&C education in Norway has centred around why and how crafts, art and design should be a part of education.

At the time when it was introduced into the school, Norway was mainly a country of small communities dependent upon farming, and the ability to maintain tools and clothes was necessary knowledge. The basic crafts were seen as important skills to sustain the household (KSD 1924; KUD 1925). When the subject was first introduced, it was seen as vital to manage everyday life in both rural and urban life. Drawing was included as well as patterns and work plans for emerging industrial production (Efland 1990), but also for farm related processes (Digranes 1933). There was richness in thoughts and writings concerning art and design education in Norway and the other Scandinavian countries in the period following the inclusion of the subjects in 1889 (Eng 1918; 1926; Mikkelsen 1912; Thane 1912). The discussion developed further and peaked in the years around World War II (Bakke and Arnekleiv 1948; Berg 1948; Bull-Hansen and Mæhlum 1932; Digranes 1933; Eng 1944; Roti 1940; Trætteberg 1934). Sadly, most of these writings have remained in the past. As the romantic persuasion from Read (1945) and Lowenfeld (1970) took hold in the subject area (Bull-Hansen 1953; Jørgensen 1945; Komitéen for vandreudstillingen 1945), these earlier writings were to some extent forgotten. They are mostly mentioned in passing remarks in recent literature for the teacher training in A&C (Haabesland and Vavik 2000).

With the launch of the 9-year compulsory school in 1960, the three subjects became one (Forsøksrådet for skoleverket 1968). This was preceded by the merging of the different teachers of the crafts in a common national association *Norsk tegne- og håndarbeidslærerforbund (NTHF)* in 1931 (Nielsen 2006). The other countries in the Scandinavian tradition, however, do not operate with a joint subject area. Sweden has 'sloyd', and 'textile sloyd' — craft oriented, and 'bild' — which is art oriented, but also incorporates design and media. There are different teacher education programmes for each subject, and the time resources are given separately on the timetable. The teachers within the different subjects are worried that the area will lose ground to more theoretical subjects such as Mathematics, Science and languages. They are today debating a joint effort under a new

banner, to appear unified and stronger.³⁷ In Denmark on the other hand, the area has been reduced to exist mostly in ‘Billedkunst’ (Fine art), which to a great extent is built on a romantic tradition of art history and analysis, and placed within the frames of the subject Danish. The sloyd (wood) and textile are restricted to 5th and 6th grade, but only for half of the year. There have been different teacher education programmes for the sloyd and textile subjects. This changed in 2007, when the two teacher training courses became one new course called Material culture. The school subjects still remain separate in 2008/2009, and have time resources given separately on the timetable.³⁸ Finland still operates with Textile sloyd, Technical sloyd and Art training (Kunstfostran). The teacher training mirrors this division, but now includes courses from the other areas. The school legislation has opened up for a change in schools. Most commonly the school children have Textile sloyd and Technical sloyd until 6th grade. Seventh to 10th grade they choose one to specialize in. The school has to provide teachers in both areas. The new legislations also allow not offering specialization, but rather have one teacher teach all. The subject area is still strong in Finland, but as the politicians have announced the start of a new curriculum process, the question regarding subject development and survival is relevant.³⁹

In Norway the separate subjects were gathered under the new name *Forming* in 1960. In retrospect, this merger, preceded by the merging of the teacher’s associations, can be seen as an important political and educational move towards positioning one strong subject as opposed to several smaller subjects. From a Scandinavian perspective, it appears that, while the other Scandinavian countries presently struggle to unite the teachers and organisations in a common professional cause, this struggle has been ongoing, and has to some degree levelled out in the Norwegian educational discourse. Notwithstanding the internal struggle of uniting the craft tradition with the art tradition, the subject A&C has always had a strong position within both educational practice and the national curricula (Nielsen 2000). The new subject Forming in the 1960 curriculum represented a new direction for the subject area in school. It still maintained a lot of the focus on materials and techniques, but was visibly inspired by romantic ideas and had as its main aims to: “develop and cultivate the creative forces and the aesthetic sensibilities” (Forsøksrådet for skoleverket 1968:254) of the children. It kept the name Forming through the next curricula *Mønsterplan for grunnskolen 1974* (M74) (KUD 1974), and *Mønsterplan for grunnskolen*

³⁷ This was presented at the Nordic Sloyd and textile teacher’s union’s annual meeting at Helsinki June 2.-3. 2008, by PhD candidate Peter Hasselskog from the *Swedish Slöyd Teachers Association*.

³⁸ This was presented at the Nordic Sloyd and textile teacher’s union’s annual meeting at Helsinki June 2.-3. 2008, by Leif Rosenbeck from the *Danish Slöyd Teachers Association*.

³⁹ This was presented at the Nordic Sloyd and textile teacher’s union’s annual meeting at Helsinki June 2.-3. 2008, by Maj Åberg-Hildén and Dr. Jaana Lepistö from the *Finnish Slöyd Teachers Association*.

1987 (M87) (*KUD 1987*). The romantic ideals were at its clearest in M74. The subject changed names again to *Art and Crafts* with the *Curriculum of 1997 (L'97)* (KUF 1996). The romantic ideals were still present, but tempered by a renewed focus on societal questions and knowledge. This approach to the subject area was also introduced as a way of thinking from other political documents (Kulturdepartementet 1992). The curriculum was divided into the 2D — image and fine art, and 3D — crafts and sculpture, which provided an unclear division between fine art and material culture (Digranes 2006b). The fine art orientation was still strong, and the use of named 'artist canons' was important. Design and architecture were mentioned in the subject-matter as parts of 3D thinking.

Prior to the launch of L'97, there was a heated debate concerning the new name of the subject (Vestøl 1995b). The debate came as a reaction to the new developments in the curriculum. The different sides were for 1) keeping the existing name (Sundvor and Melbye 1995), 2) giving it the name Art and Design (Lied 1995), or yet again the name 3) Art and Crafts (Reitan 1995). The craft orientation, which, even in times of romantic ideals, has been and still is strong in educational practice, resisted the change to Art and Design as it was seen as too far removed from the craft tradition. This debate surrounding the change of subject name is an example of what a name can, and should, signal for the future of a subject in view of content and epistemology. The debate was later given the name *Navnefeiden* — 'The battle of names' (Vestøl 1995b), and in the aftermath, Art and Crafts was established (Vestøl 1995a). The name of a program or field can thus be of such importance that extensive debates will be held in case of any change. A name will signal what a specific field or subject prioritises in terms of epistemology and ontology, and knowledge concerning both, not only to the experts but to the lay community. The orientation towards a clarification of the importance of the physical environment was enhanced in the curriculum of 2006 (KD and Udir 2006). In the *Knowledge Promotion (LK06)* of 2006 the new sub-categories *Fine art, Architecture, Design* and *Visual communication* allows for an understanding of the difference between fine art and our physical surroundings. Even as the debate concerning names ended with another conclusion in 1997, I find that *Art and Design didaktik* in light of this new development will be a better choice of name. Design, as opposed to craft, will also cover architecture and the new visual medias (Nielsen 2008), as well as the traditional crafts (Reitan 2007).

The new sub-categories spell out and illuminate the characteristics and importance of the different parts. This has an impact on the struggle for recognition and legitimisation that is taking place in the curriculum debate in relation to the new focus on *the knowledge society*. As these subdivisions

correspond to aims and areas of further work in several White papers — *Reports to the Storting* — they contribute to the positioning of the subject (KKD 2003b; 2005; KUF 2004; Kulturdepartementet 1992; UFD 2003; 2005). Even though the subject in the 2006 curriculum is given new sub-categories (KD and Udir 2006), the more traditional themes drawing, woodwork, sewing and metalwork are still strong within the practice, the subject's ontology (Mauren 2006a; 2006b).

This might at first glance seem outdated in a world filled with gadgets, and technology accessible to all. Still, some skills that are important in the visual society that we have created come from the ability to master the basic skills of drawing and manipulating materials (Nielsen 2000; 2003). This is highlighted rather than hidden by the new categories. The built environment and everyday products rank as importantly as fine art. It is also the practical part of the subject most recognised as important by the school children (Carlsen and Streitlien 1995; Kjosavik et al. 2003). Visual communication, which makes use of all forms of drawing techniques, can be seen as the basis for the other three. While the subject-matter knowledge base seems to be made clearer by these divisions, the struggle at practice level to sustain both the art perspective and the crafts and design perspective becomes visible yet again. This struggle reflects another problem area within the subject practice that has been present throughout the subject history. There is a constant need to reconcile the perspective of useful knowledge through skills and theory, and the artistic freedom of the individual, emotive perspective of child art.

THE 'ART WORLD' — GOVERNING THOUGHTS

The Norwegian art scene might not have a long history compared to other European countries, but it still has been through several changes. Theories addressing the art scene can be said to fall within a normative approach or an analytical approach (Bjørkås 1996). The practice, however, might not be that clear-cut. Thus, a brief look into the dominant views of the Norwegian art scene is a necessary backdrop to understand the artist's role in DKS.

The Normative Approach — The 'Charismatic Artist'

One of the influential figures in the normative approach (Bjørkås 1996) is Kant, and his notion of the artist genius can be recognised in the romantic views expressed in the art scene today (Aslaksen 1997; Mangset 2004). The paradigm instigated by Kant's (1995) theories of moral and divine inspiration has also been admired within educational paradigms in art education. I will not delve deeply into Kantian philosophy, but take a brief look at the part where he discusses art, the artist and why something is seen as art or not. This

brief look into his work is included because of its impact on the artists' view of their professional field today, and also on young aspiring artists' social and cultural expectations (Aslaksen 1997; Mangset 2004).

Art, Nature, Science and the Genius

Art is separated from nature through the fact that it is created with a conscious goal by the artist, while nature cannot be said to be conscious as such. Kant claims; "By right we should not call anything art except a production through freedom, i.e., through a power of choice that bases its acts on reason" (Kant 1987:170). Nature produces beauty, but from instinct not reason. Art is therefore exclusively manmade objects — artefacts and the presence of an artefact are mandatory for anything to be art. Kant writes: "But if we simply call something a work of art in order to distinguish it from natural effect, then we always mean by that a work of man" (Kant 1987:170). He then goes on to describe the division of science and art through beauty and reason. Beauty is concept free and art is arrived at through beauty. Science on the other hand, is not in beauty, but in good — in reason. Science is an absolute that we in theory might learn, while making art might not. While science and craft is done in the service of occupations, and as such the pay check, art is spirit and freedom to enlighten the reason. "Fine art, on the other hand, is a way of presenting that is purposive on its own and that furthers, even though without a purpose, the culture of our mental powers to [facilitate] social communication." (Kant 1995:185) The art is autonomous, while craft and science need to be used for a purpose beyond itself. The artistic genius is thus introduced to solve the dichotomy of nature and the sublime and the human limitations. Kant lets the artist become a vessel for something higher outside him as nature graces the artist with his ability to produce art.

"Genius is the talent (natural endowment) that gives the rule to art. Since talent is an innate productive ability of the artist and as such belongs itself to nature, we could also put it this way:
Genius is the innate mental predisposition (*ingenium*) through which nature gives the rule to art" (Kant 1995:187).

The important question is; who makes it and what is the content? The production of art is not subject to ordinary skills, or rules of simple crafts, it is subordinate to the genius in the shape of the artist — the 'Charismatic Artist'. The genius guides the content, and taste guides the shape and expression it is given. Taste is the link between genius, originality, spirit, idea, and the presentation of the aforementioned. Henceforth art is created by man, but at the same time not by man. Something has to be added to human

nature before art is achievable. This is the artistic *genius*. How something is made is not an important question and, as such, education is redundant.

The Analytical Approach — The ‘Art World’ Institution

To create total opposites of science/knowledge/reason and beauty/aesthetics/art is neither equally highlighted in the analytical approach, nor in newer theories of art, design, and architecture (Cross 2006; Digranes 2006b; Schön 1995). In more recent theories the focus is taken off either the art object or the artist, and instead the focus is on the analytical approach to the totality, the ‘art world’ institution. “... what I now mean by the institutional approach is the view that a work of art is art because of the position it occupies within a cultural practice...” (Dickie 1984:53). The artist is an artist as an act of choice, through his knowledge of the ‘art world’ and because he chooses to operate in this particular world (Danto 1986; Dickie 1984; 2001). This view opposes the notion of the genius as the deciding factor in art. It becomes an act of choice that anyone might execute if they have the right knowledge to do so.

The institutional theory agrees with Kant on the fact that for something to be art it has to be an artefact. Dickie and Danto disagree with Kant however (Danto 1986; 1996; Dickie 1974; 1984; 2001), on how something becomes an artefact, and the manner in which it is seen as art.

”For the purpose of the discussion the driftwood alone (unaltered and unused) is a simple object and the driftwood altered or used is a complex object. The complex objects are complex because their original (simple) objects have undergone a change at the hands of an agent” (Dickie 1984:45).

A found object can become an artefact, as it is given a new meaning by the artist. He places it in a new context, where the then artefact becomes something that it was not before. It becomes art. Art can be made by almost anyone; “The final assumption is that artmaking is something which almost everyone can do. (...) Various primitive skills are required to make art, as well as the ability to understand the nature of the enterprise” (Dickie 1984:14). Making good art is another matter. This is something the institutional approach does not wish to discuss. The question whether it is a masterpiece or good art, is placed in the artworks’ *something extra*. If the *something extra* is to be defined, who will have the power to define it? The art public is introduced as: “... a set of persons the members of which are prepared in some degree to understand an object which is presented to them” (Dickie 1984:81). In other words, this large and seemingly homogeneous group should perform the quality judgment. Since this is located in the

problem *quality in art*, rather than in the problem *what is considered an artwork*, how this is done is not clear in the institutional approach. Knowledge and power are, thus, unconsciously introduced as factors, though not clearly voiced in the theories.

The Norwegian Art Scene

The Norwegian art scene can be said to have progressed through several stages. Through a 'borgerlig-nasjonal' — a 'bourgeois national' epoch that lasted until the end of World War 2. After the war, building the nation became the main object, and the art scene supported a 'velferds-nasjonal' — 'welfare national' epoch that would last until the mid 80^{ies} (Bjørkås 1996). This included an orientation towards establishing Riksutstillingen, that toured the country giving the public art access to make them into a qualified art audience (Solhjell 2006). This political project was also reflected in the 'school world' orientation, the 'lecturing attitude' and the desire to bestow on people useful cultural knowledge.

The postmodern influence on the cultural can be seen in the 'art world' (Bjørkås 1996). It is not clear what this postmodern orientation will mean in terms of the belief in the 'charismatic artist'? Will it be viable to say that the romantic orientation is gone with the postmodern influence? In light of the change from modernism to postmodernism both in artistic expression and ideology, several new artist roles have been suggested as alternatives to the charismatic (Abbing 2002). Abbing, in his discussion of the 'exceptional economy' of the art, presents new attitudes to the artist's role by today's practice field. They all spring from the modernist role, but are nourished into separate avenues of managing the professional work. He introduces the *artist-researcher*, the *postmodern artist*, the *artist-craftsman*, and the *artist-entertainer*.

The artist-researcher has already entered the scene, as part of the expert discourse — closed from the main public, and is not really preoccupied with the audience or the buyers. The artist-researcher displays a willingness to demystify the arts if this could secure the professional status. Taking an approach that resembles a scientist, this artist type is as such willing to enter academia and teach. However, this 'research take' on art, does not offer the entertainment or sacred aura that is useful for buyers or donors. The artist-researcher seems already to be on the way out according to Abbing, because if this artist attitude becomes dominant, art would be marginalised in a market not responding to it (Abbing 2002).

The postmodern artist is all about challenging the rules and breaking boundaries. Moving between art genres, and ignoring the earlier schism of

commissioned art and free art, the postmodern artist challenges the views of art — denying economy, and often establishing a business where assistants can do some of the work. The postmodern artist, however, cannot exist without boundaries and tends to be a paradox. To survive, this artist type will either become an established businessperson within a professional field, or accept the re-establishment of borders. According to Abbing, the postmodern artist is not a force to count on in the long run (Abbing 2002).

The artist-craftsman lost some standing during the era of conceptual art, but is now reclaiming his place. The refocusing on techniques — both old and new — and the introduction of traditional expressions in paintings and sculptures through craftsmanship means they are again recognised as accepted forms of art. However, the artist-craftsman is not after stardom, and modestly asks no more than the piece is worth in materials and time. This makes the artist-craftsman type, in Abbing's view, a limited influence in the 'art world' (Abbing 2002).

The artist-entertainer on the other hand, seems to pick up where the 'charismatic artist' left off. It is all about pleasing the audience, and as a consequence of this, pleasing the market. The market responds to the orientation towards re-establishing the notion of art as something 'more'. The artist-entertainer tends to deny economy, and does not want a secularisation of art, as profit is linked to the conception of the 'magic' or the sacred in art. The artist-entertainer might be seen as a 'cynical-romantic artist attitude', as the keeping of the romantic through maintaining the dominant paradigm of the 'charismatic' is the agenda for the portrayed ideology. Abbing claims that this artist type will be the most influential, as donors — both the free market and the government will respond to it — and, as such, *fund the attitude* (Abbing 2002).

Solhjell (2006) claims that the postmodern artist type that was oriented towards boundary breaking and existing outside the establishment was influential in Norway in the mid 90s but soon disappeared from the arena. The artists, galleries and forums that were active were soon swallowed back into the existing regime. Mangset discusses the four artist attitudes in relation to the emerging identities of young artists in Norway (Mangset 2004). Maybe not surprisingly, there is still a strong orientation towards believing in the modernist role of the 'charismatic artist', even as some of the other traits are displayed. The Visual art education institutions, and the art institutions at large, exhibit 'charismatic characteristics' that still allow for a mystification of the magic and sacred of art (Aslaksen 1997). Even as the postmodern *artist-entertainer* can be seen in some instances, it seems to me that they tend to blend into modernist notions (Schaanning 2000). Even as the strategy is

disruptive, the end result is societal progress and freedom. Even as the strategy is breaking boundaries, it is to reach a higher standard for human behaviour. The methods might have changed, but some of the goals can be seen to correspond.

The 'Charismatic Artist' and the 'Art World'

Even as it appears that on the practice level, the current dominant thought in Norway when it comes to making art is still that of the 'charismatic artist' (Mangset 2004), the acceptance of the thoughts of the art institution exists alongside in terms of the total 'art world'. The 'art world' is seen as an institution (Solhjell 1995), not in the formal sense of the word — as laws and regulations — but as an established work practice. This theory does not discuss the internal running of such an institution, but presupposes a system where all the involved parties are equal in position and power. The important questions that have been raised concerning the inclusion and exclusion of 'art world' members, is in my view difficult, if not impossible, to address through Dickie's theories (Dickie 1974; 1984; 2001), as he, as mentioned previously, does not address the question of quality. This discussion is seen as something to be addressed by the 'art world' participants. The inclusion in the institution is seen as the decisive step, and quality judgements are ideally made on all levels of the institution. The normative is said to have given way to the analytic approach (Bjørkås 1996). Nevertheless, in practice, the normative and analytical seem to exist quite comfortably side-by-side. Even as the 'gate-keepers' and boundaries are recognised, the vocational aspect of art and the view of the artist as a person guided by outside forces, compelled to make art because he can do nothing but follow his inner voice, is still very much alive in today's art scene (Aslaksen 1997; Mangset 2004).

The combination of the 'charismatic artist' — where quality cannot be discussed through anything but the genius, and the artist-entertainer (Abbing 2002) — where quality cannot be discuss through anything but boundlessness, the magic and the sacred, leads to a lack of discussion concerning quality in the 'art world' The boundaries of what is art are seen as inclusion in a system rather than as qualities in the artwork itself, and leaves the dilemma: Who is responsible for judging the 'unfathomable' qualities that exist in an art work, and on what grounds are these quality judgments made? In practice this turns out to be a somewhat more mundane action, with gate keepers and power struggles, were money and status, the right schooling, the right exhibitions and friends are important factors (Bjørkås 2004), and paradigm shifts follow these developments (Bjørkås 1996). Thus the quality of the artwork is still a debate not ventured into, as it is either addressed in an execution of 'genius' or 'definition of self', or in whom you know.

KNOWLEDGE & CHARISMATIC ART

Ever since art and design education was established as a school subject in Norway, and Art and design didaktik have developed as a field of expertise, it can be recognised that two opposite views have dominated the epistemological debate of the subject. These two positions can still be seen in today's debate. The first is based firmly in the thoughts of relevant skill and knowledge, and the other in the focus on individual growth and self-expression (Digranes 2006b). In the initial years of the subject, the craft tradition, originally based in useful everyday techniques, and education through copying of models was strong in both theory and practice. But at the same time, as a counter movement to industrialisation and its work methods, the reform pedagogical orientation gained influence on all levels of education, (Telhaug 2005) and also in A&C. The romantic notion of the child as the original artist unencumbered by external knowledge became an accepted view in the practice of the subject. The romantic tradition manifested itself through figures such as Rousseau, Ruskin, Fröebel and Dewey (Efland 2004; Eng 1918) and was important to the Norwegian tradition. The reform pedagogy and child art oriented movement were influential and advocated the critique of industrial processes and mass production, and what they saw to be the consequence — what, if it is given a label, might be called 'recipe thinking' — in teaching. They were also an influence within A&C education, and became the base for the 'individually centred side'. It highlights the nurturing of the individual through an ideology supporting total freedom of expression rather than external teaching.

As a result the skill-oriented model-based approach of the craft tradition was questioned and modified, and gradually the school subject changed into the facilitation of self-expression. In its extreme form it advocated no outside influence in the child's learning processes. The world should as such be discovered untainted by grownups. The individually centred person is a moral person, and a moral person is the best society can hope for in terms of development. In Norway, Lowenfeld and Brittain's book: *Creative and Mental Growth* (1971), validating child art and the romantic attitude towards education, held the throne for a long time (Nielsen 2000).⁴⁰ Art and design education in the subject named Forming was dominated mainly by ideals of free expression and child art (KUD 1987). When the Scandinavian schools embraced this, it appears as though feeling and self-expression became dominant to such an extent that the previous written texts (Aagesen et al.

⁴⁰ Nielsen shows in her thesis from 2000 how the book went out of print in the Danish version used in Norway in 1996. Even though it is referred to in important books in the teacher training still, the original text is no longer available in Scandinavian. Because English literature is not common in Norwegian teacher training this might, according to Nielsen, show the decline of this specific tradition (Nielsen 2000:72).

1912; Bull-Hansen and Mæhlum 1932; Digranes 1933; Trættestad 1934) lost some of their attraction. Who would need theory at all, if no learning can be derived from education? Why would texts concerning technique and examples be considered anything but redundant?

Anna Lena Lindberg (1988) writes of two distinct attitudes in Scandinavian art education. It seems that even though they differ somewhat in orientation, in my view they can both be seen to originate from a romantic notion of individualism and moral growth through art. One view, the 'lecturing attitude', is recognised by its need to fill the receiver with useful cultural knowledge. Through this knowledge, the individual will be able to better understand the need for culture and art. It might be possible to say that this has some links to democracy and the notion that everybody has the right to an equal opportunity to participate in society, here in the form of observing and understanding culture. Lindberg, however, does not discuss the 'lecturing attitude' in light of democracy, and it is described as a dubious passive way of organising art education. It promotes the view of the student as a passive recipient, rather than an active participant in the knowledge field. The 'charismatic attitude' on the other hand is recognised by its ideology of art as feeling, not reason. All learning is individual from an inner source. Learning is derived from the inner voice of the individual, and this is what is necessary to develop society (Lowenfeld 1970). Neither the 'lecturing attitude' nor the 'charismatic attitude' captures the strong craft tradition and the knowledge contained in the practice,⁴¹ and both are in my estimation in its own way a passive view of art education. Because of the lecturing attitude's lack of focus on skills as a part of the knowledge base, and because the charismatic attitude considers knowledge that exists outside the individual to be irrelevant to the subject as such, no teaching is possible. This is a paradox in an educational setting.

Remnants of these problems can also be seen in the A&C curriculum of 2006, where the practical aspect of the subject, such as techniques, skills and materials are no longer linked directly to specific models or projects the way it used to be. This is seen as hindering the creative processes that will enable the child to explore their place in the world. Freedom from constants such as models or canons is seen as preferred over a base where the pupils solve the same problem by the same procedure. To draw a comparison to Mathematics, it would mean that the pupils were asked to solve the given problems, not by a set way of working, but by experimenting on their own with no models to learn from or set tools to use. In any other subject than Arts and Crafts this way of teaching would be recognised as irresponsible. Experimentation

⁴¹ This is a problem that deserves a further discussion. I will however not address it at present.

would be seen as the last step after learning a set of skills and models for solutions. This is yet again the dilemma of artistic freedom within an institution of education. I do not advocate that the model-based approach is the only right way to conduct the subject. However, it is one of the ways towards a common knowledge base and skills that are required to achieve a certain level of proficiency in the subject. To choose an approach only through creative self-expression will not ensure that the pupils are uninfluenced by outside sources, but that they will be influenced by all external sources that might have an aesthetic agenda, be it beneficial or not (Duncum 2007). Having no knowledge to reflect on aesthetical or material choices is a poor point of departure.

The teaching professional's role and discussion of expert knowledge becomes vital along with a reflection on the subject's history and practice. If consulting the sub-categories of the Curriculum of 2006, I would claim that these two views of A&C try to reconcile within one document. There is a difference in the purpose and use of the objects — creative art works, or designs and models. If pressed to highlight the factors behind the different approaches, I would say: 1) the individual focus of fine art — how one person/group chooses to substantiate a comment on an idea, and 2) the group concerns of design, architecture and visual communication — how to make the best product/solution to secure a gain — financial, social, cultural, ethical and/or environmental. One work is executing an ethical comment and the other is causing an ethical consequence. One is individual expression, while the other is a knowledge-based product. This is as important as some of the similarities in techniques and/or materials or compositions used. In spite of having these two distinct features present, the main focus of the A&C subject-matter content is on the qualified users and clients in the material world. The knowledge described in the “new subject” cannot be said to be ‘wrong as such’, as it is a result of a tradition and a contemporary focus on what constitutes a qualified user and consumer. However, in connection to the focus of the *Core curriculum*, there is a need to deliberate over the concept of knowledge (Skarpenes 2005) and basic subject-matter content in question to the qualified user and subject-matter knowledge.

The core curriculum of the current curriculum highlights some of these dilemmas as it states that the end result for the professional teacher should be to provide an education which contributes to a society of ‘integrated human beings’ (KUF 1996). This integrated human being is equipped to deal with a rapidly changing society. It is a moral being. The common platform for all is being able to continuously learn. It can then be argued that this constant 1) focus on feeling safe, seen through the widely used slogan; *School — a safe place to be, a good place to learn*, where learning somehow is placed as

secondary, and 2) the focus on the changing society and a need for qualification for participating throughout a situation of change reflected in the slogan; *Responsibility to educate yourself*⁴² can be seen as a development on the expense of subject-specific knowledge (Skarpenes 2005). The constant inward focus on personal knowledge and everyday actions, combined with focus on societal change has eroded the knowledge base of the Norwegian curriculum (Skarpenes 2004; Time 2005). The need to feel safe warrants an integration of everyday experiences into the individual learning and teaching/ learning strategies for future knowledge gain takes precedence over basic knowledge content (Telhaug 2005; 2006). To be able to learn continuously can be read as being more important than possessing any fixed level of knowledge (Skarpenes 2005).

In addition to this general problem regarding subject-matter knowledge content, for A&C and the knowledge aspect, there is another factor that becomes important as well. Is the subject recognised as a knowledge subject? Even as it tries to communicate knowledge content on several levels, there is no demand for final examination within the subject. It will be evaluated solely by what is called Overall achievement grades, not by external evaluations (KD and Udir 2006). It can be seen as a signal towards seeing the subject as lacking a knowledge base, but rather accepted as a place to 'relax' (Henriksen 2008). This attitude is a survivor of the romantic orientation. This focus on individuality and feeling has an impact on the A&C teachers' positions as professionals as well. If nothing can be taught, why do you need a professional to teach? If A&C is not to be considered a knowledge-based subject at all, and coping with change is more important than a minimum of skills and knowledge, why hire a professional? If this *emotivism* (Skarpenes 2005) and its romantic individual focus (Borgen 2005) continues to be the leading paradigm, then the teachers' personality traits will continue to be seen as more important than the teachers' professional knowledge (Skarpenes 2005). However, the merge of 1960 forced a discussion between the crafts and their focus on 'practical useful knowledge and skill', the art and the focus on a charismatic view of the individual, and the romantic view of the child. Through a continuous debate at practice level Art & Crafts has slowly developed into a subject where 'sloyd', 'textile', 'technology', and 'fine art' topics imbricate and cooperate within the four sub-categories Architecture, Design, Visual communication, and Fine art.

Now, in light of new technology and visual media, there is an orientation back towards some of the craft thinking, product, knowledge, and process. The tenet is that this holistic approach offers a strengthening of the parts. In

⁴² Norwegian slogan: Ansvar for eiga læring!

Scandinavia Otto Salomon and the Nääs-sløid, Uno Cygneus and Aksel Mikkelsen (Aagesen et al. 1912; Digranes 1933) were early on part of establishing an education based on tradition but consisting both of knowledge, technical skill, and individual creativity, and today these sources and resources are rediscovered in texts written before the war. The Knowledge promotion can be seen as a step towards reconciling the two sides of A&C. It has an opening for teaching art as creative self-expression, and to teach knowledge of scale, work plans, materials and the acquisition of specific skills. It is into this landscape DKS is introduced. In a subject that, from my point of view, after almost 50 years of discussing an integration of all parts, has reached a point where agreement is under way, a new professional is introduced. The romantic focus and the knowledge focus that within the teaching profession has gone through countless rounds of deliberation, is now revived by political intervention. I do not claim that DKS is not an admirable effort to give children the possibility to widen their horizon. However, I do question the way it is done, and the lack of any considerations in regards to consequences and the subjects it affects. The ‘art world’ that is included into the program, have their own particularities that they bring to the table.

Two Views in Art and Design Education

Individual expression and knowledge have become key concepts in relation to the discussion within the A&C subject, and lately in regards to DKS. The re-entry of the focus on skill and knowledge in the A&C curriculum might at several points be seen to go against the former dominant romantic educational practice within the subject. The subject itself is a meeting ground between two worlds, art and education. A brief look at literature on art and design didaktik in Norway from 1900 onward and through the curricula debates, show that the questions that were of concern at that time are still disputed today. The struggle continues to combine: individual — society; skill — creativity; taste — quality; technique — self expression; artist — craftsman; artistic expression — tradition; innate talent — knowledge; and freedom — teaching. These conflicts might never be resolved, but might be eased by research on professional practice. However, in the field of A&C education in Norway, the research base is limited so while the practice in A&C in Norwegian compulsory school is strong, it is not as yet strongly established as a knowledge producing discipline outside of practice (Gulliksen 2006; Nielsen 2008; Reitan 2007).

End Comment

In the school-anchored program Den Kulturelle Skulesekken, based on thoughts of a collaboration of equals between the two worlds, and artists and teacher, some of these contradictions and tensions are brought to the surface and might allow for studies into these professional dilemmas and the development of the subject. To see the two worlds as opposites would, in my view, restrict both the school subject and the DKS program in its formation process. The Norwegian school is a project of democracy — of bringing a basic level of knowledge to all. However, the 'art world' and the concept of knowledge i.e. Kant's science v art, and the 'charismatic artist-entertainer' do not easily coexist, even as the Norwegian 'art scene' itself has been inspired by the democratic thought of educating the public through bringing art and art understanding to everyone. The mysteries of art and the well accepted 'artistic freedom' do not cohabit with the thoughts of transferable knowledge and goals for judging quality. Quality is not accepted as a defined goal, as this means giving others outside the professional field a standard to judge by. If the quality discussion in the 'art world' is absent, there is a challenge in how it is to be handled in school, particularly in collaboration within the DKS program.

Agreement and Discord

Throughout the previous chapters I have referred to A&C teachers and artists as professionals. The concept professional is used in the two documents *Den Kulturelle Skulesekken. St.meld. nr 38* (KKD 2003a), and *Kulturell skulesekk for framtida. St.meld. nr 8* (KKD 2007). To go about exploring some factors of the collaboration in light of professionalism, I include a short discussion of the concept. After a short introduction to the field of theory of professions, I will introduce the theory regarding justification of choices. I do this to find the point of departure for the professional justification narratives of choices within the practice of the DKS case, and what is presented to the public. The professionals involved in the projects justify their practice and aims, and do so from a set of values and attitudes.

TEACHERS AND ARTISTS AS PROFESSIONALS

Professionalism and the *professionalisation project* are often addressed through structural theories (Nolin 2008), where the process is seen at system level, and described as a rather uniform process with stages that will occur in the ‘professional project’. Professionalism can then be labelled within the two orientations, as: “... normative value system and as controlling ideology” (Evetts 2003:399). The difference lies in how professions are perceived and portrayed — as a positive contribution to society through a wish to contribute positively, or as a control mechanism for economic gain for a social group. In a way these two takes on professionalism might be seen to correspond to the difference between the concepts *calling* and *occupation* — presented as work concerned with values or as an organism in an ideological capacity. The actors in DKS display some of the characteristics towards being labelled professional (Abbott 1988; Evetts 2003; Freidson 2001; Hughes 1984; Larson 1977; Parsons 1951; 1978; Stronach et al. 2002; Witz 1992) Artists can be seen to exist within a state of calling even as professionals. They are compelled to do art (Aslaksen 1997; Mangset 2004). Teachers have been perceived as having a calling as well, and as this stands in opposition to the search for financial gain — efforts to increase salaries can be seen as teachers ‘falling from grace’ in the eyes of the public. The questioning of teachers’ professionalism is not unique to Norway, but is a more comprehensive

development (Hargreaves 2000). Can professional status be conferred while recognising that an expert knowledge base requires higher pay without this being in breach of the ideal to be a contribution to the society rather than a market monopoly?

Professionalism as Ideology

Professionalism as ideology, discuss monopoly on competence as the aim of professionalisation (Evetts 2003). The professions are seen as new, created markets where knowledge can be gathered and harvested as capital by a group of practitioners (Larson 1977). To do this it is necessary to limit the access to the knowledge, and as a result educational institutions teaching expert knowledge are organised, with gatekeepers to exclude all but the accepted. The disciplines to set the standards were medicine and law, and many occupations with a very different set of practices would covet the professional model instigated by these groups. Schoolteachers have, for instance, a propensity to belong to ‘the teaching profession’.

An occupation is bestowed the status of profession on the basis of prerequisites, such as specialisation of function and the accumulation of bodies of expert knowledge (Abbott 1988; Freidson 2001; Hughes 1984; Larson 1977; Parsons 1951). These have roots back to the guilds, which were a very important prelude for the *making professions* later on (Dunin-Woyseth and Nielsen 2003). The formation of specialist education and examination for the elite, connection to the universities, and certificates of expertise distinguished professionalism from the guild tradition. “From dependence upon the power and prestige of elite patrons or upon the judgment of a tightly knit community, the modern profession came to depend upon specific formal training and anonymous certificates” (Larson 1977:4). In this lies the seed to gain control over the market — not a part of it — as even a market of knowledge contains tools for bargaining for position or influence.

Professionalism as Value Structures

The view of professions as primarily an instrument of control is contested, and there are theories that approach professions in a more normative manner, as value structures (Hughes 1984; Parsons 1978). This normative element is recognisable in the expressed conviction that some good might come of bestowing professional status to groups. The shared identity and felt responsibility that a professional group might inhabit will guide them to strive towards a common goal that is more than the economic gratification of controlling a part of the market (Stronach et al. 2002), or shaping a group that would be a form of contrast to the market (Freidson 2001). Expert knowledge

indicates that the lay client will not be in a position to evaluate fully the professional practice undertaken. Trust is a key concept in a client/professional relationship. This requires ethical considerations on the part of the professional; "... this issue also raises the fundamental question of integrity — namely, not only whether, if it exists, it will be used to exploit or benefit the participation lay elements or, as I much prefer to put it, be used in a higher-order *common* interest" (Parsons 1978:46). Client satisfaction and the good of the client are seen as more relevant than the benefit from the control of a specific service. Professionalism has to be earned in the ethical sense, where lay people's trust in the profession must be honoured:

"...a good professional has also to be someone who possesses, in addition to specified theoretical or technical expertise, a range of distinctly moral attitudes, values and motives designed to elevate the interest and needs of clients, patients or pupils above self-interest" (Carr 2000:26).

When professionals put the interests of the lay public over their own interests, it will function as a contradictory force to pure profit or bureaucracy (Freidson 2001; Hughes 1984). This orientation outward towards social change or development has some of the aspects of having a calling, or a vocation.

THE WORK PRACTICE AS A VITAL FACTOR

Both of these approaches have been questioned as to their lack of focus on the actual processes of work at practice and actor level (Abbott 1988; Evetts 2003). The structural approach, which is necessary, can be limiting if it supposes that professions are uniform structures — that the same processes and sequence in development will be equal to all professions. As professions are operational on different levels of 'consciousness': at state, market and societal level, at organisational and institutional level, and at work, actor and group level (Evetts 2003), thus theories of professionalism must be as well. Parsons claims that professional status is limited by the occupations having to proceed through three stages (Parsons 1978:40). Abbott, on the other hand, claims that the work practise is fluent and diverse, with continued change of boundaries and positions. The professions will all differ and this will make a unitary definition complicated. They create themselves in several manners — as a community of practice (Wenger 1998), or rather a community of reference (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000).

"This common identity is produced and reproduced through occupational and professional socialization by means of shared and common educational backgrounds, professional training

and vocational experiences, and by membership of professional associations (local, regional, national and international) and societies where practitioners develop and maintain a shared work culture” (Evetts 2003:401).

In view of this, structural models at the state and organisational level are not sufficient. Abbott claims that: “The central problem with the current concept of professionalization is its focus on structure rather than work” (Abbott 1988:19). Also the professions are changing, some becoming redundant, and some growing with new demands. However, there is a factor to consider even on the level of work practice that will apply to them all. The professions will be seen as parts of a whole. Not any one profession can be seen as unrelated to another. They are recognised by their boundaries — what separates them from the next. Here the thoughts of a system, rather than a structure, are valuable. “Professions are never seen alone, but they are also not replaced by a single encompassing category of “the professions”. They exist in a system” (Abbott 1988:33). This will mean that discussions concerning the professionalism of *A&C teachers* within DKS, have to be made in relation to the *Artists* in the project. One profession’s boundaries are recognised by the boundaries of the professions in proximity to it. They ‘work’ together, and as such, can tell us of the dynamics that come into play in that particular case.

My focus on this ‘micro’ perspective in the DKS program and evaluated DKS projects — the perspective of the work and the justifications concerning the choices made in the work practice — thus becomes of great importance. “It is the content of the professions’ work that the case studies tell us is changing. It is control of work that brings the professions into conflict with each other and makes their histories interdependent” (Abbott 1988:19). It is in the justifications of the DKS practice that the agenda of the two involved professions and their place in relation to each other are communicated and established. Their expert knowledge is commented on and expressed by media and evaluation narratives. It is in the differences that characteristics are highlighted (Latour 2005), and in the similarities that cause disruption that the change in placement can be seen, and the public is brought into the struggle. It is in the *ambiguous situations* (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006) that occur and the justification narratives that are told that the boundaries between the professions are challenged, and recognised, as they are articulated through purpose and the distribution of perceived relevant knowledge. The collaboration projects within DKS can, in my view, be seen as an arena for *narratives of professional struggle* based on how representations of professionals and professional practice are presented to the public. Actions can be seen as a form of justification in its own right. The strategic sides of actions, to organize the work in relationality, are what professional claims are

related to. “How can the growth of capabilities be disconnected from the intensification of power relations?” (Foucault 1984:48). The stake then becomes the strength of the claims. In the case of DKS this suggests that the stronger the claim is anchored in a publicly accepted set of values through narratives and strong arguments, the more they will bring control over the professional field in question.

In the case of DKS, this focus on the work practice is not mainly a way to study the process of professionalisation but rather a step towards what Nolin (2008) claims to be the next stage in professional research and theories: “... does not start with the empirical question ‘what are professions really like and how do they really work?’ Rather, there is a point in asking: ‘what kind of professional work does society need?’” (Nolin 2008:25). It moves in a more normative direction, dealing with the professional mandate and tasks, asking if they are good or bad for society in a moral sense. It is a question of quality: “... professionals are knowledge workers and as such they should be steadily working to improve the quality of their work (professionalism) and on their professional identity” (Nolin 2008:25). Even if the professionals involved in DKS justify their presence within the program and work practice, and establish boundaries for their work practice, it is necessary to then apply the question whether it will benefit the pupils and the school institution in strengthening education.

ON JUSTIFICATION

To provide a framework for the discussion on the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ and their concept of what is valuable and good, I have chosen to focus on the theories of *On Justification* by the French sociologists Luc Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot (2006). To strive towards a view that; “... adopts a pluralistic and descriptive strategy towards actions, actors and things” (Bénatouil 1999:379). The Sociology of Critique — a blend of the pragmatic stance and the critical stance (Bénatouil 1999) — is in the process of articulating itself in a language that still partakes of the critical stance, but that also includes the actors of ANT in a project that is actor specific and situated, but at the same time part of a generalisable base: “... the critical impulse presuppose reference to ideals with which the reality to be criticized can be compared” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005:X). They describe the process of trying to reach an agreement that can also be said to cover all the areas in a discussion concerning professional jurisdiction. In DKS, the professionals, organisations and politicians are vocal in their views of the program. They are active in their critiques and have clear views on the best way to proceed and why, and are active in their critique of the situations and what can be perceived as quality. They are not always in agreement, though,

and the discussions concerning the understanding of program aims, content and quality are present on all levels of the collaboration. However, not all the narratives are distributed in equal force by the media to the wider public. This is what is interesting in my study, and why theories of justifications are interesting. When there is disagreement, be it small or large, values are expressed by the actors. “To be able to converge towards an agreement, persons really have to refer to something which is not of persons and which transcends them” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:213). Explicitly or implicitly they explain the reasons behind their going into conflict. To start a conflict is a choice, more or less conscious. In a situation an actor might force the other actors involved to reason for, or justify, the choices or actions that oppose what he himself perceives as the best way to proceed in the given situation. Both through the justification of his actions and the demand for the others to justify theirs will the underlying worth and values be highlighted. This justification for professional practice is what is presented to the public through narratives, and functions as suggested symbolic boundaries, where justifications can be established into new harmonious situations where one argument is stronger than the other and sets the agenda for further collaboration and professional jurisdiction of an area.

Symbolic and Social Boundaries

Boundaries define what is seen as included, excluded, related or overlapping. They can be more or less formal. A division into social and symbolic boundaries has been suggested: “Social boundaries are objectified forms of social differences manifested in unequal access to and unequal distribution of resources (material and nonmaterial) and social opportunities” (Lamont and Molnár 2002:168). So while social boundaries can be found as actual differences in terms of social benefits, living areas or in regulations concerning who has which responsibilities or rights, symbolic boundaries are set up at relational level between the actors in their practice. “Symbolic boundaries are conceptual distinctions made by social actors to categorize objects, people, practices, and even time and space” (Lamont and Molnár 2002:168). They offer a group to identify with, and even more important groups to distance themselves from. “Symbolic boundaries also separate people into groups and generate feelings of similarity and group membership” (Lamont and Molnár 2002:168). If set up, these symbolic boundaries presuppose that someone, on some basis, has a right to make a judgment on quality. These ideals exist both as ideas and as physical manifestations of ideals within the *making disciplines* and particularly at the ontological level of the *making professions*, through form ideals and the concept of quality within the Visual arts.

The Common Good

The theory lists several choices in regards to what is labelled the Higher Common Principle — the view of what constitutes the common good and how to best achieve this goal. The Model of situated judgement: "... primarily recognizes the existence of persons-in-acts characterized by different *positions and chances*" (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:211). This theory of situated judgement does not claim to describe all aspects of the social and as such present itself as a complete social theory. It offers one view, on one aspect of the social: "... one of the regimes that are capable of controlling the moves on which social activity is based (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:209). Social activity can be harmonious or ambiguous. A break from normal — a *situation* — will set in motion criticism to try to control the situation in a way that will bring it back to harmony. The different parties will present different justifications towards different desired states of harmony. In DKS it has a specific frame in a specific location/institution and at a certain time. Still, the modes of justification and *Orders of worth* are universal. The values brought into play, or the professional justification in DKS; "... poses universality as a horizon searched after by agents" (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:209). In their search for stability they search for a common platform. The understanding of what that platform should be might be very different. To communicate outside of your own understanding of the situation, you have to relate to a common conception of the world and *worthy values*.

Boltanski and Thévenot have approached the problem by saying that it is not always necessary to ascribe power motives or economic gain as the final destination to an action. It will factor in, but the final aim might be a higher motive. In their work *On justification: Economies of worth* (2006), Boltanski and Thévenot present an; "... instrument with which to analyse the operations persons perform when they resort to criticism, when they have to justify the criticism they produce, when they justify themselves in the face of criticism or collaborate in the pursuit of a justified agreement" (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:208). They want to use their model in analysing situations where people express disagreement in non-violent confrontations. At some time the disagreement will end in a more or less lasting agreement. The model has, as its point of origin, market theory. The authors' objective is to show, through the model, that capitalism as a value set might have several traits that transcend the self-interest of the individual. There is a reference to a higher principle in every argument where a party is called upon to justify themselves, even within capitalism. "What we are saying is that the persons in the market are moral beings, in the sense that they are capable of taking abstractions from their particularity in order to agree on external goods,

which are universally listed and defined” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:213). To refer only to oneself and personal economical gain would never win the other party of a conflict over and convince them to join in a quest purely for someone else’s gain. There has to be a reference to something outside of the actor, something that is open to the common public, should they wish to be a part of it. This something, Boltanski and Thévenot calls; “the Higher Common Principle” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:140). Important *actions*, *actors* and *things* in the situation will be of interest in discovering the world that is being called upon in the justification.

When a project within the DKS program is set into motion, there will be an attempt towards reaching a common state of relationality — a common set of values to work from. If all involved parties are situated within the same ‘world’, they are often in agreement at the start of the project. If the actors are situated in several ‘worlds’, a conflict can then establish a new set of values that are of both worlds; “... this opening towards alternative forms of generality also brought to the surface the critical tensions that results from the juxtapositions of several different ways of establishing equivalencies among beings, and thus of generalizing” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:9). Wenger (1998) mirrors the view to some extent through his social theory of learning. He sees social participation as the basis for learning and knowing. Through a group’s pursuit of a shared enterprise, with resulting practices that are the property of the group, a community will take shape. Some components are necessary to describe what constitutes learning within this social participation: meaning, practice, community and identity. These factors come together in the form of *communities of practice* (Wenger 1998). These *communities* exist throughout society, and professions are one of the ways in which they constitute themselves. This theory covers learning in the world at large, and if seen in light of this theory, teaching is a practice, and practice is a prerequisite for *meaning*: “Practice is, first and foremost, a process by which we can experience the world and our engagement with it as meaningful” (Wenger 1998:51).

What I find left out in this theory, is the guide to establish the *pivotal points*. It very clearly states that they exist, and will be negotiated, but it gives no specifics. If the person involved in the critique tries to ‘push’ to the adversaries, he does this through the underlying moral standards that he perceives as right. However, Wenger has not addressed any value sets that might be more general, but only commented on their existence. The *Orders of Worth* that are found in what Boltanski and Thévenot (2006) call more broadly a *community of reference* is therefore of great importance. These Orders of Worth are general and can be used to justify arguments in situations of criticism, as well as establish a sense of what point of view the

negotiating parties might hold. As some of the value sets are more at odds than others, the clarification of point of departure might facilitate the understanding of the conflict, and the scale it might have.

“Our model of the sense of justice invites a similar reconstruction by recognizing the plurality of goods and the injustices that arise from their confusion, while still being concerned with the demands resulting from an extension of the common good to a community of reference, which is supposedly without limits” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:215-216).

A community of reference gives room for more than the practice — also inanimate objects, artefacts, and, importantly, the lack of a common practice. The community of reference holds judgements, voiced as a critique by the actors, and is seen in how the actors unveil their stand towards the world. The products — thing-beings — that come out of the DKS projects, student work or knowledge gain, are ‘negotiation events’ in a discussion of the power to define the *common good* and as such quality and goals in the future execution of the project. We place value in what is important to us, and *how* it is important to us — is it beautiful, a tool for economic gain, or sacredness? In relation to DKS as a complex new organisation, this negotiation or rather act of justification can be seen as necessary to produce a truce within which frames the projects can be brought about. This truce will affect the professional boundaries in some way, as by introducing a new profession into an already existing professional area, the search for new stability will produce some kind of shift in responsibility and work division. In light of this it will be illuminating to discover whether the compromises are very precarious, or very strong. Will the justifications produce new situated judgments, or will the compromises be one sided? Will one world win out over the other to create a new subject? Can tension and reoccurring justification be a permanent situation between the two professions involved?

A Higher Motive

In a situation with a break from the normal practice, any choice made by an actor will come from a conviction — a belief in a set of values that the actor sees as the solution towards a better society — *a common good*. The conviction of how to reach the best possible future might vary, but will always follow a higher motive; “A higher common principle” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:140) than self interest. “The model of orders of worth aims to establish that in these situations, in order to reach an agreement, one must be capable of justifying one’s self by referring to a principle that is valid for all”

(Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:212). This; "... principle that is valid for all..." can of course be debated in light of recent theories of post-modernism, where nothing universal is appreciated. Through his writings on post-modernism in research, Alvesson (2002) has highlighted the value of variations and ambiguity. Within a scene where the view is that there exists no *one* 'grand-narrative', variation and ambiguity can be seen as just as valuable as generalisations. I do not place myself within post modernism and embrace relativism. Instead I recognise the valuable traits of the new pragmatic approach (Skarpenes and Hestholm 2007). They present a form of generality that is partial in form. It exists as the grand narrative for a limited group. This narrative is their reference outside themselves in situations where they are challenged. It is not enough to justify yourself from an individual point of view, so the actor therefore refers to the higher common principle that forms the value set in the conviction that the arguments also will convince others. "To be able to converge towards an agreement, persons really have to refer to something which is not of persons and which transcends them. This common reference we call a *principle of equivalence*" (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:213). In the theory of justification, this results in the outlines of different worlds described as value sets that guide actions and development within groups and how they respond to outside groups and actions. They function as groups in the sense that they have formed symbolic boundaries — not formally established, but recognisable in vocabulary, attitude towards thing-beings and human-beings. "They are tools by which individuals and groups struggle over and come to agree upon definitions of reality" (Lamont and Molnár 2002:168). People trying to explain their actions will do so in light of what they think people might understand. It has to be connected to the *higher common principle* i.e. what they think will be the best way towards 'the best for all'. In situations where a confrontation of opinions happens, objects, actions or phenomena will have to be explained to the opposition in terms of how they will be an avenue towards *the common good* — the higher common principle. These explanations will come in the shape of *justifications* in relations to this goal: *...I choose to do this because...I think this is the better solution because...My priorities are right because...* The 'because' will come from the world-view of the actor.

The six separate 'worlds' that are outlined in this theory, are general in the sense that they exist outside the single actor, but specific in the sense that not all actors find themselves within one of the worlds. Not all actors belong simply to one world either. As they have different arenas of actions, sometimes the perceived goal — common good — can be justified through more than one world, as the arena with a specific group of people might differ slightly from another and might profit from a different angle in the

justification. However, some of the value sets provide values that oppose each other to such an extent that they are antagonistic and hardly compatible. In A&C and DKS, a difficult struggle has been and is, the merging of the romantic self-expression and the skill and knowledge focus.

THE COMMON WORLDS

To identify the worlds or value sets, Boltanski and Thévenot analyse written texts and establish a difference between several opposing polities, and what they see as different worlds for the actors. They are expressed and discussed in these texts and can be given characteristics that make it possible to express a ‘universal state’, a set of values and attitudes towards the world that will be supported by more than one person — a ‘community of reference’ that the individual will partake in through his justification. These six worlds are not absolute settings in a sense that if one is present the others are not. Although, in a given situation one of them will, through the process of agreement, take precedence for the individuals involved, and will guide the search for a solution to a difficult or conflicting situation. The situations will work itself out through a negotiation of value — represented by the common worlds — and the result will be a *situated judgment* with values that are specific for that context, but at the same time recognisable for others through the common world that is located in the agreement. In light of professional boundaries, the public’s acceptance of the situated judgement will play a part as well. I will discuss this further at a later stage.

‘Identifiers’ are used to illuminate different sets of values that might guide the arguments that arise in an ambiguous situation. The Higher Common Principle is just the first of a list of identifiers. There might be a multitude of situated arrangements where transitory and ambiguous situations might arise, and they have listed six different sets of values that they claim have a certain universalism in the fact that they are recognisable outside the single individual. To isolate the separate worlds that manifest the justification executed in a situation of conflict, Boltanski and Thévenot (2006) have drawn an outline of the six common worlds. They are not new inventions, according to Boltanski and Thévenot, but rather a bringing together and systemizing of already existing thoughts about society and the polity. According to them, the six common worlds that they propose are already outlined in existing texts within theories of political philosophy — *narratives of polity*. There might be numerous situations of conflict, but a limited set of worlds to base reaching agreement on.

Identifiers

To draw the line between the worlds, and give evidence of the difference in character, they present us with descriptions of a set of identifiers.

1. Higher common principle

The higher common principle (HCP) tells of what is considered good. It is the goal to attain, and the guiding ideal of the group. This is recognised through characteristics in the form of State of Worthiness.

2. State of Worthiness

State of Worthiness (SoW) is how the HCP is given voice and shape in human-beings and thing-beings — what is recognised as ‘holy’ or as ‘useful capital’. How do you behave to be recognised among the group as a member voicing the HCP? What do you value in your possessions?

3. Human Dignity

What is prized as forms of behaviour? What drives the work/choices made within the group?

4. List of Subjects

Who are seen as the guiding subjects, the leading thinkers? How is the world structured in terms of organisation? Who and how is someone recognised as a figure of authority?

5. List of Objects and Arrangements

What are the central objects or happenings that define the actor’s inclusion in the group HCP?

6. Investment Formula

What are the important words and actions that an actor invests, to prove he is worthy in the situation?

7. Relation of Worth

What is the ultimate goal of the actor in his choice of actions?

8. Natural Relations among Beings

How do the actors interact? What is the accepted way of going about one’s business?

9. Harmonious Figures of the Natural Order

What arenas do the HCP unfold in its purer form? Where is the ‘home of the HCP’?

10. Model Tests

What are the important transitory situations where the members reinforce their belonging to a world?

11. Mode of Expression of Judgment

By what criteria are the members of a world evaluated?

12. Form of Evidence

By what means are the evaluations of others done?

13. State of Deficiency and Decline of the Policy (the fall)

What is the absolute opposite of the current HCP that might cause the exclusion from the world, through the loss of SoW and, as such, the belief in HCP? As well as giving each world its characteristic, these principles lay the basis for criticism of the worlds. In comparison with one's own principles, the other worlds will not fulfil what is seen as the quest for good, i.e. if the state of worthiness is different — in one world worthiness corresponds to the Bizarre, and in another the Effective — the criteria for judging will differ, and an argument will follow. Through the orders of worth described in the theory *On Justification* a discussion can be made of what happens when representatives from the 'art world' and the 'school world' and their dissimilar value sets, happen to be represented at the same time in a situation of collaboration within the Visual art and A&C in DKS.

THE HIGHER COMMON PRINCIPLE

The Higher common principle surfaces in how actors approach a conflict, and criticize the befallen. They reflect on and judge their own choices and those of others, although it is not always explicitly stated: "... actors rarely make explicit the general principles of their actions" (Boltanski and Thévenot 2000:210). From the assumption that there has to be something higher that can be called upon to justify choices in the market world, it follows that there has to be more than one *Higher Common Principle (HCP)*: "To provide a basis for association, the parties involved thus need to have access to a principle that determines relations of equivalence" (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:33). Otherwise agreement would be a matter of fact in any situation. The fact that conflict does exist calls for us to recognise that there are more than one way to understand value, worth, status and objects. "This process of shifting to a higher level of generality, which in classificatory orderings takes the form of referring to more abstract categories, could be pursued indefinitely in the quest for an even higher principle of agreement" (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:33). However, total relativity in the sense of an indefinite search is countered by the fact that identifying some general HCPs is possible. These general HCPs will represent worlds, and actors move between these worlds as contexts change. Work, home, hobby might all belong to different worlds, and it is in actions or objects where these worlds collide within one situation that the 'agreement reaching' is set in motion.

Thus artists and A&C teachers operate within their professional traditions and values that underlay their understanding of education and art while involved in DKS. The actors involved are forced to make an argument where they justify their actions and their position through values, but also laws and regulations that have impact on the practice. This justification will be tied to a world, and it will correspond to the values and worthiness that constitute this world.

The Six Worlds

Boltanski and Thévenot operate with six worlds that they claim have universal value. They manage to place their argument in a Higher Common Principle (HCP) that is recognisable as a value set transcending the singular person being. It is accessible to others, and might therefore figure as a justified argument in a situation of conflict. These worlds are; *The Civic World*, *The Industrial World*, *The Domestic World*, *The World of Fame*, *The Market World*, and *The Inspired World*. These display very different value sets in terms of what constitute the common good and the right way of going about getting there.

The Inspired world

The inspired world is where the 'outpouring of inspiration' is the higher common principle. If all people could reach a state where they could be one with the ethereal and inexpressible, they would know the secrets of life. The opposition to the established, the unique and passionate expressed through creativity by the genius are seen as the ultimate good, as this is the path of the *Bizarre*, *Unusual*, *Marvellous*, *Unspeakable*, *Disturbing*, *Exciting*, *Spontaneous*, *Emotional* — all prized concepts in this world. Artists, the child and the madman are all seen as ideals and authority figures in this state, where love, creation and the passion is seen as human dignity expressed. No formal organisation is preferred, as chance meetings and fate are seen as the binding force. To renew the connection and commitment to this value set, escape from habits, the calling into question, risks, and detours from the establishment are needed actions. Important concepts are: *Adventure*, *Quest*, *Mental voyage*, *Path-finding*, and *Lived experience* — *The personal journey* to reach the place where you passed the test of the 'world'. The journey's end is the stroke of genius: *Illumination*, *Intuition*, *Spring up*, *Appear*, *Chance*, *Bubbling up*, *Revolution*, *Vertigo*, *Surpass* (oneself), *Masterpiece*, *Planet*, *Aura*. The ultimate goal is the unique — the genius.

The fall from grace lies in the temptation to come down to earth. To exist within the boundaries of the establishment is seen as being paralyzed by

habits and external signs. To be a part of reproducing what is — is to step out of this ‘world’, and no longer be part of the group of *the unique*. Now this in itself can, in my view, be seen as a paradox, as the unique becomes the established, and the calling into question is the rule.

The Domestic World

In the domestic world, the figures of authority are: *Father, King, Ancestors, Parents, Family, Grownups, Leader, Boss* as opposed to the less worthy beings: *I, Unmarried person, Foreigner, Woman, Child, Pet, or the ‘others’: Visitors, Surroundings (members of), Neighbours, and Third party*. In this world, traditions, and the keeping of these is the higher common principle. The existing hierarchical establishment is seen as the common good — and the authority figures are trusted to be benevolent and wise. People are prized for their faithfulness, discretion and honesty. Breeding and poise is seen as distinguishing traits. Good sense and habits will be appreciated, as they are the guiding forces of work and human dignity. The rules of good etiquette - *Good manners, Proper behaviour, Rank, Title, Dwelling, Introduction, Signature, and Announcement* — and the rejection of selfishness through consideration, duty and harmony is seen as important. Through the company of well-brought-up people in the home, you learn through exemplary anecdotes the ways of respect and responsibility.

The fall from grace in this world comes through erratic behaviour and a lack of inhibition. To be impolite, indiscreet, disorderly, or vulgar, will earn you the brand of the traitor or troublemaker. You can no longer be a part of the domestic world.

The World of Fame

In the world of fame, the only reality that is of importance is that of public opinion. The higher common principle is to have others recognise you. You are worthy if you are: *Reputed, Recognized, Visible, Successful, Distinguished, Persuasive, or Attention getting*. Human dignity lies in the desire to be recognized, the desire to be loved and respected by the public. Stars with their fans are part of the authorities in this world. To be famous is to be worthy. You are defined into this group through the *Brands, Campaigns, Public relations, Press, Interviews* etc. that is given space. To gain entrance and stay in this world, the giving up of secrets, to reveal oneself to the public is necessary. You have to be recognised. To do this, persuasion is the key — *to seduce, to hook, to entice, to capture, to convince*. The test then is: are you known to the public, or not?

If you are content being unknown, forgotten or undistinguished you have failed in this world. If you accept continuing to be a ‘faceless’ part of the general public, this is no longer your world.

The Civic World

The civic world on the other hand, is all about the collective. The common higher principle is seen as the will of all. It is rule governed and representative, and human dignity is based on the aspiration to civil rights and participation. The authority figures are collective persons and their representatives: *Public collectives, Party, Federation, Chapter, Office, Committee, Elected official, Representative, Delegate, Secretary, Member*. Legality is seen as important, and rights and legislations, policy and elections, transcripts and records are all defining concepts. To prove oneself in this world, the renunciation of the particular, in terms of solidarity, transcending divisions, and the struggle for *common causes* are necessary. The goal is to be a part of something bigger. The democratic republic, the state, democracy, institutions are arenas where the civic world is seen. To vote and support, oppose regulations as a part of achieving awareness is seen as reinforcing the belonging to this world. *Justice, the law, rules and regulations* are honoured.

If you fall for the temptations to be self-serving in your individualism — not in terms of the collective good, arbitrary in your choices — not respecting the rules and regulations, and withdraw from participation in elections, you cannot be a part of this world.

The Industrial World

In the Industrial World, efficiency and performance are seen as the HCP. That is how you build the future. A performance has to be reliable, operational and functional and you are in a state of *unworthiness* if you are: Inefficient: *Unproductive, Not optimal, Inactive, Unsited, in a state of Breakdown, Unreliable*. Human dignity is bound in your work, and the energy put into that — the human potential for activity is valuable and as such needs to be used for the good of the production. Important people in this world are *professionals, experts, and specialists* — people that know their work. They are more worthy, not because the other workers need to defer to them, but through their higher responsibility over the process and production, and the increased control of the future. Persons are part of a system where they serve a function, and objects are means to get the work done. They are an extension of the human activity. *Tools, Resources, Methods, Tasks, Space, Environment, Axis, Direction, Dimension, Criterion, Definition, List, Graph, Chart, Calendar, Plan, Goal, Quantity, Variables, Series, Average,*

Probability, Standard, Factors, Causes are all objects that human activity sets into motion. These are used to set up production in an effective arrangement that works, and as such serve the future.

However, you must never fall in the trap of treating people as objects. To treat people as things in the course of production is to misuse the human potential for work. If that happens, you are no longer part of the industrial world.

The Market World

In this world the HCP is the competition, the belief that from this competition there will emerge winners. To be wanted in the market, to possess something of value that others might covet is to be desired. Choices are made on the basis of self-interest. Wealth and luxury will be proof of your status and the important roles in this world are held by: *Businessmen, Salesmen, Clients, Buyers,* and *Independent workers*. They are all competitors, but all part of the market. To prove your worth, you need to take advantage of the openings when they present themselves in business, and do it with detachment and emotional distance. If you manage this, you will possess the objects that are desired. You *Buy, Get* (for oneself), *Sell, Business* (do business with), *Negotiate, Benefit* (from), *Pay, Compete*, all within the ideal form — the Market. You are judged by the deals you land, the contracts you secure. The *price* has to be right, justifiable and reasonable, and the evidence of this is the result you bring out of it — the paycheck or the return.

The fall from grace in this world might seem contrary to what you might think. The fall comes through the enslavement to money. When you let your possessions ‘own you’. The money becomes more important than the market with its intricate relations that are good and reasonable and sustaining the work for all. If you value money above the market, the fairness of the competition is rejected, and you are out of the market world.

Where Should We Look for Justification?

To initiate agreement reaching through justification by economies of worth, there has to be a conflict; “in our everyday experience, coexistence does not always produce a situation” (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006:35). Some meetings are harmonious and will not create a *situation*, and the ordinary will provide the known and habitual. A tacit understanding of the workings of the World secures a harmonious co-existence. Meetings that, on the other hand, break from the ordinary, known, and habitual will hold the potential for becoming a situation. The thought on situated judgement and narratives, both grow from the understanding that, in situations of conflict, human-beings

offer reasons for their actions. In collaborations between the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ within DKS these are breaks from the ‘normal professional practice’. Conflicting values surface and the actors respond with argumentation they see as being able to persuade the opposing party in the conflict, to begin seeing their side of the argument. “Unpredictability does not imply inexplicability. Explanations are possible because there is a certain teleology — sense of purpose — in all lived narratives” (Czarniawska 2004:13). The conversation is the ‘live’ justification, and the narrative is the retelling of the experience. The narrative, in the form of an interview, artefact, or written text, as such, offers an even more explicit reasoning as it has been given time to mature in the mind of the narrator and its highlights are chosen among others for a reason. Media narratives can be said to be even more concentrated in this respect. Narratives constitute social patterns in their own right, and they relate to something outside the narrator. This can be said of artefacts (Gulliksen 2006), as well as texts (Czarniawska 1998) and oral accounts (Bruner 1991). It is put in the form of the narrative most likely to be accepted in the situation, in the language most likely to persuade the listener (Abbott 1988; Boltanski and Thévenot 2006; Lave and Wenger 1991).

“... life stories must mesh, so to speak, within a community of life stories; tellers and listeners must share some “deep structure” about the nature of a “life,” for if the rules of life-telling are altogether arbitrary, tellers and listeners will surely be alienated by a failure to grasp what the other is saying or what he thinks the other is hearing” (Bruner 2004:700).

In the retelling of a situation of conflict, points of view are accentuated as oppositions to easier identify sides in a conflict (Latour 2005). The end result is to present your side of the matter, your value sets, as the only way to go; “Like all social actors, I seek to persuade myself and others that I am a good person. My narrative is inevitably a self representation” (Riessman 1993:11). These narratives are used to enhance the values that underlie any professional choice, and are, as such, an invaluable tool towards understanding the basis for a conflict on both a professional as well as a personal level. In these lie the transitory occurrences that mark the conflicts of your value sets and the return to harmony with a new agreed upon value set after the conflict is settled. The narratives will give an opening into the ambiguous situations, as the narratives themselves are a form of criticizing the moment, either justifying the narrators own choices or criticising the other party’s solution to the problem (Czarniawska 2004).

Narratives of justification within DKS will therefore not only present the reason behind choices in the professional practise, but also present the

opposing choices as somehow not justifiable. In other words, they might present the *hero* and the *obstacle*. The media adds to these narratives by adding their own focus on the conflicts. In lived tales, it is the ambiguous situations of instigated critique that stand out, and the need towards justification that tells the story. Narratives are what people turn to, to explain themselves, also in different settings — as opposed to or in concert with others (Bruner 1991). It might take different forms, and it is a socialisation project (Lave and Wenger 1991). Justification is performed through patterns of narration that you are taught, and it is performed through given tools, such as worth and value. The *identifiers* presented in the theory *On justification* in forms of concepts used, aims to strive for, and people of authority, help define the value sets, or worlds, that the actors use as their basis for justifications. They are tools towards isolating the critical points in the narratives of justification of the professionals from the two worlds. The most important indicator in this case is the HCP, as all the other indicators are correlated to this.

End Comment

The efforts towards persuasion in argumentation and justification can be seen on several levels in the DKS collaboration in professional justification narratives, where the involved actors choose to explicitly state their position through exclamations such as: ... *But you have to agree that ...* or ... *Even you must see that...* In light of a theory of justification, the actors do not *have to* agree or see the other actors' point of view as valid, not if it is in contrast to their own value set. They can disagree on the basis of the worldview that infuses their practice. The values possessed by the actors in regards to their professional practice, the identifiers, surface in the arguments they use while trying to organise the chaos into new and more harmonious stories. Justification both departs from value sets, develops them further, and gives them away, and one of the ways to find the governing values is through the narratives of professional justification.

The DKS Narratives

In this chapter I will identify the narratives of professional practice within DKS projects that can be found in the official documents, the media, and the evaluations by using the value sets from the different Worlds to illuminate the different perspectives. Through quality and expert knowledge that is communicated to the public concerning DKS, I will proceed to locate the narratives of professionalism, and question if they are located within the frames of the school's knowledge base and curriculum guidelines, where knowledge, legitimisation and skills are spelled out and openly discussed by all involved parties, or if they are placed within the concept-free frames of the art scene. I choose to see the media narrative separate from the evaluation narratives, as they have different positions in regards to the public, and the selection of who is heard in the two narratives is different. While the evaluations permit both professions the chance to present their arguments, the media texts show a different tendency. In all the media documentations collected, the representatives from the Visual art projects were predominantly artists or children. This in itself tells a powerful narrative of how the media can set the agenda for the public's understanding of a practice.

The 'school world' and the 'art world' are concepts that are imbued with several layers of meaning. It is not only a way of organising institutions, persons, intentions, and professions (Abbott 1988; 1995; Lamont and Molnár 2002) into two categories. Purely by being seen as containing these, the concepts are given status, voice in the public debate, and power (Bjørkås 1996; Borgen and Brandt 2006). Even these are diverse and layered, as the inside perspective on a world will differ from the outside view of this world. In a collaboration between these two worlds, there will also exist a third 'view', represented by the public that exists outside the 'school world' or the 'art world' (Bjørkås 1996; Boltanski and Thévenot 2006). Within all these layers, when asking what the challenges in collaborations might entail, there is a need to trace the gaps that might exist in terms of motivation, intentions, expectations and values between the professionals. However, just as importantly, it is useful to address one profession's perceived view of the other profession's motivation, intentions, expectations and values. This can be seen in and through the creation and existence of critique that is launched

in relation to professional practice within the DKS program. The involved actors activate criticism to position themselves in relation to what they see as quality, relevant content i.e. subject-matter knowledge, and in regards to the epistemological foundation. The narratives that are created in the argumentation for professional practice and choices are communicated to the ‘outside world’ — the public at large — often inhabited with laymen, some in the guise of knowledgeable politicians. To study these critique-initiated narratives of professionals, the choice in this study is to focus on the practicing professionals — the way their aims for the program, intentions regarding content, expectations for quality, and values concerning professionalism are communicated through different narratives of critique to the public. How are the professionals portrayed — what are the narratives told, and why — and are they concurrent with narratives found in performed evaluations.

AMBIGUOUS SITUATIONS AND JUSTIFICATION

In DKS, projects that bring together professional artists and professional A&C teachers can be seen to offer up an abundance of situations, where both professions step out of the normal practice to create a new arena. By including two professional world views in one professional work practice, the DKS program is a situation where the people involved enter into relationships where, at some point, there is a possibility for realizing that something ‘has gone wrong’ and that to remain silent is not an option (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999). An ambiguous and transitory situation is born because the break from what is normal or ordinary forces a new agreement, where the worlds and the state of worth is not as yet decided. In DKS these situations give rise to justification narratives concerning the professionals involved. The identifiers come into play through narratives.

I will not directly discuss what in the narratives correlate to all the specific identifiers, but rather discuss them in light of the actor’s view on some broader categories that contain the identifiers. Even as I have tried to separate the identifiers and problem areas that I have chosen to further discuss, they are all related topics. There are several ways that I could present the narratives. I could do it separated by sources or by worlds. However, these narratives meet, and it is in the frictions that they are made visible. I therefore choose to present them as parts of a larger discussion through topics that are easily recognised in the discussions. The identifier called the State of Deficiency and Decline of the Policy (the fall) is often activated through the positioning towards the other actors in the situation. It is done by distancing themselves in relation to the other side’s stance or by introducing a dichotomy against the Higher Common Principle that guides their choices.

The hero will be recognised by encountering the obstacle. The language will also tell us of the point of departure, as the theory on justification provides identifiers recognisable in concepts used.

The official documents are used mainly to establish the point of departure for the program. They are used by the DKS professionals to justify their practice through the narratives that are presented to the public — through the media texts. I will use the official documents for the program to clarify the point of departure before I identify the media narratives. I will briefly state the aims for the program that can be found in the official documents regulating the DKS program. I progress to find the dominating DKS narratives within the media. The narratives found in the evaluations will be used to discuss whether the media narratives reflect the evaluated professional practice in DKS, while the studies provided on professional practice outside DKS will be used as reference. To make it clear what sources are used at what time, I will mark the references: D — official document, E — evaluation, S — study of profession, I — interview,⁴³ and M — media text.

AIMS FOR THE PROGRAM

As previously mentioned, the documents that initiated the national program listed, the DKS: “... has as its foremost goal to give children in compulsory school a cultural capital and cultural competence that will make them better suited to deal with the challenges of society” (D:KKD 2003a:9).⁴⁴ The way to do this is listed in the three points that say that the main aims of the program are to: “...

- corroborate towards offering professional culture to pupils in general education
- facilitate that pupils in general education get access to, can get to know and develop a positive view of artistic and cultural expressions of all kind
- corroborate towards a holistic inclusion of artistic and cultural expressions in the realisation of the curriculum knowledge aims” (D:KKD 2003a:9).⁴⁵

⁴³ The interviews will be labeled as such: - the American researcher I:Gee, - the artists I:A1 and I:A2, - the teachers I:T1, and I:T2.

⁴⁴ OQ: “... har som sitt fremste mål å gje born i grunnskulen ein kulturell kapital og ein kulturell kompetanse som vil gjere dei betre i stand til å møte utfordringane i samfunnet”.

⁴⁵ OQ: “- å medverke til at elevar i grunnskulen får eit profesjonelt kulturtilbod, - å leggje til rette for at elevar i grunnskulen skal få tilgang til, gjere seg kjende med og få eit positivt forhold til kunst- og kulturuttrykk av alle slag - å medverke til å utvikle ei heilskapleg innlemming av kunstnarlege og kulturelle uttrykk i realiseringa av skulen sine læringsmål”.

These aims include the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ by placing art and culture within a school context, where outside expertise, in collaboration with inside expertise, develop curriculum relevant projects of high professional quality. All this is enveloped in the thought of *equality* between the two sides participating (D:KKD 2003a). The document highlights that the way to ensure the aims listed is, in fact, this collaboration of equals. The ‘school world’ has knowledge of learning and educational frames, curriculum and school development, laws and regulations governing school situated projects, and special education and age specific thinking (Aase et al. 1998; Bjørndal and Lieberg 1978; Bruner 1997; Brønne 2004; Dale 2001; Digranes 2006b; Klafki 2001; Ongstad 2004). The ‘art world’ has knowledge of the art scene and art philosophy, the production of art, art dissemination and culture trends (S:Aslaksen 1997; E:Bumgarner 1993; Danto 1986; 1996; Dickie 1974; 2001; Kjörup 2000; S:Mangset 2004; Solhjell 1995). Each side is professional in their field, but to develop local productions they are expected to work together to cover all the areas that come into play (D:KKD 2003a).

IDENTIFYING NARRATIVES

Why is it important to look for narratives of what is expressed as aims by the two parts of the collaboration? First of all it will tell of any conflict in point of departure, and the point of departure will consequently affect the questions concerning content and quality. However, a few years into the program, it is evident to me that the meaning ascribed to these aims and the importance of the three are not understood as the same within the justification narratives that are presented to the public as representing the two worlds that make up the Visual art part of the program. In searching for the narratives that justify one set of values, the ‘faults’ within the other value system present are highlighted. The narratives that exist therefore need to be read to find both the *hero* and his *obstacle*. As such, the narratives are built on the identifiers in the theory of justification. What is seen as valuable, as quality, and who are seen as the authorities? What are the prized behaviours and the important concepts and modes of judgment? Finally, and most importantly, what is seen as the opposite of all the desired factors? I have gone through the texts to find the dominant appearance of these identifiers, and have moved on to identify several media narratives that exist, and how they depict the presence of the two worlds in the DKS Visual arts program. The narratives I present will take these into consideration and present the way this combination is set up, and label them accordingly. I will again stress that I only address the Visual art projects in the program. I will start by presenting the narratives that are presented to the public through the media. I will then discuss the narratives that are present in evaluations, to see if they show some commonalities. The

findings will provide a backdrop for the following discussion on professional boundaries in the DKS case.

Media Narratives

Values come into play when education is in question. Epistemology will influence the ontology and vice versa. The aims for the program are what define the content and the understanding of quality, which again will influence the subject-matter discussion of A&C. The narratives presented within aims are therefore the starting point from which the justification process unfolds.

The Child — the Pupil

A point to mention is the concepts used in telling all these stories. While I have chosen throughout to highlight the school setting by referring to the *schoolchild* or *pupil*, the artists mostly refrain from calling the main characters *pupil*. They mainly refer to them simply as the *child*, though *schoolchild* is sometimes used.⁴⁶ I would suggest that this is done to place the narrative in their world, rather than to concede to the school context. The teachers, on the other hand, refer to them in context as the *schoolchild* or the *pupil*. There are some exceptions to the rule, but not many. Already there is a conflict in point of departure and suggests that the artist and teacher have their value sets set in different worlds. This use of the concept, child, as opposed to pupil, surfaces throughout all the narratives in the media.

Extending the Culture Sector — Uneducated Public

Funding from both the program and from districts and municipalities is made available to cultural institutions, organisations and actors (D:KKD 2003a). As such, DKS has led to a growth in the culture sector in the districts. This is also one of the narratives of DKS that is told. DKS is a means towards creating a basis for extending the culture sector. It is sometimes very explicit, stating that DKS is: "... the biggest that has happened within the culture sector in many decades and there is no doubt that the artists now should know to come knocking" (M:Landsverk 2004a:9).⁴⁷ There is an abundance of buildings and availability within productions — professional artists at work — but not enough users. DKS provides not only funding for the work, but also the users. DKS is a project that is located in schools, but that brings finance to culture:

⁴⁶ I have not listed any references specifically, as this is based on all sources.

⁴⁷ OQ: "... det største som har hendt innenfor kulturfeltet på mange tiår, og det er ingen tvil om at billedkunstnere nå bør kjenne sin besøkelsestid".

“... today we are flooded with offers without having gotten more users. Den kulturelle skolesekken is a culture project, and the intention is to increase the production of culture from the bottom up, not the top down. We do this by building competency in the pupils. We let the money follow the user, even as it really ends up with the artist” (M:Landsverk 2004a:9).⁴⁸

It is a remnant of the thoughts behind the pilot project in Sandefjord, which ended as one of the models for the nationwide program. The initiating organisation stated originally that: “The main goal is to make DKS the foundation for establishing Sandefjord — and now Vestfold — as a city and a region of culture” (M:Skrede 2002b:9).⁴⁹ They wanted to use the school as a basis, and to legitimize this move it was based in the curriculum. It might seem that placing it in schools is more a means to an end, rather than an aim in itself: “— Being rude, one might say that the school pupils have become more important for the art and culture politics, than the other way around...” (M:Landsverk 2004a:9),⁵⁰ as commented on by artist organisations themselves.

This pilot project, a pre-runner for DKS-program signalled an opening to include the teachers, but at the same time they voiced concern. The artists did not want them to be part of the decision process (E:Fønhus et al. 2000). They talk contemptuously of the course mentality that they find saturates the Norwegian educational system (M:Landsverk 2004a). The argument is that instruction in culture to qualify people is a waste of time. This is confusing considering that, at the same time, they advocate the aspect of bringing the people the necessary knowledge to understand what quality art is, because the local crafts and amateurs are not good enough. They “... are certain that the lack of an opera house is closely connected to the fact that most Norwegians have no training in experiencing art and culture, and definitely that artists many places have had no natural place in the community” (M:Skrede 2002b:9).⁵¹ The professional offers are centralised in the major cities, while the amateurs are in the districts. The enjoyment of these amateur productions will never provide us with a central opera house or a rich artistic scene. These thoughts are problematic in relation to the DKS program that is supposed to

⁴⁸ OQ: “... i dag oversvømmes vi av tilbud uten at vi har fått flere brukere. Den kulturelle skolesekken er et kulturprosjekt, og intensjonen er å øke kulturproduksjonen nedenfra, ikke ovenfra. Dette gjør vi ved å bygge opp kompetansen hos elevene. Vi lar pengene følge brukeren, selv om de egentlig ender opp hos kunstneren”.

⁴⁹ OQ: “Hovedmålsettingen er å gjøre DKS til grunnmuren i å gjøre Sandefjord – og nå Vestfold – til kulturb og kulturfylke”.

⁵⁰ OQ: “For å være stygg, kan man si at skoleelevene er blitt viktigere for kunsten og kulturpolitikken enn omvendt ...”.

⁵¹ OQ: “... mener beste OQ at mangelen på operahus har en nær sammenheng med at nordmenn flest ikke har blitt opplært til å oppleve kunst og kultur, og ihvertfall at kunstnere mange steder aldri har hatt en naturlig plass i nærmiljøet.

be anchored locally. “A joint Norwegian culture scene ought to line up behind the suggestion of a proper art dissemination organisation directed at children and youth” (M:Amundsen 2002:3).⁵² The focus remains on receiving the funding that is offered: “The culture scene must not accept settling for scraps and courtesy nicely” (M:Amundsen 2002:3),⁵³ and are quite contemptuous when it comes to letting the educational side into the execution (Landsverk 2005b).

Artistic Freedom — Limiting Administration

One of the aims for the program is the wish for a joint endeavour. This is also brought into the media debate: “Competence gain for both teachers (about art and culture) and for artists (about schools) is an important part of DKS” (M:Holen 2002:5).⁵⁴ The collaboration of equals that is stated as the aim is challenged by one of the narratives told in the media. The picture is painted as unreachable, as the differences are seen as too great. “Den kulturelle skolesekken is supposed to be a meeting between the school sector and the culture sector, but the two sectors often sport very different opinions on how, and on what grounds this meeting should work” (M:Landsverk 2004a:10).⁵⁵ To relinquish any control of the program for the ‘art world’ is not seen as possible: “It would be tragic if artists were transformed into pedagogues. Artists have to be allowed to do what they do best, namely creating art...” (M:Landsverk 2004a:10).⁵⁶

The thoughts of artistic freedom cannot be interfered with. Even where the ‘school world’ and the ‘art world’ are seen to be more equal, the sentiment that it is worrisome that the ‘school world’ be more involved shines through. “It is very important that the artistic side is maintained. Therefore I am worried that the school itself could get too much influence on the content...” (M:Landsverk 2004a:10).⁵⁷ This is direct contrast to the documents that state that the schools should have a say in content and curriculum issues. However, in this media narrative there is still a tendency towards accepting that the artwork belongs to the artist, and as such the school sector — even as they are welcomed into the collaboration — should know their place. They are even suspected of being susceptible to the temptation of using the funding for

⁵² OQ: “Et samlet norsk kulturliv bør stille opp bak forslaget om et skikkelig fungerende formidlingsapparat for kunst rettet mot barn og unge”.

⁵³ OQ: “Kulturlivet må ikke finne seg i å ta til takke med smuler og neie pent”.

⁵⁴ OQ: “Kompetanseutvikling for både lærere (om kunst og kultur) og for kunstnere (om skole) er en viktig del av skolesekken”.

⁵⁵ OQ: “Den kulturelle skolesekken skal være et kulturmøte mellom skolesektor og kultursektor, men de to sektorene har ofte sært ulike oppfatninger om hvordan og på hvilke premisser dette møtet skal skje”.

⁵⁶ OQ: “Det ville vært tragisk om kunstnerne ble omgjort til pedagoger. Kunstnere må få gjøre det de er best på, nemlig å lage kunst...”.

⁵⁷ OQ: “Det er svært viktig at den kunstneriske siden blir ivaretatt. Derfor er jeg bekymret over at skolen selv skal få for mye hånd om innholdet...”.

other purposes: “Yes, I believe there can be a danger of the schools using the money to other areas of education...” (M:Landsverk 2004a:10).⁵⁸ It is even more directly stated that: “It is theft to subsidise poor schools with culture money in a rich country like Norway” (M:Haaland 2007:12).⁵⁹ Also, the school administrations are seen as not concentrating enough on culture, but rather are said to be worried over; “... sustaining the school’s reputation and relations to those with economic resources” (M:Nesje and Klakegg 2007:14).⁶⁰ This is a very limiting view on what the school administration has to coordinate and be responsible for. The individual orientation, special education, pedagogical quality, economy and timeframes are just some of the responsibility that, in the end, rests with the headmaster and administration. It can also be read as a hidden attack on the school’s ethics and values, as it suggests that the administration is willing to circumvent the regulations to spend the assigned money for their own purposes. However, told as a part of the narrative of uneasy equality, it is effective in stating how the best interest of the *child* lies with tipping the equality scale in favour of the artist.

Art the Saviour — School the Oppressor

One of the narratives that continue to surface in the media is art’s ability to save the child. This narrative is expressed through several smaller narratives, although some of them are contradictory in nature. Art can save the children from being ordinary by letting them stand out through the awakening of their potential. If the school has kept them from seeing their true inner gifts, the artist can liberate the hidden strengths. There is an assumption that the child that is not ordinarily validated, will be able to accomplish anything as long as an artist is there to help: “I have experienced pupils crying for joy, saying: «I can draw». They had gone to school for several years and thought that they couldn’t” (M:Sund 2002a:26).⁶¹ The contrast is set between the ‘school world’ that limits and hinders, and the artist that sets free and helps. “I disseminate joy, not only techniques. I show that it is fun to work...” (M:Bendz 2002:17).⁶² Comments like these seem to imply that this is in contrast to what usually goes on. That while the ‘normal’ education is not joyful, but rather dreary, the artists can exhibit an enthusiasm lacked by teachers, that can make the school children understand that working with art can be fun and not only boring techniques, and as such free their potential.

⁵⁸ OQ: “Ja jeg tror det kan være en fare for at skolene kan bruke pengene til annen undervisning ...”.

⁵⁹ OQ: “Det er tyveri å subsidiere fattige skoler med kulturpenger i et rikt land som Norge”.

⁶⁰ OQ: “... ivareta skolens rykte og relasjonene til de som sitter på de økonomiske midlene”.

⁶¹ OQ: “Jeg har opplevd at elever har grått av glede og sagt: «Jeg kan tegne». De hadde gått på skolen i mange år og trodde de ikke kunne”.

⁶² OQ: “Eg formidlar glede, ikkje berre teknikkar. Eg viser at de er gøy å jobbe ...”.

Another expressed way to represent the saviour narrative is how art can be a means towards inclusion, by letting the children find their place in the community of reference by not standing out any more. It addresses how children with learning difficulties will profit from art: “They got to show another side of themselves than usual, and that way they achieved a new and greater understanding of self” (M:Nesje and Klakegg 2007:14).⁶³ Not only special education, but also multi-cultural aspects are brought into this. “— In the work with children of a multi-cultural background it is important to tap into their energy. If we can transform this, these children will see themselves as resourceful” (M:Stavanger Aftenblad 2005:48).⁶⁴ Art is presented as the way to save the children that might otherwise fall outside the regular group. If surveying the offers within Visual art in DKS, the multi-cultural aspect is not highly present within the Visual art projects.⁶⁵ The offers within this area presented in DKS are quite narrow — and do not necessarily translate well into non-western cultures or sometimes even local traditions. Some of the projects that directly address the issue might be successful, but as the projects now stand I would rather think that, in a wider sense, the DKS program might intensify some of the issues in multi-cultural, or even multi-regional, or multi-social status classrooms, rather than be a solution. However, this narrative is strong and seems to be accepted within the media texts.

The saviour narrative further suggests that not only can art save the child that might otherwise be lost in a school institution that, in their view, consists of routines and an unhealthy focus on theory. Art is a way to liberate the potential, and free the soul from the bonds of the ordinary. “... art mirrors life itself. — If we live only in the everyday toil, we easily become tired and despondent. Art can give us a breath of freedom and make a sky above our lives. Art is food for the soul” (M:Sund 2002a:26).⁶⁶ Art is also listed as a way to question and revolt against others by being provocative and on the edge, at the same time as it is the only thing to bring us together properly in harmony. This is a tall order, but one that is told with conviction. Art is seen as a way to the salvation of humankind, as well as for the single child: “... in reality art is the only possibility to learn how to communicate with someone that wants to beat you to death. It is the most essential survival mechanism that we have” (M:Haugen 2006).⁶⁷ It is the elevation of art to the only possible medium towards the utopia of a world of complete peace and

⁶³ OQ: “De fikk vist en annen side av seg selv enn til vanlig, og fikk på den måten ny og økt selvforståelse”.

⁶⁴ OQ: “— I arbeidet med flerkulturelle barn er det viktig å få tak i energien deres. Får vi transformert denne, vil disse barna oppleve seg som ressursrike...”

⁶⁵ <http://www.denkulturelleskolesekken.no/index.php?id=regionaltoglokalt>

⁶⁶ OQ: “... kunsten speiler selve livet. – Hvis vi lever kun i det hverdagslige slitet, blir vi lett trøtte og motløse. Kunst kan gi oss et pust av frihet og lage en himmel over våre liv. Kunst er mat for sjelen”.

⁶⁷ OQ: “... i virkeligheten er kunsten den eneste mulighet man har til å lære å kommunisere med noen som vil slå deg ihjel. Det er den mest essensielle overlevelsesmekanismen vi har”.

harmony. However, this is problematic in face of the view that education, or learning, is something not present in art. So to be able to avoid conflict, you are not supposed to learn it in any educational knowledge setting, but reach it through experience of art. The problem is that art is often for the select few — not a communication tool for the many (Solhjell 1995). Some of the avenues towards this awakening of potential are more limited, where the artist finds a particular technique or medium necessary to expression: “Every child should be allowed to express themselves through a wide selection of colours and quality paper to paint on” (M:Flatby 2002:38).⁶⁸ This seems to be a remnant of the convictions guiding the ‘child art’ movement, and, in light of the LK’06, is a very limited view on A&C, and, according to contemporary art philosophy, the Visual arts.

Art as Experience - Subject-matter Content

The narrative of the joy of art as experience surfaces quite often in the media, as opposed to subject boundaries and content. While art experience leaves the child with stars in their eyes, wonder and joy, the pedagogical school version is theoretical and restraining in terms of creativity. Claims about the school are made in the direction that: “Many have the more or less unconscious attitude that learning is supposed to be boring” (M:Karlsen 2007:10).⁶⁹ It is true that the teachers show a tendency towards demanding relevant content: “The teachers then again, were more preoccupied with the questions of content...” (E:Kristiansen 2007:41).⁷⁰ As long as DKS is placed in a school context, this is a relevant concern. What happens in the narrative of content is that it is seen as an old fashioned notion of school education as something very theoretical and uniform. Pedagogisation becomes a way to characterize it easily as something opposing art. It is also assumed that the school education, methods of learning and teaching, differs in all accounts from artistic work: “The school and the teacher work primarily with linear logic, while the artist primarily works with inner coherence...” (M:Christiansen 2007:30).⁷¹ This is in my view a claim to make the artist seem more qualified in relations to teachers — that they are not preoccupied with inner coherence. The art of teaching demands that you pursue all these avenues, at the same time as they think logic, planning and strategy (Klafki 1997). In cases where the teachers and subject-matter content were not brought into the projects:

⁶⁸ OQ: “Alle barn bør få utfolde seg med et stort utvalg av farger og med godt papir å male på”.

⁶⁹ OQ: “Mange har en mer eller mindre ubevisst holdning om at læring egentlig skal være litt kjedelig”.

⁷⁰ OQ: “Lærerne var imidlertid mer opptatt av det innholdsmessige...”.

⁷¹ OQ: “Skolen og læreren jobber primært med liniærlogikk, kunstneren jobber primært med indre sammenheng...”.

“... the school children saw it more as a positive break” (E:Kristiansen 2007:42).⁷²

This dichotomy, however, is established, and the narrative has a tendency towards presenting the school as boringly preoccupied with curriculum. The ‘art world’ that focuses on good experiences is presented as the ‘cure’. While the productions by artists provide experience and joy: “... I have seen stars! I have seen big, bright eyes on six-, seven- and eight-year olds whom with their mouths open and complete concentration live the life of Anna. I have seen wonder. I have seen joy” (M:Pettersen 2007:5),⁷³ there is an expressed concern of prejudice against pedagogisation, and that it is unfortunate that this influences the agenda. However, at the same time it is stated rather firmly that: “It is fair to say that there is a lot of bad pedagogy being performed, but then it is bad craftsmanship. One can’t judge a whole subject by those that do not know it properly” (M:Karlsen 2007:10).⁷⁴ However, in the context of calling into question ‘a lot of bad pedagogy’ this is a quote that compromises the whole profession to a certain degree. It allows the word its negative connotation, and adds to it by accepting a ‘truth’ of lots of bad pedagogy. It does not question this at all. The ‘art world’ finds it timely, even as they ask for a dialog and respect between the worlds, to also issue a warning: “... also warn the teachers against having negative attitudes to hosting artist visits, because it can destroy the pupils’ experience” (M:Skjelbred 2007:1).⁷⁵ The solution is again given in the art experience that is ‘untainted’ by pedagogisation or influence from teachers.

Saving the Child — Limiting the Pupil

The narrative of quality within DKS, as the Visual art project visits from artists as a contrast to the normal school lessons is prominent in some artists’ argumentation. The artist:

”... takes the children seriously. The whole time she catches what they say and asks follow up questions. Never are there any signals that the answers are right or wrong, but she gets the children to think another step, then a little more, to look around

⁷² OQ: “... elevenene så på det mer som et positivt avbrekk”.

⁷³ OQ: “... eg har sett stjerner! Eg har sett store, strålende auge på seks-, sju- og åtteåringane, som med open munn og full konsentrasjon lever seg inn i livet til Anna. Eg har sett undring. Eg har sett glede”.

⁷⁴ OQ: “Det er greit nok at det er utført mye dårlig pedagogikk, men da er det dårlig håndverk. Man kan jo ikke dømme et helt fag ut fra personer som ikke kan det skikkelig”.

⁷⁵ OQ: “... advarte også lærere mot å ha negative holdninger til det å ta imot kunstnerbesøk fordi det ka ødelegge elevenes opplevelse”

some more, to put more into words. And they see — more and more” (M:Skrede 2002a:12).⁷⁶

The institutional frames are seen as confining, and along with how the artists perceive the teachers’ slights of some *children*, opens up for a narrative of how you can measure quality by how the artists have saved the creative potential of these children. It states that DKS is needed because the art education is suffering. The teachers’ are depicted as not qualified, while the artists are. There is also a ‘charismatic’ notion that art is a way for: “Theoretically weak pupils took responsibility and saw that they themselves had impact in the great whole” (M:Nesje and Klakegg 2007:14).⁷⁷ There is seldom any mention of the teachers’ contributions in these stories, except to set up a contrast. They establish how the children prefer the artist to the pedagogical personnel or teachers that might be present: “The pupils seldom know that I am coming, but are happy that I am not a student teacher or sent from the PPT (Practical Pedagoical Service)” (M:Trohaug 2002:22).⁷⁸ The way this narrative is expressed, it is clear that the opinion of teachers and the school system is not entirely positive. It is also, to some extent, attacking the qualifications of teachers. The curriculum presupposes that teachers can teach A&C, which might, to some, demand new knowledge. According to this narrative, the teachers show a lack of competence or just a dislike of the subject so that they won’t teach it properly. It is a very bleak outlook on the teachers.

Into the mix of this strides the artist. Both the confines of being the ‘good girl’ and the ‘noisy boy’ will be shattered by the artist that can see through all these labels to the very inside of the child: “The good girls and the noisy boys look at me with astonishment, but they all pay attention” (M:Trohaug 2002:22).⁷⁹ Then, there is a union that will set the child free from the established. There is an assumption that the pupils that can’t ordinarily perform will be able to as long as an artist is there to help. This is also the notion of the saviour: “I have experienced pupils crying for joy, saying: «I can draw». They had gone to school for several years and thought that they couldn’t” (M:Sund 2002a:26).⁸⁰ There are suggestions that *the noisy boys’* talents are not appreciated until the artist walks into the classroom. Then they come forward with what they have hidden from the teachers. Single

⁷⁶ OQ: “... tar barna alvorlig. Hele tiden fanger hun opp hva de sier og stiller oppfølgingsspørsmål. Det kommer aldri noen signaler om svarene er rette eller gale, men hun for barna til å tenke enda et hakk videre, å se enda litt mer, å se seg om litt mer, å sette ord på enda litt mer. Og de ser – mer og mer”.

⁷⁷ OQ: “Teoretisk svake elever tok ansvar og så at de selv hadde en betydning i den store helhet”.

⁷⁸ OQ: “Elevane veit sjeldan at eg skal komme, men dei er lykkelege over at eg verken er lærarstudent eller utsendt frå PPT”.

⁷⁹ OQ: “Dei flinke jentene og bråkete gutane ser forundra på meg, men dei følger med alle saman”.

⁸⁰ OQ: “Jeg har opplevd at elever har grått av glede og sagt: «Jeg kan tegne». De hadde gått på skolen i mange år og trodde de ikke kunne”.

statements by the children in passing are given as proof of this. “The boys at the smokers’ corner, wonders if I cannot come back again. It was pretty cool” (M:Trohaug 2002:22).⁸¹ At the same time as the artist can awaken potential in the outsider, the good students need her to bring out all their potential and give them challenges that the teachers cannot. One of the artists quotes a letter from one of the children to a big sister, where the artist visit was described. The girl told her big sister that since the artist told her she could do anything with her life, she had figured out she needed challenges. “I could do nothing but cry. For what I gave her, and she gave me. And God damn, yes it is necessary...” (M:Trohaug 2002:22).⁸² This is seen as the final evidence that the artists are needed, and the implication is that the teachers will never give these children the reinforcement she can give them. In this narrative it is expressed that the child: “... made a small work of art” (M:Gerhardsen 2007:8).⁸³ The methods of choice seem to be broad brushes and paint, or art appreciation talks in front of a work of art. In the scope of teacher training today, this is a limited way of thinking education — in A&C especially.

Boundary Breaking — Regulations and Censorship

“And I am concerned with the fact that art should sting a little. The art that is distributed must not be too nice” (M:Schjønby 2004:11).⁸⁴ Art should exist on the outside of the established, and the projects are of high quality if they create a disturbance. The quality is not related to curriculum or age relevant content as such: “We do not consult the curriculum when we make projects, and we don’t make projects adapted to, for example, seven or eleven year olds. We focus first and mostly on making good exhibitions” (M:Schjønby 2004:11).⁸⁵ The quality, if not discussed in relation to curriculum aims or age relevant education, becomes located wholly within the art scene discussion of quality. The educational setting discontinues being relevant, and the DKS projects could be placed anywhere, not just school. Quality is connected to the artists calling into question values, and quality is, to some extent, personalised in the ‘art world’. It becomes confessional in the sense that the artist — speaking only for themselves can allow for personal opinion to be the sole basis for quality judgment. The curriculum, age thinking or boundaries that are set are not taken into account, and what is left is the opinion of the artist (Sørheim 2005). This can be seen when, in answer to the comment on a project by schools, a curator, who personally witnessed a similar project herself, claimed that this convinced her of the quality. Instead

⁸¹ OQ: “Gutane på røykehjørnet lurer på om eg ikkje kan kome igjen. Det var ganske kult”.

⁸² OQ: “Eg kunne ikkje anna enn å gråte. For det eg gav henne og ho gav meg. Og visst faen er det vits ...”.

⁸³ OQ: “... har laget et lite kunstverk”.

⁸⁴ OQ: “Og jeg er opptatt av at kunsten skal rive litt. Den kunsten som distribueres må ikke bli for snill”.

⁸⁵ OQ: “Vi forholder oss ikke til læreplanen når vi lager prosjekter, og vi lager ikke posjekter tilpasset for eksempel syv- eller elleveråring. Vi fokuserer først og fremst på å lage gode utstillinger”.

of discussing the original concerns she refers to the fact that one of the teachers has said: “It is so good that there are others than us teachers that talk of values!” (M:Sørheim 2005:11).⁸⁶ In a quality discussion, where concerns have been voiced, this is the only mention of teachers, as someone signalling the need of assistance. There is also a claim that while the decision regarding project choices lies not with the museums or curators, neither is it at school level, but rather with the districts and municipalities. This is in itself a concern, because, as a locally founded project, the choice should reside with the responsible party, which in schools is the headmaster. She will stand responsible for any economical, pedagogical or personnel problems or choices. “It is important that the information about each project reaches those who make decisions on behalf of the children” (M:Sørheim 2005:11).⁸⁷ The ‘culture market’ that the districts arrange, cannot always be attended by all headmasters or Art and craft teachers. To be cut out of the process of evaluating projects or even collaborate in this, will make the headmaster’s work more difficult. She becomes responsible by law for other actors’ choices, actors at municipal or district level that might be unaware of the wishes and needs of the particular schools. Any discussion on project quality is then kept at the ‘art world’ side of the collaboration.

The question, whether contemporary art might be suitable in DKS or not, is raised by artists themselves:

“The question is whether DKS should include smoke bombs, activism and civil disobedience in the name of free art, or if the rules that apply to the society the art so want to work in, also should apply to the art? This problem has been addressed most recently by the project leader for Artistic disruptions Per Gunnar Tverbak who claims that if art is to be taken seriously the same rules have to apply. If not, art will only be seen as an irresponsible jester outside of society, with no possibility of wielding any real influence” (M:Mortensen 2005a:4).⁸⁸

This view surfaced in a discussion concerning the group Adbusters’ work towards critiquing the media and commercialism. One of the school projects ended with the pupils throwing smoke bombs at the municipal building demanding more money to schools. The project, though it could be seen as a

⁸⁶ OQ: “Det er så godt at det kommer andre enn oss lærere inn og snakker om holdninger!”

⁸⁷ OQ: “Det er viktig at informasjonen om hvert prosjekt kommer ut til den og de som tar avgjørelser på vegne av barna”.

⁸⁸ OQ: “Spørsmålet er om Den kulturelle skolesekken skal ha plass til røykbomber, aktivisme og sivil ulydighet i den frie kunstens navn, eller om reglene som gjelder i det samfunnet kunsten så gjerne vil virke i, også skal gjelde kunsten? Denne problematikken er reist senest av prosjektleder for nettopp Kunstneriske forstyrrelser, Per Gunnar Tverbak, som hevder at dersom kunsten skal tas alvorlig, så må nettopp de samme reglene gjelde. Hvis ikke, blir kunsten bare betraktet som en uansvarlig narr på utsiden av samfunnet, uten mulighet til å utøve reell innflytelse”.

success for activist art, as a project involving minors in care of the school institution, it would be regarded as a catastrophe. DKS should stimulate individual growth and the aesthetic, but also be a part of the socialisation project that the school is. The school children are expected to learn how to function within rules and regulations, even while calling into question. As a consequence of the project run wild, several headmasters and schools uninvited the group. This became a debate into the regulation and epistemological foundation that the 'school world' has to adhere to. The schools are responsible for projects within the school day, and can be held responsible by parents or other governing instances if they fail to hold by the frames set them. Rather than discuss collaboration, the 'art world' would just concede to the view that contemporary art might be too revolutionary to 'fit in the frame'. "The problem is that parts of the contemporary art in no way related to the point of departure for the program" (M:Mortensen 2005a:4).⁸⁹ This is another myth of the boundary breaking revolutionary artist that cannot be boxed in by any rules or regulations. It is camouflaged as concern for the schools involved.

The view that the artist is the outsider always calling into question becomes a paradox when the 'art world' itself does have very firm rules of conduct and inclusion. To be included in the outsiders is quite a notion. Another challenge to the 'art world' and its view of quality is issued from the education researcher Jorun Spord Borgen. She claims that the fact that contemporary art is relational, activist oriented and socially conscious is not a problem. So is the education in Norwegian schools, and also in the subject A&C. The problem is rather that: "... contemporary art is not as daring in the end, but writes itself into the charismatic myth of the arts' extraordinary contribution to society" (E:Borgen 2005:12).⁹⁰ Some of the concerns raised are real, that artists do not address their audience, but rather the audience they would wish for. The solution, from the 'art world', to these problems is however not to caution artists into a collaboration, but rather to suggest lowering the ambitions for the whole program: "... so that we are spared hysterical art dissemination projects, with concurrent shocked parents and headmasters that have to resort to censorship" (M:Mortensen 2005a:4).⁹¹ At the same time as several schools chose to remove themselves from the projects because they felt they could not in good faith be a part of this, the 'art world' found this project to be of such high quality that it was rewarded the yearly Gullsekken award for best project (M:regjeringen.no 2007a; M:regjeringen.no 2007b;

⁸⁹ OQ: "Problemet er at deler av den samtidige kunsten på ingen måte forholder seg til utgangspunktet for ordningen".

⁹⁰ OQ: "... samtidskunsten ikke er så dristig allikevel, men skriver seg inn i den karismatiske myten om kunstens ekstraordinære bidrag til samfunnet".

⁹¹ OQ: "... slik at vi slipper hysteriske kunstformidlingsprosjekter, med tilhørende sjokkerte foreldre og rektorer som må ty til sensur".

M:regjeringen.no 2008). The fact that equality in the collaboration would prevent censorship or shocked parents, outrageous projects and failed opportunities is not mentioned in the debate at all. The one world does not touch the other, as the award would show.

The Entertaining Lesson — The Incompetent Teacher

There is recognition that some projects have a difficult time as the professions have opposing interests. However, the only critique in this is that the ‘school world’ has to be better at pedagogic reflections in the aftermath of projects. The artist comments on the exhibition situation that: “I get so inspired by being part of it, and I see how important it is that artists get to relay their competence to the children” (M:Gerhardsen 2007:7).⁹² The text goes on to explain that the artist has: “... understood what it takes to incite engagement and interest” (M:Gerhardsen 2007:7).⁹³ The teachers are described as lacking necessary competence to be involved (M:Eidem 2007a; M:Eidem 2007b; M:Holdhus 2008), and it is suggested that this lack of competence, not collaboration difficulties, is the main problem. They welcome productions, but are not involved as: “At the same time I can understand schools, because art is not necessarily important to them. One is afraid of what one cannot understand...” (M:Eidem 2007b:8).⁹⁴ It is even explicitly stated that while artists are creative, the teachers have a responsibility to keep the pupils quiet and calm. “... have not taken on any kind of teacher role, we haven’t yelled or scolded sort of...” (I:A1).⁹⁵ The artists don’t want to deal with the ‘problem of individuality’ in relation to anything other than when the child is occupied in a set frame with a set project in a set context with a teacher to facilitate. The story of the blackboard regime has become a way to label teaching as static and pacifying. However this backfires in my view when the pictures show the “new blackboards”, paintings and PowerPoint. At the same time, this represents a recipe thinking that is very traditional in form. There are a few works of art, the educator talks of techniques, content and use of colours. They talk of whether the picture is abstract or not. Then they talk of the feelings it might incite in the children. This is what has been labelled ‘black boarding’ by pedagogues themselves. Sometimes it is needed, but a lot of the time it is pacifying.

⁹² OQ: “Jeg blir så inspirert av å være med, og jeg ser hvor viktig det er at kunstnere får videreføre sin kompetanse til barna”.

⁹³ OQ: “... skjønt hva som skal til for å vekke engasjement og interesse”.

⁹⁴ OQ: “Samtidig skjønner jeg skolene, fordi kunst ikke nødvendigvis er viktig for dem. Man er jo redd alt man ikke forstår ...”.

⁹⁵ OQ: “... ikke har tatt noe sånn lærerrolle, vi har ikke kjefta, vi har ikke smelt liksom!”.

It is stated that: “The school and the artist has to understand and know each other’s reality and work processes” (M:Nesje and Klakegg 2007:15).⁹⁶ Indirectly it supports the claim that DKS projects will get the best results if the teachers are involved, and the school has an active role: “The pupils receive a holistic experience of art and culture, and it is placed in a larger subject theory frame” (M:Nesje and Klakegg 2007:15).⁹⁷ At the same time there is a turn around to claim that the teacher cannot fulfil the educational aims. Not necessarily as they lack competence — but they fail to motivate the pupils and demand results: “The artist often has different demands of the pupils, and sometimes even demand more, than the school does. The artists style of work, methods and dissemination seem to engage and motivate the school children to give more” (M:Nesje and Klakegg 2007:15).⁹⁸ I do not possess the background material for this school development project, but it would, in my view, have to be an extensive study to be able to so conclusively state that the artist’s approach differs radically from the teacher’s work.

There is also a conception of individualism, but not individuality, as something prized in the ‘art world’. They prize the inspiration that can make the single individual create a work of art, or produce a singular result. At the same time they have no interest in facilitating the differentiation question in schools. In a classroom the school children are all on different levels in knowledge, skills and self-sufficiency. The romantic notion that, through fantasy, the child will produce art sets limitations on the thoughts of individual learning adaptation: “... everyone managed it — at least nearly everyone” (I:A1).⁹⁹ This is in itself a paradox. The artists enter and claim that they are representing individuality, however are not inclined to find individuality in their classes simulating. Too much freedom of thought and actions from the children during their presentations are labelled as rude, disruptive or unwanted. The teachers are blamed for not keeping the children in line, or not managing their jobs properly (M:Henmo 2006). This stands in contrast to the view expressed as to how the pedagogisation and limiting classroom methods are hindering the child’s creativity. Pedagogisation becomes a way of labelling the opposing view through giving a negative connotation to the basis for the profession. Cleverly situated amidst claims of old-fashioned teachers, blackboards and strict rules that limit the freedom, pedagogisation then becomes associated with something restraining the spirit and standing in the way of personal growth.

⁹⁶ OQ: “Skolen og kunstneren må forstå og kjenne til hverandres virkelighet og arbeidsprosesser”.

⁹⁷ OQ: “Elevene får en helhetlig opplevelse av kunst og kultur, og det settes inn i en faglig teoretisk sammenheng”.

⁹⁸ OQ: “Kunstneren stiller ofte andre krav til elevene, og tidvis høyere krav enn det skolen gjør. Kunstnerens arbeidsstil, metoder og formidling ser ut til å engasjere og motivere elevene til å yte mer”.

⁹⁹ OQ: “...alle fikk vel til det – nesten i alle fall”.

FROM JUSTIFICATION TO STEREOTYPING?

The smaller narratives of justification of the professionals in the DKS *Visual arts* program can, in my interpretation, be seen to create two main stereotypes that are communicated to the public through the media. The media narratives that are told are anchored firmly in the Inspired World. I have chosen to sum up by writing the two narratives very clearly, almost in a caricatured manner, to highlight the position towards the two separate professions. In my view, the media has created what can be called the *DKS myths of professional stereotypes*. The result of the media narratives is a creation of the *artist hero* and the *teacher obstacle*. The professionals are in these narratives measured by the value set that the Art world brings to the collaborations. The language partakes of all the identifiers within the theory of justification, in particular the Investment Formula and State of Worthiness, in prizing what is seen as Human Dignity. In writing out the two professional stereotypes that I have identified, I will highlight the values that come into play. The *artist stereotype* is given as a positive falling within the judgment criteria of the identifiers, and the *teacher stereotype* as a negative, represented by the Fall, the failure to recognise the HCP of the Inspired world.

The Media Narrative of the Artist in DKS — the Hero

The artists often see themselves as outsiders, not in the sense that they are excluded, but by how they consider themselves *free from the structures and unwilling to partake in the ordinary*. They see their part as *calling into question*, and serving as *wake up calls*. The goal is to *break the bonds of the established*, and create a state of mind where the *individual* use the *internal creativity* that it has been given by nature. If they are challenged they tend to see themselves as the *revolutionary* that are being censored in their effort to critique. The *child* is seen as the *unspoiled and innocent vessel* of creative power, a natural wellspring of *fantasy* and *imagination*. They are '*spontaneous artists*' by *intuition* and by chance. Undisturbed, they will produce works of unusual expression. The *inspiration bubbles* in them, and the personal satisfaction and experience are seen as the *journey towards the stroke of genius* that might ensue from the projects. This personal journey is a way to *free the children from the habits and traditions* of education. Through education, the creative light of the child is extinguished. The artist is the *rebel* that will free the child from the bonds of society's shackles. The troubled youth or misunderstood rebel can be reached by the artist, for he can relate to the outsiders and *free their potential*. The artists themselves have achieved their artwork through their own *force and inner talents*, not through education. Even as they study at an educational institution, they reject the notion of teaching. They learn from their own practice, but not from their

teachers. *Variation* and *creativity* is claimed to be the realm of the artists, while teachers represent the establishment. The old quote:” Those who can, do, and those who can’t, teach”, is still to be found in the inspired worldview. This provides for a slightly contemptuous attitude towards teachers of A&C.

The Media Narrative of the A&C Teacher in DKS — the Obstacle

The media narrative of the teacher becomes a narrative of their *State of Deficiency*, defined by how they do *not* fit with the inspired worldview. It becomes the tale of the negative. While the artist is the free outsider, calling into question the established, the teacher represents this *established conformity* and *rule driven behaviour*. The artist’s goal to create a state of mind where the individual uses the internal creativity to flourish, is disrupted by the teachers’ *adherence to frames, educational aims* and *set boundaries for the practice*. The teachers step into the inspired world of the media narrative to spoil the child that is the natural artist by their innocent imagination by requesting them to attain *specific knowledge* as a *pupil*, rather than experiencing the inner wake up call. The teacher thwarts the artist’s revolution by bringing *censorship* into the free artistic expressions by respecting *regulations* and *traditions*, and *question boundary breaking* in any form within the education *institution*. While the artist is on a quest for the inner light and inspiration, the teachers are seen to represent *the already known* and show a tendency towards wanting to *evaluate* from *given standards*. They are *linear* and *rule driven*, which make them *boring* and *uninspiring*. This makes them unqualified to take part in the artist’s world. The *inspired genius* is not allowed its free reign, as the *good for the many* in the classroom take precedence, and age specific thinking and individual planning calls into question the artist’s choices. The artist’s quest to support the rebellious outsider is not prized, *as membership in the group* as a whole is seen as more important, and to conform to guidelines and frames is a set practice. The free artist is bound by the teacher’s behaviour, and advocates that to achieve DKS projects, the obstacle of the teacher is best removed from parts of the collaboration. They are welcome to facilitate, but not to participate.

MEDIA STEREOTYPES & EVALUATION RESULTS

The media operates within the inspired worldview while producing and validating professional stereotypes of what I have chosen to label the *artist hero* and the *teacher obstacle*. The creation and distribution of stereotypes are one dimensionally positive — negative, and one sided — told by artists and artist organisations. Whether this is a deliberate choice, or more an unconscious process by the media I have no basis to comment on here. As it

stands, the A&C teachers are not given the opportunity to tell their representation to the public via the media, and as such the construction of these stereotypes is made on the basis of one profession's value sets. They are created by the artists' and artist organisations' agenda, rather than by research into the field. Selmer-Olsen cautioned against such a predicament already at the start of the program in 2003.

“The development of knowledge in the field is defined by special interests and a lack of a unifying perspective. The distribution of culture is to a great extent guided by good will, politics and ideology, and not by research based knowledge and systemized experience. The professional educations (from teaching, to health, and art), traditional teaching and narrow interests related to the different areas of art and culture are prominent” (Selmer-Olsen 2003:3).¹⁰⁰

The value set that guides educational practice within state legislation is based in the Civic orientation of social democracy, common causes and opportunities, and the Industrial values of professionals, expert knowledge, and results. These values surface occasionally in the media narratives, but are subordinate to and dominated by the inspired orientation, and often listed as the obstacle. This is alarming in light of the DKS program and its placement within the school institution. If the media is allowed to stand unchallenged in their construction of stereotypes, what will this herald for the program and the educational content? What will be the consequences for the professionals involved? Will the teacher's be requested to bow to the judgment of the stereotypical artist?

Before I go further into this discussion, I find it necessary to find the narratives told in DKS evaluations and studies of professional A&C teachers practice. These evaluations are made on a different basis, one where the point of departure is the school context and the Schools curriculum learning aims. I want to see whether the *stereotypical teacher obstacle* is the dominating narrative in these as well, or if the media stereotypes are simply a highly developed construct.

The Boring A&C Teacher?

This is contradicted once more by the evaluations of the subject. They show that A&C is one of the most popular school subjects. It is seen as both useful and engaging by the schoolchildren. From the school children's point of view

¹⁰⁰ OQ: “Kunnskapsutviklingen på feltet preges av særinteresser og mangel på samlende perspektiv. Kulturformidlingen styres i høy grad av god vilje, politikk og ideologi, og ikke av forskningsbasert kunnskap og systematiserte erfaringer. Profesjonsutdanningene (fra lærer- til helse- og kunstfagutdanning), tradisjonelle formidlingsmetoder og snevrere interesser knyttet til de forskjellige kunst- og kulturområdene råder grunnen”.

in evaluations within the subject A&C, the most important in regard to the teachers role was: “— that the teacher shows you what to do” (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995:72),¹⁰¹ that the teacher motivated and demanded quality from your work, discuss with you how to use shapes and colours to achieve the desired result. The least desired in this regard was that the teacher: “... talk to you about what you want your picture or sculpture to communicate” (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995:73).¹⁰² Also, deemed the most important result by the school children, was that the product was useful as well as beautiful. This is also noticed by the artists in projects: “... to work with physical materials, it seems like they like that a lot...” (I:A1).¹⁰³ However, this is not the view reported through the media. As a result, these *myths* can be seen to substantiate the claim: “... as a creating artist, you never compromise on your artistic intention” (M:Christiansen 2007:30).¹⁰⁴ The romantic notion of inspiration is very much at hand here, as they claim that the intention of art take precedence of any content the ‘school world’ might welcome.

The Useful and Creative

”To work with design, to make something that can be ‘useful’, can also provide a feeling of accomplishment that is more difficult to find in other subjects” (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995:86).¹⁰⁵ It is strange how the industrial and inspired view meets in this quote — the useful and the fulfilment of the human potential, but at the same time the inclusion of those that fall outside in other subjects. Studies show that the majority of A&C teachers disagree that copying is a proper method in A&C. The picture of the rigid and dominating teacher, where personal expression is not given any room, and creativity is discouraged, is not the real picture (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995; S:Kjosavik et al. 2003). However, designing useful products/objects is regarded as very important. These two things are not opposites, as many in the ‘art world’ seem to signal with their ‘art of the useless’. “The pupils should both experience and learn. The artist has to maintain his artistic work. The involved A&C teachers are preoccupied with the pupils subject specific knowledge gain in *their subject*” (M:Nesje and Klakegg 2007:13).¹⁰⁶ When teachers evaluated the school children, the most important factor was the effort the pupils put into it. Then the personal expression, individual ideas, technical skill, and practical knowledge were

¹⁰¹ OQ: “— at læreren viser deg hva du skal gjøre”.

¹⁰² OQ: “... snakker med deg om hva du vil fortelle med bildet eller skulpturen”.

¹⁰³ OQ: “... å få jobbe med fysisk materiale, det virker det som de liker veldig godt...”

¹⁰⁴ OQ: “... som skapende kunstner kompromisser du aldri på den kunstneriske intensjonen”.

¹⁰⁵ OQ: “Det å arbeide med bruksformer, lage noe som kan brukes til noe “nyttig”, gir også en mestringsglede som kanskje er vanskeligere å erfare i andre fag”.

¹⁰⁶ OQ: “Elevene skal bade oppleve og lære. Kunstneren skal ivareta sitt kunstneriske arbeid. De involverte faglærerne er opptatt av elevens faglige utbytte i *sitt fag*”.

evaluated. The knowledge of aesthetical, artistic factors and knowledge of materials didn't rate as that important (E:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995). "The teachers are clearly aware of the value of art dissemination" (E:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995:31).¹⁰⁷ It is strange how the myth being presented by the artists, of teachers preoccupied with formalism, uniformity, and restraining the child's creative expression is countered by this data.

Content and Learning

The teachers expect to get something from the projects when they spend a day or more on it. They appreciate it if the artist knows more than themselves and have a relevant content that is age appropriate in terms of communication (E:Kristiansen 2007). Also the curriculum relevance is seen as important, when time is taken away from the time frame allotted the subject-specific teaching. There is a questioning from the teachers whether the experience remains in the long run, and the feeling of a break from the normal is more the allure. One of the projects where the school children were asked if they had learned anything at all, 15 of 25 answered that they had not learned a single thing, but had enjoyed themselves. The fact that the school children enjoyed the projects is good, but it is worrisome that there is no perceived learning in it. The problem with this is that once the teachers start to request a result, they are seen as focusing on theory and techniques and being old fashioned. They are seen to focus on being boring knowledge pushers. However, if this is true, why do evaluations of the school subject repeatedly show that well over 90% of the pupils enjoy A&C (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995) and the majority find it both interesting and useful (S:Kjosavik et al. 2003). "We register that the school children to a greater extent than the teachers emphasizes learning to master tools, techniques and having knowledge of materials" (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995:77).¹⁰⁸ This does not correspond with the view put forward by the 'art world'. Evaluations also show that the pupils want to learn from examples and instruction (E:Kristiansen 2007). They want to realise their ideas, but see that to do so they need help to figure out techniques, tools and composition. The children don't seem to notice the constructed dichotomy of imagination, self-expression and creativity on the one hand, and techniques, instructions and frames for the assignment on the other. They incorporate it seamlessly into their A&C practice, and the teachers are knowledgeable enough to allow for all approaches (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995; S:Kjosavik et al. 2003).

¹⁰⁷ OQ: "Lærerne er tydelig oppmerksomme på verdien av kunstformidling".

¹⁰⁸ OQ: "Vi registrerer at elevene i større grad enn lærerne legger vekt på å lære å bruke verktøy, beherske noen teknikker og å ha materialkunnskap".

There are differences between teachers and artists in their feeling towards children and art dissemination. There is, at the same time, the reflection from the ‘school world’ that: “... it varied how well the disseminator managed to talk to, and establish a rapport with the children, and that some of them were lacking the pedagogical background” (E:Kristiansen 2007:31).¹⁰⁹ The teachers and schools are responsible for the pupils in terms of curriculum, ethical concerns and regulations that determine the professional practice. They are bound firmly by laws and regulations in their professional practice. At the same time as the teachers display thought on the learning potential and knowledge content of productions, they are not brought into the collaboration as equals: “... the culture contact felt that the collaboration between the school and the artists consisted of greeting the artists, serving the coffee and giving them flowers. She pointed out that apart from this, they had no collaboration” (E:Kristiansen 2007:19).¹¹⁰

Collaboration and Knowledge Gain

Through the evaluations, and the few media texts where teachers were represented, one narrative is evident. The teachers feel quite strongly that they are not brought into the DKS projects enough. They are presented with an offer and: “—We don’t get to know much up front” (M:Sund 2002b:27).¹¹¹ The teachers that are quoted in the evaluation seem to be highlighting the factor that is most present for the pupils at the moment — the visit of something new and unknown — rather than any noticeable knowledge gain. It might seem that the projects function as a break from the normal, and that the introduction of something novel is of more significance than the content or gain. This is not surprising, as the experience has been presented thoroughly as the good way to go about a DKS project. Teachers are positive to the program and signal a wish for it to continue. However, they also signal that the lack of any influence, or any gain for their own practice in the aftermath of any project is a problem. “Productions were mostly well received by the teachers, as long as they were notified well in advance” (E:Kristiansen 2007:32).¹¹² A teacher in one of the evaluations states that they: “... came into the room where the exhibition was without knowing anything about content up front and that made it difficult to prepare the school children” (E:Kristiansen 2007:33).¹¹³ The same teacher points out

¹⁰⁹ OQ: “... det var varierende hvordan formidler klarte å snakke til, og få kontakt med, barna, og at noen av dem manglet den pedagogiske bakgrunnen”.

¹¹⁰ OQ: “... kulturkontakten mente at samarbeidet mellom skolen og kunstnere gikk ut på å ta i mot kunstnere, servere dem kaffe og gi dem blomster. Hun påpekte at ut over det hadde de ikke noe samarbeid”.

¹¹¹ OQ: “- Vi får vite lite i forkant”.

¹¹² OQ: “... produksjoner stort sett ble godt mottatt av lærerne, så lenge de fikk beskjed i god tid”.

¹¹³ OQ: “... kom inn i rommet der utstillinger var uten å vie noe på forhånd om hva den inneholdt og da var det vanskelig å forberede elevene”.

that in the one case where she was given the possibility of being informed up front, she was much better prepared to work with the school children before and after the production. She was very clear on the fact that this was the only course she had ever been offered, but she would welcome more. The sentiment is that the school children should experience and learn to appreciate, but the teachers also have an obligation towards the curriculum.

Time spent on DKS projects has to count in the year's lesson plan, or it is school lessons wasted: "What we miss is to get the request early enough to put it in our half year syllabus. When it comes, we have to make room in the education. It seems like some people believe that teachers never prepare..." (M:Sund 2002b:27).¹¹⁴ This is a real point of frustration, that the work they do, preparing and planning is seen as not valuable, or less important than accommodating visitors. "The teachers pointed out that there was never enough time in school, and that visits from productions affected other subjects. The visits worked because the teachers conformed to the productions and found room, but often it felt hectic" (E:Kristiansen 2007:42).¹¹⁵ At the same time, there is an orientation with the teachers towards favouring longer projects. The experienced teachers express concerns regarding short projects in relation to their own A&C lessons. They have little value in a knowledge perspective. 73% of the teachers felt that they could not support A&C projects that were no more than one day/one unit (2 classes of 45min). These were seen as not being viable (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995). Rather they supported the notion of fewer and lengthier projects that could support in-depth understanding of the subject knowledge base. They would welcome courses and knowledge recourses to make it more relevant in their school syllabus: "Ideally she wanted more pedagogical resources" (E:Kristiansen 2007:42).¹¹⁶ This is interesting in relation to DKS, where a majority of the projects offered in Visual art are short visits or limited exhibitions.¹¹⁷ From the 'art world' there is a complaint that teachers don't read what they get from the DKS project. They: "... have experienced that information for the schools not always get there. And if it does, it is not always read by the teachers" (M:Sund 2002c:28).¹¹⁸ This is, of course, a problem, and can maybe be seen as a result of the missing communication on the projects as a whole?

¹¹⁴ OQ: "Det vi savner er at vi får henvendelsen tidlig nok til å sette dette inn i halvårsplanen. Når det kommer, må vi rydde plass i undervisningen. Det virker som om enkelte tror at lærere ikke forbereder seg..."

¹¹⁵ OQ: "Lærerne påpekte at det alltid var for liten tid i skolen, og at besøk av produksjoner stadig gikk utover andre fag. Det fungerte med besøk av produksjoner fordi de jenket seg og fant plass til det, men ofte føltes det litt travelt".

¹¹⁶ OQ: "Ideelt sett kunne hun ønsket seg mer pedagogisk materiale".

¹¹⁷ <http://www.denkulturelleskulesekken.no/>

¹¹⁸ OQ: "... har selv erfart at info til skolene om utstillinger ikke alltid når fram. Og hvis det gjør det, blir det ikke alltid lest av lærerne".

The teachers or school contacts seem to have little influence of what is offered them from the DKS program. “She could not remember receiving any work prior to any production, and after the productions they did not have the time” (E:Kristiansen 2007:42).¹¹⁹ They feel swamped in their daily tasks, and the curriculum they have to teach. They feel unable to influence the schedule, and a signal from one of the few media texts featuring teachers was that they: “... could not breathe between the shows during the autumn semester” (M:Borgen 2007a:10).¹²⁰ Even as they see the DKS projects as welcome distractions, they feel they lack the learning content to make them an integrated part of the school year. They are positive towards the program and the artists within it, and see the experience as valuable, even as they felt excluded from the collaboration and the possibility to have any real influence on pedagogical solutions or relevant content. There is also the question of target group: “... to a great extent they have to take what they get, and cannot choose which grade gets a visit from a production” (E:Kristiansen 2007:39).¹²¹ Teachers react to the fact that Visual art DKS projects seem to be created to accommodate children from the age of 6 to 16. “We would have liked to be a part of the decision process. We have experienced that some exhibitions would be better suited for older children...” (M:Sund 2002b:27).¹²² The only possible gain for such projects is an experience, and this might not be a good one for most involved, with such a diverse audience. One of the teachers involved claimed: “ — We teachers have to be censors. Often we are not given the opportunity to do this...” (M:Sund 2002b:27).¹²³ This is a bit of a concept issue. To be a censor in the Norwegian educational system is to say something of the quality involved — to evaluate the quality of a work. It is in this context a way to establish a level that is in accordance with both the educational and ethical regulations that the school has to maintain. As long as a project is within the school day, the head master is the responsible party. In the ‘art world’, censors are understood as being tied to censorship — which is fought against tooth and nail in the ‘art world’. “I am surprised. The municipalities that participate in the projects receive two exhibitions in autumn and spring. It is art of high quality which I welcome no censorship of...” (M:Sund 2002c:28).¹²⁴

¹¹⁹ OQ: “Hun kunne ikke huske å ha fått noe forarbeid til noen produksjoner, og etterarbeid hadde de ikke tid til”.

¹²⁰ OQ: “... fikk ikke puste mellom forestillingene i høsthalvåret”.

¹²¹ OQ: “... i stor grad må ta det de får, og ikke kan velge hvilke klassetrinn som skal få besøk av en produksjon”.

¹²² OQ: “Vi skulle gjerne vært med å bestemme. Vi har opplevd at enkelte utstillinger nok hadde egnet seg bedre for eldre barn...”.

¹²³ OQ: “- Vi lærere må være sensorer. Ofte får vi ikke muligheten til det...”.

¹²⁴ OQ: “Jeg er overrasket. De kommuner som er med i prosjektet får to utstillinger i løpet av høst og vår. Det er kunst på høyt nivå som jeg ikke ønsker noen sensur av...”.

Opposing Narratives?

Art and craft teachers have a long subject history, and some of the traditions that permeate the subject-matter thinking will be of importance to the teachers in projects within DKS. Both the product and technique comes into play: “A part of the subjects tradition in Norway is to learn to be self-reliant and handy, in contrast to similar subjects in other countries that are of a more informative character (Pleym 1993). Many consider this Norwegian tradition to be an important quality in the subject” (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995:87).¹²⁵ Still, so does the individual development and creativity: “When it comes to evaluating the school children, the teachers emphasise commitment to the subject, individual development of ideas, and a personal expression” (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995:7).¹²⁶ These traditions allow for a joining between knowledge content and experience, and technical skill and individual focus. It can all be included in the aim of what could be called a balancing act — to open for both sides of the collaboration on equal grounds.

Quality in DKS is tangled in the discussion of aims and content. It reflects the different understandings of what the program is and should be. As a result, the quality criteria are diffuse and varied. The narratives concerning quality that surface in the case of DKS often have the air of opposition. It is not necessarily said that something is good, but it is rather how something else is not the way to go. Once again the narrative presented by the ‘art world’, consists of several stories, while the teachers through evaluations represent another balancing act. This is a result of how several stories on aims and content thinking will affect the discussion regarding quality.

The strange thing in the discussion on quality is that even though all the evaluations point to the fact that the result, both in terms of experience, learning and knowledge gain for the school children, hinges on the teacher being informed and involved. This is a narrative hard to find for the public. If the teachers are positive, informed and knowledgeable and use this to work before and after the productions, the schools children display a higher level of commitment and learning (E:Borgen and Brandt 2006; E:Kristiansen 2007), and if there is practical work involved, even more so. Teachers are concerned with the quality and knowledge content of the productions. “The teacher had, on the other hand, not been as satisfied with the quality of the local (projects),

¹²⁵ OQ: “En del av tradisjonen i Forming i Norge er det å bli selvhjulpne og nevenyttig, i motsetning til tilsvarende fag i andre land som er av en mer orienterende karakter (Pleym 1993). Mange anser denne norske tradisjonen som en viktig kvalitet ved faget”.

¹²⁶ OQ: “Når det gjelder elevvurdering, legger lærerne mest vekt på at elevene viser engasjement i faget, selvstendig idéutvikling og et personlig uttrykk”.

she claimed that sometimes they were lacking in content” (E:Kristiansen 2007:38).¹²⁷

The fact is that there are no resources made available specifically to implement the DKS program in schools. None of the funds are supposed to be used either as economy to give teachers courses or information in front of projects, or to buy materials that are needed. The money should go solely to the projects — which seems to mean to the art institution, as artists’ salaries and ticket and transportation money per child. This leaves little room for the teacher to contribute with her knowledge. The result seems to be that the teachers, in retrospect, question the productions: “... felt that the quality of kultur.akershus’ productions were high, but that they seldom were relevant to the target group, and therefore not belonging in school” (E:Kristiansen 2007:39).¹²⁸ The projects overshoot the target group, as the focus seems to be on presenting art as the ‘art world’ feels appropriate, rather than give the school children a tailored creation (E:Cordt-Hansen 2008).

The teachers signal that the DKS program is not integrated in the everyday workings of the school. The time is not there, and the courses are not available due to economic concerns. Exhibitions were often presented with no advance information or material for work. One of the teachers reported being satisfied with a project where they were given an introduction course in front, to be able to prepare the school children in advance. The workshop, with a lot of practical work made sense in light of this, and the teachers worked with the artists to instruct and guide the pupil work. The curious fact is that of all the projects the pupils had been through the previous years, this is the only one they could remember clearly (E:Kristiansen 2007). When asked if they could remember any other projects, only six of seventeen remembered projects they had enjoyed. Most could recall some, but could not say much about the content. They found them forgettable or boring (E:Kristiansen 2007). If the teachers were allowed to tell stories of breakthroughs with pupils, what stories would we hear? This is information that can never be disclosed to the media by right of law.

Alongside these several art focused media narratives that provide the stereotypes of the *artist hero* and the *teacher obstacle*, is the evaluation narrative I have chosen to call the *balancing act*. This balancing act is mostly found on the school side of the collaboration, with the teachers’ view expressed in evaluations and studies of professional practice. An evaluation performed in a local school district proclaims that: “DKS has to be seen in

¹²⁷ OQ: “Læreren hadde imidlertid ikke vært like fornøyd med kvaliteten på de lokale, hun uttalte at det noen ganger har blitt for lite innhold”.

¹²⁸ OQ: “... mente at det var høy kvalitet på kultur.akershus sine produksjoner, men at de ofte ikke var relevante for målgruppen og derfor ikke hørte hjemme i skolen”.

relation to the schools view on culture and learning, concentrated in aims of individual learning” (E:Mæland 2006:3).¹²⁹ It is clear that the ‘school world’ chooses to see the program in relation to the curriculum and the school regulations that govern any projects within the school institution. The *balancing act* however, does not exclude the artists, the experience or the artwork. It tries to accommodate all of it: “... felt that an adaptation to the school within the DKS frame was more important than showing a production that solely concentrated on being a good experience” (E:Kristiansen 2007:41).¹³⁰ It can neither be just subject, nor just experience. It has to contain all sides, and the teachers are open to letting in new things: “... it creates a strong engagement with the children, I think, and they get an experience they otherwise would not get in school...” (I:T1).¹³¹ The teachers also emphasise the special education and individual adaptation of productions as important: “But then there is always someone that finds this too difficult” (I:T1).¹³² Not all schoolchildren manage to the same extent, and not all productions are age relevant if seen through a teachers experience: “They wanted to a greater degree to adapt the themes to each grade” (E:Kristiansen 2007:39).¹³³ Subject-matter content, individual learning and technical skills are topics not easily broached in DKS. As concepts associated with curriculum and theory, it is in its educational setting seen by part of the ‘art world’, and the media constructs (S:Aslaksen 1997; M:Karlsen 2007) as redundant in relations to the *free art*.

EVALUATION NARRATIVE—THE BALANCING ACT

While the artists represented in the media, and also within the evaluations, are placed firmly within the inspired worldview, the A&C teachers have somewhat of a more complicated narrative to tell. This is in the nature of the field of education, the teaching profession, the curricular frames, and also the *regulations governing the everyday work practice*. The educational system is of a civic orientation in Norway. It is about *democracy* and *cultural heritage*. To belong to *something bigger than the individual*, but at the same time make sure that all the individuals have *the same opportunity*. *Equality* and *belonging* has to go hand in hand, and the goal is a society where people *elect their representatives* and *pulling together* through everyone having a say. In a classroom every voice is *entitled a hearing*, no matter the estimated talent or

¹²⁹ OQ: “Den Kulturelle Skulesekken må sjåast i forhold til skulens kultursyn og læringssyn, konsentrert i foremål om tilpassa opplæring”.

¹³⁰ OQ: “... mente at en tilpassing til skolen innenfor DKS rammen var viktigere enn det å vise en produksjon som kun la opp til å være en god opplevelse”.

¹³¹ OQ: “... det skaper et veldig engasjement hos ungene syns jeg, og så får de en erfaring som de ellers vanligvis ikke får i skolen...”.

¹³² OQ: “Men så er det alltid noen som synes dette blir vanskelig”.

¹³³ OQ: “De ønsket å tilpasse i større grad til tema for hvert klassetrinn”.

creativity involved. The thought of including everyone — creating a place where there are *no outsiders* — is predominant. Campaigns against bullying, *structures* to help those who need special attention, or extra training, and collaborations with homes, experts, police etc. to create the best possible learning environment for all, are results of this thought of inclusion and democratic rights (KD and Udir 2006). At the same time, some of the industrial world comes into play through thought about *relevant knowledge* content and 'audit' — in the forms of *evaluating and grading* pupils' works. At the same time as the stories of useful knowledge and democracy through inclusion are predominant, the inspired story of the *charismatic artist* lies at the root of the school subject. The narrative of the Art and craft teacher is one of trying to include the outsiders, without taking away the outsider status. To *appreciate the spontaneity* of children, while knowing that learning from examples and using *familiar knowledge* is a large part of *creativity*. To promote the *fantasy* of children while recognising that the pupils' and teachers' *collaboration* exists in every classroom setting in the conversations that are necessary to learn.

Fusion and Confusion

If the artists in DKS refuse to recognise anyone outside the 'art world' as competent to comment on art quality, and the public accepts this, they command a powerful boundary that is capable of excluding other claims by A&C teachers or school administration based in curriculum or legislation. The magical and sacred cannot be discussed through standards or absolutes. The 'school world', on the other hand, has very transparent quality demands, openly given in the curriculum document as knowledge aims, and cannot claim any magical content separate from the given. The 'school worlds' pedocentric and romantic attitude, especially within parts of the A&C subject also add to A&C teacher professions dissolving boundaries, as they are prone to accept the claim from the artists of the non transferable magical free art.

Suggestions that basing the DKS program on the Core curriculum satisfies the DKS demands for basing projects in curriculum aims, is in the evaluations questioned by the A&C teachers. The core curriculum is something of a paradox, as it is a political document that is a combination of all worldviews, and can be used accordingly — as a tool for justification for all worldviews — and does not address the knowledge/learning aims. The core curriculum's nature makes it a potential peace-treaty — a cease fire contract — at the same time as it can be the starting point in its vagueness where it is a guide to educational values and strategies — rather than subject-matter thinking. If, in their aims, the 'art world.' as 'visiting' actors. choose to highlight only what they see as important from the Core curriculum i.e.

having an experience, and choose to ignore the parts that they find unsuitable — it is difficult to say that it warrants an entry into a subject.

Why should the program then be divided into separate focus areas? While the teacher in the ‘school world’ will have to attend to all sides of the regulations, and to the subject-matter curriculum that the projects are located within, the artists — as shown in the previous discussion — do not always acquiesce to a knowledge focus in art education. The different positions in relation to content can be seen as whether the DKS should be based on the aspect of experience, of learning, or of both? However, just as big a question is: Who holds the definitive power to decide?

End Comment

The quality debate, and as such the content choices, is in the DKS media narratives not performed through defined knowledge, but rather through the individual artist’s ‘freedom of expression’, which can only be judged properly by the media stereotype the *artist hero*. The quality discussion effectively excludes all non-artists, such as the *teacher obstacle*, as they do not understand or exist in the realm of ‘artistic freedom’ and cannot grasp the artists’ true genius. The acceptance of these stereotypes will have consequences for the execution of DKS as it is located within the educational sector. Within the media narratives, the professional A&C teachers or their organisations are not given the opportunity to participate in the quality discussion within the program, in regards to project content, execution and quality standards. They are portrayed as outsiders to be excluded and, in extreme cases, the expert knowledge they represent is to be disregarded. The division between knowledge and the indefinable artistic freedom can be already seen, to some extent, to infuse the DKS program, even as evaluations show that the teachers perform their *balancing act*. The concern is whether the media stereotypes together with the teachers effort to balance, will contribute to locking the quality discussions for the school-anchored program within the art scene, instead of opening up for a collaboration of professionals.

Shifting Boundaries

In this chapter I will discuss how stereotypes can be seen to impact the discussion of the development of the DKS program and the A&C subject in school. The repercussions of accepting the stereotypes that are identified through the analysed sources of documentation will be described and discussed through professional theory, especially through the concept of professional boundaries and jurisdiction (Abbott 1988).

JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES

Even though structure is important, the professions today are diverse, and the way they are organized mirrors this diversity by having few commonalities in their day-to-day practice. However, some vital processes can be labelled even if the execution of these differ in day-to-day practice. Professions have a field of knowledge over which they hold jurisdiction. They have the authority to practice within these particular boundaries. “The professionals claim the exclusive right to practice, as a vocation, the arts which they profess to know, and to give the kind of advice derived from their special lines of knowledge” (Hughes 1984:375). The area of expertise is the professions jurisdiction. Witz (1992) uses the term ‘demarcation’ as boundaries for professional control, even though he speaks more broadly in terms of occupation’s. “Demarcation strategies are concerned with the creation and control of boundaries between occupations” (Witz 1992:46). This is the field where the professionals control the *diagnosis, inference* and *treatment*. Those with power use this to intensify their hold on the right to infer treatment. “The jurisdictional claims that create these subjective qualities have three parts: claims to classify a problem, to reason about it, and to take action on it: in more formal terms, to diagnose, to infer, and to treat” (Abbott 1988:40). It is in this process according to Abbott that the concept of work has to be introduced. It is in the practice that the professions separate in style, solutions and manner of execution, and where they put forth their claim to legitimacy, to jurisdiction.

Jurisdictional boundaries change over time. Some professions disappear, while others split or merge. “Each profession is bound to a set of tasks by the ties of jurisdiction, the strengths and weaknesses of these ties being

established in the processes of actual professional work” (Abbott 1988:33). The movement of jurisdictional boundaries can be slow and made in agreement between the dividing forces. It can come from some groups being redundant and others become important. The justification of new jurisdictional boundaries can come from new technology or the division of current fields that have expanded so that the original profession is unable or unwilling to cover all areas. Change can also come in the form of one profession moving in to claim a position already filled, where the existing profession then loses their control over the field of expertise. This can be a slow take over, but can also be more of a struggle and come from what Abbott labels bump events.

Bump Events

A bump event is when a group tries to forcibly dislocate the existing profession by offering their own abstract knowledge as more valid than what is already on offer. It might not be an all out pronounced take-over, but it is still an attack on the existing boundaries. “Jurisdictional change inevitably involves interprofessional contests. In bump events those contents arise when one profession attacks another...” (Abbott 1988:89). If the profession can be seen in terms of value sets as well as a knowledge area, with participants being apprenticed into a dominant ‘world view’, it is fair to assume that the value systems used in justifying the jurisdictional boundaries will vary (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006). They will however, all justify their jurisdictional claims in terms of how they can play a part — *how* the betterment of the world at large will be achieved through their professional contribution.

In my view this can be said to vary between the warring professions according to their understanding of *the Higher Common Principle* (HCP) and world-view as well as the expertise. This is particularly relevant in the DKS case, where a large part of the expert knowledge is *making* knowledge that is based on practical experience in a tactile understanding that can sometimes be difficult to access due to it being concept poor (Schön 1995). This is why the practice — the argumentation in and through the work itself — has to be considered vital in the DKS case (Abbott 1988). Through the discussions but also actions on the practice level, conflicts in the value sets that guide the practice will surface.

The Public as a Factor

In bump events the public becomes important. The public will, through bringing forth their problem to a profession, allow them to keep jurisdiction

— by lack of another choice of services, or by recognition of the jurisdictional claim of the profession (Abbott 1988). The public constantly justify the profession's existence in allowing them the everyday execution of diagnosis, inference and treatment. This process of continued justification of jurisdictional boundaries, is challenged by groups that want to expand their professional fields, and consequently to expand their jurisdictional boundaries. There will be a fight for the public — for the clients — if the jurisdictional claims are several for the same area of expertise, and as such the values expressed will be of importance. Abbott talks of: "... Act, Scene, Agent, Agency, Purpose. Jurisdictions are often organized around one of these terms" (Abbott 1988:99). Of all these factors, the jurisdictional claims anchored in a *purpose* and *acts*, are identified by Abbott as the most powerful. To be anchored in purpose means to exist as a calling, as opposed to being anchored in *agency*, or *scene*, where the regulations and documents, or the belonging to an organisation or institution are the defining factors. In light of Boltanski and Thevenots polity model, professional claims in DKS made with the inspired worldview can be made through the *purpose* they exhibit to save the child, while the claims from the Civic worldview or Industrial worldview will be weaker as they are built on *agency* and *scene* through their belief in regulations and legislations.

The stereotypes the *hero* and the *obstacle* created through the narratives of educational practice in DKS can, in my view, be seen as an effective argument in the quest for recognition of the artist as the vital actor of the DKS program in the public opinion. Whether the media can be said to operate with their own agenda, and what this might be, I cannot comment on. What I can propose is that even if they have their own agenda, in the process of furthering this, they can be seen to corroborate with the creation of stereotypes within DKS. The stereotypes that I have identified in the DKS case is, in my view, part of a jurisdictional claim in terms of who is qualified to proclaim expert knowledge in DKS projects, to offer the public expertise they can recognise as such. If the inference performed by a profession becomes transparent and the expert knowledge is accessible to those who are on the outside, the public will demand new experts to replace the ones that no longer can offer exclusive abstract knowledge (Abbott 1988). As a result, for the challenging profession to be able to dislocate the current profession from the jurisdiction of an area of expert knowledge, the public has to agree to seek *treatment* from the new group.

In DKS, the composition of stereotypical professional behaviour that is distributed to the public is one way of challenging the boundaries for professional control, as they address the issue of relevant expert knowledge in relation to the execution of the professional practice and qualifications

within the school subject. Even as it is made permanent, the DKS program is, still in a phase where the jurisdictional boundaries are in play, also within a day-to-day practice (E:Borgen 2007b; E:Borgen and Brandt 2006).

DKS AND JURISDICTION

The subject A&C is in itself rarely addressed in the media or the public at large, while, in comparison, the DKS projects in Visual arts are. In its own way, this is a signal as to who is allotted time by the media and, as such, the means to reach the public to comment on the DKS program, and, through this, parts of the A&C education in schools. I will try to show how the jurisdictional struggle for the right to perform A&C education comes to life in how the stereotypes that have been created could impact on the future of the program, and how this could affect the school subject A&C. I will then move on to show how jurisdictional consequences of these stereotypes can be seen in what I have chosen to label *bump signs* of change within the debate. It is too soon to talk of an entire bump event, but I will show how it is relevant to talk of signs of change — bump signs.

The first bump sign concerns the content of the concept of the professional within DKS. The new official document concerning the DKS program was released in 2007 (D:KKD 2007), and the changes in the view of program responsibility and quality control will be debated. I will question who is described as a professional A&C teacher and who in the DKS program is described as a professional artist.

This brings us to the second bump sign of change in who is depicted to hold the most relevant expert knowledge. This is done through addressing both the official document *Kulturell skulesekk for framtida. St.meld. nr 8* (KKD 2007) and the award process of the national prize Gullsekken (The Golden Rucksack) — a national prize that will be given to a school and an art project each year. Two prizes are presented. A jury selects the best art project and the best school to receive 100.000 NOK each. This award process was introduced in 2007 (M:regjeringen.no 2007a), and it is the first award situation I will use to highlight how stereotypes might be said to affect the program. I will get back to these bump signs after I clarify the ongoing discussion.

Changes in Central Tasks

A profession has both objective and subjective characters of its central tasks (Abbott 1988). It is vulnerable to changes in both. The curriculum of 2006 has brought the changes in the objective character — written regulations — while DKS has brought about a questioning of the subjective in terms of what the central tasks are. Since the previously mentioned merge in 1960, A&C

teachers have tried to reconcile the crafts and the art part of the A&C subject, as well as the democratic and the individual aspects. Change, ending in the curriculum of 2006 has made it possible to both teach the specifics, and merge the sub categories of the subject, and after almost 50 years, the internal struggle has subsided to a large extent. However, when DKS was introduced, this internal struggle, almost over, was given a new form, where outside professionals were invited in through the DKS program. The division into parts surfaced again in the inclusion of external factors. “The view of art and culture that at any time dominates society, will have influence on the subject Forming’s content and status as a school subject” (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995:89).¹³⁴ In DKS this influence through the introduction of another profession into the A&C education has, in my view, led to a new fragmentation into parts. Projects with a sole focus of design, craft, architecture, or fine art are produced. This move of breaking the A&C subject into partial knowledge areas has created a possibility for external forces to question professional boundaries through the struggle to control the content and quality standards, i.e., claim expert knowledge for the separate areas in DKS.

This has made the A&C profession vulnerable from both sides. They question the objective themselves (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995; S:Kjosavik et al. 2003; M:Mauren 2006a; M:Mauren 2006b; E:Mæland 2006), and are questioned in the subjective by outsiders in DKS projects. Designers, craftsmen and architects are not involved in the jurisdictional bump event to the extent the fine artists are. Designers and Architects in particular are to a great extent absent in the discussions. Instead, the claims and narratives that, in my view, can be seen to herald a possible bump event seem to be orchestrated from the fine art professionals. In my view, the documents concerning the program discuss Visual art through an understanding of the area as mostly fine art (D:KKD 2007). In light of this development I propose that the A&C teachers are met with another disadvantage. They have to defend a broader approach, which demands anchoring their practice in several purposes that differ from that of fine art. While fine art and culture are seen by some as the same, and in A&C it is treated as different, the discussion becomes disarrayed, also at the political level (M:Dokk Holm 2006; M:Giske 2006a; M:Giske 2006b; M:Giske 2006c; M:Ullmann 2006a; M:Ullmann 2006b). This acceptance to focus on fine art is problematic in view of the curriculum, and if it is not questioned and reflected upon, it might lead to an impoverished A&C subject. As a part of a bump event for artists to

¹³⁴ OQ: “Synet på kunst og kultur som til enhver tid er rådende i samfunnet, vil ha innvirkning på formingsfagets innhold og status som skolefag”.

stake a claim to the area of fine art, jurisdiction that can include the entire field of culture will make their area of jurisdiction even greater.

The Outside Advisor

The artists in DKS have been given an advisory position: “Advisory jurisdiction is thus sometime a leading edge of invasion...” (Abbott 1988:76). Abbott claims that all professional problems will, at heart, have some sort of objective base, and in the case of the A&C subject and DKS this would probably be the increased amount of classes in A&C, combined with the lack of teachers with specialised A&C education from 1st to 7th grade. While most of them know crafts, still; “... about 17% answered that they had no art education in their formal training” (E:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995:21).¹³⁵ It is an objective gap, but as he also says, the interpretation of the gap requires subjective perceptions of the problem. Instead of addressing the issue of teacher training, the problem was placed outside the profession. Involved parties view the problem through their own professional Orders of Worth. Reinterpreting the problem from the ‘art world’ point of view is, unconsciously or not, a move towards establishing jurisdiction of the particular problem, to diagnose it. The inference seems to be to question the competence in education within the subject A&C. Reinterpreting the problem has, in my view, been curiously absent from the ‘school world’ on the other hand, strangely enough as they currently should own the problems concerning general education. By not trying to classify the problem, this can be interpreted as the ‘school world’ having expressed an acceptance to ‘outsource’ the problem through DKS, and as such relinquish some of the control of the content and quality questions along with it.

Through the artists’ involvement in creating and executing projects, they are to be involved in the professional work that used to be the teachers’ responsibility, and in some cases even replace them. Through narratives of their own proficiency they are trying to establish their right to take over these responsibilities. The teachers don’t seem to fight this.

“... consider how the social organization of professions affects the kinds of jurisdictional claims they make and their success in achieving those claims. First, other things being equal, the more strongly organized a profession is, the more effective its claims to jurisdiction” (Abbott 1988:82).

A&C teachers’ are organised in *Art and Design in School*, and the artists have their own organisation. In the case of DKS, artists are heard through the

¹³⁵ OQ: “... svarte vel 17% at de ikke hadde noen forming sin utdanning”.

media and: “In contests between professions, the profession with more extensive organization usually wins” (Abbott 1988:83). In this case, extensive is, in my view, measured in media coverage rather than size. The artists are, in media use, by far outracing the teachers in relation to DKS.

The Antagonist

Being an artist contains the possibility to oppose the established. The *artist hero* does not have to respect institutions or curriculum regulations to perform their task (S:Aslaksen 1997; S:Mangset 2004; McFee 1999). For the purpose of saving the child they: “... get there and they are doing it while they are holding their nose and looking around and being very condescending about the environment of which they are in” (I:Gee). To admit to have set criteria would be against the *purpose* of the artist profession. This is, in my view, a strategic move, as all professional choices can be justified through a state of being in disagreement with what is. It is recognised in professional theory that: “... antagonists have possessed more current cultural legitimacy” (Abbott 1988:83). This is important seen in connection to DKS and education. If the legitimacy of the antagonist is brought together with the ‘poor’ understanding of democracy that exist at several levels in society, the artistic myth of the ‘lone fighter of the established’, and the inner development of the individual is easily recognised as valid argumentation, and the school’s aims of being part of the whole and inclusion in the established are seen as static and limiting.

The *artist stereotype* is good at creating symbolic boundaries, especially in terms of themselves against all the others. The purpose voiced by the *artist hero* is how, as the only ones seeing the world, they can question the established and, as such, can afford all others with clarity. Their profession as presented in the *artist hero* stereotype is to be separate from the ‘ordinary man’: “... there is a sort of negativity towards schools and institutions because what we are trying to create as people is outside of that, and all of these rules and regulations, and the ways schools are run is antithetical to what it is to be a creative person and artist” (I:Gee). The paradox is that in being unique they also belong to a highly defined group. They become the homogeneous groups of artists, that have as their commonality their uniqueness and individuality from all others. The Artistic is built purely on purpose, and as such they seem free to base their jurisdictional claims in the sphere that is most suited to the specific situation:

“... if there is one thing you cannot do in the actor’s stead it is to decide where they stand on a scale going from small to big, because at every turn of their many attempts at justifying their

behaviour they may suddenly mobilize the whole of humanity ...” (Latour 2005:185).

The artists can shift between justifying their inference and treatment at a personal, local or universal level. Purpose is not located in institutional or organisational frames. The fact that the main clients in this case are the school children¹³⁶ is of less importance, as purpose is not bound by whom it concerns either (Abbott 1988). The *artist hero* thrives on opposition and individuality and, as such, in the situation where the *teachers’ balancing act* searches for stability and peace, can be seen to possess an advantage when there are conflicting views.

The teaching profession on the other hand is based more on scene and agency. DKS was introduced as an addition to the school subject, and the A&C subject’s aims are set by regulations and curriculum. The purpose has become more elusive to the public, as the ‘failed audits’ and salary struggles have become visible. In a short statement, teachers have gone from being associated with status and knowledge, to being associated with efforts in pursuit of a pay-check (M:NRK 2008). When they justify their actions, it is a mix — *the balancing act* — of purpose, agency and scene. The A&C teachers have to be concerned with the target group, the regulations and the institutional frames. This is an argument more difficult to sustain, even as one might say that the “Scale is the actor’s own achievement” (Latour 2005:185), it is in the case of A&C teachers’ professional choices in A&C education, locked in the situation.

Claims to Expert Knowledge

It is also important to question the professional’s attempts to gain public ‘approval’ for their mandate. “Each of the three modes of professional work — diagnosis, treatment, and inference — helps create ties that connect profession and task” (Abbott 1988:57). Abbott alleges that the knowledge and skills the professionals possess have to be seen as abstract and foreign enough to the public for it to be relevant for the public to accept it as expert knowledge. If the public feels like they themselves can do the same, or do it better, the ties between professional and task will be weaker. In light of this, it can be said that the A&C teaching profession has to contend for the public approval that somewhat dissipated with the focus on the teacher as the caregiver (Hargreaves 2000; Skarpenes 2005). In addition, the professional field of A&C education has not provided enough abstract knowledge for the public to recognise it (Nielsen 2008). The *artist hero*, as he is presented in the

¹³⁶Parents and society as a receiver of educated persons can also be seen as clients in a wide capacity in regards to the education profession. However, I will not address this in my discussion.

debate, however, has perfected the abstraction of artworks (M:Samuelsen 2002; M:Sund 2002c). Although concrete concerning what falls within their right to judge, they use very abstract knowledge to perform the judgement. How they express their understanding of their own power and competencies will also have an impact on the public. The artists involved claim the stereotype of the *hero*; we know — we decide — we are competent to make educational choices in our area, and display a strong attitude. The American researcher Gee professed in her interview to harbour the same thoughts before evaluating the American Artist in residence program. She states:

“It was with disdain I thought about art education at that point, and I thought that these people don’t know anything about art, they are not good practitioners, they can’t paint they can’t draw. I mean I sort of bought into George Bernard Shaw’s adage about it: those who can — do, those who can’t — teach, so I had a pretty disdainful attitude about art education”
(I:Gee).

Even though they might show a lack of understanding when it comes to teaching and children, the *artist hero* will not budge from the “I know my work”- stance (E:Kristiansen 2007). The danger in acknowledging this stance is that it is sometimes limiting if expressed as a focus on the artists’ personal art practice, rather than the school’s learning aims. The same tendencies were also found in English (E:Orfali 2004), and the American program (E:Bumgarner 1993):

“The artists basically were going to teach what they did, so they went into the classroom and said: “Well so I do ceramics in this way. This is what I will teach you to do!” [...] But it wasn’t within a larger context. It didn’t connect with what the teachers were in the most part trying to do — trying to have a curriculum” (I:Gee).

While the *artist hero* displays a strong belief in the ability to make the only right choices for the DKS projects, the *teachers’ balancing act*, on the other hand, turns out to be accommodating in agreeing on everyone else’s competencies, while displaying uncertainty of their own credentials regarding art (I:T1; I:T2; S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995; S:Kjosavik et al. 2003). The *hero* and *obstacle* is once again presented in the media where the A&C teachers are not visible to dispute the stereotypes. It might be due to a lack of acceptance in the media and, as such, a place and time to express their view. It might be due to a lack of time to participate in the media debate. It might also have a connection to the teachers’ lack of belief in their own ‘artistic’ skills, as that is not their primary profession. “It is interesting to note that the

teachers have a feeling of not being 'artistic' enough in relation to M87" (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995:46).¹³⁷ An A&C teacher with respect for the A&C subject area, presented with an outside professional artist would maybe find it easy to step aside and let the artist steer the project: "It is they (the artists) that have been the responsible party — I was not really involved in the planning, I was neither much involved in the execution so I have just been following along at this time" (I:T1).¹³⁸ The paradox is that, if taken the time to ask, teachers show a high level of competency when it comes to the projects.

The case I observed in school showed that while the teachers are careful not to criticise any choices by the artists, and even hesitate getting involved if not directly invited, they will instantly, if asked, clarify what in their opinion would make the DKS project better in the educational setting for the pupils if it were to be repeated, or if they were called to decide the running of it (I:Gee; I:T1; I:T2; E:Kristiansen 2007). The observed cases show that, even going into an unknown project, the teachers possess the ability to access competency when it comes to breaking down knowledge into digestible lectures and tasks for the age group or number of students involved, and to secure individual instruction is also a key motivator. If asked to express what their competency in terms of the project consisted of, the teachers in the school project I observed were not able to answer. However, by asking the question what they would do differently if they were in charge, they had thorough and reflected answers. Thus they are, in my view, a required factor in the projects executed. Still, it is a competency, skill or tacit knowledge that is hard to voice in a discussion concerning specific topics and resources in the form of rooms, tools and materials which are more easily brought to the fore. This seems to result in the complimentary division between artists and teachers. A&C teachers are seen to be good at planning and details, while the artists are flexible and adaptable (M:Skrede 2002b). This discussion is manageable for both sides in the cooperation both in visibility and words and the new document has to some extent accepted this. As a result, even the point that should be treated as positive — the school experience in educational practice — to structure and break down the work to suit every child, the time frame, the subject aims, are, in my postulation, treated as something of an *obstacle* for the free thinking artist. The priority in the civic school oriented thinking is rejected, and the result is, in my assumption, not necessarily a stronger A&C subject, but an opening towards discontinuity and fragmentation of the school year.

¹³⁷ OQ: "Det er interessant å merke seg at lærere har en følelse av at de ikke er "kunstneriske" nok i henhold til M87".

¹³⁸ OQ: "Det er de som har hatt den meste styringa da – jeg var ikke så involvert i den planleggingsfasen, jeg var heller ikke så mye i gjennomføringa sånn jeg har jo egentlig bare blitt med underveis her".

Double Standards for Professional Expertise

The ‘art world’ claims that artists are needed because: “To get the (teacher) students to make ‘good pictures’ is no warranty for them to later be able to facilitate good work processes for the pupils” (M:Christiansen 2007:31).¹³⁹ The discussion spins in circles. If volunteers at the local level can be counted as artists into DKS projects (D:KKD 2007), how come the A&C teacher training, which is very practically oriented, and offers courses in Visual arts and crafts is not counted as valid qualifications by the art world? “... either you are an artist or teach the arts, it is necessary to have a background in the arts” (M:Christiansen 2007:30).¹⁴⁰ What does it then mean to have a background in art? This ties in with the quality discussion and is not ventured into in any of the narratives. The question: “What are the quality criteria for professional art? Is it the artist that has art as his occupation and livelihood? Or can professional art be developed and performed by amateurs?” (E:Mælum 2006:36),¹⁴¹ has also been asked in evaluations of DKS. The documents do not discuss if it means formal training, or if informal recognition of work practice is enough. This to me is a paradox. To be trained as a teacher and also make ‘good works of art’ does not to the art world mean that the result will be a good art educator. However, at the same time the *artist hero* stereotype can be seen as claim towards acceptance for the position that artists, or even a good local amateur, will automatically be a good art educator.

If making a work of art does not qualify student teachers to teach art, why does it qualify artists, with no teacher training at all to do a more professional job as claimed by the *hero — obstacle* stereotypes? Is it in the power of being an artist that they automatically transcend these borders? The stereotypical claim that: “The artist’s point of departure demands another presence than the teacher role qualifies for. It is in short two different competencies” (M:Christiansen 2007:31),¹⁴² is presented repeatedly in the media narratives. The *teacher obstacle* is depicted as incompetent by whom they are supposed to be collaborating with and it is hard to find any objection narratives in the sources of documentations that I have analysed. The same tendency could be seen in the US project: “It was almost amazing to me that they were putting in print the most condescending attitudes towards schools and teachers I have ever ... In their publications! It was flabbergasting to me. It was just stunning” (I:Gee). It seems to me that it is the artists interviewed both in the

¹³⁹ OQ: “Det å få studentene til å lage “gode bilder” er ingen garanti for at de selv skal kunne tilrettelegge gode arbeidsprosesser for elevene”.

¹⁴⁰ OQ: “... enten man er kunstner eller underviser i kunstoffag er det behov for en kunstfaglig bakgrunn”.

¹⁴¹ OQ: “Kva er kvalitetskriteriet for profesjonell kunst? Er det kunstnarar som har kunsten som yrke og ’levebrød’? Eller kan profesjonell kunst utviklast og utøvast av amatørar?”.

¹⁴² OQ: “Kunstnerens innfallsvinkel krever en annen tilstedeværelse enn hva lærerrollen kvalifiserer til. Det er rett og slett to forskjellige kompetanser”.

media and the evaluations that have failed to combine the areas of art and education. They claim that both teachers and artists are needed if the projects are to be successful, but the DKS choices are left in the hands of the *artist hero* — an artist that never compromises in art. This is, in my view, another variant of expressing the *obstacle*. The teachers can join as facilitators as they are practical and logical, but they cannot be trusted to lead the projects because they lack inner coherence. The stereotypes try to justify a situation of free reign of the DKS program for artists, and a situation of limited access to decision processes for the A&C teachers.

The Easy Way Out?

Borgen and Brandt (2006) write of two approaches to DKS projects, namely the *dialogic* and *monologic* approach. The dialogic approach, in my view, shows new symbolic boundaries in an ‘us — we’ approach, where, through cooperation, teachers and artists form a new collaborative group and the pupils are actively included. This involves both sides of the project, and calls for a different approach to decision processes, an acceptance towards sharing the power in terms of content and quality discussions in advance of the projects’ proposals and execution. The monologic approach on the other hand illuminates a strong division between the groups, a symbolic boundary strongly in place where an ‘us — them’ approach where the responsibility is not shared, but divided between the two professions, and the pupils are the audience. The ‘art world’s’ comment and critique of this is:

“Everybody who has heard music, seen theatre, read a book, listened to a poem, experiences a dance recital or glanced at a painting has by definition been involved in a ‘dialogic communication strategy’. They have reflected upon what they have experienced, taken in the impression, been provoked, been happy, angry, offended, snubbed, or moved in other ways” (M:Haaland 2007:12).¹⁴³

However, within this interpretation, every experience can be seen to be dialogic, and the problem raised within the evaluation, was in my view one of collaboration between the sectors within an educational context, rather than the nature of art experience.

Some of the claims made by the media stereotyping that falls within the monologic approach have been applied in the document *Kulturell skulesekk for framtida. St.meld. nr 8* (KKD 2007). Even as the national evaluation

¹⁴³ OQ: “Alle som har hørt musikk, sett teater, lest en bok, lyttet til et dikt, opplevd en danseforestilling eller tittet på et maleri har pr. definisjon vært involvert i en “dialogisk kommunikasjonsstrategi”. De har reflektert over hva de opplever, tatt inn inntrykket, blitt provosert, blitt glade, sinte, fornærmet, sure eller berørt på andre måter”.

ordered by the Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs themselves points to these sensational visits as a weakness rather than a strength for the subject, the new document authored chose to go against the evaluation advice. I have to assume that this is a choice. As one of the media sources reported:

“Recently the MCCA and MER sent out a joint press release, with the headline “Positive experiences with DKS”. “DKS is a popular and firmly anchored program in schools, and is established nationwide. This is shown in an evaluation from NIFU STEP” the introduction reads. And so the press’ potential interest in the matter is effectively killed” (M:Henmo 2006:22)¹⁴⁴.

It deliberates further on the evaluation that: “More neutral readers will find all the criticism it contains, more obvious” (M:Henmo 2006:22).¹⁴⁵ I will not comment on the fact that even as the media themselves comment on the fact that there are problems that could be addressed, they choose to accept the press release, and not approach the issue further. The media narratives survive and the stereotypes are in operation. The new document includes the view supported by the stereotypes, and creates an opening to pursue the orientation of division rather than inclusion that was one of the main concerns in the evaluation.

“Even if Den kulturelle skulesekken should be concerned as to the school’s plans, Den kulturelle skulesekken is to be something special or extra-ordinary. Den kulturelle skulesekken should supply the extraordinary art and culture experiences in every day practice in schools. At the same time it is important that children and youngsters feel that Den kulturelle skulesekken is a natural part of the school, and that the pupils know that the content also is connected to the core curriculum and the subjects they are taught in” (D:KKD 2007:23).¹⁴⁶

It is interesting that the monologic approach seems easier for everyone involved, even the ‘school world’. It would for all parties involved mean no need to find a common value stance or reflect on language and overall aim. It

¹⁴⁴ OQ: “Nylig sendte Kulturdepartementet og Kunnskapsdepartementet ut en felles pressemelding, med overskriften “Positive erfaringer med Den kulturelle skulesekken”. “Den kulturelle skulesekken er et populært og godt forankret tiltak i skolen og er etablert over hele landet. Det viser en evaluering fra NIFU STEP” lyder innledningen. Og slik drepes effektivt pressens potensielle interesse for saken”.

¹⁴⁵ OQ: “Mer nøytrale lesere vil synes kritikken den inneholder, er langt mer påfallende”.

¹⁴⁶ OQ: “Sjølvsagt om den kulturelle skulesekken skal ta omsyn til skulen sine planar, skal Den kulturelle skulesekken vere noko særskilt eller ekstraordinært. Den kulturelle skulesekken skal syte for dei ekstraordinære kunst- og kulturopplevingane i skulekvardagen. Samstundes er det viktig at born og unge kjenner at Den kulturelle skulesekken er ein naturleg del av skulen, og at elevane er fortrulege med at innhaldet også heng saman med den generelle læreplanen og faga dei har undervisning i”.

requires separate work responsibilities, and rejects a collaboration process where commonality is the key factor. The merge of the professional fields through collaborative work alongside one another seem weaker in the second document.

The inclusion of two groups in the project is exactly what infuses the “us — them” metaphor with power. “Symbolic boundaries may be more likely to generate social boundaries when they are drawn in opposition to one group as opposed to multiple, often competing out-groups” (Lamont and Molnár 2002:174) The opposing group that is most vocal in their boundary construction is given recognition in political processes. The set up of the ‘art world’ philosophy, choices, knowledge, and experience as opposed to the ‘school world’ is an effective way of emphasising the attributes of the one world. It is a tool to show how good one profession is compared to the others in a situation where there is a need to legitimise the division of work practice in the DKS endeavour. A feeling of shared culture is less binding than the feelings of communality defined as opposition to the perceived identity of other groups. It is visible in the questioning of *pedagogisation* that has spread from the ‘art world’ to the public and political institutions (E:Borgen and Brandt 2006). The monologic approach promotes more of a ‘Culture to the schools’ than ‘Culture as an integral part of the school’. If this type of collaboration, that now might exist temporarily as symbolic boundaries, is set into social boundaries, the art side of the project will be given the decision making process in the chain of distribution. The question then becomes if this one-sided focus is desirable.

The Romantic Inheritance as a Current Disadvantage

Norwegian general education can still be seen to be influenced by the reform pedagogy that, in the 70s, centred in an understanding of *bildung* — upbringing through safe arenas, where learning could ‘happen’ (Skarpenes 2004; 2005; Telhaug 2005; 2006). Some of the guiding thoughts in A&C education have been romantic, and together with the reform pedagogy, this led to the unfortunate event that professional expertise, such as i.e.; *the ability to understand space, visualize solutions, constructing a syllabus, interpreting the curriculum, evaluate the school children’s work, breaking down knowledge into understandable units, and age specific planning*, becoming invisible knowledge even as it is predominant in the professional practice (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995; S:Kjosavik et al. 2003). As a result, the teachers were associated with having an inner ‘talent’ in empathy or care, rather than possessing expert subject-matter didaktik knowledge, and expert knowledge associated with care has led to a questioning of A&C teachers’ professional status. In my view, the A&C would benefit from challenging the

stereotype of the *obstacle* presented as a personal standard for the individuals inhabiting the A&C teacher profession. If the romantic ‘caring’ and ‘free expression’ is the only recognised positive position outside the ‘school world’, the artists’ will have a stronger position in the jurisdictional struggle. In my opinion, knowledge and know-how in the A&C teachers’ professional practice has to be articulated, and instead of limiting the public understanding of the subject to the notion of ‘caring’ or even ‘free expression,’ I estimate it as necessary to defend the reason for a professional education scene and a broader subject-matter base. Teachers already exhibit a high level of expertise and commitment to their field of knowledge (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995; S:Kjosavik et al. 2003).

An interesting question is how the weak professional status of the presented A&C *teacher obstacle* in DKS will affect the outcome when seen in relation to the professional *artist hero*. The *artist hero* has, through both post-modernism and romanticism, escaped the frames that might bind the A&C teacher in the public debate. Teachers in the *balancing act* operate within given statutes and legislation, curricula and budgets, while the *artist hero* does not. “There are, for example, serious limits to the possibility of originality and creativity in teaching — and a teacher, unlike an artist, is hardly free to do whatever might commend itself to him or her in a spirit of imagination or self-expression” (Carr 2000:9). Teachers exhibit, as shown in *the balancing act*, a willingness to reconcile the demand for personal expression, a broader subject-matter knowledge base represented through various voices such as curricula, national tests and quality controls from external sources, with the demands for a stronger internationalisation with basis in the local (Nielsen et al. 2005). In the case of DKS, they also invite into collaboration the external sources claiming ownership of their professional field. The question then becomes, in managing all these roles at the same time as expert knowledge is unspoken in their profession, might the introduction of another profession into the school subject lead to a crisis within the A&C teacher profession?

DKS — A BUMP EVENT?

The problem of jurisdiction appears when the public expects results. What results will DKS produce, or rather, what are the results the different worlds and professions will highlight, and which argument will the public accept? What will the public opinion see as desired results? This will influence the development of the subject in terms of which profession will have jurisdiction in this case. As such, to win the public is ‘the’ professional project in DKS.

It is the teaching practice in particular that is singled out as problematic in the stereotypes. The *artist hero* narratives give hands on examples to tell how something or other failed due to the other group's wrongs or incompetency, as try to substantiate claims such as: "... they are not used to working creatively like this". Rather than questioning a whole system that is impossible to abolish — namely the school as a national institution, it is possible to attack the singular act of A&C teaching in DKS projects. The critique of the practice in a single project still has as its function to be a positioning exercise to show that one group is better qualified than the other to take the leading role. It is not necessarily the profession or person as such that is labelled foreign to the values and persuasion of the artists, but the practice of teaching in this specific area. Teaching as such — through the myth of the very traditional blackboard and chalk lesson (Hargreaves 2000) that provides an *obstacle* on the way towards the goal of the free spirit and inspired child — might by the 'art world' in some way be accepted in all other areas of the school institution *except* in the A&C subject. Here, the perceived practice of teaching is highlighted as a practice that opposes the free spirited work of the creative that is needed in art and culture.

The question that it would be interesting to discuss has been raised in evaluations earlier; "Maybe what we see is a development where the pedagogs (educators) hands the field over to the artists, while the artists experience a demand of pedagogical relevance and structure that guides and limits their freedom?" (E:Mæland 2006:13).¹⁴⁷ The distinction between the artist and teachers, outlined especially by the *artist hero* narratives has not yet become an entirely established symbolic boundary. There are still discussion where the 'art world' practice is not conceived as separated from the 'lower' 'school world' teaching practices. The boundaries are still in movement, both in terms of symbolic power and formal jurisdiction.

The Professionals in DKS

This brings us back to the 'art world' and the 'school world' professionals. There seem to have been instances where the Practical Pedagogical Program (PPU) — the PPU degree to gain knowledge and formal qualifications to enter into the school institution and the educational field — resulted in the artist in question being excluded from receiving funding through DKS.¹⁴⁸ They possess a double professional competence, but are primarily counted as

¹⁴⁷ OQ: "Kanskje ser me ei utvikling der pedagogane overlet feltet til kunstnarane, medan kunstnarane opplever at det blir stilt krav om pedagogiske relevans og til rette legging som styrer og avgrensar fridomen deira?"

¹⁴⁸ In the study of artists' professional practice by Aslaksen 1997, she explicitly excluded artists with a PPU degree from her informants because they had to be seen as belonging to the educational field, and not the art scene anymore. At the same time she chose to include artists with no formal training in the study.

teachers by the ‘art world’ (S:Aslaksen 1997). They are from thereon not qualified to receive funding for projects. I do not claim that this is common practice, but have knowledge of PPU graduates experiencing this problem.¹⁴⁹ Artists wanting to collaborate closer with schools on a *subject-matter didaktik* level can in this light be seen as being punished. This might be read as a need to keep clear boundaries in terms of expert knowledge as an avenue towards shifting the jurisdiction of the professional practice.

Schön argues that people have lost their faith in the professions (Schön 1995), but Carr (2000) and Stronach et al. (2002) claim that professionals are still respected as sources of specific knowledge, but the ethics and identity within the professional field is the deciding factor for being perceived as such. In DKS this becomes evident in how all the documents and narratives use the concept of *High professional quality* to cement the project in the public opinion. In my view the *artist hero* has managed to make a professional position out of being an outsider. This is a powerful position to inhabit, as by being an outsider and a rebel, none of the ‘inside restraints’ of institutional arenas have to be taken into account. The consequence of this, in my view, is that the professional artist is harder to criticise than the A&C teacher in terms of status or quality, as there are really no formal barriers or standards by which they can be judged. The *artist hero* bases the practice on the *purpose* ‘individual artistic freedom’. Neither formal competence nor real competence can be said to be a decisive measure for the public, and the internal judgments of the ‘art world’ by the ‘art world’ provide the standards. The gatekeepers of expert knowledge are not educational institutions, but the art scene themselves that guard the right to judge the professionals. The A&C teachers on the other hand, have formal standards of education, laws and regulations concerning their day-to-day practice in terms of time, space and location, as well as quality standards by which the school children and they themselves perform. These are publicly known, open for all to see, and easily questioned.

There are regulations governing the content of a school day. “The teachers had a pedagogical requirement that they had to honour” (E:Kristiansen 2007:41).¹⁵⁰ While the *artist hero* often presents the attitude that as long as the school children display joy the projects are successful. This is portrayed as the opposite of a school day within the A&C subject (M:Trohaug 2002). This is in sharp contrast to how much the school children report to like the school subject A&C (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995). A text titled *Stars in their eyes* written by an artist illustrates the romantic view that art projects as

¹⁴⁹ I cannot claim any certainties beyond the stories told in the sessions with PPU students, however students have told of this happening on more than one occasion. It would be interesting surveying this.

¹⁵⁰ OQ: “Lærerne hadde et pedagogisk ansvar de måtte ta hensyn til”.

something outside the normal: “The pupils are fascinated. They stare and stare. They point and chat. They have stars up above — and stars in their eyes. I think: This must be what Den Kulturelle Skulesekken should and shall; give the pupils stars in their eyes?” (M:Pettersen 2007:5).¹⁵¹ If the evaluations are to be heeded, the school subject is not free from these moments of wonder. If the school children themselves are to be believed, these experiences also exist with the teachers in the A&C classroom on a regular basis (E:Bumgarner 1993; S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995). It is not something limited to artist originated projects, even if it is portrayed that way in the media stereotypes. In continuation of this myth, it is hard to be critical of artists when enthusiasm is displayed and children are happy.

The claim of educational censorship has become a conjoint protestation for the inspired oriented ‘art world’ — not only is it a proof of how they challenge society, it is a way to solidify the belonging to the group of boundary breakers and a way to gain status in the ‘art world’. It is a curious fact to witness the story of censorship that has been established within DKS. It surfaces in discussions concerning content, where the artist has decided their course is different from what the school might want (M:Sund 2002b; 2002c). This claim of not being subjected to censorship is a good strategy, because no one wants to be narrow-minded or a part of the oppression of free expression. This notion of censorship limits the options of the schools’ or teachers’ influence in cases where the artist ‘draws a line in the sand’. However well founded in the curriculum or ethical considerations for the teaching personnel, any contribution in the direction of change is met with contempt for the oppressing voice of the established. The children are depicted as restricted by conformity, and the more concerned the teacher’s *balancing act*, the more oppressed the *artist hero* — with a right to express opinions in any way seen fit, as the owner of the artistic work.

At the same time, the blame for certain collaboration failures is said to be a result of the ‘school world’ not understanding the work process of the ‘art world’ (M:Christiansen 2007). Even as the artists might see the need to learn the language of the school, know the curriculum and the age groups, they will not relinquish ownership of the organisation or content (M:Schjøsby 2004; M:Sund 2002b). DKS will: “... contribute with a competency that the school lacks” (M:Karlsen 2007:11),¹⁵² as DKS contains professionals within art and culture with a deep understanding for their field, and the school is requested by the ‘art world’ to respect the artist. However, the teachers’ *balancing act* of

¹⁵¹ OQ: “Elevane er fascinerte. Dei kikkar og kikkar. Dei peikar og småpratar. Dei har stjerner over seg – og stjerner i auga. Eg tenkjer: Dette må vel vere akkurat det Den Kulturelle Skulesekken skal og vil; gje elevane stjerner i auga?”

¹⁵² OQ: “... bidra med en kompetanse skolen mangler”.

acceptance and inclusion can also be seen as being passive. “Generally speaking the teachers were really happy to have an artist in there, and readily just stand back and say: “well this is a professional artist. They know a lot more about art than I do” which is sort of self effacing and not necessarily true” (I:Gee). I witnessed this behaviour in the observation case I did in school as well. The teachers were ready to accept the artists’ work, and were content to step back, without questioning intentions or implications. In the observed case, during the project’s first day, the first contact between the professionals from the two worlds within this particular project were after 45 minutes. The artist came, took charge and the teachers positioned themselves at the back until they were asked to join. The teachers’ can in this self-exclusion be said to help solidify some of the shifting symbolic boundaries. The A&C teacher will need awareness of his own position to reflect on unwanted change, and unfortunately in the observation case this awareness seemed to be somewhat lacking.

Balancing or Falling Down?

The artists and A&C teachers are expected to collaborate in the execution of DKS projects, i.e. share the professional area during the project period. The *artist hero* clamours for the sole ownership by offering up a new set of diagnosis and treatment. The ‘art world’ has had access to the public space through the media, and has been able to promote this narrative — a narrative that supports their claim to the professional field of A&C education, on the basis of ephemeral artistic concepts. The romantic streams that still linger in the view of children and self-expression have made the public perceptive to the argument, while calling for hard evidence of learning in the case of the teachers. This is a paradox in itself. Teachers in the *balancing act* try to focus on the knowledge aspect of the subject. However, knowledge as a concept in relation to art is questioned by the media stereotype that is constructed, even by some A&C teachers themselves. Art is presented in the media narratives as ‘something else’, but at the same time the *balancing act* forces reflection concerning the need to present measurable results. This presents the teachers with a handicap in their argumentation.

The ‘art world’ claims in their narratives to own the right of quality control in DKS, and even where in practice the quality criteria is experienced as being somewhat negotiated, findings are that it is ‘art world’ controlled (E:Cordt-Hansen 2008). To control the quality is to control the professional expertise and expert knowledge, because: “Only the professional can say when his college makes a mistake” (Hughes 1984:376). This is, in my view, a claim for jurisdiction and a sign of a bump move. The ‘school world’ is depicted as almost removed from the opportunity, or even to be short of qualification to

criticise or have an opinion. However, at the same time, outside groups such as politicians or journalists display a willingness to comment: "... Conflicts which become political projects, exceeding and transforming the boundaries of the discursive field, tend to be fuelled and expanded from the outside or from the margin, by both unauthorized speakers and experts who abandon the professional mode" (Larson 1990:40). I am concerned that if this development is not challenged it can be damaging to the A&C subject in the long run. If content and quality in DKS is seen not as a part of the school responsibility through the A&C teaching profession, will it have any place within schools? Further it is possible to ask, if DKS results in locating all the choices outside the A&C teacher profession, will it spread to the whole subject. If it affects the whole subject, will it be removed from the school curriculum altogether as an area not within education? Will the school subject be lost? The bump move or challenge that is being put forward offers an opportunity to discuss the future of the subject in a larger political context.

The actors are currently given tasks that do not seem to overlap. The 'art world' is given the responsibility to develop quality productions, dissemination methods and arrange for cultural happenings. The 'school world' on the other hand has to be responsible for good preparations before, and follow up work after, the productions they are 'allowed' to receive through the DKS program (D:KKD 2007). They have to find a way to include these in the syllabus any way they can, anchored in the curriculum. Even as the document states that there is a need to create arenas for quality discussions between the 'school world' and the 'art world', it seems that these discussions are to be held after a production or when the production is in fact finished to be delivered (D:KKD 2007). Thus, the narratives seem to project an assumption that teachers or school leaders cannot learn enough about art to comment on the relevance for their curriculum and syllabus, while the artists are allowed to comment on whatever choices the teachers make. The 'school world' is not explicitly mentioned in relation to evaluating 'art world' expertise or to comment on 'art world' knowledge in any way, while, on the other hand, the 'art world' is invited, or even stimulated to seek out, the knowledge relevant to art education to use in their work with art dissemination to develop new methods (D:KKD 2007).

The stereotypes that are distributed concerning educational practice in DKS show that the statements that have been made that the collaborations work fine, and that there are no real disagreements (M:Kristiansen 2007), are questionable. Regarding the question of whether there is a disagreement to talk of at practice level in DKS, it is confirmed through the majority of interviews and documents, along with the media narratives that there are several critical points. In DKS the arguments are present in all the narratives

that can be found in the discussion surrounding it and in the stereotypes that emerge from this. The media plays an important part in the argumentation process regarding jurisdictional claims, as they are the avenues to the public, and to be accepted into the media narrative is powerful in its own right. This makes some narratives of jurisdictional justifications better heard than others. It does not necessarily make them more valid in regards to content, as shown in the media stereotypes in comparison to the narrative exhibited in the evaluations of DKS.

I do not claim that DKS is a program with no possibilities for positive results, but once again one side of the collaboration is named a resource in all areas, and the other side limited to more of a facilitating tool. From both my own experience, and all the research and theory I have had access to, I am quite confident in proposing that the ‘school world’ of the collaboration should well be brought in to discuss contents, quality, and methods in DKS. This discussion has been the chief task for all the school development work and research within the educational field since before the subject was instigated in general education. It is questionable to assume that the way to develop new and worthwhile efforts within DKS projects in A&C education will come from outside the ‘school world.’ (D:KKD 2007). As long as the DKS program has its base in the ‘school world’, the experience accumulated through a long history of the subjects would, in my view, be valuable as a resource to defer to, and not discard.

End Comment

When DKS includes two professions to cover the same work task, the need to make jurisdictional claims and justifications is brought to the surface. The stereotypes that surface in the DKS narratives are introduced to the public in order to substantiate a claim to the area in question. The narratives and the construction of stereotypes reveal quite fundamental differences in how the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ view children, education, and the DKS program in relation to the school context. There might not be open conflict, but there certainly is a disagreement that has not yet been settled as to who will decide this in future projects. It tells me that as the parties strive towards a new agreement, the issues are not as yet decided but an effort is put into justifying the different points of view. The DKS program has set the stage for an interesting polarisation of interests. The worlds collide as the artist profession is placed solidly within the Inspired World and the A&C teaching profession has characteristics from all the worlds though mainly from The Civic World, The Industrial World, but also The Inspired World. The *hero* narrative of the professional outsider, and the *balancing act* of the

professional A&C teacher is put into play within the initiated projects and media discussions and has consequences for future practice.

Establishing a Myth?

The media narratives and construction of stereotypes has, in my view, led to a shift in the interpretation of professional boundaries within DKS. I will not claim that the shift in DKS jurisdiction is a bump event, but I will venture to suggest that there are signs of a bump event. As established earlier I will discuss two bump signs that I have discovered in relation to DKS practice. The first is how certain factors of the stereotypes are accepted into the new official document, and the national award Gullsekken given schools and productions.

BECOMING A PROFESSIONAL

I will succinctly outline the path to becoming an A&C teacher or an Artist. This is done to highlight the problematic concept of being professional in DKS. To discuss the different approaches by the ‘school world’ and the ‘art world’ in terms of labelling the professional status, the Norwegian concepts *formell kompetanse* — ‘formal competence’ and *realkompetanse* — ‘real competence’ will be used (Lagerstrøm 2007). *Formell kompetanse* — ‘formal competence’ covers the education given through governmentally approved educational systems, while *realkompetanse* — ‘real competence’ covers the skills, values and knowledge gained through life experience. The ‘real competence’ is based on educational institutions, regulations and law and, as such, in *agency* and *scene*, while the ‘formal competence’ is based on *purpose*. I will briefly outline the avenues toward attaining the status of A&C teacher and artist.

Becoming an Art and Crafts Teacher

A practice, in our case in form of the teaching profession, will need meaning in the broad sense, in the way that Wenger (1998) approaches it. It has several levels: negotiation of meaning, participation and reification, and the duality of these factors. In his book *Professionalism and ethics in teaching* David Carr (2000) is concerned with whether teaching is a professional activity and education is a profession. However, even though this distinction can be interesting when addressing the issue of education, it immediately

calls for a clarification in concern to what constitutes the activity of teaching. Teaching can take place outside of a formal educational institution, and will take place within it. The context is the factor that changes. Teaching might not be a professional activity in all situations, but if education is a profession, then the teaching activity performed by professionals of education, is professional activity. In this sense, A&C teachers are professionals.

There are several avenues to becoming an A&C teacher. It is possible to become a *Classroom teacher* (Allmennlærer), a *Specialised Art and Crafts teacher*, or an artist with *Practical Pedagogical Training* (Praktisk Pedagogisk Utdanning). Common to them all is that they require ‘formal competence’ and consist of required courses in pedagogy, practice in schools and didaktik as well as subject knowledge. The formal titles *Teacher*, *Adjunkt* or *Lektor* cannot be bestowed without formal competence. Those working in the schools without formal competence are labelled “un-schooled” (ufaglærte).

A Classroom teacher attends a 4 years course qualifying to teach all subjects from 1st to 10th grade — attaining the title Adjunkt. There is a core consisting of basic training in the main school subjects, pedagogy, practice training with didaktik and then further training in chosen subjects. The Classroom teacher students can choose to study no A&C at all, take 15stp, 30stp or 60stp.¹⁵³ In reality teachers can become qualified to teach the subject with no formal training whatsoever. However, statistics into the competency of teachers in general education shows that Classroom teachers with limited or no formal training in A&C teach very few classes each. However, the Classroom teachers cover a lot of A&C classes, as their numbers are great (Lagerstrøm 2007).

To become a Specialised A&C teacher, a bachelor degree in Art and design education — attaining the degree Teacher, or a master degree — attaining the degree Lektor are offered. These courses qualify to teach from 1st grade to 10th grade, as well as at high school level. To become a Specialised A&C teacher with an Education from the Visual art is also possible. A formal bachelor or master degree in art, can be complemented by a 60stp university level course of Practical Pedagogical Training (PPU). This course contains pedagogy, didaktik and practice in schools. Artists attaining this formal degree of Teacher or Lektor, however, run the risk of no longer qualifying for the status or support as an artist (Aslaksen 1997). It is possible for teachers without any A&C training to teach if there is a need in the school. This mainly concerns the primary school level — 1st to 4th grade. Most specialised

¹⁵³ 60 stp equals a year of studies, 30 stp a semester, and 15 half a semester. Stp = ESCT

A&C teachers choose to teach 7th to 10th grade when in general education, and are seen to cover most of the classes there (Lagerstrøm 2007).

Becoming an Artist

While the right to be titled Teacher, Adjunkt or Lektor remains locked within formal competence, the label ‘artist’ is not protected in the same manner. ‘Formal competence’ is one way to attain the title. Architects that want to be a part of the National Association for Norwegian Architects (NAL) have to have ‘formal competence’ in the form of a *Sivilarkitekt* degree, or a Master in Architecture. However, the title ‘architect’ is not protected, and can be freely used by those who have no formal education. To consult the NAL membership list is the only way to find whether the title architect is self-appointed or gained by formal training.¹⁵⁴ The title ‘designer’ has no formal organisation behind it and is even a bit more varied, as there are several branches that display a varying degree of required formal competence. Some branches have looser boundaries in accepting practitioners by way of ‘real competence’. There are also professionals that do crossovers between design and fine art. Artists within visual fine art can get ‘formal competence’ through education at the art academies. However, ‘real competence’ is accepted as signifying artist status, if the practice is recognised by the ‘art world’. The nature of the artist identity, the credo ‘artistic freedom’, and the ‘art world’ organisation, allows for practitioners without formal education to be counted professional artists.

The Professional A&C Teacher and the Professional Artist in DKS

Into this already unclear landscape, in DKS the group of professional artists is allowed to extend even further. In the official documents concerning DKS, that claim that along with those labelled artists by the ‘art world’ — both those of formal and real competence — “good local amateurs” can be counted as artists within school projects.

”A person is professional mainly if he has artistic or cultural practice as their work. At the same time it is, especially within cultural heritage, volunteer groups or person with local and practice achieved knowledge that can be important resources in Den kulturelle skulesekken” (D:KKD 2007:38).¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁴ Still, very few architects chose to participate in DKS projects. Those who do – and NAL architects seldom do, seem to mainly work within culture institutions and organisations and not primarily as practicing architects: <http://www.denkulturelleskulesekken.no/index.php?id=regionaltoglokalt>

¹⁵⁵ OQ: “I hovudsak er ein person profesjonell som har kunstnarleg eller kulturfagleg arbeid som yrke. Likevel er det, særleg innanfor kulturarvfeltet, frivillige miljø og enkeltpersonar med lokal og handlingsboren kunnskap som kan vere viktige ressursar i Den kulturelle skulesekken”.

Supported by the new legislation, local amateurs can also be counted as artists if they have practiced art of some quality. This seems enough for the DKS Secretariat to claim that: “All Norwegian school children are now experiencing meetings with professional artists several times a year” (M:Tessem 2007:2).¹⁵⁶ What constitutes quality in this case is not clear and not addressed. The DKS program is situated in this unclear picture of formally titled teachers, and both formally titled and self-claimed artists. How is it that into the school world with education professionals, local amateurs can be seen as more qualified to teach the A&C subject than the A&C teacher? “It was important that the project had to be controlled from the culture sector, Torbjørnsen states. — The content would surely have been completely different if the schools had the helm” (M:Skrede 2002b:8).¹⁵⁷ What does this really say about the recognised status of the professional teacher? I posit that this is an issue of distrusting the school institution more than it is recognition of the professional competency of the ‘art world’. Artists don’t need any kind of formal training, or even recognised exhibitions, nor sales records. They are not obliged to present any formal credentials before applying for funding of their projects, even though it might be an advantage.

The Generic Teacher

When addressing the issues of DKS and professional questions, the institutional demands set in place are a part of defining the A&C teacher. In teaching the vocational aspect,¹⁵⁸ which still holds some relevance even within the view of teachers as ‘professionals’, sometimes conflicts with the demands from external control mechanisms,¹⁵⁹ and serves to fragment the identity of the teacher. “As a result, the professional is moralized both by being ‘reduced’ to a singular meaning and emplotment, and simultaneously inflated to improbable symbolic importance” (Stronach et al. 2002:111). From outside the profession the teacher is seen not as an individual, but as a part of the collective individual — the teacher. In other words, the teacher turns into the collective professional; the teacher, with a concrete meaning ascribed to the more evanescent quality that inhabits the practice. “Public discourse must concern homogeneous groups” (Abbott 1988:61).

The paradox is that even though the outside might see the collective professional, in his practice and value set the teacher is very much alone in

¹⁵⁶ OQ: “Alle norske skolebarn opplever nå møter med profesjonelle kunstnere flere ganger i året”.

¹⁵⁷ OQ: “Det var viktig at prosjektet måtte styres fra kulturetaten, understreker Thorbjørnsen. – Innholdet ville garantert ha blitt helt annerledes hvis skolen hadde sittet med roret”.

¹⁵⁸ The vocational aspect is seen as the teachers’ view of their role as a chosen agent of good morals, and human virtues, and as an instrument for the good of society.

¹⁵⁹ Budgets, policies, national tests and school evaluation, performance related bonuses etc.

the work practice. "... we claim that the question of 'professionalism' is bound up in the discursive dynamics of professionals attempting to address or redress the dilemmas (etc.) of the job" (Stronach et al. 2002:109). They are forced to address these dilemmas on a separate, not collective, basis within the frames of the classroom (Ohnstad 2008). The teachers within DKS are seen as representatives of the 'school world' more than single A&C teachers with subject-matter knowledge. They are restricted by both the generic nature of *the teacher* and at the same time, having a function as a solitary signpost for moral standards in the classroom, and claiming ownership of knowledge within the specific field such as the subject A&C (Hargreaves 2000). There are sub-groupings such as 'the music teacher', the 'mathematics teacher' and 'the Art and Crafts teacher'. 'The A&C teacher' is in a position where he will include in his professionalism, not only the generic nature of the teacher but also be open to the relation to the artist. Through a larger context, the professional role — and the basis for claims on justification and jurisdiction — are negotiated. "The teacher's attitude towards the curriculum will naturally be influenced by attitudes displayed by colleges and the school administration, but also by their experience and value set" (E:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995:27).¹⁶⁰ They try to reconcile several worlds and common goods in their narrative justification, as described in the balancing act, even as the generic picture presented through the media is *the Obstacle*.

The Singular Artist

The artists, on the other hand, are free to question the motives of the A&C teachers solely on the basis that they belong to an institution: "To be an artist you can't be supportive of institutions. You have to be a rebel, on the other side of that" (I:Gee). The A&C teacher is forced into a role where they defend regulations and curriculum content in their *balancing act*, rather than displaying expert knowledge. The *artist hero*, as opposed to the teacher does not operate within regulations and rules. They base their professional justifications on purpose. This makes them very convincing in their arguments. "They are coming into this environment, into something that is repugnant in some way, but they are coming in because they have to. They need to come in and save the kids and make this point and do something good" (I:Gee). They can also be seen to operate as a generic concept. However, while the teacher is a concept of 'one for all and all for one', the *artist hero* functions as a separate unit, an outsider and rule breaker in the sense of being unique in relation to everyone around, even the artist next door (S:Aslaksen 1997; S:Mangset 2004). Instead of operating together, they

¹⁶⁰ OQ: "Lærerens holdninger til læreplanen vil naturligvis bli påvirket av holdninger som registreres hos kollegaer og skolens ledelse, men også av egne erfaringer og eget verdisyn".

operate as themselves within their own givens. Even if they base their professional practice on the purpose of their work, rather than by regulations or legislations, they have their expert knowledge, and their field of expertise where they diagnose, infer and treat. “All professions depend to a certain extent on large organizations and on the state — if nothing else, because all have a teaching arm” (Larson 1977:179). The artists do have an organised scene, and they have established an expert knowledge impenetrable to others by not being willing to be ‘judged according to set criteria’.

PROFESSIONALS IN THE 2007 DKS DOCUMENTS

When there is a struggle concerning ownership of the work practice, it can happen that one of two professions involved becomes subordinate (Abbott 1988) and only seen ‘by public opinion and legislation’ as qualified to handle the routines and not the content or hold advisory control. The superordinates have won the argument and established a valid symbolic boundary of justifications (Boltanski and Thévenot 2006). The question of jurisdiction in the DKS program becomes relevant when the artists challenge whether the problem should be reinterpreted outside the school institution, not in terms of physical placement, but in terms of who should inhabit the right to diagnose, infer and treat the problem. The work division is unclear, and research has been requested also from the ‘art world’ (M:Oftestad 2008). If the stereotype of the *artist hero* succeeds in being the only deliverer of diagnoses, inferences and treatments, accepted into the media and the quality discussion available to the public in the DKS case, the jurisdictional boundaries can be affected in the work practice if not yet in the regulations and laws (E:Borgen 2007b; E:Borgen and Brandt 2006; E:Kristiansen 2007; M:Landsverk 2004b; M:Sund 2002b). In 2007 a new official document concerning the DKS program; *Kulturell skulesekk for framtida. St.meld. nr 8*, that would replace the 2003 document; *Den kulturelle skulesekken. St.meld. nr 38*, was published by the Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs in 2007. This Report to the Storting is the new guiding document for the nature of the collaborations, funding distribution, the work division between the professions, and quality discussions within the DKS program. As such the change from the first to the second document can shed some light on whether there are bump signs in the DKS case.

Work Division

The 2007 document shows a slight move from the 2003 document towards accepting and including some of the arguments provided in the stereotypes, and states that:

“The culture sector is responsible for offering professional art and culture experiences of high quality, while the school is responsible for integrating the activities in the every day school practice and anchor them in the curriculum” (D:KKD 2007:38).¹⁶¹

From highlighting collaboration, the work is more separate and it is said several times that the culture and art sector is responsible for content, while the schools should connect the offered projects to the curriculum.

“The role distribution culture — school: The educational sector has responsibility to make available pre- and post-production work for the pupils, while the culture sector has responsibility for the culture content in Den kulturelle skulesekken, and for informing of the content early on” (D:KKD 2007:22).¹⁶²

The original thought of ordering and offering has been slightly modified towards accepting the claims made by the stereotypes set up, rather than listening to research and evaluations performed. Some schools have registered that the agenda is set by the ‘art world’: “We just get put on the list. Rarely there is the possibility for us to accept or refuse...” (M:Sund 2002b:27).¹⁶³ This is an orientation towards beginning to accept into the official documents the myths, expressed by the stereotypes created in the media. Teachers are depicted as useful when they keep the children still, fix materials, and include the delivered production into their plans, while organising the classroom. Artists are presented the responsibility to deal with content, dissemination and quality aspects.

“The culture sector with a competence to evaluate the quality of the artistic and cultural content, dissemination methods and cultural arrangements, and the educational sector with a competence for how to connect the content to the curriculum,

¹⁶¹ OQ: “Kultursektoren har ansvaret for å tilby profesjonelle kunst- og kulturopplevingar med høg kvalitet, medan skulen har ansvar for å integrere aktivitetane og tilboda inn i skulekvardagen til elevane og forankre prosjekta i læreplanane”.

¹⁶² OQ: “*Rollefordeling kultur-skule:* Opplæringssektoren har ansvaret for å leggje føre- og etterarbeid pedagogisk til rette for elevane, medan kultursektoren har ansvaret for kulturinnhaldet i Den kulturelle skulesekken og for å informere om innhaldet i god tid”.

¹⁶³ OQ: “Vi blir bare satt opp. Sjelden har vi mulighet til å si ja eller nei...”.

of the target groups and how to facilitate learning and experience in school” (D:KKD 2007:39).¹⁶⁴

The power to make professional claims to content and quality seem to be trusted more to the art sector. This is worrisome, as it seems as though dividing the work this way has been shown, both in Norwegian and American evaluations, to limit the pupils’ gain, while collaborations would give better results.

There is also the discussion of quality to consider, as this displays the attitude towards expert knowledge within the DKS program. This is a discussion that, in my opinion, is ineffectual, as the document states that: “It is neither possible or desired to have given criteria for content quality in Den kulturelle skulesekken” (D:KKD 2007:39).¹⁶⁵ There is such a thing as art and culture of high quality, but there are no givens as to what constitutes this quality. Local amateurs can be accepted as professionals, and the quality must be good, however there are no guidelines to judge by. Except to:

“It is the culture sector that should facilitate a good and professional content in Den kulturelle skulesekken. Productions must be quality checked within professional frames” (D:KKD 2007:22).¹⁶⁶

Also, the boundary breaking, revolutionary, free artist that must be allowed to provoke is brought into the program. The *artist hero* struggling to challenge the establishment is included into what used to be more collaboration oriented thinking. The aim to facilitate the inspired view of the rebel is introduced in the 2007 document:

“One aim put emphasis on the fact that pupils would «get a *positive* attitude towards artistic and cultural expressions». It is not always the case that meeting art and culture makes for a positive attitude. Art should also aggravate and provoke, and the new formulation will support this aspect in a better way” (D:KKD 2007:22).¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁴ OQ: “Kultursektoren med kompetanse til å vurdere kvaliteten på det kunstnarlege og det kulturfaglege innhaldet, formidlingsmetodar og kulturarrangement, og utdanningssektoren med kompetanse om korleis innhaldet kan knytast til læreplanverket, om målgruppene og korleis ein kan leggje til rette for læring og oppleving i skulen”.

¹⁶⁵ OQ: “Det er korkje moglege eller ynskjeleg å gje ferdige kriterium for kvaliteten på innhaldet i Den kulturelle skulesekken”.

¹⁶⁶ OQ: “Det er kultursektoren som skal leggje til rette for eit godt og profesjonelt innhald i Den kulturelle skulesekken. Produksjonar må kvalitetssikrast innanfor profesjonelle rammer”.

¹⁶⁷ OQ: “Ei målsetjing la vekt på at elevane skulle «få eit positivt forhold til kunst og kulturuttrykk». Det er ikkje alltid at møte med kunst og kultur gjer at ein vert positivt innstilt. Kunsten skal òg forarge og provosere, og den nye formuleringa vil ivareta dette aspektet på ein betre måte”.

The 2007 Report to the Storting seems to have given ground on the terms of the collaboration. It seems rather focused on perpetuating the division between the sectors.

“The Visual arts dissemination in Den Kulturelle Skulesekken can best be developed through strengthening the regional museums of fine art and museums of crafts, design and architecture as producers and disseminators of professional art, in collaboration and dialogue with a strong national field of knowledge” (D:KKD 2007:31).¹⁶⁸

This is from the Report to the Storting outlining the road ahead for the area Visual art. The school side is not mentioned at any part in the pages concerning the area. It is all focused on the museums and culture institutions and the professionalism they represent. In my view, this is contrary to the directly stated fact that the collaboration should be between equals. Here one side is given the responsibility to provide content, form, and quality standards. The problem of concepts are also present in the document at large as it states that: “Mainly a person is professional, that has artistic or cultural work as their occupation” (D:KKD 2007:38).¹⁶⁹

Responsibility for Quality Control

Even as the ‘art world’ creates narratives to reinterpret the problem outside the A&C educational frames, the fact is that the DKS program in Visual art has a mandate (D:KKD 2003a; D:KKD 2007). It is placed within the school institution, with a basis in the learning aims within the A&C subject. This might be why the ‘school world’ has not been active in reinterpreting the problem. It is in the seen as expected that it is to be a part of the school year, in light of offering projects in collaboration with, and in addition to, the subject A&C. The framework is the curriculum — the school subject syllabus — and it has to function within the school institution, and within the provided funding. So, the discussion of professional jurisdiction in DKS has to take into account all these factors. It is very much a situated judgement, and any argumentation or justification of the professional choices made has to be seen in light of its placement and mandate. Otherwise the discussion will be displaced and irrelevant. To accept that the school world and A&C teachers should not be involved in this quality check is questionable.

One of the stranger results of accepting the art world’s claim to quality control is put forth in the quote:

¹⁶⁸ OQ: “Den visuelle kunstformidlinga i Den Kulturelle Skulesekken kan best utviklast vidare gjennom å styrkje dei regionale kunst- og kunstindustrimusea som produsentar og formidlarar av profesjonell kunst, i samarbeid og dialog med eit sterkt nasjonalt kompetansmiljø”.

¹⁶⁹ OQ: “I hovudsak er ein person profesjonell som har kunstnarleg eller kulturfagleg arbeid som yrke”.

“To secure the quality of what is produced for Den kulturelle skulesekken, it is an important mission to stimulate increased productions. The experience with the work up until now has been that there is a continued lack of qualitative good productions. There is a lack of innovative productions, productions that mirrors today’s society, and productions that can challenge the conceptions we have of art. This lack of productions will increase as the program is extended to vidaregåande opplæring (11th-13th year of school), if nothing is done” (D:KKD 2007:40).¹⁷⁰

The politicians are willing to extend the program, and increase the production, even as they state that there is a lack of quality. The ‘art world’ is given an opportunity to control the content and quality check even as is it stated that the productions that are produced within these frames have questionable quality. If quality can’t be a given, and it is not desired to be, and discussions concerning what quality should constitute within A&C education and Visual art projects cannot be performed, there is a contradiction in terms. *We want quality, however we do not want to discuss what this might entail. We are against quality judgements, and pro freedom of expression, however we want educational sound projects of high professional quality.* The A&C teachers are not given an opportunity to judge the educational value of the projects, and the documents avoid the question by stating that the discussion will be performed at a philosophical level. “Quality and innovation in Den kulturelle skulesekken must be secured through continued discussions between the involved parties. It is important with a running deliberation of the concept of art and how it is to be understood” (D:KKD 2007:39).¹⁷¹ So, as a result of the shift from a focus on collaboration, the discussion is placed within the philosophical question; *what is art*, rather than at a subject-matter didaktik level, which would have been relevant in terms of education.

The Reports to the Storting concerning DKS — both the first *Den Kulturelle Skulesekken* (KKD 2003a), and the recent *Kulturell skulesekk for framtida* (KKD 2007) address professionalism. However, the concept is used in the 2007 document in terms of the artists involved. The ‘art world’ has to deliver professional art, of professional quality, be professional in their work. The

¹⁷⁰ OQ: “For å sikre kvaliteten i det som vert produsert til Den kulturelle skulesekken, er det ei viktig oppgåve å stimulere til fleire produksjonar. Røynslene i arbeidet fram til no har vore at det stadig manglar kvalitativt gode produksjonar. Det er mangel på nyskapande produksjonar, produksjonar som kan spegle det samfunnet vi har i dag, og produksjonar som kan utfordre dei førestillingane vi har om kunst. Mangelen vil verte større når ordninga utvidast til vidaregåande opplæring, dersom det ikkje vert gjort noko med denne situasjonen”.

¹⁷¹ OQ: “Kvalitet og nyskaping i Den kulturelle skulesekken må tryggjast gjennom at dei involverte aktørane diskuterer seg imellom fortløpande. Det er viktig med ei løpande drøfting av kunstomgrepet og om korleis det skal forståast”.

‘school world’ has to facilitate the ‘art world’ and do the work in front of, and after the professional visit. “In our view the teachers’ competence is the most decisive factor to being able to complete an art education after the set intentions” (S:Carlsen and Streitlien 1995:88).¹⁷² The teachers’ contribution is referred to in terms of professionals. The A&C teachers are listed as responsible for finding ways for the projects to be included in the curriculum aims (KKD 2007). In the 2007 document, even the responsibility for a professional dissemination is placed on the artists. The teachers are formally educated to a profession where curriculum, dissemination, teaching, methods, subject-matter content, and knowledge of age group, individual orientation, guidance and assistance are all directly aimed at creating the best possible learning environment for the school children. Thus, the fact that they are dismissed from most parts of their area of expertise in relation to DKS projects (KKD 2007) should, at some level, give rise to concern. It did in the national evaluation, and it would have been beneficial to see some of the questions mirrored in the 2007 document. This did not happen, as the Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs (MCCA) themselves comment: “... the evaluation of the program from NIFU STEP does not provide basis for any major or far-reaching changes in the running of DKS” (M:Oftestad 2008).¹⁷³ The ministry further authored the 2007 political document that sided with the critique of the evaluation the ministry itself had requisitioned, rather than address the issues referred to in it. It is voiced in the manner that enforces the view that the school is a performance venue for the *artist hero*, rather than the main arena in terms of educational content for the program. “In 2005 the National museum was given the task of developing a plan of action for a nationwide dissemination of fine arts, crafts, architecture and design by The MCCA” (D:KKD 2007:31).¹⁷⁴ As I see it, it mirrors the public myth of the *artist hero* as an automatic teacher in light of artistic freedom of expression, while the *teacher obstacle* is a bad pedagogue in light of institutional affiliation.

GULLSEKKEN

The concept of professionals and quality that is expressed in the stereotypes, and also now in documents concerning DKS, is also reflected in regards to the national prize Gullsekken (The Golden Rucksack) that was first established and rewarded in 2007. The jury selection, and further, on the selection of winners by the jury, can, in my view, be seen as a case of

¹⁷² OQ: “Etter vårt syn er lærerens kompetanse den mest avgjørende faktoren for å kunne gjennomføre en formingsundervisning etter intensjonene”.

¹⁷³ OQ: “... evalueringen av ordningen fra NIFU STEP ikke gir grunnlag for [gj:re store og omfattende endringer i organiseringen av DKS ...”.

¹⁷⁴ OQ: “I 2005 fekk Nasjonalmuseet i oppdrag frå Kultur- og kyrkjedepartementet å utarbeide ein handlingsplan for landsdekkjande formidling av biletkunst, kunsthandverk, arkitektur og design”.

challenging jurisdictional boundaries on the basis of the presented media stereotypes. The jury that was selected to evaluate both artistic productions and schools consisted of:

- Jury leader Mai Britt Andersen — artist
- Shanti Bramachari — leader of the Actor center
- Ove Eide — author and Lektor
- Erling Dahl Jr — festival director at Bergen International Festival
- Trond Johnsen — director of education in Oppland region
- Vera Micaelsen — children’s movie consultant in Norsk Filmfond (M:regjeringen.no 2007b)

Once again the educational side is given less of a part. Not all the ‘art world’ jury members are currently practicing artists, but have a background in arts. It is unclear whether the Lektor included is done so on the basis of his work as an author or as a teacher since his artistic practice is specified before his formal title. It is tempting to believe that this is done deliberately to imply that since he is an artist first, he is qualified to comment on quality. The jury selection has accepted that to pass quality judgment, not only on artistic productions but also on educational practices and planning, it has to be done by artists if it is within DKS.

Jury Statements

Even as the basis of educational practice throughout the school year, strategic thinking concerning integration of culture in education was one of the criteria, as listed in the jury’s reasons for the choice of nominated schools:

“The prize for the best school will be awarded a school that works with Den kulturelle skolesekken, faithfully to the main aims of the program. Gullsekken for the best school will be used to further the schools’ work with art and culture”

(M:regjeringen.no 2007a).¹⁷⁵

The school is given the role as receiving a product. The fact that some Art and Craft teachers have high quality art projects with their pupils does not seem to be recognised in this context, as this is a part of the school year as a whole rather than the particular projects involving artists. Instead of recognising the professional standard of the teachers involved with the projects, the jury instead chose to state that:

¹⁷⁵ OQ: “Prisen for beste skole vil gå til en skole som arbeider med Den kulturelle skolesekken mest mulig i tråd med de overordnede målene for satsningen. Gullsekken til beste skole skal gå til skolens videre arbeid med kunst og kultur”.

“... these schools have distinguished themselves through stable and continued integration of Den kulturelle skolesekken in the everyday workings of the school. They have also received the professional artists in a friendly and convincing manner” (M:regjeringen.no 2007b).¹⁷⁶

The fact that the choice is based as much on how they receive the ‘professionals’ in the project — in this case listed as the artists — as on the recognition of the educational aspect is very illustrative of some of the obstacles for an equal collaboration between the professions. The word professional is never mentioned in relation to the teachers or schools involved in the articles released of the event. This is curious as in the criteria for the projects — the ‘art world’ prize — is mentioned explicitly:

“The prize for best production will be awarded a production that most faithfully follows the aims of Den kulturelle skolesekken. With production we mean every way the pupils meet professional art and/or culture in their time in school...” (M:regjeringen.no 2007a).¹⁷⁷

Only artist/art institution initiated projects are seen as projects in this sense. The reasons for nominating the art projects are very different from the school nominations. The art projects; “... are chosen because they are professional at all levels, have a high artistic content, challenge the pupils and facilitate art dissemination” (M:regjeringen.no 2007b).¹⁷⁸ While addressing the ‘art world’ the word professional is used on several levels, while it is not mentioned in regards to the ‘school world’. Even if it is an unconscious decision of words on the part of the reporter, it is a representation of the attitudes towards the involved parties.

It might seem trivial to point out that the word professional is only mentioned in relation to the ‘art world’ — both in criteria for and evaluation of the Gullsekken prize but it illustrates a tendency also shown in the choice of jurors. The jury consists of six members from the ‘art world’, one member from both worlds, and a single member from the ‘school world’ — in the form of a representative at the administrative regional level. It does not state whether he has a background in professional teaching. This is a signal in itself that the importance of educational professionalism is not regarded as

¹⁷⁶ OQ: “... disse skolene har utmerket seg gjennom stabil og vedvarende integrering av Den kulturelle skolesekken i skolehverdagen. De har også tatt i mot de profesjonelle kunstnerne på en imøtekommende og overbevisende måte”.

¹⁷⁷ OQ: “Prisen for beste produksjon skal gå til en produksjon som er mest mulig i tråd med målene for Den kulturelle skolesekken. Med produksjon menes alle de måter elever møter profesjonell kunst og/eller kultur i skoletiden”.

¹⁷⁸ OQ: “... er valgt ut fordi er profesjonelle i alle ledd, holder et høyt kunstnerisk nivå, er utfordrende for elevene, og legger til rette for god formidling”.

vital to evaluate the project. In my estimation it implies that artists will be qualified to judge not only art projects, but that they are also competent to pass judgement on educational choices when it comes to resources, structures and curriculum. What might be the most questionable aspect of all this, though, is the willingness school administrations and teachers show in accepting this as right. The schools exhibit joy to be nominated, and if they receive the prize of 100.000 NOK for the best school in DKS express thankfulness (M:regjeringen.no 2007c). The second questionable aspect, in my view, is the fact that when the MCCA put together this jury and gave them the mandate to judge and award both the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ efforts, the Ministry of Education and Research (MER) that should share the responsibility for the program, did not react to the ‘art world’-heavy jury. Nor did it react to the fact that the ‘art world’ would pass judgment on education quality and long-term strategies for inclusion of culture in the educational aims for the schools nominated. Why are neither the schools nor the MER, that are responsible for education, critical when it comes to being evaluated and judged by someone from a field very different from their own? Would artists accept it if a group of teachers, headmasters and maybe a museums administrator were asked to curate — choose the best artworks — and jury a national exhibition with a 100.000 NOK prize at the end? The representatives from the ‘school world’ seem to be self-effacing in their attitude to the DKS program. Even as they have objections and ideas about making the projects better, they withdraw from open conflict and let themselves be dislocated from the debate. The narrative of the teachers does not have the strength of existing in one worldview. It spans several value sets every day, in regulations, practice and language.

Selected DKS project

When the first project prize was announced, the question of professional boundaries and control of the field surfaced again. The jury decided to award the art project named *Jam*. This project was said to be engaging and inspiring for the pupils. The group *Adbusters* had workshops aimed at creating art that could be used as a statement — political or otherwise. One of the projects ended in a very controversial incident, where pupils threw smoke bombs at the municipality building to protest the fact that their school books were too old (M:Mortensen 2005a; 2005b). The debate following the smoke bombing questioned if projects within Visual art in DKS should respect the same rules and regulations as that of all other educational practice, as long as it is located within the school institution. Can creating situations where pupils are involved in breaking the law and allowing it to happen in the name of artistic freedom be tolerated within the frames of the educational institution and its

mandate and regulation? The artists involved did not want their artistic freedom tampered with, and kept the project. As a result several headmasters chose to withdraw from participation in the project, and were criticised, even though they very clearly based their decisions on the mandate they have as an educational institution within the state. This is a discussion that, in my view, ended too soon, and will hopefully reappear as a discussion on the ethical considerations of both teaching in general, and externally introduced projects such as DKS in particular. This is the one explicit case where the ‘school world’ actively used their professionalism to reject a DKS work practice they found problematic.

If the collaboration were on equal basis, the decision from the ‘school world’ to not accept an offered project should be respected by the ‘art world’ Why then, does the ‘art world’-heavy jury (M:regjeringen.no 2007a), in the Gullsekken award, choose to disregard the professional statement from these headmasters by deciding to reward the same project the prize of 100.000 NOK? Is it a political statement that schools should not interfere with artistic judgement? Or are they simply ignorant of the fact that the ‘school world’ finds this problematic and not in accordance with the regulations they have to uphold? In any case, be it agenda or agenda-free, it is a problematic decision, even more so when the official document reports the result with no deliberation on the incident (KKD 2007). The question that it never answers, and that it would be interesting to discuss, has been raised in evaluations earlier: “Maybe what we see is a development where the pedagogs (educators) hand the field over to the artists, while the artists experience a demand of pedagogical relevance and structure that guides and limits their freedom?” (E:Mæland 2006:13).¹⁷⁹

Attack and Defence

The narratives show that the *artist hero* display a strong conviction based in one HCP, while the teachers have their *balancing act* between several world views and HCPs. The official 2007 document and the arranged Gullsekken prize seem to accede to the stereotypes that have been created in the media narratives rather than heed the evaluation results. The *artist hero* displays no problem justifying handing out a prize to a project *the obstacle* opposes, as this is the purpose of the *artist hero* — a purpose that, to some extent, is sanctioned by the 2007 document (KKD 2007). By invoking the stereotype and artistic freedom the ‘art world’ can, to some extent, disregard curriculum frames, and criticise any quality judgement presented by the ‘school world’.

¹⁷⁹ OQ: “Kanskje ser me ei utvikling der pedagogane overlet feltet til kunstnarane, medan kunstnarane opplever at det blir stilt krav om pedagogiske relevans og til rette legging som styrer og avgrensar fridomen deira?”.

A vital part of the expert knowledge of *the hero* stereotype advocates breaking of boundaries and challenging the established. They are equipped to attack, while the teacher has to defend. The teacher *balances* between the A&C subjects historic dichotomies such as technique — idea, usefulness — free expression, knowledge — individuality, equality — uniqueness, etc., and justifying all the parts of the subject is not as undemanding as justifying one part over the others.

The defensive position is not an easy one to inhabit, especially if you agree to parts of the opposing agenda. The A&C teacher will have to accede to all the artist's arguments as this is located in the A&C curriculum under the sub category fine art, and the aims of self expression and individual creative work, while the artist does not have to accede to any of the A&C teachers' arguments concerning the other parts of the subject-matter, legislation or moral choices that might interfere with artistic freedom. In light of this, the symbolic boundary set by the *artist hero* stereotype will have an unhealthy potential to become stronger, and might be the first step towards supporting new formal jurisdiction through social boundaries. The aim is not necessarily explicitly to gain power over an area, or funding, but rather to set the agenda in a field seen to be important to both worlds, and the public at large. Even if I disagree with the professional choices or justifications presented, I cannot well condemn them and still say that all worlds are equally valid in a discussion. What becomes difficult is that we all have an opinion, — even as a researcher — as to the benefit of a certain professional position.

A danger in this is to become relativistic, and say that everything is equally valid and state the fact that everyone argues from a point of view of what is best for the school children. In my view, the MCCA have made a choice to accept the stereotypes constructed by the media, disregarding the context in which DKS is situated. The choice is based on the values of the *artist hero*, rather than in consideration of the pupils' learning in accordance to aims in any subject. Through the 2007 document, the MCCA has consented to let opposing arguments be settled by who manages to be most vocal in the media, and as such, appealing to the political environment even if it will mean ignoring the mandate that is given in the DKS program and the school institution. A question that I would like to pose is; was the MER involved in creating the 2007 document, and if so why is the *artist hero* stereotype dominating the quality and content discussion. Why are the 'school world' and the *balancing act* less visible? If both ministries accept without contesting the nature of and influence by convincing argumentation based only in media narratives of professional values, without considering context or given content, I fear it will make the DKS program one of personal preferences of the few rather than the general knowledge base for the many.

The media has, in my opinion, successfully, through the stereotypes created myths of *the artists as automatic teachers*, and *the teachers as linear thinkers unsuitable for art education*. I would like to see the political level take responsibility for the DKS program's future development through a discussion including both worlds concerning content and quality, rather than accept the media stereotypes and myths that sanction the lack of any standards for an educational endeavour.

End Comment

The 'school world' has its tradition of inclusion and acceptance of outsiders. I suggest that in the DKS case this has resulted in the 'school world' surrendering the part of the criticism that causes disagreement in favour of the part of justification that can be agreed upon. Some of the worthiness is sacrificed in the *balancing act* in favour of peace and the appreciation of quiet self-restraint and the good of the many above the singular. The conflict that is often seen as positive and a creative resource for the *artist hero* in the inspired worldview of the 'art world' can be seen as instability and degenerative in the 'school world'. If the strongest arguments — predominantly those that are based in artistic purpose and are solidly anchored in the inspired worldview — gain public acceptance through the constructed media stereotypes and myths of *the artists as automatic teachers*, and *the teachers as linear thinkers unsuitable for art education*, it would herald changes for the professional field of A&C education. It could also affect the subject matter content in the long run. The professions within the DKS program, however, are still in the phase where they are trying to cement routines and regulations, their control over these, and also public trust in their jurisdictional claims. For the future of the program, I would wish for a discussion to reignite — from practice level to political level — a request for collaborative efforts rather than *myth*-based work-divisions, and that the discussion be addressed in terms of educational-situated content and quality.

The Myth Exposed

The inclusion of two professions in the same work practice within the DKS program has shown itself to bring challenges in terms of different perspectives regarding the program aims and content. The field holds justification narratives of professional practice from both the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’. I entered into this research posing two questions:

What narratives of professional choices and justifications by Teachers of Art & Crafts and Artists within DKS collaborations are communicated to the public?

How and why can these narratives affect the collaborations and the professional jurisdiction in the Art & Crafts school subject and the DKS program?

The narratives found in this study show that the professionals from the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ involved in DKS have fundamental differences in approach to the project. From the ‘art world’ there is a tendency to portray DKS projects in terms of art as experience. The ‘school world’ approaches the program from a curriculum point of departure. The media narratives of professional choices and justifications in the practice have created stereotypes of the professionals involved in the DKS collaboration. The stereotypes of the *artist hero* and *teacher obstacle* that are distributed to the public through the media texts are, however, not compatible to the narrative of the teacher performing their *balancing act* as depicted in evaluations of DKS practice.

When the DKS program was initiated, the ‘art world’ and ‘school world’ were expected to work together on an equal basis, while, on the other hand, the money was conferred to the ‘art world’. The work tasks within the collaboration were not assigned the professionals from either world involved but were to be divided between them in a collaborative effort. In my view, the unclear work division opened for jurisdictional claims of the area by the ‘art world’ through media narratives and, indeed, stereotypes to justify an increased responsibility of Visual art DKS projects within the school institution. The narratives in the DKS that succeed in becoming media stereotypes are introduced to the public. These stereotypes are ‘art world’

oriented, and have in my interpretation created myths for the public of *the artists as automatic teachers*, and *the teachers as linear thinkers unsuitable for art education*. The acceptance of these stereotypes and myths creates movement, and signs of shifting professional boundaries — bump signs — concerning the division of work in the DKS case, and also in the understanding of professional competence with the public. If these symbolic boundaries become strong, and accepted by the public, they might move into the realm of becoming social boundaries. The control of a work practice can be made permanent by mandate, or the demand for professional expertise to fill a position might formally change. The narratives and the construction of stereotypes reveal quite fundamental differences in how the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ view children, education, and the DKS program in relation to the school context. There might not be open conflict, but there certainly is a disagreement. The *artist hero* narrative of the professional artist outsider, and the *balancing act* of the professional A&C teacher are put into play within the initiated projects and media discussions and have been shown, through the bump signs in the documents and prize awarding, to have consequences for the future practice of the program. The move in DKS from symbolic to social boundaries might become a bump event in the long run.

THE ROAD AHEAD

The question I find vital to ask as a result of these findings is: If a bump event results in the DKS program being ‘art world’ governed, is this a desired outcome? As long as the program is situated within the school institution and the learning aims within A&C and core curriculum, the program has to be discussed within the frames of A&C education in the curriculum. I have earlier referred to Nolin (2008) and his request for a normative approach to professions and the work they provide. The focus on the content of the work provided in terms of whether it is beneficial and has quality, rather than a structural approach or a focus on the professionalisation project, has been directional in my research. At the end of my study, I therefore put forth this focus for further research: In terms of the mandate given in the school institution, what do the different professions involved in the DKS program contribute that should justify their presence — not as the media see fit to advocate, but in terms of the frames that are a given. What do they contribute to the quality of the A&C education and the DKS program in terms of content and learning within an educational frame and the national curriculum’s learning aims?

At the moment the professionals from both worlds involved seem to be in a position where they present no answer. The A&C teachers seem to have few opportunities to articulate their professional expertise to the public in a way

to successfully challenge the *myths*, while the ‘art world’ and the mysteries of art and the well accepted ‘artistic freedom’ do not cohabit with the thoughts of transferable knowledge and goals for judging quality. Before any of these questions can be answered, the meaning of the concepts content, quality, and collaboration, that are all understood differently by the ‘art world’ and ‘school world’, have to be addressed by challenging the media stereotypes.

The Question of Quality and Content

What is regarded as quality will affect choices regarding content. If it is seen the other way around, to agree on the content might make the quality question more manageable. In DKS context, content and quality is specific and situated within curriculum learning aims and an educational frame where the mandate is increased subject-matter knowledge and understanding. If the content is given, the quality standards have to be derived from that point. My findings show that there is a gap between what the ‘art world’ and the ‘school world’ perceive as relevant content and quality, but mostly the debate is performed separately and dominated by the ‘art world’ (E:Cordt-Hansen 2008). The Ministry of Culture and Church Affairs (MCCA) avoid any questions of quality within the program, through their reluctance to accept any set standards. The Ministry of Education and Research (MER) are invisible in the discussion, which, in itself, is questionable in my view. The ‘school world’ requests standards and guidelines for quality in light of the given content of the curriculum. However, the teachers display uncertainties regarding their own qualification in regards to judging art in particular contemporary art — but at the same time they clearly suggests criteria in light of the A&C subject.

As defined by standards related to different contexts, quality is not accepted by the ‘art world’ in the media narratives, even though some discussions might exist at project level. The *artist hero* depicts the view that any articulated standard is limiting to the child, even as they can be said to present the view of quality as free expression. If the quality discussion in the ‘art world’ is unarticulated, there is a challenge in how it is to be handled in an educational setting, where learning is the main goal. To discuss content and learning is to address the quality concepts in terms of what is defined as the desired result of the learning process. In collaborations within the DKS program, the *myths* accepted into the documents have moved the quality discussion of the projects to the ‘art world’. The quality discussion in the ‘art world’ effectively excludes all non-artists or ‘art world’ participants, and, in regard to project content and execution, the professional A&C teachers are not given an opportunity to participate in the quality discussion within the

program. They are presented as outsiders to be excluded, and the expert knowledge they represent is held in disregard or labelled censorship.

The division between knowledge content and the indefinable artistic freedom that can be already seen, to some extent, to infuse the narratives of the DKS program, prompts me to ask a new question. Is the shift seen in the bump signs contributing to locking the quality discussions for the school-anchored program within the art scene, instead of opening up for a collaboration of professionals, and is this a desired shift? A&C, and, as such, Visual arts in DKS, needs a content discussion placed within the ‘school world’ context as well, within the frames of knowledge aims of the A&C subject, as compulsory school is not professional art practice. The consequences in the shifting boundaries are as yet unknown for the execution of DKS.

The Question of Participating Artists and Quality

Artist organisations have claimed that artists that work with children and schools have a status problem within the ‘art world’ (E:Cordt-Hansen 2008). They have been considered less successful than those surviving by their art (M:Stavanger Aftenblad 2005). This view is mirrored by their outspoken view of education and pedagogisation. However, in light of this statement, it is relevant to raise the concern: Why do they want to work within education if it is a problem relating to their status in the ‘art world’? Combined with the inclusion of local amateurs, this should be a question of disquiet to the ministries when they strive for the highest level of professionalism. Projects, as such, become a short-term economical benefit in the form of salaries, but also of recognition by possible buyers (M:Bendz 2002; M:Henmo 2006) when there is no artist funding available. This was seen most explicitly in the journal for fine artists within the Visual arts that wrote about the project as “A Cultural Moneybag” (M:Landsverk 2004a) at the start of the program in 2004, and discussed it as a means for funding art practice, not for providing better education. The earlier mentioned question posed by one of the evaluations: “What are the quality criteria for professional art? Is it the artist that has art as his occupation and ‘livelihood’? Or can professional art be developed and performed by amateurs?” (E:Mæland 2006:36)¹⁸⁰ needs further research. The question of who the artists are that choose to participate in the DKS program is also a question of quality.

¹⁸⁰ OQ: “Kva er kvalitetskriteriet for profesjonell kunst? Er det kunstnarar som har kunsten som yrke og ‘levebrød’? Eller kan profesjonell kunst utviklast og utøvast av amatørar?”

The Question of the Absence of the Critical Teacher and Quality

To be able to discuss the field, the field must be defined. There will be a difference in approach to all these areas of the field, and DKS is situated within the school organization. As it is written in the regulations, it is supposed to be an integrated part of the school day through the curriculum aims. Since the curriculum aims provide some framework, to outsource the discussion of content completely to the ‘art world’ will mean to let the subject be outsourced. Is this educationally sound, and why has the ‘school world’ not initiated a debate into this question? I don’t think this would be seen as viable in any other subject. Would one outsource mathematics to engineers or accountants, English to anyone who might speak it, or geography to mountaineers or globetrotters? This would evoke protests. How is it then, that in the aesthetic subject, A&C, even local amateurs with no formal artistic or educational training can be accepted by the MCCA as better suited than the A&C teachers to handle the education, with the argument that they somehow enthusiastically practice within the field? Maybe a more important question is why would the MER, A&C teachers, and the school administrations allow this to be an accepted picture? These questions can only be answered through thorough research into the identity, views and reflections of the A&C teachers, the school administrations, and even the Ministry of Education and Research on their absence in defining the frames for the DKS program. To access self awareness of their professional expertise and justification of choices on the parts of the ‘school world’ in the program, a larger study would be preferred.

End Comment

The DKS program has a laudable goal. However, it might have severe consequences if not thought through in relation to the educational context and curriculum content. If the agenda is set by accepting the stereotypes and myths, the *artist hero* will come out the expert in the projects, and the *teacher obstacle* will be obliged to let the reins go. If the impression that the A&C teachers are not competent to teach the subject is accepted — both inwards in schools and outwards in society, family, media and politics — it will, in my view, damage not only the A&C subject, but also the DKS program. Pedagogisation has become the caricature of the ‘school world’ by the ‘art world’ as they have positioned themselves to justify their position and social boundaries in the professional struggle to own the ‘common good’. If the myths of *the artists as automatic teachers*, and *the teachers as linear thinkers unsuitable for art education* somehow gain permanent status, it will affect the economy and central governing of the program, and new social boundaries

might be introduced within DKS. These are harder to change and dispute, and, in my estimation, might in the long run prove more harmful than beneficial.

In my view, before the DKS program can reach its full potential, several factors are in need of clarification. Research into the question of quality within both worlds, as a collaborative effort, has to be performed. Without articulating the dissimilar expectations for the project results, myths and stereotypes will reinforce the direction the program has been heading without considering if this is a desired result. The understanding of quality is tied into the expectation of project contents, collaboration and professionalism. What is seen as relevant content by the 'art world' and what is seen as relevant content by the 'school world', and what is meant by collaboration? These issues need to be addressed by the professionals themselves situated in the DKS collaborative practice, not by the media stereotypes, in order to consider what constitutes quality. These questions not only require further knowledge of the A&C teachers' and artists' expectations of project results, professional choices and the justification of these, but also the pupils' gain in terms of subject-matter learning gain and growth. The DKS case will profit from clarifying the key concepts, rather than perpetuating media stereotypes and myths, and further research into the program is needed in all areas.

Bibliography

- Aagesen, Fr., Martin Attrup, N.P.L. Kjærgaard, and Professor Edv. Lehmann, eds. 1912. *Hvorledes skal jeg undervise? Haandbog i praktisk skolearbejde*. København: V. Pios Boghandel (Povl Branner).
- Aase, Laila, Åse Streitlien, Svein Lorentzen, and Anne-Lise Høstmark Tarrou. 1998. *Fagdidaktikk: innføring i fagdidaktikkens forutsetninger og utvikling*. Oslo: Universitetsforl.
- Abbing, Hans. 2002. *Why are Artists Poor? The Exceptional Economy of the Arts*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Abbott, Andrew. 1988. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Abbott, Andrew. 1995. Things of Boundaries. *Social Research* 62 (4):857-882.
- Alvesson, Mats. 1996. *Communication, Power and Organization*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Alvesson, Mats. 2002. *Postmodernism and Social Research, Understanding Social Research*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Amundsen, Carl Morten. 2002. Blir det noen gang noe oppi der? *Arabesk* 2002 (Den Kulturelle skolesekken - Temanummer):3.
- Aslaksen, Ellen K. 1997. *Ung og lovende. 90-tallets unge kunstnere - erfaringer og arbeidsvilkår, Rapport / Norsk kulturråd - utredning nr 8*. Oslo: Norsk Kulturråd.
- Bakke, Karl, and S. Bj. Arnekleiv. 1948. *Arbeidsmåten i landsfolkeskolen: Handbok for lærarar i samla og fådelte skular*. Oslo: Cappelen.

- Bénatouïl, Thomas. 1999. A Tale of Two Sociologies. The Critical and the Pragmatic Stance in Contemporary French Sociology. *European Journal of Social Theory* 2 (3):379-396.
- Bendz, Marit. 2002. Formidling til felles glede. *Arabesk* 2002 (Den Kulturelle skolesekken - Temanummer):17-18.
- Berg, Sigrid. 1948. Handarbeid. In *Arbeidsmåten i landsfolkeskulen: Handbok for lærarar i samla og fâdelte skular*, edited by K. Bakke and S. B. Arnekleiv. Oslo: Cappelen.
- Berg, Thomas. 2007. Den folkelige eliten. *Morgenbladet*, <http://www.morgenbladet.no/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20071130/OKULTUR/126336899>.
- Bjørkås, Svein. 1996. *Det tapte hegemoni. Profesjonsutvikling og statsstyring i norsk kunstpolitikk, Notat / Høgskolen i Vestfold 8/96*. Tønsberg: Høgskolen i Vestfold.
- Bjørkås, Svein. 2004. Kvalitetsparadokset. In *Risikosoner: Om kunst, makt og endring*, edited by S. Meyer and S. Bjørkås. Oslo: Norsk kulturråd.
- Bjørndal, Bjarne, and Sigmund Lieberg. 1978. Didaktisk relasjonstenking. In *Nye veier i didaktikken? En innføring i didaktiske emner og begreper*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Boltanski, Luc. 1984. How a social group objectified itself: "cadres" in France, 1936-45. *Social Science Information* 23 (3):469-491.
- Boltanski, Luc, and Eve Chiapello. 2001. Die Rolle der Kritik in der Dynamik des Kapitalismus und der normative Wandel. *Berliner Journal Fur Soziologie* 11 (4):459-477.
- Boltanski, Luc, and Ève Chiapello. 2005. *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Boltanski, Luc, and Laurent Thévenot. 1999. The Sociology of Critical Capacity. *European Journal of Social Theory* 2 (3):359-377.
- Boltanski, Luc, and Laurent Thévenot. 2000. The Reality of Moral Expectations: A Sociology of Situated Judgement. *Philosophical Explorations* September (3):208-231.

- Boltanski, Luc, and Laurent Thévenot. 2006. *On Justification. Economies of Worth, Princeton Studies in Cultural Sociology*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Borgen, Gøril Fromyr. 2007a. Øverst på dagens saksliste står abonnementsordningen for DKS-arrangementer - ...i regi av Akershus fylkeskommune. *Nationen*, 02.02.2007, 10.
- Borgen, Jorunn Spord. 2005. Kulturell skolesekk: Kunst som bedøvelse? *Aftenposten*, 04.12.2005, 12.
- Borgen, Jorunn Spord. 2007b. Evaluering av Den kulturelle skolesekken - funn, problemstillinger og utfordringer. In *Dissemination of art - realities, ethics and challenges*. Høgskolen i Oslo, Oslo, Norway.
- Borgen, Jorunn Spord, and Synnøve Skjersli Brandt. 2006. *Ekstraordinært eller selvfølgelig? Evaluering av Den kulturelle skolesekken i grunnskolen, Rapport / NIFU STEP 5/2006*. Oslo: NIFU STEP.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1995. *Distinksjonen. En sosiologisk kritikk av dømmekraften*. Oslo: Pax forlag.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loic J. D. Wacquant. 1995. *Den kritiske ettertanke*. Translated by B. N. Kvalsvik. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.
- Bruner, Jerome. 1991. The Narrative Construction of Reality. *Critical Inquiry* 18 (Autumn 1991):1-21.
- Bruner, Jerome. 1997. *Utdanningskultur og læring*. 2 ed. Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal.
- Bruner, Jerome. 2004. Life as Narrative. *Social Research* 71 (3):691-710.
- Brønne, Karen. 2004. Kunst- og designdidaktikk i lærerutdanning. Praksisfellesskap og kunnskapsutvikling. In *DesignDialog: designforskning i et demokratisk perspektiv. HiO-rapport; 2004 nr 22*, edited by L. M. Nielsen. Oslo: Høgskolen i Oslo, Avdeling for estetiske fag.
- Bull-Hansen, Rolf. 1953. *Tegning på naturlig grunnlag forming som middel i oppdragelse og opplæring fra småbarn til voksen*. Oslo: Fabritius.
- Bull-Hansen, Rolf, and G.E. Mæhlum. 1932. *Tegning. Skrivning, Arbeidsmåten i folkeskolen*. Oslo: Gyldendal.

- Bumgarner, Constance M. 1993. *Artists in the Classroom: An Analysis of the Arts in Education Program of the National Endowment for the Arts*. PhD, College of Arts and Architecture, The Pennsylvania State University.
- Carlsen, Kari, and Åse Streitlien. 1995. *Elev- og lærerperspektiv på formingsfaget resultater fra en spørreundersøkelse, Evaluering av formingsfaget i grunnskolen, Rapport / Telemarksforskning. Notodden 05/1995*. Notodden: Telemarksforskning.
- Carr, David. 2000. *Professionalism and Ethics in Teaching, Professional Ethics*. London: Routledge.
- Christiansen, Ingunn Blauenfeldt. 2007. Kunst og pedagogikk - en krevende kombinasjon. *ABM-skrift* 39 (Lykketreff. Om de gode møtene i Den kulturelle skolesekken):30-31.
- Clandinin, D. Jean, and F. Michael Connelly. 1996. Teachers' Professional Knowledge Landscapes: Teacher Stories. *Stories of Teachers. School Stories. Stories of Schools. educational Researcher* 25 (3):24-30.
- Clandinin, D. Jean, and F. Michael Connelly. 2000. *Narrative Inquiry. Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cooke, Bill, and Uma Kothari. 2001. *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London: Zed Books.
- Cordt-Hansen, Hege Marthe. 2008. Høy standard. En undersøkelse av kvalitetsforståelser i Den kulturelle skolesekken. Master thesis, Institutt for sosiologi og samfunnsgeografi, Universitetet i Oslo, Oslo.
- Cross, Nigel. 2006. *Designerly Ways of Knowing*. London: Springer.
- Czarniawska, Barbara. 1998. *A narrative approach to organization studies, Qualitative research methods vol. 43*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Czarniawska, Barbara. 2004. *Narratives in social science research, Introducing qualitative methods*. London: Sage.
- Dale, Erling Lars. 2001. Introduksjon til grunnlagsproblemer i didaktikk. In *Om utdanning: klassiske tekster*, edited by E. L. Dale. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.

- Danto, Arthur C. 1986. *The Philosophical Disenfranchisement of Art*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Danto, Arthur C. 1996. Danto. In *Konsten och konstbegreppet*. Stockholm: Kungl. konsthögskolan/Raster.
- Dickie, George. 1974. *Art and the Aesthetic. An Institutional Analysis*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Dickie, George. 1984. *The Art Circle. A Theory of Art*. New York: Haven.
- Dickie, George. 2001. *Art and Value*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Digranes, Adolf. 1933. *Håndarbeid for gutter, Arbeidsmåten i folkeskolen Håndbok for lærere*. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Digranes, Ingvild. 2005. Den kulturelle skulesekken. Teachers of Art and Crafts and their negotiation of professional identities. In *DesignDialog - Design og fagdidaktiske utfordringer*, edited by L. M. Nielsen and I. Digranes. Oslo: Høgskolen i Oslo.
- Digranes, Ingvild. 2006a. *Bygg meg eit bilete - skap meg ei verd. Skulptur i samtidskunst og undervising, Hovedfagsrapport 2006 nr 6*. Oslo: Høgskolen i Oslo, Avd for estetiske fag.
- Digranes, Ingvild. 2006b. Det doble kjeldespring. Kunst og handverksdidaktikk. In *DesignDialog - Kunnskapsløftet og visuell kompetanse*, edited by L. M. Nielsen and I. Digranes. Oslo: Høgskolen i Oslo.
- Dokk Holm, Erling. 2006. Gjør kulturpolitikk viktig. *Aftenposten Morgen*, 22.03.2006, 5.
- Duncum, Paul. 2007. Reasons for the Continuing Use of an Aesthetic Discourse in Art Education. *Art Education* 2007 (March):46-51.
- Dunin-Woyseth, Halina, and Jan Michl. 2001. *Towards a Disciplinary Identity of the Making Professions*. Vol. 4, *The Oslo Millennium Reader, Research Magazine*. Oslo: Oslo School of Architecture.
- Dunin-Woyseth, Halina, and Liv Merete Nielsen. 2003. From Apprentice to Master. Some Notes on Educating Design Scholars and Developing Design Scholarship. In *The Doctoral Education in Design, 3rd*

- Conference, Epochal Tsukuba, 14-17 October*, edited by D. Durling and K. Sugiyama. Tsukuba: University of Tsukuba.
- Efland, Arthur D. 1990. *A History of Art Education: Intellectual and Social Currents in Teaching the Visual Arts*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Efland, Arthur D. 2004. Emerging Visions of Art Education. In *Handbook of Research and Policy in Art Education*, edited by E. W. Eisner and M. D. Day. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eidem, Åshild. 2007a. - Ikke plass til flere kulturfag. *Aftenposten*, 13.08.2007, 8.
- Eidem, Åshild. 2007b. Venter på nytt trekk i skolen - Ønsker å gjøre Den kulturelle skolesekken obligatorisk. Store forskjeller mellom kommunene. *Aftenposten*, 13.08.2007, 8.
- Eisner, Elliot W. 1998. Does Experience in the Arts Boost Academic Achievement? *Art Education* 51 (1):7-15.
- Elliott, Jane. 2005. *Using narrative in social research: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. London: Sage.
- Eng, Helga. 1918. *Kunstpædagogik*. Kristiania: Aschehoug.
- Eng, Helga. 1926. *Barnetegning: med illustrasjoner i sort og farver*. Oslo: Cappelen.
- Eng, Helga. 1944. *Margrethes tegning: fra det 9. til det 24. året: andre uttrykksformer, fortsettelse av barnetegning*. Oslo: Cappelen.
- Evetts, Julia. 2003. The Sociological Analysis of Professionalism - Occupational Change in the Modern World. *International Sociology* 18 (2):395-415.
- Familie- kultur- og administrasjonskomiteen. 2003. innst.S. nr. 50 (2003-2004) Innstilling til Stortinget fra Familie- kultur- og administrasjonskomiteen om Den kulturelle skolesekken. St.meld. nr 38 (2002-2003). Oslo: Familie- kultur- og administrasjonskomiteen.
- Flatby, Bjørg Åsta. 2002. Gi barnet spillerom. *Arabesk* 2002 (Den Kulturelle skolesekken - Temanummer):38-40.

- Forsøksrådet for skoleverket. 1968. *Læreplan for forsøk med 9-årig skole*. 3rd ed, *Forsøk og reform i skolen; nr 7*. Oslo: I kommisjon hos Aschehoug & co.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984. Truth and Method. In *The Foucault Reader.*, edited by P. Rabinow. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, Michel. 2000. *Power*. Edited by R. H. et.al. Vol. 3. New York: The New Press.
- Freidson, Eliot. 2001. *Professionalism the Third Logic*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fønhus, Kirsti, Guri Kjelstrup, Dag Henrik Skattebo, and Marta Tuff. 2000. Evaluering av "Den kulturelle skolesekken" i Sandefjord. Bø: Høgskolen i Telemark.
- Geelan, David. 2003. *Weaving Narrative Nets to Capture Classrooms. Multimethod Qualitative Approaches for Educational Research*. Edited by W. W. Cobern. Vol. 21, *Science & Technology Education Library*. London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Gerhardsen, Anki. 2007. Glede av glass. *ABM-skrift 39* (Lykketreff. Om de gode møtene i Den kulturelle skolesekken):6-8.
- Giske, Trond. 2006a. Kulturens rolle i det nye Norge. *Aftenposten Morgen*, 09.03.2006, 4.
- Giske, Trond. 2006b. Kunsten å leve sammen. *Aftenposten Morgen*, 08.04.2006, 4.
- Giske, Trond. 2006c. Ullmanns utholdelige letthet. *Aftenposten Morgen*, 15.03.2006, 4.
- Goodlad, John. I. . 1979. *Curriculum Inquiry. The Study of Curriculum Practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Groat, Linda, and David Wang. 2002. *Architectural Research Methods*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gulliksen, Marte. 2006. *Constructing a formbild an inquiry into the dynamical and hierarchical aspects of the hermeneutical filters controlling the formbild construction in design education situations, CON-TEXT. Avhandling 25*. Oslo: Oslo School of Architecture and Design.

- Haabesland, Anny Å, and Ragnhild E. Vavik. 2000. *Kunst og håndverk: - hva og hvorfor?* Bergen: Fagbokforl.
- Haaland, Agnete G. 2007. Absurde påstander om kunst. *Aftenposten*, 06.02.2007, 12.
- Hargreaves, Andy. 1996. *Lærerarbeid og skolekultur. Læreryrkets forandring i en postmoderne tidsalder*. Edited by E. Plyhn and S. Vaage, *Det utdanningsvitenskapelige bibliotek*. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.
- Hargreaves, Andy. 2000. Four Ages of Professionalism and Professional Learning. *Teachers and Teaching: History and Practice* 6 (2):151-182.
- Hatch, Amos, and Richard Wiesniewski. 1995. Life history and narrative: introduction. In *Life, History and Narrative*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Haugen, Karin. 2006. Kunst som redning. *Klassekampen*, 09.05.2006.
- Henmo, Ola. 2006. Kulturkollisjonen. *Aftenposten. Amagasinet*, 06.10.2006, 22-24.
- Henriksen, Arve. 2008. - Slutt med kosen. Bård Vegard Solhjell vil sette kunnskap i høysetet. *Aftenposten*, 29.03.2008, 8.
- Hiim, Hilde, and Else Hippe. 1998. *Undervisningsplanlegging for yrkeslærere*. 2. ed. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Holdhus, Kari. 2008. Den kulturelle skolesekken - ikke bare tull og tøys. *Stavanger Aftenblad*, 05.03.2008, 1.
- Holen, Astrid. 2002. DKS har kommet for å bli. *Arabesk 2002* (Den Kulturelle skolesekken - Temanummer):4-5.
- Hopmann, Stefan. 1997. Wolfgang Klafki och den tyska didaktiken. In *Didaktik - teori, reflektion och praktik*, edited by M. Uljens. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Hopmann, Stefan, and Kurt Riquarts. 2000. Starting a Dialogue: A Beginning Conversation Between Didaktik and the Curriculum Traditions. In *Teaching as a Reflective Practice: The German Didaktik Tradition*, edited by I. Westbury, S. Hopmann and K. Riquarts. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Hughes, Everett Cherrington. 1984. *The sociological eye selected papers, Social science classics series*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books.
- Jenssen, Anna B. 2007. Lei av taus kultur-makt. *Dagens Næringsliv*, 16.03.2007, 60.
- Jørgensen, Aksel. 1945. Opdragelse til kunst. In *Kunst i skolen*, edited by Komitèen for vandreudstillingen. Oslo: Fischers.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1987. *Critique of judgement*. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1995. *Kritikk av dømmekraften*. Oslo: Pax Forlag.
- Karlsen, Signy Irene. 2007. Opplevelseslæring. *ABM-skrift* 39 (Lykketreff. Om de gode møtene i Den kulturelle skulesekken):9-12.
- KD. 2007. *Skapende læring: strategi for kunst og kultur i opplæringen 2007-2010*. Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet.
- KD. 2009. *Læreren, rollen og utdanningen. St. meld. nr 11 (2008-2009)*. Oslo: Departementet.
- KD, and Udir. 2006. *Læreplanverket for Kunnskapsløftet. Midlertidig utg. juni 2006*. Oslo: Utdanningsdirektoratet.
- Kjosavik, Steinar, Randi-Helene Koch, Edith Skjeggstad, and Bjørn Magne Aakre. 2003. *Kunst og håndverk i L97. Nytt fag - ny praksis?, Rapport / Telemarksforskning. Notodden 03/2003*. Notodden: Telemarksforskning.
- Kjørup, Søren. 2000. *Kunstens filosofi: en indføring i æstetik*. Frederiksberg: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.
- KKD. 2003a. *Den kulturelle skulesekken. St.meld.nr 38 (2002-2003)*. Oslo: Departementet.
- KKD. 2003b. *Kulturpolitikk fram mot 2014: St.meld.nr 48 (2002-2003)*. Oslo: Departementet.
- KKD. 2005. *Kultur og næring. St.meld. nr 22 (2004-2005)*
- KKD. 2007. *Kulturell skulesekk for framtida. St.meld. nr 8 (2007-2008)*. Oslo: Departementet.

- Klafki, Wolfgang. 1997. Kritisk-konstruktiv didaktik. In *Didaktik - teori, refleksjon och praktik*, edited by M. Uljens. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Klafki, Wolfgang. 2001. Kategorial dannelse: Bidrag til en dannelsesteoretisk fortolkning av moderne didaktikk. In *Om utdanning: klassiske tekster*, edited by E. L. Dale. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.
- Komitéen for vandreudstillingen. 1945. *Kunst i skolen*. Oslo: Fischers.
- Kristiansen, Line Prøis. 2007. *Den kulturelle skolesekken i Akershus - en brukerundersøkelse, HiO-rapport 2007 nr 2*. Oslo: Høgskolen i Oslo.
- KSD. 1924. *Normalplan for landsfolkeskolen: Utarbeidd av skuledirektørane og målmenn for lærarstandet*. Kristiania: J.M. Stenersens forlag.
- KUD. 1925. *Normalplan for byfolkeskolen*. Oslo: Stenersen.
- KUD. 1974. *Mønsterplan for grunnskolen*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- KUD. 1987. *Mønsterplan for grunnskolen: M 87*. Nynorsk ed. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- KUF. 1992a. *Studieplan for allmennlærerutdanningen: godkjent av Kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet 10. juli 1992*. Oslo: Departementet.
- KUF. 1992b. *Studieplan for faglærerutdanning i forming og formingsfag*. Oslo: Kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet.
- KUF. 1996. *Læreplanverket for den 10-årige grunnskolen*. Oslo: Det kongelige kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet,.
- KUF. 1999. *Rammeplan og forskrift for 4-årig allmennlærerutdanning*. Oslo: Norgesenrådet.
- KUF. 2004. *Kultur for læring. St.meld. nr 30 (2003-2004)* Oslo: Departementet.
- Kulturdepartementet. 1992. *Kultur i tiden. St.meld. nr 61 (1991-92)*. Oslo: Departementet.
- Kulturdepartementet, and KUF. 1995. *Broen og den blå hesten*. Oslo: Departementet.

- Kvernbekk, Tone. 2001. Introduksjon. In *Pedagogikk og lærerprofesjonalitet*, edited by T. Kvernbekk. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.
- Lagerstrøm, Bengt Oscar. 2007. *Kompetanse i grunnskolen hovedresultater 2005/2006, Rapport / Statistisk sentralbyrå 2007/21*. Oslo: Statistisk sentralbyrå.
- Lamont, Michéle, and Virág Molnár. 2002. The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences. *Annual Review Sociology* 28:167-195.
- Landsverk, Johanne. 2004a. En kulturell pengesekk. *Billedkunst* 2004 (7):9-10.
- Landsverk, Johanne. 2004b. Kunstnersenter satser på Skolesekken. *Billedkunst* 2004 (7):10.
- Larson, Magali Sarfatti. 1977. *The rise of professionalism a sociological analysis*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
- Larsson, Staffan. 2005. Om kvalitet i kvalitative studier. *Nordisk Pedagogik* 2005 (1):16-35.
- Latour, Bruno. 1998. From the World of Science to that of Research? *Science* (April).
- Latour, Bruno. 2004. Why Has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern. *Critical Inquiry* 30 (winter):225-248.
- Latour, Bruno. 2005. *Reassembling the social. An introduction to actor-network-theory, Clarendon lectures in management studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger. 1991. *Situated Learning. Legitimate Peripheral Participation, Learning in Doing: Social, Cognitive, and Computational Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Law, John. 1992. Notes on the Theory of the Actor-Network: Ordering, Strategy, and Heterogeneity. *Systems Practice* 5 (4):379-393.
- Lieblich, Amia, Rivka Tuval-Mashiach, and Tamar Zilber. 1998. *Narrative Research. Reading, Analysis, and Interpretation*. Vol. 47, *Applied Social Research Methods Series*. London: Sage.

- Lied, Edith. 1995. Forming. Ad diskusjon om navnebytte og deling av faget forming. *FORM* 95 (2):30.
- Lindberg, Anna Lena. 1988. *Konstpedagogikens dilemma - historiska rötter och moderna strategier*. Lund: Institutionen för konstvetenskap.
- Lowenfeld, Viktor and W. Lambert Brittain. 1970. *Creative and Mental Growth*. 5th ed. London: The Macmillan Company.
- Lowenfeld, Viktor, and W. Lambert Brittain. 1971. *Kreativitet og vækst: en redegørelse for den tegnpsykologiske udvikling hos børn og unge og nogle pædagogiske konsekvenser*. København: Gjøellerup.
- Mangset, Per. 2004. "Mange er kalt, men få er utvalgt": kunstnerroller i endring, Rapport / Telemarksforskning. Bø; nr 215. Bø: Telemarksforskning-Bø.
- Mauren, Arnfinn. 2006a. Skal ikke bety slutten for praktisk arbeid. *Aftenposten Morgen*, 28.11.2006, 19.
- Mauren, Arnfinn. 2006b. Sløydfaget trues av mer teori. *Aftenposten Morgen*, 28.11.2006, 18.
- McFee, Graham. 1999. Truth, arts education and the 'postmodern condition'. In *Education, Knowledge*, edited by D. Carr. Florence, USA: Routledge.
- McVee, Mary B. 2004. Narrative and the exploration of culture in teachers' discussions of literacy, identity, self, and other. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 20 (2004):881-899.
- Mikkelsen, Aksel. 1912. Sløjd. In *Hvorledes skal jeg undervise? Haandbog i praktisk skolearbejde*, edited by F. Aagesen, M. Attrup, N. P. L. Kjærgaard and P. E. Lehmann. København: V. Pios Boghandel (Povl Branner).
- Molander, Anders, and Lars Inge Terum. 2008. Profesjonsstudier - en introduksjon. In *Profesjonsstudier*, edited by A. Molander and L. I. Terum. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Mortensen, Jørn. 2005a. Røykbomber som kunst. *Aftenposten*, 17.11.2005, 4.
- Mortensen, Jørn. 2005b. Skolesekk og engasjement. *Aftenposten*, 11.12.2005, 10.

- Myhre, Reidar. 2001. *Didaktisk basiskunnskap*. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
- Mæland, Kjellfrid. 2006. Den kulturelle skulesekken forventning - formidling - fellesskap. Stord: Høgskolen Stord/Haugesund.
- Nesje, Sara Birgitte Østfi, and Liv Klakegg. 2007. Den kulturelle skulesekken som skoleutvikling - erfaringer fra et prosjekt i Oslo. *ABM-skrift* 39 (Lykketreff. Om de gode møtene i Den kulturelle skulesekken):13-16.
- Nielsen, Liv Merete. 2000. *Drawing and Spatial Representations: Reflections on Purposes for Art Education in the Compulsory School*. Oslo: Oslo School of Architecture.
- Nielsen, Liv Merete. 2003. Design Education of the Lay Client. *Information Design Journal* 11 (2-3):184-188.
- Nielsen, Liv Merete. 2006. Med Kunst og design inn i framtiden. *FORM* 2006 (4):3-4.
- Nielsen, Liv Merete. 2008. Art, design and environmental participation. Norwegian research in art and design education 1995-2006. In *Nordic Visual Arts Education in Transition. A research Review*, edited by L. Lindström, H. Illeris, L. M. Nielsen and M. Räsänen. Stockholm: Svenska Vetenskapsrådet.
- Nielsen, Liv Merete, Dagfinn Aksnes, Janne Reitan, and Ingvild Digranes. 2005. Multidisciplinary Design Curricula from Primary to University Level. In *Crossing Design Boundaries*, edited by P. Rodgers, L. Brodhurst and D. Hepburn. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Nielsen, Liv Merete, and Ingvild Digranes. 2006. *DesignDialog - Kunnskapsløftet og visuell kompetanse, HiO-rapport; 2006 nr 24*. Oslo: Høgskolen i Oslo, Avdeling for estetiske fag.
- Nielsen, Liv Merete, and Ingvild Digranes. 2007a. Norwegian Design Education — Developing the Scandinavian Perspective. In *The International Association of Societies of Design Research. Emerging Trends in Design Research, 12-15 November, 2007*. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University School of Design.
- Nielsen, Liv Merete, and Ingvild Digranes. 2007b. User participation - Real influence or hostage taking. In *Shaping the Future? The 9th International Conference on Engineering and Product Design*

- Education*. The School of Design at Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Nolin, Jan. 2008. *In search of a new theory of professions*. Edited by B. Brorström, *Science for the Professions*. Borås: University of Borås.
- NRK. 2008. Dagsnytt 08.00. In *Dagsnytt*, edited by P1. Norway.
- Oftestad, Eldrid. 2008. Savner mer forskning. *Nationen*, 18.04.2008, 24.
- Ohnstad, Frøydis Oma. 2008. *Profesjonsetiske dilemmaer og handlingsvalg blant lærere i lærerutdanningens praksisskoler, Doktoravhandlinger forsvart ved Det utdanningsvitenskapelige fakultet, Universitetet i Oslo no. 98*. Oslo: Det utdanningsvitenskapelige fakultet, Pedagogisk forskningsinstitutt Unipub.
- Ongstad, Sigmund. 2004. Fagdidaktikk som forskningsfelt. In *Kunnskapsstatus for forskningsprogrammet KUPP: kunnskapsutvikling i profesjonsutdanning og profesjonsutøving*, edited by N. forskningsråd. Oslo: Norges forskningsråd.
- Orfali, Ann. 2004. *Artists working in partnership with schools*. London: Arts Council England.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1951. *The Social System*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1978. *Action Theory and the Human Condition*. New York: The Free Press.
- Pettersen, John Roald. 2007. Stjerner i auga. *ABM-skrift* 39 (Lykketreff. Om de gode møtene i Den kulturelle skolesekken):4-5.
- Poirier, Suzanne, and Lioness Ayres. 1997. Focus on Qualitative Methods. Endings, Secrets, and Silences: Overreading in Narrative Inquiry. *Research in Nursing & Health* (20):551-577.
- Rabinow, Paul, and Michel Foucault, eds. 1984. *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Read, Herbert. 1945. *Education through art*. 2nd ed. London: Faber and Faber.
- regjeringen.no. 2008. *Gullsekken deles ut for første gang* [Pressemelding]. regjeringen.no, 29.03. 2007a [cited 29.04. 2008]. Available from

<http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kkd/pressester/pressemeldinger/2007/Gullsekken-deles-ut-for-forste-gang.html?id=461870>.

regjeringen.no. 2008. *Gullsekken og 100 000 kulturkroner i sikte* [Pressemelding]. regjeringen.no, 10.05 2007b [cited 29.04. 2008]. Available from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kkd/pressester/pressemeldinger/2007/Gullsekken-og-100-000-kulturkroner-i-sik.html?id=465938>.

regjeringen.no. 2008. *Jublende Gullsekk-vinnere* [Pressemelding]. regjeringen.no, 31.05. 2007c [cited 29.04. 2008]. Available from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kkd/aktuelt/nyheter/2007/jublende-gullsekk-vinnere.html?id=469457>.

regjeringen.no. 2008. *Åtte finalister til Gullsekken* [Pressemelding]. regjeringen.no, 17.04. 2008 [cited 29.04. 2008]. Available from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kkd/Tema/kultur/atte-finalister-til-gullsekken.html?id=508135>.

Rehal, Saddek. 2004. *Föreställning og eftertanke. Bilder og verbalt språk i tidiga skeden av designprocessen*. Göteborg: Chalmers Tekniska Högskola.

Reitan, Janne. 1995. Fra forming til kunst og håndverk. *FORM* 95 (2):29.

Reitan, Janne. 2007. *Improvisation in tradition: a study of contemporary vernacular clothing design practiced by inupiaq women of Kaktovik, North Alaska, CON-TEXT. Thesis; 28*. Oslo: Oslo School of Architecture and Design.

Rhodes, Carl, and Andrew D. Brown. 2005. Narrative, organizations and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 7 (3):167-188.

Riessman, Catherine Kohler. 1993. *Narrative Analysis*. Edited by J. L. Hunter. Vol. 30, *Qualitative Research Methods*. London: Sage.

Roti, H. C. 1940. *Læraren og skulen: Verdsetting av gamalt og nytt*. Oslo: Fabritius.

Samuelsen, Arne Marius. 2002. Er kunsten vanskelig? *Arabesk* 2002 (Den Kulturelle skolesekken - Temanummer):42-46.

Schaanning, Espen. 2000. *Modernitetens oppløsning*. Oslo: Spartacus.

- Schjønby, Nina. 2004. Kunstfaglig kompetanse er viktig. *Billedkunst* 7:11.
- Schön, Donald A. 1995. *The Reflective Practitioner. How Professionals Think in Action*. Aldershot: Arena.
- Selmer-Olsen, Ivar. 2003. Barnekulturforskningens utvikling og nytte. In *Barnet. Konstruksjoner av barn og barndom*, edited by S. Sagberg and K. Steinholt. Oslo Universitetsforlaget.
- Skarpenes, Ove. 2004. *Kunnskapens legitimering: en studie av to reformer og tre fag i videregående skole*. Bergen: Sosiologisk institutt Universitetet i Bergen.
- Skarpenes, Ove. 2005. Pedosentrismens framvekst - Kunnskapens rolle i skolens nye sosialiseringssparaigme. *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift* 2005 (04):418-431.
- Skarpenes, Ove. 2007. Den "legitime kulturens" moralske forankring. *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning* 2007 (04):531-558.
- Skarpenes, Ove, and Roger Ivan Hestholm. 2007. Den "nye" franske pragmatikken. In *Sosiologisk årbok*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Skjelbred, Liv. 2007. Vil nå alle med kultur i skolen. *Utdanning*, http://www.utdanningsnytt.no/templates/udf20_15495.aspx?mode=print
- Skrede, Tori. 2002a. Bilder på og fra en utstilling. *Arabesk* 2002 (Den Kulturelle skolesekken - Temanummer):11-12.
- Skrede, Tori. 2002b. Kan et luftslott bli til en opera? *Arabesk* 2002 (Den Kulturelle skolesekken - Temanummer):8-11.
- Solhjell, Dag. 1995. *Kunst-Norge en sosiologisk studie av den norske kunstinstitusjonen*. Oslo: Universitetsforl.
- Solhjell, Dag. 2006. *Kuratorene kommer. Kunstpolitikk 1980-2006, Norsk kulturpolitikk 1814-2014*. Oslo: Høgskolen i Lillehammer, Universitetet i Oslo.
- Stake, Robert E. 2000. Case studies. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln. London: Sage Publications.

- Stavanger Aftenblad. 2005. Pressen skriver for lite om barnekunst. *Stavanger Aftenblad*, 02.06.2005, 48.
- Stavrum, Kersti Løken. 2006. Inspirasjon. *Aftenposten*, 06.10.2006, 3.
- Stortinget. 2004. Innst. S nr.268. Oslo: Stortinget.
- Stronach, Ian, Brian Corbin, Olwen McNamara, Sheila Stark, and Tony Warne. 2002. Towards an uncertain politics of professionalism: teacher and nurse identities in flux. *Journal of Education Policy* 17 (1):109-138.
- Sund, Elin Bondlid. 2002a. Formidlingen er for tilfeldig. *Arabesk* 2002 (Den Kulturelle skolesekken - Temanummer):24-26.
- Sund, Elin Bondlid. 2002b. Tredd nedover ørene? *Arabesk* 2002 (Den Kulturelle skolesekken - Temanummer):27.
- Sund, Elin Bondlid. 2002c. - Ønsker ikke sensur. *Arabesk* 2002 (Den Kulturelle skolesekken - Temanummer):28-29.
- Sundvor, Ingvar, and Ella Melbye. 1995. Behold fagbetegnelsen forming! *FORM* 29 (1):13-14.
- Sørheim, Elisabeth. 2005. Kulturell skolesekk: Kunsten krever engasjement. *Aftenposten*, 29.11.2005.
- Telhaug, Alfred Oftedal. 2005. Ideene som former dagens lærere. *Aftenposten*, 14.01.2005, 4.
- Telhaug, Alfred Oftedal. 2006. Lærerutdanningen - klisjeenes forum. *Adresseavisen*, 13.03.2006, 18.
- Tessem, Liv Berit. 2007. Deler ut kulturgull. *Aftenposten*, 11.05.2007, 2.
- Thane, L. 1912. Undervisning i Askov-Nääs sløjd. In *Hvorledes skal jeg undervise? Haandbog i praktisk skolearbejde*, edited by F. Aagesen, M. Attrup, N. P. L. Kjærgaard and P. E. Lehmann. København: V. Pios Boghandel (Povl Branner).
- Thavenius, Jan. 2004. *Den goda kulturen och det fria skapandet. Diskurser om "Kultur i skolan", Rapporten om utbildning*. Malmö: Malmö Högskola, Lärarutbildningen.

- Thavenius, Jan, and Lena Aulin-Gråhamn. 2003. *Kultur och estetik i skolan. Slutredovisning av Kultur och skola-uppdraget 2000-2003, Rapporter om utbildning*. Malmö: Malmö Högskola, Lärarutbildningen.
- Thavenius, Jan, and Magnus Persson. 2004. *Skolan och den radikala estetiken*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Thévenot, Laurent. 1984. Rules and implements: investment in forms. *Social Science Information* 23 (1):1-45.
- Time, Jon Kåre. 2005. Invitasjon til fagleg sjølv mord. *Morgenbladet* (32), <http://www.morgenbladet.no/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20050812/OAKTUEL003/108120030&SearchID=73233046192596>.
- Trier, H. 1892. Sløjdundervisning. Foredrag ved det 6. nordiske Skolemøde 6. August 1890. In *Pædagogiske Tids- og Stridsspørgsmaal: Pædagogiske strejflys*. København: Philipsen.
- Trier, H. 1893. *Pædagogiske Tids- og Stridsspørgsmaal: Pædagogikken som videnskab*. København: Philipsen.
- Trohaug, Marit. 2002. Jo visst er det vits... *Arabesk 2002* (Den Kulturelle skolesekken - Temanummer):22.
- Trætteberg, Signi. 1934. *Håndarbeid for piker, Arbeidsmåten i folkeskolen*. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- UFD. 2003. *Ei blot til lyst. Om kunst og kultur i og i tilknytning til grunnskolen. St.meld nr 39 (2002-2003)*. Oslo: Departementet.
- UFD. 2005. *Commitment to Research: Report No. 20 (2004-2005) to the Storting*. Oslo: Utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet,.
- Ullmann, Linn. 2006a. Bak slottet Soria Moria. *Aftenposten Morgen*, 18.03.2006, 3.
- Ullmann, Linn. 2006b. Det svarte puslespillet. *Aftenposten Morgen*, 13.03.2006, 3.
- Vestøl, Tone. 1995a. Så er det altså avgjort. *FORM* 29 (3):4.
- Vestøl, Tone. 1996. Ikke enten, eller - men både, og! *FORM* 30 (1):3.
- Vestøl, Trine. 1995b. Navnefeiden. *FORM* 95 (1):10.

- Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of Practice. Learning, Meaning, and Identity, Learning in Doing: Social, Cognitive, and Computational Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Westbury, Ian, Stefan Hopmann, and Kurt Riquarts, eds. 2000. *Teaching as a Reflective Practice: The German Didaktik Tradition*. Edited by W. F. Pinar, *Studies in Curriculum Theory*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Witz, Anne. 1992. *Professions and patriarchy, The International library of sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Yin, Robert K. 2003. *Case study research design and methods*. 3rd ed., *Applied social research methods series vol. 5*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Øde, O. Th. 1880. *Husflid og husindustri, Husflids-Bibliothek No. 1*. Kristiania: Malling.
- Østerud, Svein. 1998. Relevansen av begrepene "validitet" og "reliabilitet" i kvalitativ forskning. *Norsk pedagogisk tidsskrift* 1 (2):119-129.