



Master's thesis

NTNU  
Norwegian University of  
Science and Technology  
Faculty of Humanities  
Department of History and Classical Studies

Cecilie Mauseth

## Norway and the EU Education Programmes

Motivations for participation by Norwegian  
primary and lower secondary schools

Master's thesis in European Studies

Trondheim, November 2012

## Norway and the EU education programmes

*Motivations for participation by Norwegian primary and lower secondary schools*



## **Acknowledgements**

The writing of my master thesis is near its end. It has been a period filled with ups and downs, unhealthy quantities of coffee and tea, rounds of tendinitis, joy of achievement and also much frustration. There are a number of people I would like to thank for helping me along the way. I would like to thank my sister for always being calm and helpful every time I called her for technical support and other computer related questions. I would like to thank my mother for reading my drafts and answering school related questions, as well as for emotional and financial support. I would also like to thank my grandparents for all the help and support through the years, especially financially, so I could concentrate on my studies and not use even more time on additional work.

I would like to thank my advisor Kristian Steinnes for helpful comments, constructive feedback and support, as well as for answering my mails amazingly fast. I am thankful to the staff and people at IHK, for being understanding and helping me when I ended up on sick leave due to my arm, and Studentservice for lending med equipment so I did not ruin my arm completely.

I would like to thank all my friends for listening to my master thesis ravings, for supporting phone calls, welcomed diversions, and for dragging me along for a change of scenery when my studies became too consuming. I would also like to thank my fellow inhabitants of room 6381 at Dragvoll for talks over coffee, mutual support and for a great time in England.

My time at NTNU is coming to an end. It has been a time filled with knowledge, learning, fun and excitement, and I will always remember it with delight. Thank you.

Cecilie Mauseth

Trondheim, November 2012



# Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	7
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1 Current trends in education policy: lifelong learning and internationalization	9
1.2 Existing literature/previous research	11
<i>1.2.1 Norway, the EU and education policy</i>	11
<i>1.2.2 The EU and the Lisbon Strategy</i>	12
1.3 Research questions	15
1.4 Approach	16
1.5 Structure and main arguments	19
<b>2. Education policy in the EU</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1 Early beginnings	21
2.2 The 1980's and the internal market	22
2.3 Maastricht and the 1990s	24
<i>2.3.1 The European Dimension</i>	25
2.4 New momentum and Lifelong Learning	26
<i>2.4.1 The Lisbon Strategy</i>	27
<i>2.4.2 The Lifelong Learning programme</i>	29
<i>2.4.3 The OMC</i>	30
<i>2.4.4 Evaluation of the Lisbon Strategy</i>	31
2.5 Europe 2020	31
2.6 Future developments: Erasmus for all	32
2.7 The use of education policy in the EU	33
<b>3. Norwegian education policy</b>	<b>37</b>
3.1 Brief overview until the end of the Second World War	37
3.2 From the Second World War to the end of the 1980's	39
3.3 1987 to 2002: Reforms	40
3.4 2002-today: Reforms and LLL	40
<i>3.4.1 The Knowledge Promotion reform</i>	41

3.4.2 <i>Lifelong Learning</i>	43
3.5 International cooperation in Norwegian compulsory school	44
3.5.1 <i>International education cooperation beside the EU, which Norway takes part in</i>	45
3.6 The development of Norwegian education policy, and current trends and features	46
<b>4. Participation by Norwegian primary and lower secondary schools in the EU education programme</b>	49
4.1 The EEA Agreement	49
4.1.1 <i>How Norway is connected to the EU education policy: The EEA Agreement and programme cooperation</i>	50
4.1.2 <i>Before the EEA Agreement</i>	51
4.1.3 <i>The EEA Agreement and education</i>	52
4.2 The LLP	53
4.2.1 <i>The LLP and Norway</i>	53
4.2.2 <i>The organization of the LLP</i>	54
4.3 Internationalization of education in Norway	56
4.4 The Comenius programme, and participation by Norwegian primary and lower secondary schools	57
4.4.1 <i>Comenius partnerships</i>	58
4.4.2 <i>The use of the Comenius programme in Norway</i>	59
4.5 The future of EU education programme	61
4.6 Conclusion	62
4.6.1 <i>Motivations</i>	63
<b>5. Conclusions</b>	65
Bibliography	71

## List of Abbreviations

EC	European Community
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
EEC	European Economic Area
EFTA	European Free Trade Area
EU	European Union
EMU	Economic and Monetary Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
IEA	International Association for the Evaluation of Education Achievement
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies
LLL	Lifelong Learning
LLP	Lifelong Learning Programme
MT	My translation
NA	National Agencies
NMER	The Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research
NPM	New Public Management
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OMC	Open Method of Coordination
PIRLS	Progress in International Reading Literacy Study
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
R&D	Research and development
SEA	Single European Act
SIU	Senter for internasjonalisering av utdanning
SSB	Statistisk sentralbyrå
TIMSS	Trends in Mathematics and Science Study
VET	Vocational education & training





## **1. Introduction**

The EU has gradually and over time developed an education policy, a process that has gained momentum during the last two decades. This education policy is not directly implemented in the member states, but includes measures such as programme participation, and has in the last decades been directly linked to the fulfilment of EU strategies, the current being Europe 2020. Norway has through the EEA Agreement voluntarily taken part in this programme cooperation in the area of education since the early 1990s. This might be seen as an odd thing to do, due to Norway's hesitation to fully take part in the EU, and especially considering the important role of education in society. A country's education policy has a more elaborate function than just educating the younger part of the population. Education policy transmits cultural knowledge and values from one generation to the next, educates the country's future workforce, raise the children into becoming enlightened and well-functioning citizens, and helps a country to shape its policies for the future, just to name a few (Walkenhorst, 2008, p. 567). Since education policy carries with it all these functions, countries are reluctant to hand over control of these areas to the EU. It would also be difficult to completely harmonize the education systems in Europe, due to the huge diversity in national systems, which has been developed and adjusted to fit national needs and preferences for hundreds of years (Warleigh-Lack & Drachenberg, 2010, p. 219). Norway is no exception to this view, and sees education policy and the Norwegian education system as important. But despite this, Norway has chosen to participate in the EU education programmes. Therefore one might ask what motivations Norway has for taking part in this policy area.

### **1.1 Current trends in education policy: lifelong learning and internationalization**

A general trend in education policy since the middle of the 1990s, is the increasing focus on lifelong learning (LLL). This trend can be found both internationally, promoted by organizations such as the EU and the OECD, and nationally, in countries such as Norway. The basic idea of LLL is that learning should take place at all stages of a person's life, and that both formal and informal learning

are important(Green, 2002, p. 613). Learning society can be defined as a society where everyone has the equal opportunity to learn and receive education, no matter age or place(Green, 2002, p. 613). The EU has been using the idea of LLL as one of the means to reach the goals set in the Lisbon Strategy from 2000, and in the current Europe 2020 Strategy. The Lisbon Strategy had as a goal for Europe by 2010 to “become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion”(Rodrigues, 2009, p. 2). Education was seen to play an important part in reaching the goals in the strategy, and was also seen in terms of LLL. This continued in the current strategy, and covers both formal and informal education on all levels of the education sector(KD, 2011, p. 3). This also meant increased EU involvement in the education sector in the different member states through reforms, benchmarks and goals promoted in the strategies by the new method called the open method of coordination(OMC). With a LLL perspective, an increased emphasis has been on how learning at an early age influence the rest of your learning life, and the necessity of acquiring good basic skills to be able to benefit from later education(KD, 2007, p. 7). This is also one of the important aspects in the Norwegian reform of primary and secondary education called Knowledge Promotion.

In Norway, the concept of LLL was put on the political agenda in the 1990s, but the idea of adult education and to re-educate oneself existed before that(KD, 2007, p. 7). What was new was what one wanted to achieve with it, which was responding to changes in the working life, as well as a wish for more social inclusion(KD, 2007, p. 8). When the EU launched its Lisbon Strategy, Norway joined the plans for “Education and Training 2010”. Here, one of the goals was that the participating countries by 2006 should have implemented “coherent and comprehensive strategies for lifelong learning”(KD, 2007, p.8). Norway continued the participation in the EU's LLL strategy by joining the EU education programme for 2007-2013, called the Lifelong Learning Programme(LLP). Today the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research(NMER) states that the EU is Norway's most important cooperation partner in the area of knowledge, and participation in these programmes are important for internationalization and mobility(KD, 2011, p. 2).

An other trend in education policy is internationalization. Internationalization in education can be seen as a way to deal with the challenges and opportunities in connection to globalization, and is by the Norwegian government defined as “the exchange of ideas, knowledge, goods and services between nations over established boarders”(St.meld.nr. 14(2008-2009), p. 6, my translation(mt)). In education, this takes the shape of “integrating an international, intercultural and global dimension in goals, organization and action”(St.meld.nr. 14(2008-2009), p. 6, mt). In Norway, this aspect was previously linked to higher education, but primary and secondary

education was included through Report 14 to the Storting(2008-2009)(p, 7). This report also separated between internationalization and internationalization at home. Internationalization is here understood to involve mobility and traveling(SIU, 2012e, p. 26). A basic definition of the later is that it does not involve mobility, but involves activities at the local institution or school(SIU, 2012e, p. 6). A broader definition of internationalization at home is that it involves the teaching of themes and competence goals in the subject curriculums, and ways to involve resources in the classroom such as multi cultural pupils, or the local society(SIU, 2012e, p. 6). Research conducted by SIU suggests that separating between internationalization and internationalization at home not necessarily makes sense since the two aspects is hard to clearly separate, and that it is a distinction that is not clearly understood in Norwegian schools(SIU, 2012e, pp. 29-30). Since it was linked to compulsory education quite recently, and since the distinction of the two terms is not well understood, the term internationalization will in this thesis be used to include both aspects.

## **1.2 Existing literature/previous research:**

### *1.2.1 Norway, the EU and education policy*

Existing literature on the subject of Norway, the EU and primary and secondary education is rather limited. Previous research on the EU and the Norwegian education sector has up until now mostly focused on higher education and research. Although some part of this research also might be applied on the compulsory school sector, this is not always the case. The literature that do exist on the subject is mostly published by institutions such as the Norwegian ministry of education and research(NMER) and Senter for institusjonalisering av utdanning(SIU). In 2010 SIU got its mandate extended to also function as a service and competence centre for internationalization in compulsory education(SIU, 2011, p. 29.) In connection to this, SIU has in the last couple of years conducted inquiries and published reports on primary and secondary education in Norway, with a focus on internationalization and international education cooperation, including the EU. These are some of very few sources on the subject, and have given useful insight into how this type of cooperation takes place. Aspects on the state of the Norwegian school system, especially compared to other countries is well documented in reports published by the likes of the OECD and the EU. Each year the OECD publish “education at a glance” a report with indicators on different topics related to education, involving OECD members from all over the world(OECD, 2012).

One of the few to have carried out research on Norwegian education policy in an international perspective is Gustav E. Karlssen. He considers that the most resent education reforms represents an increasing adaptation and standardization of the Norwegian education system towards

adjusting to international trends and standards(2006, p. 27). Norway's participation in the EU education programmes has according to Karlsen led to internationalization of our education system and adaptation to EU policies in the area(2006, p. 235). Karlsen also perceives EU education policy as becoming more and more subordinate to economy as a policy area and sees it as a problem that education is viewed as an instrumental means to ensure increased competitiveness and economic growth, paying less attention to other important aspects of education(2006, pp. 231, 236).

A topic that has been the subject of research is whether the EU has influence on Norwegian education policy. Both Karlsen and Tymon Bugajski argues that the EU has an influence on Norwegian education policy through the promotion of central goals, and the follow up on national implementation. Bugajski states that the EU because of the OMC have become a supplier of terms in the shaping of Norwegian education policy(Bugajski, 2009). Because this often happens indirectly, he calls this influence definition power, and that even while the decisions are taken at a national level, the scope of action has been given through the OMC(Bugajski, 2009). Karlsen goes as far as claiming that the EU, through setting the central goals, and the follow up on national implementation inside a developed system of management by objectives, is the “institution that most directly has an impact on important parts of our education”(2006, pp. 219, 214, mt). Authors such as Alfred O. Telhaug are concerned with how international influences in general influence the Norwegian education sector. He asks whether the distinctive character of the Norwegian education sector has been weakened by the changes in resent years, and been replaced by a more international profile(2005, p. 166). He suggests that signs of this include looking towards other countries to see how they are doing, and getting involved in international studies and reports published by the likes of OECD(Telhaug, 2005, p. 166). As Tove A. Baune he argues that financial motivations more and more dominates decision made concerning the education sector at the expense of cultural and pedagogical matters(Telhaug, 2005, p. 57, Baune, 2007, p. 202).

### *1.2.2 The EU and the Lisbon Strategy*

The EU education policy has been the subject of research, and there was a pronounced upswing just prior to, and after the launch of the Lisbon Strategy and the following programme development. Most of the articles refers to education policy in relation to the Lisbon Strategy itself, or issues relating to it, the two most prominent being the LLL, and the OMC and its effect on the relations between the member states and the EU. LLL has been the subject of research in different contexts, for instance its historical development and in connection to organizations such as the OECD, UNESCO and the EU. This thesis has, due to its area of focus, only viewed LLL in connection to the EU and member states, and not in a historical context or in connection to other organizations.

LLL can trace its theoretical roots back to the 1930s(Green, 2002, p. 612), and with an upswing in the 1970s especially promoted by UNESCO, but the current discourse stems from the 1990s, when UNESCO, the OECD and the EU started promoting it, each publishing key documents(Dehmel, 2006, pp. 51-52). The discourse from the 1990s shifted the policy ground by stressing “lifelong learning in a learning society”, rather than education and school(Green, 2002, p. 612). Andy Green emphasizes three reasons for the rise of LLL dominance. These are demographic change, global economic restructuring and cultural globalization(2002, pp. 613-619). LLL is then seen as a way to deal with these changes and possible challenges in society. Not everyone finds all these aspects to be equally prominent in connection to the EU. Julia Preece also sees the driving force behind an interest in LLL amongst others to be global competitiveness, demographic changes, changing technologies and social inclusion, but in an European context economic competitiveness, technology and learning of skills are most dominant(2006, pp. 308, 314). Anne Pirrie considers that the LLL has been taken over by economic policy, and used to educate people for employment and provide them with the competences needed for this(2005, p. 112). Alexander Kleibrink argues that in connection to the European framework for LLL, the economic aspect became the dominant one(2011, p. 80). Alexandra Dehmel states that most new activities in the EU, for instance programmes and initiatives, are implemented under the banner of LLL, and used by the EU to justify and summarize its policies and values, and wonders if this is part of a comprehensive LLL strategy, or just used a concept adaptable to every need(2006, p. 58). Others see the current approach to LLL in the EU as a hybrid concept trying to integrate many different ideals which are all central to EU policy in this area(Lee, Thayer & Madyun, 2008, p. 459)

The Lisbon Strategy itself is seen as both to improve economic growth and development in the EU, and to better the lives of the people living there and promote social cohesion, but the economic perspective is seen to surpass the other one. Authors such as Pirrie and Palle Rasmussen both question whether both these aims are possible, and sees the economic aspect as more dominant than the social aspect(Pirrie, 2005, pp. 109-110, Rasmussen, 2008, p. 664). Hubert Ertl finds that the discourse around economic competitiveness has changed new EU policies in education and training, for instance with the emphasis on indicators, benchmarks and quality controls(2006, p. 5). Heiko Walkenhorst views education policy in a longer historical perspective, and concludes that it has been a shift in policy aims from pro-integrationist to a pro-market orientation, and towards an inter- or transgovernmental mode of policy-making(2008, p. 567). Ertl also sees policy development after Lisbon to be build on intergovernmental legal foundations, “that follow the rationale dictated by the concept of global economic competitiveness”(2006, p. 20). Luce Pepin also considers EU education policy in a historical perspective, and sees the inclusion of education in the

Lisbon Agenda as a continuation of developments that had already taken place, a process which was strengthened by the OMC(2011, p. 25).

Another prominent researched area in connection to education policy is relations between the EU and the member states, and which possible changes have been caused by the OMC and the Lisbon Strategy. Education policy is still part of the states sovereignty, but for instance Kay Livingston argues that by using the OMC and its focus on goals, benchmarks and monitoring of progress to fulfill strategies, the EU has increased its influence on education policy in the member states(Livingston, 2003, p. 597). Risto Rinne argues that supranational organizations in recent years have become more influential in the education policy shaping at the national level, especially through standard setting, and the nation states have equally lost power and control over definition of standards and features of their education(Rinne, 2008, p. 666). Other scholars find that while this method do promote reforms, and fulfillment of common goals and targets, it still secures the sovereignty of member states in this area. Lange & Alexiadou claims that one of the techniques OMC relies on is policy learning, and that any impact of EU level policy learning “is co-constructed by both the European Commission and the member states”(2010, p. 443). Rik de Ruiter finds that while the Commission played a prominent role in the development of the OMC in education, the OMC itself was seen as a compromise on the preferences between positive and reluctant member states to take part in this policy area at EU level(2010, p. 169). Hodson & Maher sees the OMC in a political sense to be an alternative to traditional governance methods, and allows for both individual responses by the member states as well as coordinated ones prompted by the EU, which has an emphasize on policy learning(2001, p. 740). Livingston wonders if such cooperation and collaboration can have a positive effect, making the states evaluate and reflect on methods they use and if it is effective or not(2003, p. 589). Ertl on the other hand argues that the problems connected to accomplishing the Lisbon goals suggests that the impact of EU education policies and programmes in the member states to be limited(2006, p. 5). The potential standardization of education can be affected by the interpretation and implementation of the different member states, “the different current educational situations in the countries, as well as by the historical and traditional context of education in the respective countries”(Ertl & Phillips, 2006, p. 86).

Considering the amount of previous research, it becomes clear that while in certain areas some relevant research could be found, this is significantly more difficult in others. While separate areas of EU education policy have been explored, none of them combines with LLL and Norwegian primary and secondary education. Previous research in connection to EU and Norwegian education policy have mostly focused on higher education cooperation, and to a lesser extent also on vocational training.

### **1.3 Research questions**

This thesis focuses on primary and secondary school in Norwegian education sector, an area that has received less attention in connection to EU cooperation. But by participating in the LLP, Norway is also involved in the goals of the Lisbon strategy, as well as EU's take on LLL and the OMC. In the previous research on the EU education policy, the prominent view is that the progress and development in this policy area is economically motivated, and connected to the effects of globalization. It is also argued that while education policy remains a part of national sovereignty, the EU has gained influence on this national policy area by the use of programme participation and the OMC as an agenda setting role by setting goals and targets and evaluation of the performance of the countries in this process. The question is whether this can be said about the participation in the EU education programmes by Norwegian primary and secondary school, and whether the motivations of the Norwegian governments for such participation coincides with those of the EU.

The goal of this thesis is to find out why Norway has decided to take part in the EU education programmes, in primary and lower secondary school, and whether this correlates to the motivations of the EU. This level of the Norwegian school system is not the one most obviously associated with the EU and programme participation, but such participation is nevertheless a feature in the education of many Norwegian pupils. It is also a level of the education sector that has received less attention when research on the EU and Norwegian education policy cooperation has been conducted. Since LLL has become such a prominent feature in education policy both in Norway and in the EU during the time Norway has taken part in the EU's education programmes, emphasis must also be given to LLL in this context.

To be able to analyze this matter, several interlinked subjects need to be examined. Firstly, how and why did the EU's education policy develop, and what has the EU tried to achieve with this policy area? Exploring these questions will see education policy from an EU perspective, and give information about what the EU's motivations was for developing such a policy. It will also to an extent attempt to clarify what is expected of the countries participating in these programmes. Secondly, how has the Norwegian education policy developed, and what are the most prominent trends and features today? This will look at education policy from a Norwegian perspective, and explore how this policy area has developed, especially in the last twenty years, to adapt to new trends and expectations. Thirdly, how is Norway connected to the EU education policy, how is it organized, and what has been the motivations for Norway's participation in this area? This will link the EU level and the Norwegian level, and examine the nature of programme cooperation in primary and secondary school. By studying these questions, new light will be shed on the main



question in this thesis, which is why the Norwegian governments have chosen to take part in the EU education policy and programme cooperation in primary and lower secondary school, and whether this correlates with the motivations of the EU.

#### **1.4 Approach**

In this thesis, the research questions have mainly been examined by considering written sources. By choosing this approach, insight to the research questions could be found studying relevant official documents, previous academic research and reports conducted by official bodies and other serious organizations. Due to the nature of the research questions, which involved development of large policy areas and official motivations by big entities such as the EU and the Norwegian government for participation in such areas, examining official documents and previous existing research and reports on the matter was perceived as a sensible way to go.

A very basic definition of a document is that it is “a written text”, but this definition can become blurred when considering objects such as photographs, maps and coins(Scott, 1990, pp. 12-13). An advantage when studying documents is that the analysis do not affect the document itself. Documents exists independently, that is, that they were produced for some other purpose than your particular research(Robson, 2007, p. 28). This means that one has to be aware of the author of the documents, as well as its authenticity, nature, content and context, and see what effect this might have on the document, and on what one might want to find out from it(Robson, 2007, pp. 29-30). To solve this one can either combine documentary analysis with an other data collection method, or one might supplement with comparisons of a wide range of other documents. John Scott proposes four criteria when considering a document: its authenticity, its credibility(which involves excluding errors and distortions), its representativeness(is the evidence typical of its kind or not), and its meaning(is the evidence clear and comprehensible)(1990, p. 6). Scott applies these criteria to documents in social research, many of which is of old origin, but they are nonetheless useful to have in mind when considering more temporary documents. The purpose as well as the characteristics of the author also need to be questioned when considering a document(Robson, 2007, p. 89, McCulloch, 2004. p. 42). Documents can also be seen as “social and historical constructs” which involves considering how and why it was produced, and also by whom(McCulloch, 2004, p. 6).

It is common to divide documents into primary and secondary sources. In the area of historic research, primary documents is the historic sources themselves, for instance old documents, letters, newspapers and so on, while secondary sources are articles and research carried out by others about a topic involving the primary ones(McCulloch, 2004, p. 30, Rapley, 2007, pp16-17). This

distinction can however in many circumstances become blurred, for instance in connection to autobiographies which is written many years after the events described and which tries to analyze changes over time, or changes due to editing (McCulloch, 2004, p. 32). In this thesis, I have primarily used sources and documents published by official actors such as the EU and the Norwegian government, and includes official documents such as white papers, council decisions, reports and propositions to the Storting and so on.

This thesis is based on an approach to documentary analysis, where one begin with the research questions or problem area, for then to find documents which may provide some answers (Robson, 2007, p. 29). To examine the research questions, data bases such as EUR-LEX concerning the EU, and regjeringen.no concerning Norway hold documents useful for this work. Both the EU and the Norwegian government including the NMER have easily accessible databases and also informative webpages linking to relevant documents based on topic, which were a help when finding and selecting relevant documents. These were supplemented with research articles and other secondary literature, provided both by the library and by journal databases online, which were also judged by the same criteria.

Online documents can both be a helpful resource, but have their own challenges. On the one hand the internet give easy and extensive access to a large amount of documents and sources from all over the world (McCulloch, 2004, p. 34). But one must also consider why they have been published on the internet, and by whom. One example of this is official internet pages by governments, corporations and international organizations, which publish everything from speeches, to working documents, reports and finished official documents. For instance can these have been published to put an event or a person in a favorable light, or give a certain spin to a specific issue (McCulloch, 2004, pp. 38-39). While looking at such documents, it is important to note that what is stated is what is ideal, what one wants to achieve, and might not necessarily reflect what actually happened. There might also be other motivations and other things one wants to achieve with certain policies and programmes, that is not necessarily directly stated in the documents. The policy could also be motivated or affected by cooperation in other policy areas, or because of relations between current parties. To take all such variables into consideration provides for quite an extensive amount of work, and which is outside the reach of this thesis. But to get a better insight into these possible indirect motivations, reports published by the EU and the Norwegian government, as well as research articles have been considered in order to understand the historical context, current political situations and so on.

The official documents selected, especially those concerning the EU covers a long period of time, and are rather extensive. They give useful insight over a long time period, and show possible

changes during that time. But some can also be very general in tone and content, which can make it hard figuring out the essence of the document, and the relevance of the document itself can be hard to grasp without putting it into context. Therefore the official documents by the EU is used together with articles and previous research, both to put them into context and to grasp their essence, as well as to give an insight into the development of an EU education policy. Official documents published by the EU are most notably by the European Commission and the European Council. The development of education policy in the EU, especially after the launch of the Lisbon strategy and the inclusion of a LLL strategy has received increasing attention from researchers, making it easy to find relevant research and articles.

The part of this thesis concerning Norwegian education policy and primary and lower secondary education, is based on primary sources like reports and propositions to the Storting connected to the development and evaluations of the new National Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion<sup>1</sup>, as well as secondary sources concerning the historical development of this policy area. The state of the Norwegian schools sector has received much attention, which also includes the performance and learning of Norwegian pupils, as well as comparing the results with those in other countries. All this have been documented through both national tests and international tests, evaluations and reports, published by the OECD, the EU, the SSB and others. These have also given useful insight, although not all of it have been directly used in the thesis.

The part of this thesis concerning the EEA and Norwegian participating in the EU education programmes, has mainly been based on looking at reports to the Storting and reports published by SIU. Three reports have been chosen to analyze the views and motivations by the Norwegian governments to take part in EU education programmes. These are St.prp.nr 100(1991-1992), the ratification of the EEA Agreement, St.prp.nr 36(2006-2007), concerning the Norwegian participation in the LLP and its implementation in the EEA Agreement, and St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009) a report to the Storting concerning internationalization of education in Norway. These particular three documents have been selected because they all are central to the topic of the EU, Norway and education policy, and that they all consider the Norwegian school sector towards an international setting. They also, due to the years of publication, give an insight to the development and changes in motivations to such participation. Concerning Norwegian participation in education programme for primary and secondary education, reports and evaluations by SIU have been a useful source of information. It is however important to note that due to the small amount of research conducted on this topic, the reports published by SIU became quite prominent when considering participation in EU education programmes by Norwegian primary and lower secondary schools.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kunnskapsløftet

This has been counterbalanced by seeking out statistics from the SSB concerning the Norwegian school system in general to put it into a general Norwegian school context.

### **1.5 Structure and main arguments**

This thesis is divided into three chapters. The first main chapter focuses on the development of education policy in the EU. It argues that this development happened gradually and over time, closely related to bigger trends in the community. For instance, although official cooperation began taking place at EU level in the 1970s, education policy did not get a legal foundation until the Maastricht treaty. Education policy has increasingly been viewed as a means to reach goals in overall strategies of the EU, which is most apparent in the Lisbon Strategy and the Europe 2020 Strategy. This takes place through participation in initiatives and different programmes developed by the EU, and does officially not involve transfer of sovereignty of national education policy to the EU. The use of OMC however, includes the use of goals initiatives, benchmarks and evaluation of national performances set by the EU, and previous research differ in how great this influence national education policy. It will be argued that education policy always has been linked to benefit both social and economical developments in the EU, and to bring people in Europe closer together. Developments in the last decade however, indicates that education policy increasingly is linked to economic development and to deal with effects of globalization.

The second main chapter of this thesis focuses on the development of the Norwegian education policy, and consider what currently is the most prominent trends. It argues that the development of Norwegian education policy is signified by the gradual development of an unified comprehensive school for all, with the extension of compulsory school length to include secondary education, as well as to include the right to upper secondary education. The last two decades have featured many changes, including several reforms and restructuring of the general and the subject curriculums. It also argues that currently the most prominent features of Norwegian education policy includes the focus on LLL, the goal oriented approach to learning and measuring of the pupils progress through tests and evaluations, as well as increased involvement in international education participation, for instance by taking part in big scale tests and promoting participation in mobility programmes through organizations such as the EU and OECD.

The third main chapter of this thesis focuses on how Norway is connected to the EU education policy, how this is organized, using participation in the Comenius programme and partnerships by Norwegian primary and lower secondary schools as example, as well as what the Norwegian motivations for such participation is. It demonstrates that Norway takes part in the EU education programmes on a voluntary basis through the EEA Agreement, based in participation

outside the four freedoms. At the EU level Norway has access to the programme committee, expert and working groups and clusters. At the national level this is organized through SIU, which functions as a national agency(NA). It will be argued that participation in this education policy has by Norwegian governments always been seen as beneficial for the economic sector and for the individuals involved, but since the EEA agreement the motivations evolved and became more organized and goal oriented. It will be argued that participation in the EU education programmes today is seen as a means to help Norway deal with a globalized world system, directing the education sector in a more international direction. But the original motivations of mobility of students and closer cooperation between institutions, to promote language learning and to experience new cultures, to benefit individuals and the national economy still remains. These have been connected with LLL strategies, with its learning of basic skills and learning throughout life to help individuals, society and the economy facing the challenges in a world economy and a more globalized world. To a large extent this correlates to goals and motivations in EU strategies and education programmes.

## **2. Education policy in the EU**

Education policy is a policy area in the EU that has evolved gradually and over time. From a non-existent legal basis, this policy area today plays a part in the development strategies of the EU and in the process of developing a knowledge based economy. This chapter will focus on how the EU's education policy developed, why it happened, and what the EU has tried to achieve with this policy area. By looking at the development of an education policy in connection to contemporary events and actions, it will be argued that the development of an education policy in the EU is closely linked to the integration process and with other events taking place at the time. By looking at the different education programmes, and strategies such as the Lisbon Strategy and Europe 2020, it will be argued that the EU increasingly has considered this policy area to be important, especially in the last two decades, and through the use of programme participation used education policy as a means to reach goals set in their overall strategies. It will also be argued that education policy always has been linked to benefit both social and economical developments in the EU, and to bring people in Europe closer together, but that developments in the last decade indicates that education policy more and more is linked to economic development and to deal with effects of globalization.

### **2.1 Early beginnings**

The EU has its legal basis in the Rome treaty, and while most of the policy areas in the EU is based on this form of legitimization, it is not true for all current areas of cooperation. While vocational education and training(VET) is mentioned, especially in article 128 of the Treaty of Rome, where "The Community agreed to to create principles for a common policy in this field", education policy is not mentioned at all(Ertl, 2006, p. 6). Rather it developed as a policy area gradually and over time. From the 1950's to around 1970 there was some focus on vocational education, but almost none concerning general education. In this period the EEC was being established as a new organization, and with a focus on the economic aspects since it was mainly viewed as a customs union. Later in the 60's there was a period of almost standstill in connection to the empty chair

crisis(Dinan, 2004, p. 336).

The 1970's was a period troubled with economic and social crisis, not least because of the oil crisis and the following consequences for the national economies, including high unemployment and social unrest(Pepin, 2007, p. 123). The Community tried to address some of these problems, especially high unemployment amongst young people, and in their search for a solution they also focused on education and vocational training. The Janne Report that came in 1973 reviewed these areas, and promoted the creation of the Education Committee in 1974(Ertl, 2006, p. 8). The ministers of education from the different member states had an impact on the development process since they began meeting in 1972, and was involved from the start. In 1974 they agreed on a resolution that confirmed the necessity of a European cooperation in the area of education, and this committee also played a part in setting up the 1976 Action programme for Education(Karlsen, 1994, s. 68). This Action programme for Education developed ideas first promoted in the resolution two years earlier. The main focus areas included amongst others: promotion of closer relations between education systems in Europe, cooperation in the field of higher education, teaching of foreign languages, compilation of statistics and documentation on education in Europe, and work to achieve equal opportunity for free access to all forms of education. It was also stated that developments in this policy area at community level would draw on the experiences and activities of member states(European Council, 1976).

The rest of the decade was used to implement this action programme, often through different projects. According to Hubert Ertl, work in this policy area was slow, since the Community policies had limited impact on national systems "because of the modest and fragmented nature of Community projects, and(...)the unclear legal foundations(that) allowed the Member States to interpret and implement Community policies selectively"(2006, p. 9). It is true that education policy in this period had an unclear legal foundation, with the documents referring to meetings and resolutions, and not to one of the treaties. Although it had come as an initiative from the Community level, and it was supported by the member states through the Council, the projects did not have an overall coherent structure, but aimed at addressing specific issues. This all contributed to inconsistencies between the participation of the different countries. Still, this was the beginning of developing an education policy for the EU.

## **2.2 The 1980's and the internal market**

The early 1980's was a period of frustration and stagnation for the community. For instance did a new oil crisis in the late 1970's lead to a new economic downturn. The council meetings were dominated by discussions over the British budgetary question, and accession of new poor member

states such as Greece, Spain and Portugal gave the Community new challenges to deal with. But this situation changed in the mid 1980's with a new wave of initiatives led by the newly elected Commission President Jaques Delors, the French president Mitterand and the German chancellor Kohl. Intergovernmental conferences were held, which led to the Single European Act(SEA) and the realization of the internal market. The work on an Economic and Monetary Union(EMU) was also initiated. All of these new projects gave new momentum to the integration process, and led to developments in other policy areas of the EU as well, including education policy.

The beginning of a legal foundation for education policy inside the EU, began with a court ruling by the EU Court of Justice in 1985. In the Gravier case, a young French student named Françoise Gravier went against the city of Liege concerning an extra tuition fee that was demanded of her while she was studying there(Case 293/83). The Court ruled that it was discriminatory to demand different fees from non-nationals than nationals from the host country concerning vocational training, and it also stated that EU laws on vocational policy was legally binding for all member states(Case 293/83). The Court also interpreted article 128 as to include higher education, which meant that this area from then on was considered to be part of the competencies of the EC(Pepin, 2007, s. 122). By this court ruling the EC was given a clearer legal foundation for community action in these policy areas.

The EU education programmes benefitted from the renewed momentum in the integration process. Several new programmes were set up, each with its own goals and group of participants. One of these was the ERASMUS programme, which promoted exchange and mobility in higher education. Established in 1987, the idea behind it and similar programmes was that exchange and cooperation across countries would improve the quality of education, as well as bring the European countries closer together(Karlsen 1994, pp. 77-78). COMETT was another programme which aimed at enhancing the quality of vocational training, and strengthening the connections and cooperation between education and industry(Karlsen, 1994, p. 76). Lingua was a programme promoting foreign language learning, both in schools and towards the workplace, and targeted all levels of school learning(Karlsen, 1994, p. 77). EURYDICE was an information network and a database over the education systems in Europe, used to get information and carry out analysis(Karlsen, 1994, p. 82). These four programmes briefly mentioned here can be used as examples of how the EC aimed at fulfilling different parts of the education action plan that had been agreed upon in the 1970's, which included cooperation in higher education, foreign language learning, and compilation of statistical material. The EC tried to reach the agreed goals in the action programme by participation in, and cooperation through programmes, and did not impose EC policy in this area on the member states to promote closer integration in this area.



### **2.3 Maastricht and the 1990s**

The 1990's was a decade full of changes for the EU. The Maastricht, Amsterdam and Nice Treaties were negotiated, the internal market and EMU were implemented, Sweden, Finland and Austria became members of the EU, and the institutions of the EU went through reforms. The beginning of the decade also saw the end of the cold war, and the EU changed their relations with the former Soviet states. But the different changes in the Union did not just go smoothly. The implementation of EMU for instance had problems along the way, the institutional changes were the subject of debates, and older member states such as Denmark and the UK argued that certain changes went too far and opted out.

Education policy in the EU first got its judicial foundation with article 126 in the Maastricht Treaty. It states that:

"The Community shall contribute to the development of quality education by encouraging cooperation between Member States and, if necessary, by supporting and supplementing their action, while fully respecting the responsibility of the Member States for the content of teaching and the organization of education systems and their cultural and linguistic diversity." (European Council, 1992).

Based on this article, the role of the Community can be understood to be "limited to supporting and supplementing the actions of, and encouraging cooperation between, member states"(Ertl, 2006, s. 10). This treaty also confirmed the use of the principle of subsidiarity in connection to this judicial area(Pepin, 2007, s. 125). So as while the Community promoted cooperation and coordination in this area, the member states guarded their autonomy with the use of the subsidiarity principle. Legally and officially member states kept their legitimacy over their education policy, but they did implement programmes and policies adopted by the EU, which meant setting up new structures and organizations at the national level(Ertl, 2006, p. 10). So in a way the EU increased their impact on member states education policy in a more unofficial way.

The beginning of the 1990's also saw the reorganization and reshaping of the existing education policy of the EU, both in connection with the implementation of the internal market, and also as a response to reports on how the education programmes were working(Ertl & Phillips 2006, s. 79, Karlsen, 1994, p. 109). The earlier action programme concerning education policy from the 1970's was replaced by two new and more extensive action programmes. Both had their legal basis in the Maastricht Treaty, and they emphasized the importance of human resources to achieve both economic and social goals, as well as to promote the use of new technology in education and

also to try and increase mobility within the EU(Karlsen, 1994, p. 113, Ertl, 2006, s. 13).

These new action programmes were named LEONARDO and SOCRATES. LEONARDO was to focus on the area of vocational education and training, and included older programmes like COMETT and parts of LINGUA, as well as other programmes such as PETRA, FORCE and IRIS. Some of the programme's main goals were to improve the quality of the training and promote innovation(Karlsen 1994, p. 115). The second action programme was SOCRATES, covering general education on every education level from primary school to higher education in universities, but with an emphasis on higher education(Karlsen, 1994, p. 116). This programme included programmes like ERASMUS, parts of LINGUA, EURYDICE and ARION. Concerning primary and secondary education, SOCRATES especially promoted cooperation between schools from different member states, with a goal to promote mobility, foreign language learning and better knowledge and understanding of European culture amongst pupils(Karlsen, 1994, p. 117).

Both of these action programmes also played a role in the attempt to create a European identity and citizenship, which included promoting a European dimension in education(Karlsen, 1994, p. 113).

### *2.3.1 The European Dimension*

The term appeared already in 1973 in the Janne Report, but as a concept it was first properly specified in 1988(Ertl & Phillips, 2006, p. 83). The European Dimension aimed to make people aware of their European identity “and to prepare them to take part in the economic and social development of the Community”(Ertl & Phillips, 2006, p. 83). The European Dimension has also been termed as a “glue” which were hoped to hold the EU together, and make the people living in the different member states feel a belonging, and a sense of community towards the EU, despite the vast differences in economy, culture, geography and political history(Karlsen, 1994, p. 89). Education policy was seen as a means to promote this European Dimension. The promotion of a European identity was a debated one, with different opinions over what it should contain, how extensive it should be, and how to promote it. Especially linking it to education has caused much debate since the 1970's, and delayed work in this area many times, with for instance cancelation of meetings and member states not showing up(Karlsen 1994, p. 92). In the 1980's, this took the shape of emphasis on foreign language learning, student mobility, and the encouragement from the EC to include a European Dimension in the national curriculums. The learning of other European countries, cultures and of common European history was hoped to strengthen a European identity, and make the people living there feel a closer connection to Europe in a similar way as to how they already felt for their nation states(Karlsen, 1994, p. 94). Other work on a European identity at the

time included the promotion of European symbols such as the flag, anthem, day, passports and so on (Shore, 2000, pp. 46-48).

The 1993 Green Paper “the European Dimension of Education” aimed at promoting a European identity in people in Europe, especially the young ones through the education sector (Ertl, 2006, p. 8). It was also intended as a focus of discussion regarding the possibilities concerning education policy that lay in article 126 of the Maastricht Treaty (European Commission, 1993a, p. 13). It was stated that development of a European Dimension of education should be seen on the background of the “new economic, social and cultural environment (European Commission, 1993a, p. 3). A European Dimension in connection to education policy was seen as a contribution to the promotion of European citizenship, opportunity to improve the quality of education, and a way to prepare “young people for their integration into society and for a better transition to working life” (European Commission, 1993a, pp. 6-7). The green paper also states that after the implementation of the SEA, “the inclusion of a European Dimension in education became a necessity” (European Commission, 1993a, p. 17).

The European Dimension had a problem with a lack of a clear definition, as well as lack of suggestions over how to put it into practice, which contributed to the failure of influencing education in the member states (Ertl & Phillips, 2006, p. 84). Gustav Karlsen states that education has been subordinate to the economic motivations of the EU, and that education had a supporting function “in relation to the EC as a economical, liberalistic, supranational project” (1994, p. 101).

## **2.4 New momentum and Lifelong Learning**

Throughout the 90’s there was an increased focus on education in the EU, and how to use this policy area as a way to reach different goals set by the Union. One example of this is the 1993 White Paper on “Growth, Competitiveness and Employment”, which analyzed the challenges the Union would be faced with towards the 21<sup>st</sup> century (European Commission, 1993b, p. 9). Problems such as unemployment, competitiveness and growth were analyzed, and education and training policies were seen as part of the solution to these problems. Emphasis was given to education and training throughout a person’s life, making lifelong learning an overall objective (European Commission, 1993b, p. 119-120).

1996 was named the European year of Lifelong Learning by the European Parliament and the Council. Just prior to this The Commission released a white paper on “Teaching and Learning. Towards the learning society” (European Commission, 1995, p. 1). Both these initiatives were meant to launch a debate concerning the area of education and training, and address concerns for the future of the Community. Here the challenges facing the Community were stipulated, as well as the

possible solutions that could be promoted through this policy area. The first challenge was the impact of the information society, and how the working sector was changing due to new technologies and production methods(European Commission, 1995, p. 6). As some kinds of work now could be done by machines, what was demanded of the employees, as well as the skills needed, also changed. The second challenge mentioned in the paper was the impact of internationalization of the economy in the EU, with the “freedom of movement for capital, goods and services”(European Commission, 1995, p. 7). The last challenge was the impact of scientific and technological knowledge, the impact this might have on industry and progress, but also the lack of knowledge about this in the general population(European Commission, 1995, p. 8). These three challenges were all linked to industry and employment in the member states, and the response to them, the paper states, “entails a radical shake-up of European society”(European Commission, 1995, p. 9).

This white paper saw two main responses to deal with these challenges, which both were to “give everyone access to a broad base of knowledge and to build up their abilities for employment and economic life”(European Commission, 1995, p. 9). The first response was to focus on providing everyone with a broad knowledge base. The second was to develop everyone's employability and capacity for economic life, which included competence in skills such as reading, writing, arithmetic, foreign language learning and technical knowledge, as well as give everyone access to training throughout life(European Commission, 1995, p. 18). The paper also stated that human resources was the EU's main economic asset, and that Europe must invest in education to meet the challenges ahead, including developments in the labour market and demographic changes(European Commission, 1995, p. 28). Promoting the European Dimension was seen as a “necessity for efficiency in the face of internationalization and to avoid the risk of a watered-down European society”(European Commission, 1995, p. 31).

#### *2.4.1 The Lisbon Strategy*

The Lisbon Strategy, which stemmed from the European Council in March 2000, was a result of the EU trying to find a solution to rising challenges such as globalization, aging populations, changes in technology and other issues seen as threats to EU development(Rodrigues, 2009, p. 1). It was an economic and social strategy for the EU covering the next ten years, that set a goal for the EU “to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion”(Rodrigues, 2009, p. 2). By reaching this goal, the EU would have an advantage in the global market, and possibly manage to gain on countries like the USA and Japan, that right now are the leading

knowledge-based economies in the world. It promoted “greater coordination of policies on all levels”, which meant that relevant policy areas connected to the fulfillment of the strategy was strengthened and developed towards an overall approach and coordination towards fulfilling the goals set by the strategy (Pepin, 2007, pp. 127-128). This involved policy areas such as innovation, research & development, education, employment and social inclusion (Rodrigues, 2009, p. 3).

After the Council meeting in Lisbon, a memorandum on LLL was published by the Commission. Here LLL was directly linked to the creation of a knowledge-based economy and society, and it was emphasized that LLL “must become the guiding principle for provisions and participation across the full continuum of learning contexts” (European Commission, 2000, p. 3). It was stated that a new approach to education and training was needed, due to the economic and social changes in Europe (European Commission, 2000, p. 4). LLL was also seen as having aims to promote active citizenship, and to promote employability (European Commission, 2000, p. 5). These ideas were further developed in Commission communication which was published a year later, giving LLL the objectives of “personal fulfilment, active citizenship, social inclusion and employability”, and should include the “whole spectrum of formal, non-formal and informal learning” (European Commission, 2001, pp. 9, 3). Beside the reasons for LLL listed in the previous documents, investment in human capital was seen as important to gain a competitive advantage, especially considering the current economic situation in the world (European Commission, 2001, p. 6). But this communication also stressed the fact that LLL was about much more than economy. It was to promote inclusiveness, tolerance and democracy in the member states, and give the citizens the possibility to “realize their ambitions, and to participate in building a better society” (European Commission, 2001, p. 7).

Compared to the developing LLL approach in the 1990s, this new strategy had an increased focus on the economic value of education, and to a lesser extent on “the identity-creating potential of education”, and on the European Dimension, which had been more prominent in the previous decades (Walkenhorst, 2008, p. 577). Education was, besides to help achieve economic growth and development, also to be used to achieve things such as better social cohesion and employability. But which of these goals that were most dominant, is another matter. People with jobs and an education, and who have the possibility to re-educate themselves will have a greater chance to contribute to growth, competitiveness and innovation, and to become economic contributors in their nation states through taxation, instead of being dependent on social welfare for survival. But it would also lead to higher standards of living and improve the life of individuals.

Since the development of the Lisbon Strategy and a LLL perspective gave renewed emphasis on education and its connection to knowledge based society, EU policy in this area

underwent reform and changes as well. Mandated by the heads of state and government in Lisbon, a strategy document on the future objectives of the education systems was developed, which was later called Education and Training 2010. Here three main strategic goals were formulated: the education and training systems had to take up the challenge of quality and efficiency, they should be accessible to all in a lifelong learning perspective, and they should be open to society and the world (Pepin, 2011, p. 26). These three were further divided into 13 operational sub-objectives. This work in turn led to the development of the new comprehensive education programme of the EU.

#### *2.4.2 The Lifelong Learning programme*

As a consequence of the Lisbon Strategy, the existing education programmes were altered. It was established an action programme in the field of lifelong learning called The Lifelong Learning programme (LLP), which covers the time period 2007-2013, and with a total budget of EUR 6.970 million (LLP Guide 2012 part 1, p. 3). In addition to the 27 EU member states, the LLP is also open for the EFTA/EEA countries, Turkey, Croatia and other overseas countries and territories (LLP Guide 2012 part 1, p. 8). All EU education and training programmes now became sub-programmes under the LLP.

The LLP consists of four sectoral programmes, each covering a separate sector or area concerning education and vocational training, as well as one transversal programme, and also the Jean Monnet programme (European Parliament and the Council, 2006, p. 49). The Comenius programme covers pre-school up to the end of secondary education, as well as institutions and organizations providing such education (European Parliament and the Council, 2006, p. 50). The Erasmus programme is aimed at higher education, Leonardo da Vinci covers vocational education and training, while the Grundvig programme address adult education (European Parliament and the Council, 2006, p. 50). The transversal programme consists of four key activities: policy cooperation and innovation in lifelong learning, promotion of language learning, development of innovative ICT-based content, services, pedagogics and practice for lifelong learning, as well as “dissemination and exploitation of results of actions supported under the programme and previous related programmes, and exchange of good practice” (European Parliament and the Council, 2006, p. 51). The Jean Monnet programme shall support institutions and activities in the field of European integration (European Parliament and the Council, 2006, p. 51).

In the LLP, it is the task of the Commission to ensure “the effective and efficient implementation of the Community actions provided for by the LLP”, and is assisted in this task by the LLP Committee (European Parliament and the Council, 2006, p. 51 & p. 53). The member states on the other hand are responsible for everything concerning the LLP on the national level (European

Parliament and the Council, 2006, p. 52), which is organized through the National Agencies(NA) in each country. The Commission in cooperation with the member states are responsible for gathering information, evaluating and follow up of the LLP(European Parliament and the Council, 2006, p. 52). They are also responsible for the regularly monitoring and evaluation of the LLP against its objectives(European Parliament and the Council, 2006, p. 55).

#### *2.4.3 The OMC*

Beginning with the Lisbon Strategy, the EU promoted policy changes in the area of education through the use of the open method of coordination, or OMC(Pepin, 2007, p. 128). Different researchers have different ways of describing OMC, but there are characteristics they agree upon. The institutional infrastructure of the OMC consists of “1. guidelines or objectives, 2. indicators and benchmarks, 3. reporting via National action Plans(NAPs) and 4. Peer-learning groups(Ruiter, 2010, p. 158). This is a definition of an ideal OMC, but there are variations on how this is implemented and put into practice in the different policy areas. Five key principles that can be said to characterize the OMC are: subsidiarity, convergence, management by objectives, country surveillance, and integrated approach(Pirrie, 2005, p. 107).

Cooperation in education through the OMC is based on the countries' voluntarily participation. The goals to reach are set by the EU strategies, but the countries themselves decide how to reach these goals. They decide on which changes are needed, and what policies to implement on the national level. The countries also report on the current status in this policy area back to the EU(Chou & Gornitzka, 2011, s. 6). It has also allowed the EU to develop timetables for the implementation of the different policy areas, as well as the use of indicators and benchmarks to measure and compare the progress of the different member states with each other, and also with the rest of the world(Ertl, 2006, p. 15). It is also “Periodic monitoring, evaluation and peer review of member states practices organized as mutual learning processes”(Lange & Alexiadou, 2010, p. 444). This method lets the EU set the goals for the member states on what the outcome should be, but it also gives the member states the control on how these goals should be reached. It is left to the member states themselves to decide how to reach the goals, what policies to implement, and what structural changes they possibly have to make nationally to achieve this. The organization of the education systems is still part of the member states competence areas, but the EU, through the use of the OMC, has a goal to coordinate the education policies and reforms in the different member states, and in this way reach the goals set in the strategies.

#### *2.4.4 Evaluation of the Lisbon Strategy*

As the Lisbon Strategy reached its end in 2010, it became clear that not all of the objectives and overall goals had been reached. The Lisbon Strategy was a very ambitious plan, and to succeed it would need close co-operation between the EU and the member states. After the economic crisis in 2008, it also suffered set-backs. Two of its main targets were a 70% employment rate, and 3% of GDP would be spent on R&D (European Commission, 2010b, p. 3). The economic crisis caused many problems, and some of the member states were hit quite hard. Countries such as Greece, Italy and Spain still struggle for instance with high unemployment levels, especially in the younger parts of their population. The economic crisis also forced many countries to cut in the national budgets. “Total R&D expenditure in the EU as a percentage of GDP only improved marginally (from 1,82% in 2000 to 1,9% in 2008)” (European Commission, 2010b, p. 3).

In the evaluation report by the Commission, it was concluded that despite signing on to the commitments in the strategy, this had not always been followed up by actions and change (European Commission, 2010b, p. 4). There had been too many targets at the EU level, many of which did not take enough consideration to the fact that the different member states had different starting positions when taking part in the Lisbon Strategy, with some having more developed policy sectors than others to begin with (European Commission, 2010b, p. 6). Another problem for the strategy had been the absence of clearly agreed commitments, which had increased the problems of the member states feeling of ownership to the strategy (European Commission, 2010b, p. 6). The report states that in connection to the OMC, “the effectiveness of policy learning is greater when there are clear and measurable objectives...and when there is involvement of both technical experts...and the political level” (European Commission, 2010b, p. 7).

Concerning education policy, the report stated that while there were signs of progress, it had been too slow, and many of the goals were far from being reached. (European Commission, 2010b, p. 17). An example of this lack of progress was the level of reading competence, when one in the same time period saw a rise in people with problems in this area (Pepin, 2011, p. 29).

## **2.5 Europe 2020**

As the Lisbon Strategy reached its deadline in 2010, it was replaced by Europe 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. As a successor of the Lisbon Strategy, it continues and follows up on many of the uncompleted goals of the former strategy. The new strategy got five overall targets in five different areas that the EU should reach by 2020. First, 75% of the 20-64 year olds are to be employed. Second, 3% of the EU's GDP are to be invested in Research and development (R&D). Third, greenhouse gas emissions are to be 20% lower than in 1990, 20% of



energy are to come from renewables, and there should be 20% increase in energy efficiency. Fourth, in the area of education, the goal is to reduce school drop out rates below 10%, and at least 40% of 30-34 year olds should have completed third level education. The fifth target is that at least 20 million fewer people should be in or be at risk of poverty and social exclusion(Europe 2020).

To reach these five targets, as well as to boost growth and jobs, the EU has developed seven flagship initiatives, which are to be coordinated between the EU and the Member States. These seven are divided under the headings of smart growth, sustainable growth and inclusive growth. Education policy is to be found under smart growth, with the flagship initiative Youth on the Move. The EU claims to need smart growth initiatives, because it has less growth than its competitors, mainly due to a productivity gap caused by lack of investments, insufficient use of technology, an aging population, and poor results in the area of education<sup>2</sup>. Young people are here seen as essential for achieving the objectives in the Europe 2020 Strategy, and to unleash their potential, education and labour market integration and mobility are important(European Commission, 2010a, p. 2). The initiative is described as a “framework agenda announcing key new actions, reinforcing existing activities and ensuring the implementation of others at the EU and national levels, while respecting the subsidiary principle”(European Commission, 2010a, p. 3). This initiative is to help students and trainees study abroad, better equip young people for the job market, enhancing the performance/international attractiveness of Europe`s universities, as well as improving all levels of education and training(Europe2020, smart growth).

The goal of the Europe 2020 Strategy is still to improve the European economy by creating a knowledge based economy, just as in the Lisbon Strategy, but the new strategy has specified the troubling areas and the aims to achieve this. Linked to these are the flagship initiatives. Youth on the Move also has aims connected to the main focus areas, but exactly how to achieve them is a bit more vague. It says for instance that the existing EU programmes, like the LLP, should be used to support the Youth on the Move objectives, by further strengthening as well as rationalizing the programmes(European Commission, 2010a, p. 15). How this is supposed to take place is not quite explained, but the objectives of LLL, and its connection to developments in the EU is still strong.

## **2.6 Future developments: Erasmus for all**

As the LLP reaches its end in 2013, work is already underway on the education programme for the next time period. It is named Erasmus for All<sup>3</sup>. The EU Programme for Education, Training, Youth

---

<sup>2</sup> This include the lack of basic skills such as reading, not enough university degrees, the ranking of European universities and so on(Europe 2020, smart growth).

<sup>3</sup> Erasmus is currently considered the most recognizable of all the education programmes, and the name will therefor be used for this new programme as a recognizable brand name(European Commission, 2011, p. 4).

and Sport, and will, if implemented, cover the time period 2014-2020. This programme is closely linked with the Europe 2020 Strategy, both with the priorities and the flagship initiatives (European Commission, 2011, p. 2). The programme itself will differ both structurally and in organization from the LLP. The new programme will try to be more coherent and have a simpler structure than the current LLP, having “three types of key actions, which are complementary and mutually reinforcing” (European Commission, 2011, p. 5). The first key action is learning mobility for individuals. With the current proposed budget, the programme could, over its seven year time period, provide around 5 million learners with the possibility of mobility, making mobility one of the major elements in the new programme (European Commission, 2011, p. 6)

The second key action is cooperation for innovation and good practices, which include focus on “strengthening innovative partnerships between educational institutions and business” (European Commission, 2011, p. 5). The programme will also increase the support to “cooperation projects aimed at developing, transferring and implementing innovative education, training and youth practices” (European Commission, 2011, p. 9).

The third key action is support for policy reform, which will include continuous use of the OMC in this policy area, continuing implementing the Europe 2020 Strategy, as well as cooperating with third countries and international organizations (European Commission, 2011, p. 5). The Jean Monnet initiative and sports will both be treated as separate activities inside the programme (European Commission, 2011, p. 6).

The proposal is currently being considered in the European Parliament, in the Committee on Culture and Education. One issue that might delay this process is the budget. The Commission suggests an increase in funds for this programme by 70% compared to the LLP (Europa portalen, 2012). Concerning the allocation of funds<sup>4</sup>, about 66% of the budget is suggested to go to learning mobility, 26% to go to key action 2, while 5 % is suggested to be allocated to key action 3 (European Commission, 2011, p. 14). Funding and expenditure are always touchy subjects in the EU, and especially with the current financial crisis, the finished outcome might differ from what is outlined above.

## **2.7 The use of education policy in the EU**

Education policy in the EU has developed slowly and over time. It has gone from a non-existing legal basis in the Treaty of Rome until today where it is seen as a part of the means to reach the overall goals set in the Lisbon and Europe 2020 strategies. This development can also be argued to be connected to other changes taking place at any given time. For instance did work in the field of

---

<sup>4</sup> Excluding Sports, Jean Monnet and administrative expenditure.

education begin at the EU level in the 1970's, at a time troubled with financial crisis and high unemployment. This is also reflected in the action plan and initiatives at the time. The next significant step of legitimization of this policy area at EU level was done by court ruling in the 1980's, which were interpreted to also include all areas of education. This was followed by a legitimization of general education at the EU level by the Maastricht Treaty. The 1980's and 1990's was also eventful decades for the EU, where the community picked up speed in the integration process, with both the accession of new members, as well as the development of existing and new policy areas. This period of time also saw the development of new education programmes, which amongst others aimed at dealing with problems arising from the ongoing integration process.

Education policy has from the onset been a policy area where the member states have guarded their sovereignty. The work in the 1970's in this area was developed by both the EC institutions and the member states, but the lacking legal foundation and structure lead to differences in participation in the different member states. New initiatives were mainly promoted by the EU level. With the legal foundation in the Maastricht Treaty, the sovereignty of the member states were ensured by the use of subsidiarity. With the Lisbon Strategy, the OMC was introduced. This still left control of the national education policy to the states, but the EU could, by the use of benchmarks, evaluations, setting of goals, and comparison of progress, have a bigger influence nationally than before. The nation states decide how to reach the goals set by the EU, but the EU sets the goals, compares data and analyze progress. How big this influence is however, depends on the participants and their implementation and interpretation of education policy from the EU level, and how much emphasis they put on the evaluation and reviews.

At the time of the Maastricht Treaty, human resources were seen as important to achieve economic and social goals, which were also reflected by the nature of the education programmes at the time. These involved for instance mobility and closer cooperation between education institutions and the economic sector. In connection to mobility of students and pupils, the learning of foreign languages and learning and understanding about foreign cultures were viewed as important, both for an educated workforce, but also for bringing Europe closer together. This was perceived as an important part of the promotion of a European Dimension in education. With the goal to get the citizens in the member states to feel a sense of European identity and of citizenship, one tried for instance to promote foreign language learning, and a European Dimension in the different school curriculums, as well as arranging for young people from different countries to meet on exchange trips and learn from each other. At the same time, education was also seen as a way to combat unemployment and new challenges rising from growth, competition and changing demands on employees. Challenges such as the new information society with changing technologies and

methods, the impact of internationalization on the European economy, as well as the demand for new scientific and technological knowledge would lead to new demands on the future workforce. The solution would be to give everyone a good knowledge foundation through education, as well as good basic skills, and to increase their employability. This developed into part of the Lisbon Strategy, which were to help deal with the challenges of globalization, aging populations and changing technologies. It was an economic and social strategy which were linked to LLL. At the same time the European dimension and European identity aspects of education diminished. They were not that successful, and other uses were found for this policy area.

From the mid 1990's the EU started pursuing the idea of LLL as one of the means to help face challenges which included effects of globalization, demographic changes and changing demands on the work force. By providing people with basic skills, and promoting learning and education throughout a persons lifetime, it was thought to equip the people in Europe for the future. As part of the Lisbon Strategy, LLL was also seen as one of the means to create a knowledge based economy, and promote sustainable economic growth and social cohesion. A key part of LLL was education, and the policy area thus received renewed attention, with programmes and targets to help promote LLL. The education programmes were developed and restructured to fit with the overall strategies, making them part of the way to reach the goals. This trend continued with the Europe 2020 Strategy, and with the potential new education programme called Erasmus for all. At the same time, education began to be viewed as a tool, a cog in the machinery towards fulfilling the long term strategies, and the motivations behind it went in a continuing more economic direction. It is true that The Lisbon Strategy also promoted greater social cohesion, but this was seen as beneficial both from a social and an economic standpoint. Education policy in the EU has over the years become more and more focused and goal oriented, and while there still is other aspects to this policy, economic and competitive motivations have become increasingly more dominant.



### **3. Norwegian education policy**

Norwegian education policy has always been the subject of development and change over the years, but especially the last two decades have been eventful for the Norwegian education system. The most recent and prominent change has been the Knowledge Promotion, the new reform of the compulsory school system and upper secondary education. This chapter will focus on the development of Norwegian education policy, as well as finding the most prominent contemporary trends and features of Norwegian education policy. By looking at the historical development of Norwegian education policy, with a special emphasis on the last two decades, the chapter demonstrates that while the Norwegian school system always has tried to educate the younger parts of the population into becoming good citizens and prepare them for the future, there has in the last decade been an increased emphasis towards making sure that learning is actually taking place, and that the pupils of today have good basic skills to become a flexible workforce in the future. It will also be argued that the most prominent features of Norwegian education policy today are the government's emphasis on LLL, the goal-oriented approach to learning and measuring of the pupils' progress through tests and evaluations, as well as increased involvement in international education participation, for instance by taking part in big scale tests and promoting participation in mobility programmes through organizations such as the EU and OECD.

#### **3.1 Brief overview until the end of the Second World War**

Education policy in Norway has a history that can be traced back to the Middle Ages. At the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the kind of education you received depended on where you lived and how wealthy your family was. Those living outside the big cities, mostly farmers and poor people, had school a certain number of weeks each year. The main goal of this schooling was to prepare the children for confirmation, by teaching them basic reading, writing, singing and bible story. In the bigger cities there were also other types of school for the children of the officials<sup>5</sup> and citizens.

---

5 Embetsmenn

There were basically three different types of schools. Latin schools and middle class schools<sup>6</sup> were to be found mostly in the bigger cities, while the common schools<sup>7</sup> were for the people living in more rural areas(Baune, 2007, p. 43).

In the Norwegian Constitution from 1814, topics such as schools and teaching are hardly mentioned. The education of children was the responsibility of the parents, with the supervision of the church(Grankvist, 2000, p. 62). While developing a new law concerning education policy in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, there was a debate between two opposite views. One side thought that education should be adjusted to ones place in society, and that one should not educate poor people beyond what they would need in their position. The other side argued that all should be taught the same, and that people through education could be given a chance to improve their station in life(Grankvist, 2000, p. 69-70, Baune, 2007, p. 46).

The Byskoleloven from 1848 concerned schools in the cities, and had a double objects clause. The school was now to both give the pupils a Christian education, but also to educate them to become good citizens, by giving them the knowledge and skills they would need in society(Grankvist, 2000, p. 73). The common schools got their own separate law in 1860, but the objects clauses were the same. These new laws came at a time when there was an ever increasing need of skilled labour due to new industry and technological developments. There were also changes in the population, who moved from the countryside into the cities in search of new jobs in the new industries.

A new school law came in 1889, which applied both for the cities and for the rest of the country. The early beginnings of a seven year long obligatory unified school<sup>8</sup> was introduced, new courses were implemented, and all teaching should be in Norwegian(Grankvist, 2000, pp. 95-97). It was now the politicians, and not the officials who decided the schools' content, and the schools should be used to construct an uniform, national culture(Grankvist, 2000, p. 102).

The school laws in 1935 and 1936 finally established primary school<sup>9</sup> as a 7 year long unified school. This was a school for the whole population and was not linked to where you lived or your background(Grandkvist, 2000, p. 134). The double objects clause was continued, but the point about educating the citizens had become more unclear. The school was now to “help to give the children a Christian and moral education, and work to make them into useful humans both spiritually and bodily”(Grankvist, 2000, p. 142, mt). The Normalplan of 1939 was to provide a national framework all the local councils could follow, with distribution of hours, curriculum,

---

6 Borgerskole

7 Allmueskole

8 Enhetsskole

9 Folkeskole

minimum demands and obligatory finals(Grankvist, 2000, pp. 143-145). These new developments were based on new thinking in educational science, and Norwegian educationalists were inspired by what was happening in the USA and in England. The implementation of these plans were delayed however, due to the occupation during the Second World War.

### **3.2 From the Second World War to the end of the 1980's**

The first decades after the war was in Norway used to rebuild society, including the education sector. In the period 1950 to 1980, the expenses in the education sector increased from 2 % to 5,8% of the country's GDP(Baune, 2007, p. 95). Just after the war there were great differences in a child's possibilities whether it lived in a city or in the countryside. Although the primary school had been established in the mid 1930's, it had not been fully implemented before the war. The Normalplan from 1939 was also implemented, and the goal was to create equal opportunities for all through the unified school<sup>10</sup>, no matter what your background was or where you lived. This also meant that the different types of school were coordinated into one type of school. One example of this that instead of having an option to choose between both a lower secondary school<sup>11</sup> and a continuation school<sup>12</sup>, one type of secondary school was introduced(Baune, 2007, p. 95). As part of the law on primary school in 1959, the local councils were given the opportunity to extend the length of school education from seven to nine years. In connection to the law on comprehensive primary and secondary school in 1969, these nine years were made obligatory(Grankvist, 2000, pp. 188-191). Both the law from 1959 and the law from 1969 emphasized the teaching of cultural heritage, and the importance of acquiring knowledge(Grankvist, 2000, pp. 190-191).

The late 60's and 70's were years full of opposition, conflict and change. There were also changes in the population. Fewer people worked in primary industries like farming and fisheries, and instead ended up in service industries. People moved geographically, for instance to the cities for new jobs, and also experienced social mobility(Grankvist, 2000, p. 203). The number of people going to upper secondary school more than tripled from 1950 to 1990(Baune, 2007, p. 125). These factors changed the population, and also what was demanded of education and schools. The decades were full of reforms, reports and testing of different education models. This led to the law on upper secondary education, which came in 1974. As had previously happened to secondary school, the different types of upper secondary schools were organized into one type of integrated upper secondary school, which consisted of eight different branches of study(Baune, 2007, p. 126). In

---

10 The traditional definition of enhetsskolen was that all the pupils up to a certain year were to be taught the same and have the same type of classes. At a certain level there could be room for more divisions(Baune, 2007, p. 106)

11 Realskole

12 Framhaldsskole



1987 a revised version of the curriculums were introduced.

### **3.3 1987 to 2002: Reforms**

The education reforms in the 1990's were focused on the idea "of an uniform, coordinated education system, mutual for all students and independent of social, economical and geographical background"(Baune, 2007, p. 126, mt). These ideas also dominated the reforms in the previous decades, but how to approach the matter differed. Instead of seeing primary school, secondary school, upper secondary school and higher education as different entities, all the levels of education, from kindergarden up to higher education was seen as one continuous path(Baune, 2007, p. 169). In 1993 a new general part of the teaching curriculum was finished, and for the first time a basis for the whole education sector up to higher education was in place(Baune 2007, p. 171).

The new reforms continued with the idea of a unified school and the thoughts of equality. The reform in 1994 established by law the right to three years of upper secondary school education, while the reform in 1997 lowered the school beginner age from seven to six years, which at the same time increased the amount of compulsory education to ten years<sup>13</sup>. With these reforms one both wanted to give everyone the same basic knowledge foundation, and at the same time give adapted teaching<sup>14</sup>, based on the supposition of each individual. These reform also included a curriculum containing what each pupil was to learn at specific times, and also how they were to learn this material. While the previous reforms suggested academic content for pupils and teachers, these new subject curriculums were made obligatory for the schools and the teachers(Baune, 2007, p. 173). The emphasis in the schools went from a student and activity oriented educational science to a content oriented one(Baune, 2007, p. 174). These reforms had clear structures and more standardizations than previous reforms, giving schools few options when it came to the academic content of what they were to teach(Telhaug, 2005, p. 37). For a certain amount of all teaching one were to use the method of project work. The pupils were also given responsibility for their own education.<sup>15</sup>

### **3.4 2002-today: Reforms and LLL**

The Norwegian school system has since the turn of the century experienced a change of perspective, and some academics even go as far as to talk of a change of paradigm(Helgesen 2009, p. 20). Some

---

<sup>13</sup> Gudmund Hernes was the minister of church, education and research from 1990 to 1995, and led the work on the development of the education reforms that came in the 1990s.

<sup>14</sup> Tilpasset opplæring

<sup>15</sup> Ansvar for egen læring

of the background for this is the new emphasis on LLL, as well as increased contact and cooperation internationally. This change is not unique for Norway, but part of a trend that has taken hold on most parts of the western world(Helgesen, 2009, p. 21). One of the events leading up to this change in Norway was the announcement of the first results from the PISA tests in 2001. Norway was ranked number 13 out of 31 in reading and nature study, and as number 17 in mathematics(Bergesen, 2006, p. 40). It showed that Norway was placed around the international average, while the performance of countries such as Finland and Sweden were much better(St.meld. Nr 30(2003-2004) p. 13). These results were far worse than expected, and contributed to creating a debate over the state of the Norwegian education system. These bad results were confirmed by the PIRLS test results in 2003, and by the TIMSS and the next PISA test published in 2004(Bergesen, 2006, pp. 43-44). Kristin Clemet, the new minister of education at the time in a centre-right government, was “convinced that that the strong political control of the school, which is characteristic of the Hernes period, was a serious obstacle to ensure a good learning environment and learning outcome”(Baune, 2007, p. 192, mt). She wanted a change from governing by rules to governing by targets and results, which can be summed up by “clearly defined goals, de-centralizing of funds,...and systematic measuring of results combined with evaluations and reports.”(Baune, 2007, p. 192, mt). These ideas were soon supported by the other political parties, and the reforms continued to be carried out after the 2005 election and the introduction of a centre-left coalition government(Helgesen, 2009, p. 21).

#### *3.4.1 The Knowledge Promotion reform*

The main problem in the Norwegian school system, according to Clemet, was that a large number of pupils did not acquire necessary skills at school, such as reading, writing, mathematics, language, and digital skills(Baune, 2007, p. 197). Research has also confirmed that a large proportion of the pupils did not acquire these skills while at school, and that the pupils performance in schools could be linked to social and ethnic background, as well as gender(St.meld. Nr 30(2003-2004) p. 85). Research on the unified school system in Norway also suggested that it was “producing inequality in learning conditions, achievements and opportunities”(Welle-Strand & Tjervoll, 2002, p. 673). To ensure economic growth in society, one needed to promote knowledge and creativity, qualities that were closely linked to opportunities of individuals, and for the possibility to achieve lifelong learning(St.meld. Nr 30(2003-2004) p. 23). Society had become more knowledge driven, and for the school to adapt to these demands, according to the government, the schools themselves needed to be governed by “clear national targets, clear placement of responsibility, and increased local freedom to act” (St.meld. Nr 30(2003-2004) p. 9, mt).

The new education reform, Knowledge Promotion from 2006, increased “focus on core subjects and core knowledge, basic skills and clear and testable competence goals in all the subjects in school”(Helgesen 2009, p. 21, mt). The general part of the Reform 97 was kept as it was, while new subject curriculums were developed for all the different subjects in the compulsory school. These contained clear competence goals for what the pupils should have learned in a subject at different years in school. It was left more to the schools themselves how to achieve these goals (St.meld. Nr 30(2003-2004) p. 25). The five basic skills reading, mathematics, writing, digital skills and oral language were seen as tools for all other learning, and seen as crucial for succeeding in further education and working life(St.meld. Nr 30(2003-2004) p. 3). Therefore they became an integrated part in all the subject curriculums in all levels at school(St.meld. Nr 30(2003-2004) p. 9).

The Norwegian school system is based on the principles of inclusiveness, equality and adapted teaching<sup>16</sup>, available to all. Pupils have different needs and conditions, which means that adapted teaching did not mean giving all the same type of teaching, but adapt the teaching of each individual according to its specific needs and conditions(St.meld. Nr 30(2003-2004) p. 85). These principles were continued and included in the Knowledge Promotion reform.

In the new reform, the local levels were given more freedom in how to organize and govern their schools. There was given freedom locally to manage up to 25 % of the hours in each subject, based on local preferences and individual needs(St.meld. Nr 30(2003-2004) p. 9). Whether the schools achieved the goals set in the curriculums would be measured through national testing of the pupils(Elstad, 2010b, p. 104). These national tests were to each year try the pupils in 2nd, 4th and 10th grade on their skills in Norwegian, English and Mathematics(Baume, 2007, p. 195). The first rounds of these tests were held in spring 2004, and were the subject of controversy. Especially the decision to publish the results of each individual school through a web page called skoleporten.no was controversial, as well as the shaping of the tests itself, and their educational significance were questioned(Bergesen, 2006, pp. 106-110). No such tests were held in 2006, but tests were from 2007 to be held for the 5th and the 8th grade.

This reform has now been used for a number of years, and it has been evaluated to see whether it functions as intended. One of the findings is that education authorities at the national level should give more concrete support, and that the teachers, schools and local authorities need more guidance in how to successfully implement this reform and give adapted teaching(St.meld. Nr 31(2007-2008)p. 10). The reports states that the government intends a clearer national guidance of the school sector(St.meld. Nr 31(2007-2008)p. 11). The use of national tests have continued, with teachers and schools more satisfied with the information and the execution of the tests, than they

---

16 Tilpasset opplæring

were in the beginning(St.meld. Nr 31(2007-2008)p. 80).

### *3.4.2 Lifelong Learning*

LLL has by the Norwegian Governments been perceived to be important for “the personal development of individuals, for the development of democracy and society, as well as to ensure economic growth in the working sector”(KD, 2007, p. 7, mt). To benefit from a knowledge based economy with innovation, growth and work places, Norway needs an educated and competent population(St.meld.nr 16(2006-2007) p. 11). LLL is also seen as a way to improve people's life by access to work and therefore improving their economy, improving peoples' health, and contribute to participation in society, as well as decrease the crime rates(St.meld.nr 16(2006-2007), p. 8). The concept of LLL was earlier linked to vocational training and adult learning, but gained momentum in the 1990s with renewed emphasis and reasons. These included changes in the working sector, the wish for social inclusion, and the belief that learning can contribute to personal development(KD, 2007, p. 8). LLL was now to include all form of learning throughout a person's life, and to include learning both inside and outside of the education system(KD, 2007, p. 7). The compulsory school has in light of LLL a dual task. First it is to provide all Norwegian pupils with the competence needed faced with the challenges and possibilities of globalization. Second it is to lay the foundation for further learning that the individual and society will need in the future(St.meld.nr. 14(2008-2009)p. 25). A prominent feature of LLL in the Knowledge Promotion reform is the importance of learning basic skills, and how early learning at school can be seen as stepping stones for further learning(KD, 2007, p. 9).

The government has as a goal that everyone should get necessary competences and learn basic skills in compulsory school, and that as many as possible complete upper secondary school with good results. This competence should form the basis for further education, work and participation in society(St.meld.nr 16(2006-2007) p. 11). Research has shown that these goals are far from being reached. Norway has a problem with early school leavers, who do not complete upper secondary education. The number of pupils who do complete upper secondary school within five years is around 70%(SSB, 2012). This leaves a high number of pupils who leave school without formal qualifications. These will later have problems getting jobs as well as get further education(St.meld.nr 16(2006-2007) p.9). There is also a correlation between achieving bad results in primary school and not completing upper secondary school(St.meld.nr 16(2006-2007) p.8). Results from national and international tests reveal that Norwegian pupils' performance are below average in skills such as reading and mathematics in comparison to other OECD countries, despite the fact that Norway is one of those countries who spend most resources per pupil in compulsory

education(KD, 2007, p. 14). Norway is also one of the countries with highest unevenness in connection to learning outcome between the pupils, results which can be seen in connection to social background. If the parents have higher education, nine out of ten pupils complete upper secondary school within five years. If the parents have completed upper secondary or less, the same number is 65%(SSB, 2012). There is also a difference between the genders, with a higher number of girls completing upper secondary education within five years than boys(SSB, 2012). This shows that the goal to use education as a means to contribute to social cohesion is far from being reached(St.meld.nr 16(2006-2007) pp.12-13). Factors said to explain these results are: weak learning strategies, unrest in the classroom, low motivation for learning amongst pupils and low expectations to the pupils from the teachers(KD, 2007, p. 14). To improve the situation of a large number of pupils with weak basic skills, the government emphasizes the importance of learning at an early stage, and to give adapted teaching based on the pupils needs and possible diagnosis. It also promotes the use of the Knowledge Promotion reform, its emphasis on basic skills and to use education as away to promote social cohesion(KD, 2007, pp. 16-17).

Education in Norway through a LLL perspective is seen as a way to prepare the population and society itself for the future, and for the influence of an increasing globalized world, with an educated population which can form the basis of a knowledge based economy with growth and innovation. It is also seen as a way to deal with differences in the population, and lead to greater social cohesion. By giving pupils a quality basic education, and good basic skills, the population can be better prepared for changes in what is demanded of them in the working sector. But research and results from tests have shown that Norway still has a lot of work to do if the motivations in LLL are to be achieved. If people from an early age have problems in school, and do not complete compulsory and upper secondary education, this will influence the rest of their working life, giving them problems adapting to changes in society and create large social differences in the population. LLL and education in this context are therefor given both economic and social motivations.

### **3.5 International cooperation in Norwegian compulsory school**

Today Norway participates in several international education cooperations. These include the EU, OECD, UNESCO, IEA, the Council of Europe, the Nordic Council of Ministers, as well as bilateral agreements with individual countries. This cooperation is seen as important for learning in Norwegian schools, as well as for research on Norwegian education systems and learning outcome. International cooperation is understood to help develop indicators and measure developments in compulsory school, and compare these to developments in other countries(St.meld.nr. 14(2008-2009)p. 32). This also opens up for the participating countries to learn from each other, and what

type of reforms might help develop their own education sector. While education cooperation with the EU involves programme cooperation on all levels of the education sector, within a policy framework, and with formalized procedures<sup>17</sup>, other international cooperation Norway is involved with are more informal and less extensive in nature.

### *3.5.1 International education cooperation beside the EU, which Norway takes part in*

The OECD has no formal authority over the member states, but gives them advice about how their policy should be executed in specific areas (Elstad & Sivesind, 2010, p. 20). During the recent decades, the organization has become one of the leading collectors of data concerning education, publishing reports, analyses, statistics and comparisons on the basis of this material, becoming sort of a “global benchmark of standards, and in this way also a power in educational decision-making and governance” (Rinne, 2008, p. 668). The OECD also advocated the LLL towards their member countries from the 1990s, emphasizing especially the economic benefits for applying such a perspective (Green, 2002, p. 612). The PISA tests are one of many sources behind the OECD recommendations on a country’s education sector. In this big scale examination, 15 year olds in different countries are every third year tested in mathematics, nature study and reading (Elstad, 2010a, p. 56). Norway has participated in the PISA testing since the first was held, and the results published in 2001 (Elstad & Sivesind, 2010, pp. 21-22). Each year the OECD publish *Education at a Glance*, where they compare education results and key statistical figures from around the world. Norway also features in this material.

Norway participates in the big scale examinations TIMSS and PIRLS held by the IEA. The former is held every four years, and tests the pupils in fourth and eight grade in mathematics and nature studies, while the later measures the children's reading competences (Elstad, 2010a, p. 55). IEA is an international non-profit organization with roots back to the 1950s, but was reorganized in the beginning of the 1990s, with a goal to deliver an information basis as support for shaping of education policy (Elstad, 2010a, pp. 60-62). Norway has taken part in TIMSS and PIRLS since the 1990s, but it was with the PISA results in 2001 that these other examinations received more attention (Elstad, 2010a, p. 62).

As a member of Council of Europe, Norway also receives impulses on education from them. This organization focuses on the values, culture and the human rights aspects of education (Helgesen, 2009, p. 25). These aspects are shared by UNESCO, who views education as a basic human right, and as a tool in the fight against poverty. This organization also works to fulfill some of the UN’s millennium targets, education as part of sustainable growth and promoting basic

---

<sup>17</sup> Discussion on Norwegian participation in EU programmes is to be found in chapter 4.

skills in reading and writing(Helgesen, 2009, p. 25).

The results from these big scale examinations are viewed as important indicators concerning the state of the Norwegian school sector by the government. One example of this is St.meld. Nr 31(2007-2008), which dealt with the quality of the Norwegian school system. Chapter two concerns the quality level in compulsory education, and much of the data and numbers used stems from PISA, PIRLS and TIMSS tests(pp. 13-23). The results are seen as indicators about the pupils skill levels, which are not seen as satisfactory, and the government states that "the negative trend in the international examinations has to turn"(St.meld. Nr 31(2007-2008)p. 6, mt). Official Norwegian policy documents almost always use data from the OECD, which makes this organization a supplier of terms for Norwegian education policy(Karlsen, 2006, p. 201). The quality of Norwegian schools are viewed in connection to the results of such tests, and the results are considered good or bad in comparison to the international average, but specifically when compared to the other Nordic countries(St.meld. Nr 31(2007-2008)p. 14). When seeking to improve the Norwegian results, inspiration for changes have been sought in countries with better results such as Finland and Sweden. In this way the results are used to identify problematic areas at home, and to find solutions by looking at better performing countries and possibly adopt some of their solutions. But tests such as PISA, TIMSS and PIRLS do not reveal the whole picture. In current educational trends some topics and skills such as reading, mathematics and language learning are valued to be of great importance, while other topics such as creativity, self-confidence and interpersonal skills, which might not be as easy to measure, or are not directly linked to a subject do not receive the same amount of attention.

### **3.6 The development of Norwegian education policy, and current trends and features**

The development of Norwegian education policy is signified by the gradual development of an unified comprehensive school for all, with the extension of compulsory school length to include secondary education, as well as to include the right to upper secondary education. This is in stark contrast back to when the church and parents were in charge of children's education, with family background and place of residence determining what type of school and education one could expect. During the 19<sup>th</sup> century the politicians took over responsibility for education, diminishing the role of the church, and started the process of creating an obligatory unity school for all. This included more subjects, and an expansion of the curriculum. After the Second World War, there was a strong governmental control of the development of the education sector, with teaching based on curriculums developed by the state. The government also controlled the education sector through regulatory management.

Although the Norwegian education system always has been the subject of changes and development, the last two decades have been especially prominent in this respect. The 1990s saw the introduction of new reforms with detailed subject curriculums defining what should be taught when and how, giving the teachers little room for maneuvering. International organizations also began having an influence, but this became more apparent by the early 21<sup>st</sup> century. Changes were even more prominent in the new reform Knowledge Promotion in 2006, with its new subject curriculums, goal oriented approach and emphasis on the teaching of basic skills as an integrated part of teaching in all subjects. The subject curriculums changed from containing strict guidelines developed on the national level, into containing targets for what the pupils were to have learned at different stages of their education. How they gained this knowledge was now more up to the individual schools themselves, giving the local councils more freedom as to how to organize their schools. The government would instead ensure that the pupils learned what they should through national tests. Knowledge was now seen as something more measurable than before. Education was also seen as a means to ensure social cohesion in society, and LLL was seen as a way dealing with many different problems in society. It was also seen as a way to ensure a well educated work force to support the Norwegian economy in the future.

This chapter argues that the most prominent features of current Norwegian education policy includes the focus on LLL, the goal oriented approach to learning and measuring of the pupils progress through tests and evaluations, as well as increased involvement in international education participation, for instance by taking part in big scale tests and promoting participation in mobility programmes through organizations such as the EU and OECD. These features have been introduced as a result of both internal and external changes. Nationally the authorities became aware of the fact that many Norwegian pupils did not learn what they were expected to, and that a number of pupils left school without proper learning. This also meant that a part of the population was at a disadvantage when seeking jobs and in their daily life in general. Norway is a small country with an aging workforce and high wages, and is dependent on a well educated workforce in the future. Due to rapid technological developments, globalization and increased financial and cultural interaction with the rest of the world, the working sector changes more rapidly, and the skills and demands needed on the workforce are changing. This makes it important for the population to be adaptable in the working sector, which means to have the opportunity of further education learning, that is, LLL. To be able to adapt and benefit from LLL one needs a good knowledge foundation and good basic skills, which requires learning from an early age. The Norwegian authorities' education policy has increasingly put an emphasis on this line of thought. To make sure that the pupils do learn what they should, evaluation in schools, for instance through national and international tests, have become a



common feature on compulsory education. Results from international tests, as well as participation in education cooperation also influences Norwegian education policy. Norwegian education policy can no longer confine itself inside the national borders, but are today influenced by events, trends, evaluations and policy-making taking place internationally.

## **4. Participation by Norwegian primary and lower secondary schools in the EU education programme**

Since the implementation of the the EEA Agreement, cooperation between the EU and Norway has expanded both into new policy areas and become more extensive in others. Norway has taken part in the EU education programmes through protocol 31 of the EEA Agreement involving cooperation outside the four freedoms, a policy area that has evolved considerably since the signing of the EEA Agreement. This chapter analyses how Norway is connected to the EU education policy and how this is organized, using participation in the Comenius programme in primary and secondary school as an example. By exploring participation in this policy area and its developments, including an examination of three important reports and propositions to the Storting, this chapter aims to find official motives for Norwegian authorities to take part in EU education policy. It argues that such participation always has been seen to benefit the national economy, and the individual participants themselves, but as this programme participation has developed, it increasingly has been linked to dealing with positive and negative aspects of globalization. This includes preparing the population for the future by the use of LLL, and to benefit Norway in a world economy by developing the knowledge and skills of the population.

### **4.1 The EEA Agreement**

The EEA Agreement was put before the Storting as St.prp.nr. 100(1991-1992), and was accepted with a 3/4 majority<sup>18</sup>. This agreement was promoted as a mechanism that would give the EFTA countries access to the EU internal market, which lead to the economical and functional aspects of this agreement becoming the main focus areas and subject to debates, while other aspects did not receive equal amount of attention( NOU 2012:2 p. 62). The EEA agreement is a dynamic and uniform cooperation between the EFTA countries and the EU. This means that the EFTA countries are continuously taking in new and relevant EU legal documents in the EEA agreement, and also

---

18 This is also the only time § 93 in the constitution has been used, abstaining parts of Norwegian sovereignty.

implementing them in their own legislation. To make sure that they accomplish this, the EFTA countries are under supervision and control (NOU 2012:2 p. 64). Being a dynamic agreement also meant that it was agreed from the beginning that the EEA Agreement through its implementation of new EU law would expand and grow in volume, and that this new EU law would function in the same way in the EFTA countries as in the EU member states (NOU 2012: 2 p. 64).

The EEA Agreement also includes an institutional framework. This is described as a two pillar structure, with the EU and its institutional framework as one pillar, and with the EFTA institutions in the other. This is held together by the EEA Agreement (NOU 2012:2 p. 69). The institutions in the EFTA pillar are to some extent supposed to mirror the ones in the EU, but on a smaller scale, due to the lesser number of EFTA members. Representatives from each pillar meet twice a year in the EEA Council, and about once a month in the EEA Committee. Other important institutions here are the EFTA Court of justice, ESA and the EFTA Secretary (NOU 2012:2 p. 69).

The EEA Agreement itself consists of 129 articles, nine chapters and 22 appendixes. These appendixes contains lists over legal documents from the EU that have been included in the EEA Agreement, and the legal documents themselves are also part of the EEA Agreement (NOU 2012:2 p. 65). The agreement also consists of 49 protocols. New agreements between the EU and the EFTA-countries inside the framework of the EEA Agreement are included in the protocols or the appendixes. Examples of this might be Norwegian participation in the EU programmes, as well as Norwegian access to new EU bureaus (NOU 2012:2 p. 68).

#### *4.1.1 How Norway is connected to the EU education policy: The EEA Agreement and programme cooperation*

Education policy is included in cooperation outside the four freedoms in article 78, and specified in protocol 31. This part of the EEA agreement concerns areas where originally any obligations to participate or to include new legal documents did not exist, but where the EFTA countries have been allowed to participate in the degree they wish. Norway has also decided to participate in most of these areas (NOU 2012:2 p. 68). This form of structured cooperation evolves around mutual goals and priorities, but without harmonizing the laws and rules in the participating countries. Rather it focuses on mutual indicators, benchmarks, evaluations, and exchange experiences (NOU 2012:2 p. 636). The role of the EU is more in the area of coordination and structuring, and to distribute the programme funds (NOU 2012:2 p. 612).

According to article 78, the agreed parties are to “strengthen and expand the cooperation inside the framework of Community activity”, for instance in the areas of education, training and youth questions (Gjems-Onstad, 2000, s. 148, mt). The forms of cooperation shall according to

article 80 amongst others include participation in the EC framework programmes, the establishment of joint operations in certain areas and formal and informal exchange of information(Gjems-Onstad. 2000, s. 150). According to article 81, the EFTA countries shall have access to all parts of a program they participate in through cooperation administered by the EC(Gjems-Onstad, 2000, s. 151).

Article 82 states how the Norwegian contribution to the EEA is determined, and this is calculated with basis in GDP. Article 82 1.b states that when participating in certain projects or other activity, each agreed party are to cover their own expenses as well as a contribution to cover the administration costs of the community(Gjems-Onstad, 2000, s. 152). Education policy became part of “the flanking policies” which should contribute to, and which also came as a consequence of the further integration of the internal market(Gstohl. 2002, s. 169).

#### *4.1.2 Before the EEA Agreement*

Norway’s participation in EU education programmes is based in the EEA agreement from 1994, but Norway was already participating in two EU education programmes prior to that time. An evaluation from 1990 conducted by a Norwegian working group in connection to the establishment of an internal market by the EC, concluded that it was beneficial for Norway to seek cooperation with the EC in the area of education, and suggested that even a potential failure in the EEA negotiations should not stop Norway from seeking such a cooperation(Arbeidsgruppen for utdanning, 1990, p. 70). Increased exchange of students and pupils was seen to be beneficial both for the individuals on exchange, and for the development and internationalization of the economic sector, since it would involve networking and give valuable contacts and impulses for both education and the economic sector(Arbeidsgruppen for utdanning, 1990, p. 82). At the time this type of participation was perceived to involve mobility of Norwegian students abroad and foreign students to Norway for a longer period of time, as well as finding a system of mutual recognition of education taken abroad and in Norway(Arbeidsgruppen for utdanning, 1990, p. 51-52). This cooperation was also seen to involve upper secondary education, higher education and adult learning and vocational training. The levels of compulsory education was then not seen as directly linked with education cooperation with the EC. But good knowledge of European languages and cultures was perceived as a condition for a cooperation with the EU to expand and function, and the learning of foreign languages beginning in primary school was seen as important to achieve this(Arbeidsgruppen for utdanning, 1990, pp. 62-63). Before the EEA Agreement compulsory school was therefore not seen to be directly involved in this type of cooperation, but rather indirectly through the increased emphasis on foreign language learning.

#### *4.1.3 The EEA Agreement and education*

The St.prp.nr 100(1991-1992) is the ratification document of the EEA Agreement to the Storting. This document includes goals for what Norway wanted to achieve with participating in the EU education programmes at the time of membership in the EEA. Already in the introduction it emphasizes the importance of the agreement in connection to both economic and society political reasons, but the agreement is mostly seen as important for market and economic cooperation(St.prp.nr 100(1991-1992), p. 12). It made clear that for a long time an important aim in Norwegian education policy had been to increase the exchange of pupils and students as a way to internationalize the education sector, and professional and cultural connections with other countries would give them new and valuable perspectives into their own activities(St.prp.nr 100(1991-1992), p. 293). A number of initiatives shaped by the EC was included in the document, and included aims such as: the development of a European Dimension in education, increased mobility amongst teachers and students, promoting cooperation between education institutions, developing exchange of information and practice amongst member states, as well as youth exchange(St.prp.nr 100(1991-1992), p. 296). These aims was developed by the EC, and directly included in the EEA Agreement as part of the programme cooperation.

During the negotiations the EFTA countries wanted to ensure full and equal right to participate in all of the current and future EC programmes and activities concerning education, training and youth, something that also was achieved(St.prp.nr 100(1991-1992), p. 296). It was stated that while the EC programmes at the time were the subject of extensive reorganization, the basic content in the activities would not be affected(St.prp.nr 100(1991-1992), p. 293). A main principle would be “that the education demands are put forward locally, and that education policy is a national area of responsibility”(St.prp.nr 100(1991-1992), p. 295, mt). This document did not see that the EEA Agreement would lead to changes in Norwegian laws and regulations in the area of education, and that the agreement did not affect the education policy itself(St.prp.nr 100(1991-1992), p. 295). Increased mobility amongst students and pupils are seen as positive for the individuals themselves, for the development of the industry and trade sector, as well as internationalization, and the development of european networks would benefit both education and industry(St.prp.nr 100(1991-1992), p. 297). At last it is emphasized that the Norwegian participation in this area should be based on national priorities in education politics, and that Norway should participate in these programmes”to as large extent as possible”(St.prp.nr 100(1991-1992), p. 297, mt).

This document is very general in tone when considering primary and secondary education. There are in many places distinguishing between pupils and students, and between higher education

and vocational training in some places, but Norwegian education policy is also in many places seen as one entity. When considering the different education programmes at the time, the one also concerning younger pupils are Lingua and foreign language training, although this was directed towards all levels of education(St.prp.nr 100(1991-1992), p. 294-295). The mobility programmes was directed towards 16 year olds and older as well as school administrations, and cooperation schemes involved mostly universities, industry and vocational training. The document do also state participation in future programmes as a goal, although specific ones, or what shape and form this might take are not stated.

Norway took part in the Comett II programme from January 1990, and the Erasmus programme from January 1992. Participation in the other programmes began in January 1995(St.prp. nr. 100(1991-1992), p. 295). Since 1995, Norway has participated in all the EU programmes it has been given access to that involves education, training and youth questions. Programs such as Sokrates and Leonardo da Vinci had as a goal to enable exchange of teachers and pupils, and get going increased cooperation and exchange of information(St.meld. nr. 27(2001-2002), pp. 53-54).

## **4.2 The LLP**

Norway's programme participation has taken place for over two decades, but it has changed and developed over the years. In 2007, the Lifelong Learning programme covering the time period 2007-2013 was included in the EEA Agreement by St.prp nr. 36 (2006-2007), and replaced and /or continued the former education programs Norway took part in<sup>19</sup>. The total Norwegian subscription to the LLP for the whole time period is somewhat over 1 billion NOK(NOU 2012:2 p. 636). Important areas for both the EU and Norway include: LLL, the completion of upper secondary school for as many pupils as possible, the focus on basic skills, increase percentage of the population with a degree from higher education, and to get a greater number of adults to take part in further education and learning(SIU, 2011, p. 7).

### *4.2.1 The LLP and Norway*

St.prp.nr 36(2006-2007) concerns the implementation of the LLP in the EEA Agreement. The document itself is rather short, but has as an appendix the entire action plan for the LLP agreed by the European Parliament and the Council. Included in this proposition to the Storting, the Norwegian participation in the EU programmes up until then was assessed, and it finds that pupils, students and teachers have been given academic challenges and been in contact with other European

---

<sup>19</sup> For detailed content of the LLP, see chapter 2.

languages and cultures(St.prp.nr 36(2006-2007), p. 3). International education cooperation through the Comenius programme was perceived as a good addition to education nationally, giving new dimensions and perspectives to teaching in Norwegian schools(St.prp.nr 36(2006-2007), p. 3). Pupils who had taken part in this type of school cooperation said they had increased motivation towards learning, improved their achievements at school, and became more independent(St.prp.nr 36(2006-2007), p. 3).

The aims for taking part in the LLP is also considered in this document. Increased internationalization and mobility is seen as important in connection to all levels of Norwegian education, and plays a part in giving new impulses to the pupils, promoting tolerance and learning outcome, as well as preparing them for todays international society and economic industry(St.prp.nr 36(2006-2007), pp. 4-5). To succeed in a global economy, Norway and its industry and commerce are seen to be dependent on the language competence, cultural knowledge and interpersonal understanding of its citizens(St.prp.nr 36(2006-2007), p. 4). The participation itself is seen to be in accordance with Norwegian education policy interests, and contribute to the realization of LLL for everyone(St.prp.nr 36(2006-2007), p. 5). The document states that the European education and training programmes can be seen as part of the holding structures of the EEA agreement, and “an important element in the contact with the EU”(St.prp.nr 36(2006-2007), p. 5, mt). Both the Norwegian and European aims in this area is seen to coincide, and participating in international education cooperation is seen as part of the quality development of the national education sector(St.prp.nr 36(2006-2007), p. 5). This includes the teaching of foreign languages, the use of ICT, and increase knowledge and understanding of people and cultures(St.prp.nr 36(2006-2007), p. 5).

In connection to primary and secondary education, this documents contains clear references to how this education level can be part of programme cooperation, and also how they might benefit. This part of the education sector is seen in connection to the bigger perspective of LLL, with learning at an early age and the teaching of basic skills.

#### *4.2.2 The organization of the LLP*

The Commission is responsible for that the community action is implemented, but it is the participating nation states that are responsible for carrying out measures to ensure that the programme works efficiently at the national level. This includes the appointment of a national agency(NA) in each country which will be responsible for the management of the programme nationally<sup>20</sup>(St.prp. nr. 36 2006-2007)p. 2). The Commission works with a programme committee

---

<sup>20</sup> In Norway this NA is Senter for Internasjonalisering av Utdanning(SIU)

on the implementation of the LLP, where all states who participate in the LLP are to be represented. Currently 34 countries participate in the LLP, including the EU countries, the EFTA members, countries in the west-Balkans, as well as others(Education/LLP, 2012). The Commission shall, together with the participating states, evaluate the LLP according to the predetermined goals, independent external evaluations, and through statistics based on facts collected from the participating countries(St.prp. nr. 36 2006-2007, p. 2).

The Norwegian government is represented in many different expert groups and clusters concerning cooperation over development of policy in education(St.meld.nr. 14(2008-2009)p. 33). One of these is the *Standing Group on Indicators and Benchmarks*, which is to develop tools to measure progress and results in the member countries. Another is the *Advisory board for the European Indicator of language competence*. Norway also contribute with data and results to annual reports published by the EU. Some of the clusters(working groups) Norway participate in are *Cluster for ICT, Cluster for Teacher Training, Cluster for Learning Outcome, and Cluster for Math, Science and Technology*(St.meld.nr. 14(2008-2009)p. 33). Norway is also a member of the programme committee for the the LLP, which is in accordance with what is stated in the EEA Agreement. Norwegian national experts are also working in the Commission for three to four years, and follows the work in the education area both politically and practically(St.prp.nr. 36(2006-2007)p. 2). The NMER states in its EU strategy that some of its goals is to take care of national interests in policy development, promote proposals concerning indicators in the working groups that are of national interest, and make visible Norwegian policy by reporting in the groups and through suggestions for good practice(KD, 2011, p. 4).

On the national level, the Department of Education and Research has the overall responsibility for the Norwegian participation in the LLP. Norwegian involvement in education programmes are coordinated through SIU<sup>21</sup>(NOU 2012:2 p. 614), and functions as a NA. SIU defines itself as a “national competence- and information centre that promotes international cooperation in education and research”(Grøtan, 2011, p. 5, mt). About 90% of the work carried out by SIU is connected to the administration of programmes and projects on behalf of the NMER, the ministry of foreign affairs, NORAD, the EU and Nordic Council of Ministers(SIU, 2012a, p. 3). In 2011 it was in charge of over 20 different programmes and arrangements on behalf of different clients(SIU, 2012b, p. 4). SIU also functions as a competence centre, conducting research and publish reports “to expand and strengthen the basis of knowledge for further internationalization of Norwegian education”(SIU, 2012a, p. 8, mt). Before its work was mostly linked to higher

---

21 Prior to 2011 known as “senter for internasjonalisering av høyere utdanning”. SIU was renamed in connection to a renewal of the organization. In 2010 its mandate was extended to also function as a service and competence centre for internationalization in compulsory education(SIU, 2011, p. 2).



education, but today it includes all levels of education.

### **4.3 Internationalization of education in Norway**

Internationalization of education and research has been mentioned in connection to education policy for quite some time, but was in St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009) defined as part of a national objective. It states that globalization brings with it both challenges and possibilities, and that internationalization can be seen as part of the national answer to these developments(St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009)p. 6).

Internationalization is here defined as “exchange of ideas, knowledge, goods and services between nations over established borders”(St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009), p. 6, mt). When viewed in connection to education, “internationalization will be the process of integrating an international, intercultural and global dimension in goals, organization and action”(St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009), p. 6, mt).

Internationalization had previously been linked to higher education, but with this report, all levels of education including compulsory education was included to ensure a goal oriented and coherent approach for increased internationalization in education(St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009), p. 10).

Internationalization in compulsory education includes both teaching and education in schools, and participation in international cooperation by the likes of EU, UNESCO and the OECD(St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009), p. 26). “The role of the EU is to contribute to supporting improvements of the national systems through the tools at the EU's disposal, such as programmes and comparative statistics”(St.meld.nr. 14(2008-2009)p. 33, mt).

Internationalization is in this report seen as important both for society and for working life, which will benefit from improved language skills, multicultural competence and international orientation amongst people(St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009), p. 6). To compete in a global world market, Norway will need a workforce that is highly qualified, and has international knowledge and experience(St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009), p. 5). Therefore the government has emphasized internationalization of education “as a tool to promote increased quality and relevance in Norwegian education” (St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009), p. 5, mt). Internationalization is to be used as a tool to be able to compare oneself to others, and be a way to face the challenges of globalization and the challenges in a “multicultural and international oriented society and working life”(St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009), p. 11, mt). It is also a goal that internationalization should contribute to “cultural understanding and global solidarity through increased international knowledge and experience and increased language skills”(St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009), p. 24, mt).

While mobility is seen as one of the most important ways to achieve increase internationalization on all levels, the report emphasizes that to a larger extent than what is the case today, internationalization has to be seen in connection to the learning outcome of pupils and

students, as well as in connection to the teaching in schools(St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009), p. 23). In compulsory education the international perspective is found in the competence goals of the different subject curriculums, in the lesson plans and in the general part of the knowledge promotion reform(St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009), p. 15). Foreign language learning is also seen as having an important role in the internationalization of Norwegian education(St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009), p. 7). Since internationalization is based both in the objects clause and in the curriculum in compulsory education, it is relevant to all pupils(SIU, 2010, p. 5). According to the curriculum, the international perspective in education has to be an integrated part of everyday teaching in all subjects throughout the levels of education(St.meld.nr. 14(2008-2009)p. 27). To help achieve internationalization in education, means used include: Norwegian participation in international education and mobility programmes, financial support systems by the Norwegian state educational loan fund and others, as well as the creation of agencies such as SIU to administer such participation(St.meld.nr 14(2008-2009), p. 10).

#### **4.4 The Comenius programme, and participation by Norwegian primary and lower secondary schools**

Of the EU education programmes Norway takes part in, the one directed towards primary and secondary education is called the Comenius programme. It originated in the 1980s as a mobility programme, and ended up being included and restructured as part of the LLP(Lee, Thayer & Madyun, 2008, p. 452). The program has, in addition to the overall objectives of the LLP, its own set of objectives. The two specific objectives are: “to develop knowledge and understanding among young people and educational staff of the diversity of European cultures and languages and its values” and “to help young people acquire the basic life-skills and competences necessary for their personal development, for future employment and for active European citizenship”(St.prp.nr. 36(2006-2007), p. 19, mt). The Comenius programme also has six operational objectives: to increase the number of pupils and educational staff involved in mobility in different member states, to increase the number of partnerships between schools in different member states with a target of at least involving 3 million pupils during the programme period, to encourage the learning of modern foreign languages, to support the development of innovative ICT-based content, services, pedagogies and practices for lifelong learning, to enhance the quality and European dimension of teacher training, and last to support improvements in pedagogical approaches and school management(St.prp.nr. 36(2006-2007)p. 19). The Comenius programme may support actions such as: mobility, development of partnerships, multilateral projects, multilateral networks, or other initiatives that promote the objectives of the Comenius programme(St.prp.nr. 36(2006-2007)p. 19).

#### *4.4.1 Comenius partnerships*

Norwegian participation in the Comenius programme is coordinated by SIU, which administer the programme, promote participation, allocate funds, and give advice. One of the Comenius initiatives most relevant in the context of this thesis is Comenius partnerships<sup>22</sup>, which has as a goal to strengthen the international dimension in education, and give the participants knowledge of and understanding for the diversity of culture and languages in Europe(SIU, 2012c). Participation in Comenius partnerships takes place in the form of individual schools, most often initiated by a teacher or the school administration, getting involved in an education project cooperation with two or more other schools from other participating countries(SIU, 2012c). Together representatives from these partners, most of them teachers, decide on a topic, and construct a project which their pupils are to take part in. A project might also include more than one topic. By participating in this project the schools exchange ideas, and develop new teaching plans together(SIU, 2011, p. 20). The length of such a project is usually two years.

The project is to be used as part of the teaching in one or more subjects in selected classes at the participating schools. SIU states that when taking part in international project participation, it is important to link the topic to both competence goals and to subjects(SIU, 2011, p. 13). Taking part in a project can be seen as a method of teaching, and to reach certain selected goals. Norwegian schools and teachers most often base participation in such projects on the pupils learning of selected competence goals in different subject curriculums, as well as in the teaching of basic skills. The subjects that are most often involved in such projects are foreign language learning, ICT and environmental education and sociology(SIU, 2010, p. 11). The most popular topics in the applications for 2011 were: foreign languages, European dimension and citizenship, cultural heritage, environment, intercultural education, knowledge of foreign countries, active citizenship and health(SIU, 2012b, p. 15). In multilateral partnerships, the countries most popular to work with for Norwegian schools are Germany, The United Kingdom, France and Spain(SIU, 2012b, p. 14). A project also most often involves mobility, where the different schools visit each other within the two-year period. The separate schools involved in the same project can apply to their national NAs for funding, including coverage of travel expenses. Norwegian pupils themselves are not to pay for their own expenses, since this would come up against the “no expenses” principle in Norwegian schools(St.meld.nr. 14(2008-2009)p. 29). In return for these funds, the schools have to deliver two reports during the two year project, concerning the progress of the project, as well as results(SIU,

---

<sup>22</sup> Other Comenius initiatives are for instance Comenius Regio, exchange of pupils, further education of teachers and staff, and seminars.

2012d). After the project has ended, it has to be registered with a presentation and results on “European Shared Treasure”(EST), a webpage by the EU where all projects in all the different education programmes are presented, and where new partnerships might go to seek inspiration for their own project(EST, 2012). By participation in such projects, the hope is to increase motivation for learning, get new perspectives into the classroom, give the pupils a chance to meet and learn about other cultures and practice languages in a new way(St.prp.nr. 36(2006-2007)p. 3). The benefits stated by teachers, pupils, school administrations and school owners that have taken part in such a project include; increased motivation for learning including development both academically and socially, cultural awareness, contributing to an including learning environment, contribute to interest and recruitment to certain subject areas, pedagogical development, a way to linking internationalization and the local community, as well as strengthening the cooperation between school and home(SIU, 2011, pp. 8-12).

Compulsory schools might also participate in eTwinning, which is also part of the Comenius programme. This is a digital platform where teachers and schools submit a profile on a website, and meet other teachers and schools from all over Europe they can communicate with, exchange ideas and cooperate with through mutual projects. The point of eTwinning is to promote cooperation between schools through the use of ICT(eTwinning, 2012). This is international cooperation through technology, and the use of for instance chat, blogs or video transfer. As with participation in Comenius partnerships, teachers who use eTwinning in their teaching base it on the completion of goals in the subject curriculums, and the teaching of basic skills. An eTwinning project can for instance combine language learning, cultural learning and technology(Grøtan 2011, p. 17).

#### *4.4.2 The use of the Comenius programme in Norway*

In 2011 SIU received 159 applications for involvement in Comenius partnerships. 92 of these were granted funds, 86 of which were for multilateral partnerships, and 6 for bilateral partnerships(SIU, 2012b, p. 13). Of the 92 applications granted funds, 3 were from kindergartens, 50 from primary and lower secondary school, 38 from upper secondary school, and 2 were from other institutions(SIU, 2012b, p. 13). The number of applications granted funds have been relatively stable since the implementation of the LLP, with 96 from 2008, 93 from 2009, and 90 from 2010(SIU, 2010, p. 7). The highest number of applications in 2011 came from Akershus, Vestfold and Sør-Trøndelag(SIU, 2012b, p. 13). These numbers however do not include projects and partnerships which did not apply for funds, for instance eTwinning projects, or partnerships that involved projects only involving teachers and school administrations. Research has shown that the

number of participants in projects and programmes by Norwegian schools could be better(St.meld.nr. 14(2008-2009)p. 36). In the Autumn of 2011 there were 3000 primary and lower secondary schools in Norway, attended by 614 374 pupils(SSB, 2011). When comparing these numbers to the number of applications for participation in the Comenius programme, it is evident that only a small number of Norwegian schools and pupils take part in the Comenius programme in compulsory education.

Research has demonstrated that many teachers find the lack of time and funds to hamper their possibilities for working on internationalization(SIU, 2012e, p. 23). This type of cooperation and participation often depends on enthusiasts, which is most often individual teachers(St.meld.nr. 14(2008-2009)p. 28). This is not necessary a bad thing, but the responsibility and workload on individual teachers can be tough, and participation can easily fall apart if some individuals disappears, taking all competence and knowledge of this type of teaching with them. This is why the ministry sees it as beneficial that education cooperation takes place in a formalized setting(St.meld.nr. 14(2008-2009) p. 23). This means involving the school administration. Research show that there is a connection between the involvement of school administrations in internationalization, and the number of teachers participating, as well as in the work in making internationalization a part of the school's activities(SIU, 2012e, p. 4). To ensure good results from international project participation, the school administration should get involved by for instance including international cooperation in their annual plans to ensure enough amount of time, and by organizing competence development in this area by arranging ways of sharing ideas and experiences between colleagues(SIU, 2011, p. 26).

Also the school owners can contribute to good participation in international cooperation. They can for instance contribute with funds, information, guidance and contacts. If the school owners already have a strategy for international work in the region, the schools themselves could take part in this larger context and benefit from its experiences(SIU, 2011, p. 27). The school owners of primary and lower secondary schools are the local governments. Research has shown that there are great differences in the international focus of the different local governments. Often there is a lack of coherent and consistent plans for how such internationalization work can be done(St.meld.nr. 14(2008-2009), p. 28). Research carried out by SIU suggests that there is a connection between the size of local governments and the degree of formalization of strategies and work with internationalization(SIU, 2010, p. 4). While only 22% of local governments with 3000 citizens or less stated to have plans or resolution on internationalization in school, 3 out of 4 local governments with more than 100 000 citizens stated to the same(SIU, 2010, p. 14). The larger the local government the more formalized the work with internationalization seems to be, although

there are exceptions to be found, for instance on the west-coast of Norway and in Hedmark(SIU, 2010, p. 4). A focus on internationalization in school are often part of a larger more general strategy for the local government(SIU, 2010, p. 14). The report states that this is a relatively new area in development, and changes in how the school owners perceive internationalization and their arguments for it is in development(SIU, 2010, p. 4). But today it is clear that it is the schools themselves that take the initiative to take part in international work(SIU, 2010, p. 20).

Another reason for this low number of participants might be a lack of information in schools and amongst teachers and school owners about these possibilities. One of the tasks SIU has in connection to this programme is the distribution of information. This happens for instance through arrangements like seminars to inform about programme participation and the application procedure, as well as through the internet. Although programme cooperation has taken place in compulsory school for a number of years, internationalization has been linked to compulsory education for only a few years. To function as a service and competence centre in this area, SIU has in the last couple of years been mapping and analyzing compulsory education in Norway(SIU, 2012b, p. 5). Its role in internationalization in higher education is known, but there might still be a way to go before the same can be said in compulsory education. For instance was SIU invited 30 times in 2011 to national events concerning internationalization in education. Of these national events, only 3 were by organizers connected to compulsory education(SIU, 2012b, p. 8). With much research completed, and the restructuring of the organization itself well under way, maybe SIU in the years ahead will be better equipped helping schools in compulsory education in their work on internationalization. Its promotion of programme cooperation involving for instance the EU and the LLP has taken place for a number of years, but with more knowledge and emphasis on internationalization in Norwegian schools, and how programme participation might contribute to achieving this, such participation might become more popular, and a more common feature in Norwegian schools than what it is today. But then the government would also need to contribute with the funds needed.

#### **4.5 The future of EU education programme**

The EU is currently working on a new programme called “Erasmus for all” concerning education, youth and sports. If this programme is approved, it will cover the time period 2014-2020. It is based on the principles and goals in Europe 2020, and together with the flagship initiatives it shall contribute to the accomplishment of this strategy(Europaportalen, 2012). If approved, this programme will bring financial obligations. The Commission suggests an increase in funds for this programme by 70% compared to the LLP, which means that Norway possibly will have to pay more

for programme participation(Europaportalen, 2012). Another challenge might be that parts of this new budget comes from a budget line outside the area of the EEA agreement. For Norway to continue in all areas of programme cooperation, decisions must be made concerning access to these funds(Europaportalen, 2012).

This new education programme will be reorganized and restructured compared to the LLP, which might have consequences for the administrative organization in Norway(Europaportalen, 2012). In a response through the EEA, Norway had a wish to sustain most of the structure and names from the current LLP. The Commission was also asked to concretize the initiatives to simplify programme participation compared to the old ones, to make it more user friendly(Europaportalen, 2012). Political priorities by Norway connected to participation in this new programme includes increasing mobility, reducing number of drop outs in the education sector and to secure quality in education(Europaportalen, 2012).

#### **4.6 Conclusion**

Norway is connected to the EU education policy through the EEA Agreement and the cooperation outside the four freedoms. This is an area there originally did not exist any obligations to participate or to include new legal documents, but where the EFTA countries have been allowed to participate in the degree they wish. From the outset the Norwegian governments had as a goal to participate in this education cooperation to as large extent as possible, and Norway has also since then taken part in all the education programmes it has been given access to. It can therefore be claimed that the cooperation is taking place on a voluntary basis, and that from a Norwegian standpoint it has been seen to benefit both the Norwegian education sector and also other areas of Norwegian society.

The Norwegian participation in the current EU education programme LLP is organized with structures both at the EU level and at national level. Through participation in this programme, Norway has access to certain structures at the EU level, which is in accordance with what is stated in the EEA Agreement, where participating countries are to have access to all parts of a programme they participate in. In case of the LLP, Norway has access to the programme committee, as well as different expert groups and clusters concerning cooperation over development of policy in education. Norwegian goals in this context is stated to be taking care of national interests, promote proposals concerning indicators in the working groups that are of national interest, and make visible Norwegian policy by reporting in the groups and through suggestions for good practice. As with other policy areas in the EEA Agreement, Norway do not have direct access to the Parliament and the Council meetings when it comes to education.

Participation in the EU education programmes is at the national level organized by SIU,

which function as the NA in this respect. It is responsible for organization, applications, distribution of funds, as well as information on EU programmes towards potential Norwegian participants. In the case of the Comenius partnerships teachers seek out partner schools in other countries, for so to come together and create a project to use in their teaching at their separate schools. For funds they can send an application to their NA. In Norway research has shown that this type of participation often is up to the individual teachers, and in many cases not based in the school's and the schools owners' plans or strategies, leaving this type of cooperation and development of competence in this area vulnerable to changes. The number of applications versus of the total number of potential participating schools and pupils in Norway are low, and might lead one to question why not more participate in this type of programme participation in primary and lower secondary school.

#### *4.6.1 Motivations*

From the outset, participation in EU education programmes were viewed as beneficial for the education sector and for the economic sector. In an evaluation carried out in 1990 cooperation with the EU was mostly viewed in terms of mobility of individuals and cooperation between institutions, and could lead to networking, new impulses and contacts, as well as learning of foreign languages and cultures. This were seen to benefit both the individuals themselves, as well as the economic sector. St.prp nr. 100 emphasized both economic and social political motivations for participating in the EU programmes. Here this was understood to involve mobility, cooperation amongst institutions, and exchange of information and practices. It was seen as positive both for the participants and for the economic sector and for internationalization, and connected increased knowledge and cultural understanding with better international contact and as a competitive advantage in for the economy.

With the LLP, motivations for participation was linked to globalization, LLL and a world economy. To succeed in a global economy, Norway and its industry and commerce was seen to be dependent on the language competence, cultural knowledge and interpersonal understanding of its citizens. The participation itself was seen to be in accordance with Norwegian education policy interests, and contribute to the realization of LLL for everyone. Increased internationalization and mobility was deemed as important in connection to all levels of Norwegian education, and played a part in giving new impulses to the pupils, promoting tolerance and learning outcome, as well as preparing them for todays international society and economic industry. The LLP itself, and the subprogramme Comenius have clearly defined goals and targets, which are directly linked to EU's Lisbon strategy about a knowledge based economy. Norway's motivations for participating have become more extensive, and increasingly focused on economy and the global market, but there still



is some focus on cultural exchange.

The Report to the Storting concerning internationalization of education in Norway stated that increased internationalization of education could help deal with the challenges and possibilities of globalization. This was seen as important for both society and for working life, which could benefit from improved language skills, multicultural competence and international orientation. Internationalization of education can for instance involve participation in EU education programmes. Participation in the Comenius programme is by Norwegian schools and teachers used as part of the teaching in selected subjects to reach goals in the subject curriculums, in the teaching of basic skills such as language learning and ICT, as well as part of a perspective on internationalization and other goals in the general part of the curriculum. Participation might also be used to increase the learning outcome of the pupils, giving them and their teachers new impulses and perspectives on the subjects they are learning, as well as hopefully motivate the pupils for further learning. With these aims it can also be seen as part of the LLL perspective in education, and the participation itself as part of increased international cooperation in the Norwegian education sector. This is also in accordance with the goals of the Comenius programme itself.

Norway's motives for participating in the EU education programmes has developed during the last two decades, following the increased cooperation with the EU, and the continuous development of the EU education programmes. The motivations have becoming more focused and goal oriented, and participation itself seen as a means to help Norway deal with a globalized world system, directing the education sector in a more international direction. But the original motivations of mobility of students and closer cooperation between institutions, to promote languages and experience new cultures to benefit individuals and the national economy still remains. These have been connected with LLL strategies, with its learning of basic skills and lifelong learning to help individuals, society and the economy facing the challenges in a world economy and a more globalized world. In a world with more contact across national borders, this type of knowledge is beneficial both for individuals and for national economies.

## 5. Conclusion

Norway is connected to the EU strategies and education policy through the EEA Agreement and the participation in education programmes. Scholars have argued that education policy in the EU is increasingly motivated by topics such as economy and globalization, but can this be said about the Norwegian participation in the EU education programmes (Ertl, 2006, p. 5; Kleibrink, 2011, p. 80; Pirrie, 2005, pp. 109-110; Preece, 2006, pp. 308, 314)? To analyse the main question in this thesis, which was why Norway has decided to take part in the EU education programmes in primary and lower secondary school, and whether this correlates to the motivations of the EU, three subjects have been examined.

First, how and why did EU education policy develop, and what has the EU tried to achieve with this policy area? By exploring this topic, it is demonstrated that developments in this policy area was closely linked to other developments in the Community and to the integration process, and that education policy was perceived as a means to help solve problems arising in connection to this. For instance did development of education cooperation and education programmes begin in the 1970's, a time of financial difficulties and high unemployment. Another is the increased amount of activity in education policy in the 1980's and 1990's, which correlates with increased activity in the EU which for instance lead to the SEA and the Maastricht Treaty. This is even more evident in connection to the Lisbon Strategy and the strategy Europe 2020, where education policy is perceived as one of the means to reach the overall goals. Education policy has also been linked to the LLL, which remains an integrated part of these strategies. The rise of LLL in connection to education policy has by researchers been linked to demographic changes, issues relating to global economy and cultural globalization. In connection to the EU, LLL has been linked to economic competitiveness, new technology, the learning of basic skills and learning throughout life. Researchers suggest that in the EU, LLL has increasingly been taken over by economic motivations. The Lisbon strategy, which had a LLL perspective, was seen to both promote economic growth and development, as well as better the lives of people and promote social cohesion. But as time

progressed, as well as in the new strategy Europe 2020, it has been argued that the economic aspects have become more dominant.

The second topic explored in this thesis was Norwegian education policy, how it has developed, and what currently is the most prominent trends and features. Existing accounts suggest that Norwegian education policy increasingly is influenced by international organizations and trends, which also includes the EU (Karlsen, 2006, p. 27; Telhaug, 2005, p. 57; Baune, 2007, p. 202). As demonstrated, currently the most prominent features of Norwegian education policy is the focus on LLL, the goal oriented approach to learning and measuring of the progress of the pupils through tests and evaluations, as well as increased involvement in international education participation, for instance by taking part in big scale tests and promoting participation in mobility programmes through organizations such as the EU and the OECD. While the NMER has stated that the EU is its most important cooperation partner in the area of knowledge, which also include education, and while Norwegian education policy has gone through changes in the last decades, it is difficult to separate the influence of the EU from other sources such as organizations, other international participations, or from reforms implemented nationally. Today Norway participates in several international education cooperations. These include the EU, OECD, UNESCO, IEA, the Council of Europe, the Nordic Council of Ministers, as well as bilateral agreements with individual countries. For instance do the EU, the OECD and UNESCO all promote a LLL perspective in education. Both the IEA and the OECD hold big scale tests in several countries, and publish the results in comparative reports. Mobility and closer cooperation between schools across borders are for instance promoted by both the EU and through bilateral agreements with individual countries. It can be difficult separating their influence on Norway, as well as to pinpoint exactly what this has lead to, but they all contribute to international influence on the Norwegian education system, and open up for participation in international education cooperation.

Much of the current international education participation Norway is involved in, can be seen as part of a strategy of internationalization in education. According to official documents this is to help deal with the challenges and possibilities of globalization, and direct the education sector in a more international direction. It is used as a way to develop competence and knowledge the society might need in the future, such as foreign languages and cultural experience. It also involve mobility, participation in big scale tests and evaluations to ensure that Norwegian education is based on quality and good performance, as well as to promote a perspective of internationalization in the subject curriculums.

The third subject examined is how Norway is connected to the EU education policy, how this is organized, using participation in the Comenius programme in Norwegian primary and lower

secondary school as an example, as well as the Norwegian motives for taking part in this programme participation. By looking at different official documents, it is suggested that participation in the EU education programmes always have been seen as beneficial for both the economy and for the individuals taking part in them. In the beginning of the 1990's this was considered to contribute in developing competence needed in the workforce, and through mobility schemes and cooperation between education institutions, it could for instance benefit learning of foreign languages and knowledge of foreign cultures, and lead to innovation and networking.

After the EEA Agreement this participation evolved in connection to the new programmes developed by the EU, since the Norwegian Governments saw it as important to participate in them to as large extent as possible. At the same time, the motives for such participation evolved as well, becoming more organized and goal oriented. The original goals still remain, but was with the new LLP connected with LLL, which includes the learning of basic skills and learning throughout life. This was seen to help the society, individuals themselves and the economy to face the challenges in a world economy and a more globalized world. The LLP was also perceived to be in accordance with the interests of Norwegian education policy. Around the time Norwegian participation in the LLP began, the new education reform Knowledge Promotion was implemented. In the LLP and the reform Knowledge Promotion, Norway and the EU have an approach to LLL that coincides, including a focus on basic skills such as language learning, the use of ICT and learning throughout life. LLL is a strategy promoted by other organizations than just the EU, for instance the OECD, which has had a great impact on education in Norway with the results of the PISA tests and other reports. There has also been focus on LLL in Norway since the 1990's, so it is too far a leap to directly link the LLP and the reform Knowledge Promotion. But it can be suggested that this involvement has had an impact on how LLL is perceived, and contributed to the focus on goals and the teaching of basic skills in the Norwegian education sector. Norway do through its programme participation have access to certain expert and working groups on the EU level, which might have served as a source of information and inspiration. It can also be suggested that participation in parts of the LLP such as Comenius can be used to fulfil parts of LLL in Norway, by the participation in projects and by teaching linked to this, for instance the learning of foreign cultures and certain basic skills. The LLP is hoped to help prepare the pupils for the international society, economic industry, and the global market, which is also suggested to be part of Norway's motivation for this programme participation.

Participation in the Comenius programme can be seen as part of the focus on internationalization, and can also be a useful addition to other teaching in Norwegian schools. It is often used in teaching to reach selected goals in the different subject curriculums, as well as in the

teaching of basic skills, and goals in the general part of the curriculum connected to internationalization and other related topics. Such participation is said to contribute to learning outcome amongst pupils, giving them new impulses and perspectives in relation to what they learn, as well as to motivate them for continued work in a subject. These are benefits that can be directly linked to participation in such programmes, and can help individual pupils while they are learning. Getting a job and make a living is part of the motives of any education, but the learning process itself should also be inspiring. Many pupils in Norwegian schools struggle for different reasons to complete secondary school, and a high number of them drop out every year with no formal qualifications. Perhaps participation in programmes such as Comenius can inspire some of these pupils who struggle with their motivation, by providing them with a different approach to their learning, and through meeting pupils from other countries find what they are taught in school more useful to learn. The nature of the Comenius programme involves working on projects, going on exchange, meeting new people from different countries, often using foreign languages and other learning from school in a different way than in the classroom. Although the overall goals might be based in motives like economy and globalization, the participation itself might be argued to be motivated by pedagogical and cultural aspects, and how this might benefit everyday teaching in Norwegian schools.

While participation in the EU education programmes by Norwegian schools seem to have positive benefits, it is important to note the difference between the number of granted applications for participation in the Comenius programme, and the total number of schools in primary and lower secondary education in Norway. It actually shows that such participation involve only a few of the total number of pupils in Norway. While international education cooperation is seen as important at the national level by politicians and officials, reflected in reports and in the education reforms, this might not have reached the local level and the compulsory schools themselves. It is interesting to note that in the last decades there have been many changes taking place in the school system, with for instance implementation of new reforms and new curriculums, and the conduction of national and international tests. To implement such changes and make them work properly take time, and to use additional time on participation in programmes such as Comenius might not have been a priority. Teachers and schools might also have found other ways to achieve internationalization and to include a LLL perspective in their teaching. Lack of knowledge of the possibilities in taking part in the Comenius programme might also be a reason.

While it to some extent can be said that both the EU's and Norway's motivations in connection to the EU education programmes is seen to correlate on the motives of economy and globalization, and seen as a way to benefit the learning outcome of pupils, it is inadequate to

suggest that the EU can take credit for these motivations in connection to Norwegian participation. A country's education policy is interlinked with other national policy areas, and fulfil many different national objectives. To benefit the economy and deal with aspects of globalization is but two of these. Others include transmitting cultural knowledge and values from one generation to the next, to raise the children into becoming enlightened and well-functioning citizens, and help a country to shape its policies for the future. Economy and globalization can be found as motivations for participation in many different countries, but they have not been inspired by participation in the EU programmes alone. Rather they stem from many different sources, and as a response to larger changes in the world order that has taken place in the last decades. But participation in the EU programmes might have been a way to respond to these changes by the national authorities. At the moment it seems likely that this involvement will continue into the next programme period with the new programme Erasmus for all.



# Bibliography

## Primary sources

- Case 293/83. Judgement of the Court of 13 February 1985. Françoise Granier v City of Liege. Retrieved January 30, 2012 from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:61983CJ0293:EN:HTML>
- European Commission (2011). *Erasmus For All: The EU Programme for Education, Training, Youth and Sports*. COM(2011) 787 final. Retrieved August 27, 2012 from [http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus-for-all/doc/com\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/education/erasmus-for-all/doc/com_en.pdf)
- European Commission (2010a). *Youth on the move. An initiative to unleash the potential of young people to achieve smart, sustainable and inclusive growth in the European Union*. COM(2010) 477 final, 15.9.2010. Retrieved March 27, 2011, from [http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/priorities/smart-growth/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/priorities/smart-growth/index_en.htm)
- European Commission(2010b), *Commission staff working document. Lisbon Strategy evaluation document*. SEC(2010) 114 final. Retrieved August 22, 2012, from [http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/lisbon\\_strategy\\_evaluation\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/lisbon_strategy_evaluation_en.pdf)
- European Commission(2001). *Communication from the Commission. Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality*. COM(2001) 678 final. Retrieved October 12, 2012 from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2001:0678:FIN:EN:PDF>
- European Commission(2000). *Commission staff working paper. A Memorandum on Lifelong Learning*. SEC(2000) 1832. Retrieved September 7, 2012, from <http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/MemorandumEng.pdf>
- European Commission(1995). *White paper on education and training. Teaching and Learning. Towards the Learning Society*. COM(95) 590 final. 29<sup>th</sup> November 1995. Retrieved September 7, 2012, from [http://ec.europa.eu/languages/documents/doc409\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/languages/documents/doc409_en.pdf)
- European Commission(1993a) *Green paper on the European dimension of education*. COM(93) 457 final. 29<sup>th</sup> September 1993. Retrieved January 31, 2012 from [http://europa.eu/documentation/official-docs/green-papers/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/documentation/official-docs/green-papers/index_en.htm)
- European Commission(1993b) *Growth, Competitiveness, Employment. The challenges and ways forward into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. White Paper*. COM(93) 700. December 1993. Retrieved January 31, 2012, from [http://europa.eu/documentation/official-docs/white-papers/pdf/growth\\_wp\\_com\\_93\\_700\\_parts\\_a\\_b.pdf](http://europa.eu/documentation/official-docs/white-papers/pdf/growth_wp_com_93_700_parts_a_b.pdf)
- European Council(1992)Treaty on European Union. *Official Journal* C191 29/7/1992 Retrieved January 31, 2012, from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/treaties/dat/11992M/htm/11992M.html>



- European Council(1976)Resolution of the Council and of the Ministers of Education, meeting within the Council, the 19 February 1976, comprising an action programme in the field of Education. *Official Journal* C 038 19/2/1976 P. 0001-0005. Retrieved January 30, 2012, from <http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.douri=CELEX:41976X0219:EN:HTML>
- European Parliament and the Council(2006). Decision NO 1720/2006/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 15 November 2006 establishing an action program in the field of lifelong learning. *Official Journal of the European Union*. L327/45. Retrieved March 30, 2011, from [http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc848\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/doc848_en.htm)
- NOU 2012: 2 *Utenfor og innenfor. Norges avtaler med EU*. Oslo: Departementenes servicesenter. Informasjonsforvaltning.
- St.meld. nr. 14 (2008-2009). *Internasjonalisering av utdanning*. Retrieved August 27, 2012 from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kd/dok/regpubl/stmeld/2008-2009/stmeld-nr-14-2008-2009-.html?id=545749>
- St.meld. nr. 31 (2007-2008). *Kvalitet i skolen*. Retrieved August 22, 2012 from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kd/dok/regpubl/stmeld/2007-2008/stmeld-nr-31-2007-2008-.html?id=516853>
- St.meld. nr. 16 (2006-2007). *...og ingen sto igjen. Tidlig innsats for livslang læring*. Retrieved August 22, 2012 from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kd/dok/regpubl/stmeld/2006-2007/stmeld-nr-16-2006-2007-.html?id=441395>
- St.meld. nr. 30 (2003-2004). *Kultur for læring*. Retrieved August 22, 2012 from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kd/dok/regpubl/stmeld/20032004/stmeld-nr-030-2003-2004-.html?id=404433>
- St.meld. nr. 27 (2001-2002). *Om EØS-samarbeidet 1994-2001* Retrieved October 20, 2011, from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/ud/dok/regpubl/stmeld/20012002/stmeld-nr-27-2001-2002-.html?id=196152>
- St. prp. nr 36 (2006-2007) *Om samtykke til deltaking i ei avgjerd i EØS-komiteen om innlemming i EØS-avtala av avgjerd nr 1720/2006/EF av 15. November 2006 om fastsetjing av eit handlingsprogram for livslang læring*. Retrieved October 30, 2011 from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nn/dep/ud/dokument/proposisjonar-og-meldingar/Stortingsproposisjonar/20062007/stprp-nr-36-2006-2007-.html?id=446197>
- St.prp. nr. 100 (1991-92) *Om samtykke til ratifikasjon av Avtale on Det europeiske økonomiske samarbeidsområdet (EØS), undertegnet i Oporto 2. mai 1992*. Retrieved October 20, 2011, from [http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/ud/dok/regpubl/stprp/1991-1992/stprp100\\_1991.html?id=627296](http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/ud/dok/regpubl/stprp/1991-1992/stprp100_1991.html?id=627296)

## Secondary sources

- Arbeidsgruppen for Utdanning(1990). *Norsk utdanningssamarbeid med EF. Forutsetninger og strategier*. Oslo: Arbeidsgruppen for utdanning, Statssekretærutvalget for EF-saker.
- Baune, T.A.(2007). *Den skal tidlig krøkes... Skolen i historisk perspektiv*. Oslo: Cappelen Akademiske Forlag.
- Bergesen, H.O. (2006). *Kampen om kunnskapsskolen*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget
- Bugajski, T(2009). EU som premissleverandør for norsk utdanningspolitikk. In *Stat og styring Nr 1*. Retrieved August 31, 2011, from Idunn.no
- Chou, M-H. & Gornitzka, Å.(2011). Den femte frihet og kunnskapens Europa. Konsekvenser for Norge. *Rapport#6 Europautredningen. Utvalget for utredning av Norges avtaler med EU*. Retrieved October 20, 2011, from <http://www.europautredningen.no/eksterne-utredninger/>
- Dehmel, A(2006). Making a European area of lifelong learning a reality? Some critical reflections on the European Union's lifelong learning policies. *Comparative Education*. 42(1). 49-62. Retrieved August 31, 2011, from the EBSCO database
- Dinan, D. (2004). *Europe recast. A history of European Union*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Education/LLP(2012) [http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/national\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/national_en.htm) Visited November 12, 2012
- Elstad, E(2010a). Internasjonale storskalaundersøkelser: en sammenligning av PISA, TIMSS og PIRLS. In Elstad, E. & Sivesind, K. (eds) (2010) *PISA-sannheten om skolen?* (pp. 54-68) Oslo: Universitetsforlaget
- Elstad, E(2010b). PISA i norsk offentlighet. In Elstad, E. & Sivesind, K. (eds) (2010) *PISA-sannheten om skolen?* (pp. 100-123) Oslo: Universitetsforlaget
- Elstad, E. & Sivesind, K.(2010). OECD setter dagsorden. In Elstad, E. & Sivesind, K. (eds) (2010) *PISA-sannheten om skolen?* (pp. 20-41) Oslo: Universitetsforlaget
- Europe 2020. [http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/reaching-the-goals/targets/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/reaching-the-goals/targets/index_en.htm) Visited February 6, 2012
- Europe 2020, smart growth. [http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/priorities/smart-growth/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/priorities/smart-growth/index_en.htm) Visited February 6, 2012
- Ertl, H. (2006). European Union policies in education and training: the Lisbon agenda as a turning point? *Comparative Education*, 42(1), 5-27. Retrieved February 25, 2011, from the JSTOR database.
- Ertl, H. & Phillips, D. (2006). Standardization in EU education and training policy: findings

- from a European research network. *Comparative Education*, 42(1), 77-91. Retrieved February 25, 2011, from the JSTOR database
- EST(2012). <http://www.europeansharedtreasure.eu> Visited October 10, 2012.
  - eTwinning(2012), [http://www.etwinning.net/no/pub/discover/what\\_is\\_etwinning.htm](http://www.etwinning.net/no/pub/discover/what_is_etwinning.htm) Visited October 10, 2012.
  - Europaportalen(2012). *Erasmus for alle. Forslag til Europaparlamentets og Rådets forordning om opprettelse av "Erasmus for alle" EU-programmet for utdanning, ungdom og idrett*. Retrieved August 27, 2012, from <http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/sub/europaportalen/eos/eos-notatbasen/notatene/2012/feb/erasmus-for-alle.html?id=681135>
  - Gjems-Onstad, O. (2000). *EØS-Avtalen og EØS-Loven med kommentarer*. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
  - Grankvist, R. (2000). *Utsyn over norsk skole. Norsk utdanning gjennom 1000 år*. Trondheim: Tapir Akademiske Forlag.
  - Green, A.(2002). The many faces of lifelong learning: recent education policy trends in Europe. *Journal of Education Policy*. 17(6), 611-626. Retrieved September 6, 2012 from Taylor & Francis Online
  - Grøtan, T.(2011). *Ut i verden! Informasjonshefte om internasjonalisering i grunnopplæringen*. Fremmedspråksenteret/Senter for internasjonalisering av høgre utdanning(SIU). Retrieved August 27, 2012 from <http://www.siu.no/nor/Grunnskole-og-barnehage/Veiledning-for-grunnskolen/Hvorfor-samarbeide-internasjonalt>
  - Gstohl, S. (2002). "The uniting of Western-Europe in the 1990s". *Reluctant Europeans. Norway, Sweden and Switzerland in the process of integration*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers. s. 167-210
  - Helgesen, S.(2009). På veg mot Soria Moria? In Bergem, T. & Helgesen, S.(2009). *Soria Moria-neste? Perspektiver på skoleutviklingen*. (pp. 18-34). Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget
  - Hodson, D. & Maher, I.(2001). The open method as a new mode of governance: the case of soft economic policy co-ordination. *Journal of common market studies*. 39(4) 719-746. Retrieved September 12, 2012 from Wiley Online Library
  - Karlsen, G.E. (2006). *Utdanning, styring og marked. Norsk utdanningspolitikk i et interasjonalt perspektiv. 2. utgave*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
  - Karlsen, G.E. (1994). *EU, EØS og Utdanning. En studie av bakgrunn og innhold -føringer og konsekvenser for norsk utdanning*. Otta: Tano
  - Kleibrink, A.(2011). The EU as a norm entrepreneur: the case of lifelong learning. *European journal of education*. 46(1). 70-84. Retrieved April 12, 2011, from Wiley Online Library
  - KD(Kunnskapsdepartementet)(2011). *Strategi og handlingsplan for*

- Kunnskapsdepartementets EU-arbeid 2011-2013*. Retrieved September 7, 2012, from: [http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kd/tema/internasjonalt\\_samarbeid\\_om\\_utdanning\\_og\\_europa.html?id=279694](http://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dep/kd/tema/internasjonalt_samarbeid_om_utdanning_og_europa.html?id=279694)
- KD(Kunnskapsdepartementet)(2007). *Tilstadsrapport om livslang læring i Norge. Status, utfordringer og innsatsområder*. Retrieved September 12, 2012, from [http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/KD/Vedlegg/Kompetanse/Livslang\\_%20laring\\_%20Norge2007.pdf](http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/KD/Vedlegg/Kompetanse/Livslang_%20laring_%20Norge2007.pdf)
  - Lange, B. & Alexiadou, N. (2010). Policy learning and governance of education policy in the EU. *Journal of Education Policy*, 25(4), 443-463. Retrieved February 25, 2011 from the EBSCO database
  - Lee, M. Thayer, T. & Madyun, N.(2008). The evolution of the European Union's lifelong learning policies: an institutional learning perspective. *Comparative Education*. 44(4). 445-463. Retrieved August 31, 2011 from the EBSCO database
  - Lifelong Learning Programme(LLP) Guide 2012. Part 1: General provisions. Retrieved February 6, 2012, from [http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/official-documents-on-the-llp\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/llp/official-documents-on-the-llp_en.htm)
  - Livingston, K.(2003). What is the future for National Policy making in education in the context of an enlarged European union? *Policy Futures in Education* 1(3), 586-600. Retrieved September 6, 2012, from [www.wwords.co.uk/PFIE](http://www.wwords.co.uk/PFIE)
  - McCulloch, G(2004). *Documentar research in education, history and the social sciences*. London: RoutledgeFalmer
  - OECD(2012). <http://www.oecd.org/edu/eag2012.htm> Visited November 19, 2012.
  - Pepin, L.(2011). Education in the Lisbon Strategy: assesment and prospect. *European Journal of Education*, 46(1), 25-35. Retrieved April 12, 2011, from Wiley Online Library
  - Pepin, L.(2007). The history of EU cooperation in the field of education and training: how lifelong learning became a strategic objective. *European Journal of Education*, 42(1), 121-132. Retrieved February 25, 2011, from the EBSCO database.
  - Pirrie, A.(2005). Reclaiming basic skills: in defence of lifelong learning. *Policy Futures in Education*. 3(1), 106-116. Retrieved September 6, 2012, from [www.wwords.co.uk/PFIE](http://www.wwords.co.uk/PFIE)
  - Preece, J.(2006). Beyond the learning society: the learning world? *International journal of lifelong education*. 25(3). 307-320. Retrieved August 31, 2011 from the EBSCO database
  - Rapley, T.(2007). *Doing conversation, discourse and document analysis*. Los Angeles: SAGE publications.
  - Rasmussen, P.(2008). European educational futures. *Policy futures in education*, 6(6), 662-664. Retrieved September 6, 2012, from [www.wwords.co.uk/PFIE](http://www.wwords.co.uk/PFIE)
  - Rinne, R.(2008). The growing supranational impacts of the OECD and the EU on National

- Education Policies, and the case of Finland. *Policy Futures in Education*. 6(6), 665-680. Retrieved September 6, 2012, from [www.worlds.co.uk/PFIE](http://www.worlds.co.uk/PFIE)
- Robson, C.(2007). *How to do a research project. A guide for undergraduate students*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
  - Rodrigues, M. J.(2009). Introduction. In Rodrigues, M.J.(ed.).(2009). *Europe, globalization and the Lisbon Agenda*. (pp. 1-22). Cheltenham UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Inc.
  - Ruiter, Rik De.(2010). Variations on a theme. Governing the knowledge-based society in the EU through methods of Open Coordination in education and R & D. *European integration*. 32(2), 157-173. Retrieved April 12, 2011 from the Ebsco database.
  - Scott, J.(1990). *A matter of record. Documentary sources in social research*. Cambridge: Polity Press
  - Shore, C, (2000). *Building Europe. The cultural politics of European integration*. New York: Routledge
  - SIU(2012a). *Årsmelding 2011. Senter for internasjonalisering av utdanning. Publikasjon 1/12*. Retrieved August 27, 2012, from <http://www.siu.no/nor/Globalmeny/Publikasjoner/Alle-publikasjoner/SIU-AArsmelding-2011>
  - SIU(2012b). *Rapport og planer(2011-2012). Senter for internasjonalisering av utdanning(SIU)*. Retrieved November 12, 2012, from <http://www.siu.no/nor/Globalmeny/Om-SIU/Sentrale-dokumenter>
  - SIU(2012c). <http://www.siu.no/nor/Grunnskole-og-barnehage/Comenius/Partnerskap> Visited October 10, 2012.
  - SIU(2012d). [http://www.siu.no/nor/Grunnskole-og-barnehage/Comenius/Partnerskap/\(view\)/1827](http://www.siu.no/nor/Grunnskole-og-barnehage/Comenius/Partnerskap/(view)/1827) Visited October 10, 2012.
  - SIU(2012e). *Internationalisering i grunnsopplæringen. En analyse av hvordan lærere og skoleledelse forstår og praktiserer internasjonalisering hjemme. Rapport 1/2012*. Senter for internasjonalisering av utdanning. Retrieved August 27, 2012 from <http://www.siu.no/nor/Globalmeny/Publikasjoner/Alle-publikasjoner/Internasjonalisering-i-grunnsopplaeringen.-En-analyse-av-hvordan-laerere-og-skoleledere-forstaar-og-praktiserer-internasjonalisering-hjemme>
  - SIU(2011). *Håndbok. Internasjonalt samarbeid i grunnsopplæringen 2011*. Senter for internasjonalisering av høgre utdanning. Retrieved November 12, 2012, from <http://www.siu.no/nor/Globalmeny/Publikasjoner/Alle-publikasjoner/Haandbok-Internasjonalt-samarbeid-i-grunnsopplaeringen>
  - SIU(2010). *Internasjonalisering i skolesektoren 2010*. Senter for internasjonalisering av høgre utdanning. Retrieved November 12, 2012, from <http://www.siu.no/nor/Globalmeny/Publikasjoner/Alle-publikasjoner/Internasjonalisering-i-skolesektoren>

- SSB(2012) <http://www.ssb.no/emner/04/02/30/vgogjen/> Visited November 21, 2012.
- SSB(2011) <http://www.ssb.no/emner/04/02/20/utgrs/> Visited November 18, 2012.
- Telhaug, A. O.(2005). *Kunnskapsløftet-ny eller gammel skole? Beskrivelse og analyse av Kristin Clemets reformer i grunnsopplæringen*. Oslo: Cappelen Akademiske forlag
- Walkenhorst, Heiko.(2008). Explaining change in EU education policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 15(4), 567-587. Retrieved February 25, 2011 from the EBSCO database.
- Warleigh-Lack, A. & Drachenberg, R.(2010). Policy making in the European Union. In Cini, M. & Borrigan, N.P.(2010). *European Union Politics Third edition*. (pp. 209-224). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Welle-Strand, A & Tjervoll, A(2002). The Norwegian unified school-a paradise lost? *Journal of Education Policy*. 17(6), 673-686. Retrieved September 6, 2012 from Taylor & Francis Online