

Ingvild Digranes

The Norwegian School Subject Art and Crafts

- Tradition and Contemporary Debate

Abstract

This article will show the development of the Norwegian school subject Art and Crafts from its beginning to what can be labeled the New Reconstructionist Stream seen today. It sums up the essence of the practice tradition and debate throughout the subject's 120 years of history as a school subject in Norwegian general education (1st through 10th year). It addresses several theoretical approaches to describe the history of the subject, and compares these to the practice traditions as seen in original sources. It will trace how the strong practice tradition can be seen as one of the main reasons why the Norwegian Art and Crafts school subject show a new purpose for the content, a purpose that highlight democratic design and citizenship by introducing a global sustainable perspective in general education.

Keywords: Art and Crafts education, Subject-matter didaktikk, citizenship, sustainable design, globalisation.

Introduction

As a result of some decades of influence from Romantic trends of free expression and child art, the Norwegian subject *Art and Crafts* has suffered from being referred to by laypeople as a compulsory subject that is the 'break in between' or the 'possibility of enjoyment' in a knowledge-oriented school (Aubert 2008, Henriksen 2008). It is true that the pupils have signalled a love for the subject (Carlsen & Streitlien 1995, Kjosavik et al. 2003, Trier 1892), however this is not synonymous with Art and Crafts being a subject devoid of knowledge content. This article¹ is an attempt to sum up the essence of the development in the subject tradition and debate throughout the Norwegian Art and Crafts subject's 120 years of history as a school subject in general education, from what is now 1st through 10th grade (Kunnskapsdepartementet 2006). This is done to show how the subject has come almost full circle in curriculum content thinking during this period of time, though the purpose and form is coloured by the contemporary society. New development in the subject offers an understanding of the subject Art and Crafts' knowledge content as relevant and indeed necessary in a social democratic perspective (Nielsen & Digranes 2007a). A reintroduction of the subject's historical concepts such as quality workmanship, citizenship, and useful objects, combined with a focus of global awareness, provides the basis for a new subject orientation.

Practice Tradition and Written Sources

The concept tradition belongs in several disciplines and exists with different definitions. I have approached the concept in a more general rather than a discipline-specific way. It can be understood as an inherited, established, or customary pattern of thought, action or behaviour. It is a belief or story relating to the past that is commonly accepted as historical though it is not necessarily verifiable. It is seen as the handing down of information and customs, by word of mouth or by example from one generation to the next, without any support from specific written instructions. Tradition is also a cultural continuity of social attitudes and customs that have a characteristic manner, method, or style. Tradition in the sense it is presented here is then defined as knowledge and values close to the practice performed in the subject in schools. Traditions are

handed down experience, skills and reflection-in-action (Schön 1991), transferred from one generation of teachers to the next (Dunin-Woyseth & Nielsen 2003, Kvernbekk 2005). Although the subject has had several names and been through structural changes,² I will treat it as one subject area with a 120 year history from its introduction in the Norwegian curriculum in 1889 until today. I will, through my interpretation of the subject's tradition, show what I find to be the reason behind a levelling out of conflict in the contemporary debate within the subject area, and what the contemporary debate contains. To do this, I will first present theoretical approaches on the perspectives that can be recognised in the Norwegian tradition. Then I will create an overview of the Norwegian subject tradition. This overview is necessary to understand the emergence of what I see as the new orientation in both the philosophy and practice of the Art and Crafts subject. This new orientation shows a return to some of the ideals and values prevalent when the subject originated.

Evaluations performed on the subject Art and Crafts (Carlsen & Streitlien 1995, Kjosavik et al. 2003) show that in later years there has been a shortage of written material and educational instructions in the subject area. However, the schools tradition is the guiding factor in the teachers' professional practice: "The Forming teacher is often left to his own or the schools tradition within Forming" (Carlsen and Streitlien 1995:42).³ Written sources are limited, as is access to the practice tradition through research. The area *Art and Design didaktikk*⁴ is a young field in Norway, and it is difficult to say that there is a clear disciplinary tradition represented by the research field. Research into the traditions of the subject has previously been based in other disciplines that do not have a practical approach (Nielsen 2008). Jorunn Spord Borgen claims that the practical focus is part of the subject's strong points: "Ideas, theories, pedagogy and methods are inseparable in the subject Forming. The subject's strength in the Norwegian school has been its strong subject-matter didaktikk frame for the education" (Borgen 1995:44). In light of this, the more general understanding of traditions as handed down practice based knowledge – combined with the short research history of the Norwegian subject (Nielsen 2008) – contribute to making the sources for this discussion somewhat limited. As a result, I have chosen to present *some* of the more acknowledged theories or paradigmatic perspectives that have been developed in the US, Sweden and Norway (Borgen 1995, Efland 1990, 2004, Lindberg 1988, Nordström & Romilson 1972). They are used as tools to discuss the periods that can be seen in the tradition of the Norwegian subject and are selected on this basis. As research into the practice of the Norwegian school subject is not abundant, I have chosen to use original quotes from journals, meetings, and educational material and curricula as examples when I argue my interpretation of the practice tradition of the school subject. This focus on the practice tradition does not mean that I will not mention outside influence or a broader theory base, but rather that the focus is on the specifics for the Norwegian school subject.

Three Streams of American Art Education

The American theorist Arthur Efland presents (Efland 1990, 2004) what he sees as three main streams in the development of the subject area within American Art education. I will not discuss the American tradition here. Instead I introduce these streams briefly because they can be used to discuss the Norwegian tradition of Art and Crafts education. These streams are the *Reconstructionist Stream*, the *Scientific Rationalism* and the *Expressionist Stream*.

The Reconstructionist Stream has a view of art education as a force that can transform society, where social reforms and the development of society is the purpose of the subject (Efland 1990). Art as a resource will be used to solve social problems, and this in turn will lead to moral

growth. In the more general educational theories, Dewey is seen as important in this perspective. This does not apply solely to his slogan “learning by doing,” but also relates to his thoughts of education as a way for the individual to be a part of society. Further, Dewey relates closely to relevant societal questions into the educational arena, and the pupil as a possible influence on the surrounding context (Dewey 1938).

The second stream is Scientific Rationalism, a movement which employs the disciplines as defined by science as a basis for curriculum reform (Efland 1990). Psychology and pedagogy were strong disciplines in this movement, and developed theories of development stages to understand of the child’s growth. In Norway this was especially visible within the works of Helga Eng (1918, 1926, 1944), who wrote extensively on the tests performed to map children’s development of abstract ideas. Drawing was seen as part of the psychological stages of the child, and as such should be seen in concert with the child’s interests and levels of understanding. Drawing was used to develop the creative aspect of the child, and this stream can be seen as a reaction to industrialisation and mass production. Traditional work was ascribed a higher worth than the machine produced products. Lowenfeld (1947) was early introduced into this field, and within the tradition of Drawing, his ideas developed further into what became the Expressionist Stream.

The Expressionist Stream is grounded in nineteenth-century Romantic Idealism (Efland 1990). It can be seen as a rebellion against academic rules and utilitarianism and is recognised by the emphasis on personal expression. It was based on ‘the creative forces of the child’. It was highlighted that the child should be free from outside influences, as free expression is seen, in the Expressionist Stream, as the closest thing to the ideal of the ‘pure’ person and original art (Lowenfeld 1947). These thoughts of the ‘natural’ and ‘real’ can be traced to Rousseau’s notions of the Noble Savage.

Within these separate streams, several approaches to the subject are suggested as possible paradigms, with certain timeframes. Efland (2004) lists five periods that can be seen to influence the subject area of Art education in the US. These approaches are:

- 1) Academic art - recognised by mimesis and copying,
- 2) Elements and principles of design - where formal aesthetics and order result in a pleasing result,
- 3) Creative self-expression - where the individual artist and originality is valued,
- 4) Art in everyday life - where art improves the everyday surroundings and provides intelligent solutions to improve life, and
- 5) Discipline Based Art Education (DBAE) - where art is an open concept and the academic discussions into understanding the concept of art is the main element (Efland 2004).

I choose to include the concepts briefly, as some of them are useful towards commenting on the Norwegian tradition as well.

Lindberg on Swedish Art Education

The Swedish Art Education researcher Anna Lena Lindberg (1988) on the other hand claims that the subject area Bild⁵ is shaped by two distinct and opposite poles – the *lecturing attitude* and the *charismatic attitude*. The lecturing attitude is, in her words, signified by an objectification of the pupil, as s/he is seen as a vessel to fill with knowledge to make him/her better equipped to appreciate art. Through this appreciation, s/he will develop moral judgment and be a part of society. The charismatic attitude on the other hand is seen as a subjectification of the pupil, as

everything is seen as coming from within the pupil, where free untainted expression is the way towards individual growth. I will later argue that even if Lindberg claims that these are complete opposites, they exist within one period of the Norwegian subject's development and represent different expressions of the same purpose. I will return to this later with the discussion concerning the overview of the Norwegian tradition.

Development of Practice

The Norwegian tradition cannot, in my view, be represented by such an easy polarisation. To illuminate my claims of the development of the contemporary debate, I will briefly address the purpose and content of the subject as it can be seen throughout the curricula from the beginning in 1889, and the main discussions that can be recognised in the practice tradition.

The Subject's Development

When the three subjects *Craft for boys (Sløyd)*, *Craft for girls (Textile)* and *Drawing* were introduced into the 1889 curriculum (Kyrkje- og skuledepartementet 1924 Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet 1925) they had some references to what Efland calls Elements and principles of design. However, even as this is seen as part of the subject, the purpose that is stated in *Sløyd* and *Textile* is to give the pupils knowledge and skills so that they can be *self-sufficient* in their production of useful everyday objects (Kyrkje- og skuledepartementet 1924: 76&80). *Drawing* has as its main purpose to further the child's ability to *see* – to reproduce from real life or from memory. The tradition Efland labelled Academic art is visible within this subject area. The craft oriented subjects *Sløyd* and *Textile* display a tendency towards the Reconstructionist Stream, even if Efland more refers to art, the purpose of self-sufficiency in Norway was introduced to solve some economic and social problems seen in society at the time. The pre-oil economy relied on using and reusing local resources and repairing the existing objects. Lasting objects that were useful for everyday life was the basis for the craft subjects of this system of education (Nielsen 2009).

Drawing, on the other hand, even as it focused on drawing everyday objects, was more influenced by Art history and mimesis (Kyrkje- og skuledepartementet 1924, Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet 1925). Theories within pedagogy and psychology that focused on drawing were developed further around the turn of the century. Crafts such as *Sløyd* and *Textile* were not to a great extent included in the development of the Scientific Realism described by Efland (1990). The focus in *Sløyd* as seen in educational material at the time was rather kept as:

Sløyd should activate both the body and the mind, reason, heart, and hand. It should through the child's reality point from childhood towards the grown person's responsibility as a citizen (Digranes 1933:14).

Textile was more influenced by the thoughts seen in *Drawing*, but still kept the focus on the useful.

Every young girl – in whatever position she might end – needs the 'everyday knowledge' and 'everyday culture' that craft can give them. Most of them also need the economic support it provides [...] The girl has to learn, if the woman should be proficient (Trøtteberg 1934:45).

A pronounced difference in the tradition of *Drawing* and the tradition of *Sløyd* was soon visible in the practice. New theories of drawing and individuality surfaced in teacher courses held in the

subject Drawing, while within Sløyd and Textile the courses still focused on the lasting objects and craft as useful skills (Norsk lærerlag 1935).

In Sløyd and Textile subject-matter didaktikk texts following the curriculum of 1939, the focus to some degree shows the influenced by Scientific Realism. A reaction towards the Expressionist Stream that had begun in the subject Drawing could be seen also in the craft subjects (Trøtteberg 1950). However, focus on skill and the elements and principles of design, with the purpose of creating enterprising people still dominate the curriculum:

Sløyd should: [...] train the mind, determination and judgment, further the sense of 'good form and colour' and familiarize them with making the work thorough and beautiful. The subject Sløyd should help creating happy, determined and enterprising people (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet 1939:184).

Bull-Hansen, one of the most prominent figures of the subject Drawing, was early influenced by Lowenfeld's book *Creative and Mental Growth* (1947). At the 16th Nordic school meeting in Oslo in 1953, he presented the book to the audience. The previous separate teacher organisations for Sløyd, Textile and Drawing had already merged into one association consisting of teachers from all three subjects. With Bull-Hansen as the headmaster for the specialised teacher training for Sløyd, Textile and Drawing, as well as the former leader of the joint teachers association, (Trøtteberg 1934), the forces within the subject area Drawing, in particular, he pushed for a joint school subject as well (Bull-Hansen 1953).

One Subject – Forming

The resulting joint subject Forming was launched in 1960 and the curriculum states that the education within Forming has as its main goal to 'develop and cultivate creative forces and aesthetical sensibility' (Forsøksrådet for skoleverket 1960:245). The Expressionist Stream could now be seen in the curriculum. The focus on free expression and the fear of outside influence on the child's creative forces were also visible in the secondary fact that new instruction books for teachers were scarce in this subject. This can be interpreted as a result of Lowenfeld's book (1947) that discouraged any kind of adult teaching in favour of leaving the children to their natural creativity. A version of his book was published in Danish in 1973 (Lowenfeld and Brittain 1973) and became one of the main written sources for the subject in Norway. This development continued and even grew stronger with the curriculum of 1974 (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet 1974). In this light it would be tempting to believe that all the areas of the subject was strongly coloured by the new ideologies. However, the evaluations performed as late as in 1995 and 2003 show that the tradition of Sløyd was still seen as an area anchored in the goal of producing useful objects for everyday use. Similarly in these evaluations Elements and principles of design is visible in the practice and play an important part in the process (Carlsen & Streitlien 1995, Kjosavik et al. 2003). The practice tradition in Sløyd withstood the Expressionist Stream, and the curriculum of 1987 (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet 1987) showed a turn towards a new focus on content in terms of knowledge and skill. With the curriculum of 1997 (Kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartement 1996) this was openly expressed as an aim by the Minister of Education at the time in order to enhance the knowledge aspect of all the school subjects, as well as Art and Crafts. The new focus introduced a new direction for the subject, which was further developed with the curriculum of 2006 (Kunnskapsdepartementet 2006).

Complicated Traditions and Philosophical Categories

Efland concludes his analysis of the history of American Art education with the remark that “In this century, the conflict in art education has been between those intent upon teaching the content of art and those seeing it as self-expression” (Efland 1990:263). Lindberg refers to the same problem in Sweden within the field of Bild when she claims that:

What I refer to as the *dilemma of art education* is an expression of these very contradictions which mean that it is problematic to mediate between the objectification and subjectification of the receiver. The one pole, *the lecturing attitude*, cannot be easily combined with the opposite pole, *the charismatic attitude* (Lindberg 1988:346).

Karen Brønne claims in her article *Modern heritage and consequences* (2005) that the Norwegian subject Art and Crafts as a whole is presented with a paradox within the practice of evaluation and marking. The paradox within evaluation and grading is that the teachers, no matter what they might list as criteria, value creativity and novelty within the idea stages, but the Elements and principles of design in the process and product.

To introduce different criteria at different stages of the process can, in my view, be seen as a sign of the different ideals for what was seen as qualities that lingers within the traditions of the subject. Both the evaluation from 1995 (Carlsen & Streitlien) and 2003 (Kjosavik et al.), show that the Art and Crafts teachers value these parts, useful lasting objects, individual expression, and creativity, equally. I propose that it is here that the Sløyd/Textile tradition on the one hand, and the Drawing tradition on the other hand surface. The Sløyd values of quality craftsmanship, useful lasting objects, and good form are still alive in the practice; the prevailing expressive idea of the personal expression of Drawing is still present as well. Therefore, in the initial idea and sketching phase, it would seem natural that the Drawing tradition with its strong emphasis on creativity dominates. In the process of making the product and the judgment of the final product itself, the Sløyd tradition and the focus on the functions and appropriateness of the product, along with craftsmanship will dominate.

Jorunn Spord Borgen comments on the construction of these streams and the presented paradox, that the:

[...] problem with a description of ‘the rise and fall’ of an idea complex, is that a notion of the idea as an independent unit uninfluenced by the social and cultural relations they develop within is easily created (Borgen 1995:53).

I would support this statement, as the US, Swedish, and Borgen herself cover what in my view is the real duality in the tradition of the Norwegian subject: the persistence of several parallel subject area traditions that operate with different purposes for the practice. The dichotomies presented are in my view not merely opposite philosophies, but practice approaches developed and maintained in the school subject’s practice tradition. Even as the subject changed names in 1960 to Forming, and then again to Art and Crafts in 1997, 50 years after the subject changed its name, Sløyd is still alive with the pupils, teachers and the public at large (Mauren 2006a, 2006b, Olset 2006). The focus on skill and lasting objects as quality is highlighted in this particular tradition within the Art and Crafts subject, and to address *the* tradition of the subject Art and Crafts is therefore not as straightforward an endeavour as suggested.

A New Approach in Art and Crafts

Having a *debate* implies that there are two sides discussing a 'matter of concern' (Latour 2004) within the subject. The debate that often follows the implementation of a new curriculum usually concerns whether the changes are for the better or if the already established content should have been prolonged. In the aftermath of that discussion, the debate turns to the future potential development of the subject. The contemporary debate concerning the changes in the curriculum of 2006 is not as heated and polarised as the debate that preceded and followed the curriculum of 1997 in which the subject changed its name from Forming to Art and Crafts (Fredbo 1995, Nielsen 1995, Solstad 1995, Sundvor & Melbye 1995, Vestøl 1995a, 1995b, 1996). I will now propose an explanation for this, and the new direction that can be seen in the debate.

This new direction is not as yet evident in the theories presented by Borgen, Efland, and Lindberg in my view, as they stop just as they arrive at the new shift that represents the contemporary debate in the subject area, at least in the Norwegian subject. It was visible in the 1987 curriculum where the shift from the Expressionist Stream towards a view of knowledge content which has been more pronounced in the two last curricula. Brønne (2005) concludes her analysis of the Norwegian subject area with a comment on what she calls the radical modernity. Brønne argues that the Art and Crafts debate might become even more fragmented, as it rests uneasily on the truth ideals of modernity. However, in my opinion, the debate within the subject area will, in light of the strong Sløyd and Textile tradition and changes within the theory base in the area Drawing, provide a more stable value base for the debate.

From Several Practice Traditions, Towards the New Reconstructionist Stream?

The contemporary debate within the subject area, though still in a process of cementing new ideals, has less of a polarising effect between the Expressionist ideals and the Reconstructionist ideals. The contemporary Art and Crafts subject debate centres around the issue of sustainability and qualification for democratic processes (Nielsen 2008). The content and structure has undergone a significant change, in which the new division into *Visual Communication, Design, Fine art* and *Architecture* constitute a significant change from the 2-dimensional/3-dimensional division of subject in the curriculum of 1997 (Kunnskapsdepartementet 2006). However the Art and Crafts didaktikk milieus involved in the debate, though still in the process of debating whether the new direction is the right one, show a more accepting attitude and less conflict than with earlier changes (Nielsen 2009).

The practice gap that lies between the tradition of Sløyd and Drawing, where Textile exist somewhat in between, has in my view to some extent begun narrowing. I postulate that the reason for this change is the shift in the tradition of Drawing, initiated by the book; *School, Picture and Society* by the Swedish teachers Nordström and Romilson (Nordström & Romilson 1972). They write within the subject Bild, which would correspond mostly to the Norwegian tradition of Drawing. This book removed itself from the expressive ideals that were the former dominating paradigm in the Drawing practice tradition and created a new practice debate that has slowly had an impact on the understanding of the Norwegian subject in school. Nordström and Romilson called it polarizing methodology. The collective perspective was introduced, and the useful knowledge in terms of understanding the new visual world, reclaiming the concept of skill towards a competent person, and an understanding of what might be labelled citizenship was introduced also in the practice of Bild/Drawing. To show how the new stream signals what I see as coming almost full circle within the subject, I will first sum up the discussions I have

presented and the practice tradition as I see it. I will then show how the New Reconstructionist Stream reintroduces former values and concepts.

The Circular Motion

In 1889, the subject in Norway was rooted within the Reconstructionist Stream. The purpose was to enhance economy and provide better social situations for the future citizen. The focus was the lasting objects, knowledge and skill that was useful for everyday life, and a collective perspective on maintaining self-sufficiency at the local level, for a better life in society. This was particularly strong in the Sløyd and Textile subjects. However, the research that dominated the pedagogy and psychology at the time of the curriculum of 1939 (Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet 1939), included Drawing as a vital factor in child development stage theories, and brought the Scientific Realism into the subject area. Although it influenced the two crafts subjects on the surface, it didn't take root in these practice tradition subjects like it did within Drawing. Drawing moved towards a more individual approach that emphasised stages, and the importance of relating the work to the child's current interests.

The Scientific Realism made the move into the Expressionist Stream possible, where the merging of the three subjects seemed to create a purely individual approach. In this combination, knowledge and skill became redundant, as moral growth and free-expression had to be untainted by outside forces. This is where I argue that Anna Lena Lindberg's theories of the romantic notion of moral growth through art (Lindberg 1988) should be placed. Even as she calls one of the poles objectivising and passive, the end result is the individual art appreciation that will cause the person to be moral. The subjectivising and active, has the end result the untainted production of free-expression that will cause the person to be moral (Lindberg 1988). These are different methods, but the same Expressionist focus on the individual, moral growth. It is, in my view, not a coincidence that this theory is developed within the field of Bild/Drawing that also in Norway at that time was heavily influenced by the Romantic Expressionist stream. The Norwegian subject Forming struggles with the influenced by separate traditions where Sløyd, Textile and Drawing are continued as separate areas in the educational practice. Sløyd, and to some extent Textile, parts from the theory and philosophy of Drawing. Evaluations and newspaper clippings show that Sløyd in its original form is still alive in the practice tradition even now (Mauren 2006a, 2006b, Olset 2006). Craftsmanship, skill, and knowledge of Elements and principles of design in the production of useful everyday objects are still the focus of this tradition.

The contemporary debate is shaped by these strong practice traditions as well as the new philosophies behind Drawing. Although it might seem contrary, the strength of these traditions is one reason why the subject in my opinion is entering a new phase. One might also call this a New Reconstructionist Stream that also allows for a levelling out of the debate within the subject area. The strong traditions of Sløyd and Textile that still emphasise the lasting objects and the useful (Moe 2007) could provide support for the new direction within the field of Drawing.

In my view, the contemporary debate within the Norwegian subject Art and Crafts has moved into a phase showing the development of the New Reconstructionist Stream (Aasgaard & Degerud 2009, Fagrådet for Design og Håndverk 2009, Tobiasson 2009), where the useful lasting objects, citizenship, knowledge and skills useful for participation in everyday democratic processes are once again held in high regards, but where the local self-sufficiency is replaced by global sustainability as the purpose for the content. The theory, curriculum aims, and practice of Drawing are moving towards the focus still alive in the tradition of Sløyd and Textile, and henceforth facilitate a bridging of the gap within the subject area. If the Sløyd and Textile

practice traditions had been influenced by the Expressionist Stream to a greater extent, it would be difficult to perceive the move towards a re-ignition of the collective focus on global advancement.

Conclusion

The New Reconstructionist Stream reintroduces concepts and issues relating to citizenship and responsibility for the common environment. It cannot be seen simply as a “break in between” or the “possibility of enjoyment”. The subject knowledge content is debated in terms of universal design, redesign, social and aesthetic ramifications of architectural decisions, user participation and the unveiling of manipulations (Fauske 2005, 2006, Lefdal 2005, Nielsen & Digranes 2007a, 2007b). The debate highlights how the Expressionist Stream is recognised as part of the subject, but is located within the Fine art section of the curriculum. In contrast, Design, Architecture and Visual communication all rely on the thought of democratic participation, social responsibility, though the focus on local self-sufficiency is replaced by a global focus on local sustainability. In light of this, the contemporary debate can be seen as a more level debate than previously in the history of the subject. Collective values and societal anchoring is brought back into the area of Drawing, replacing some of the Expressionist ideals, and as such revitalises the concept of citizenship that was raised in the Sløyd and Textile tradition in the pre-war era.

Ingvild Digranes

Associate Professor, PhD
Høgskolen i Oslo, Avdeling for estetiske fag
E-mail: ingvild.digranes@est.hio.no

References

- Aasgaard, K., & Degerud, H. (2009). Miljø og bærekraftig design. Fra Nordisk Kurs i Drammen 2009. *FORM*, 43(4), 14.
- Aubert, M. G. (2008, 27.03). - Kulturfag er kosetimer. *Aftenposten*. s. 6.
- Borgen, J. S. (1995). Formingsfaget i et oppdrags- og dannelsesperspektiv. In B. Tronshart (Red.), *Formingsfagets egenart* (s. 44-61). Notodden: Telemarksforskning.
- Brønne, K. (2005). Moderne opphav og konsekvensar. I L. M. Nielsen & I. Digranes (Red.), *DesignDialog - Design og fagdidaktiske utfordringer. HiO-rapport 2005 nr 33*. Oslo: Høgskolen i Oslo.
- Bull-Hansen, R. (1953). Formingsfagene og kunstoppdragelse som ledd i kulturutviklingen. I L. Kielland (Red.), *Det 16. nordiske skolemøte. 5-7.august i Oslo*. Oslo: Nikolai Olsens boktrykkeri.
- Carlsen, K., & Streitlien, Å. (1995). *Elev- og lærerperspektiv på formingsfaget resultater fra en spørreundersøkelse*. Notodden: Telemarksforskning.
- Digranes, A. (1933). *Håndarbeid for gutter*. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Dunin-Woyseth, H., & Nielsen, L. M. (2003). From Apprentice to Master. Some Notes on Educating Design Scholars and Developing Design Scholarship. In D. Durling & K. Sugiyama (Eds.), *The Doctoral Education in Design, 3rd Conference, Epochal Tsukuba, 14-17 October* (pp. 25-34). Tsukuba: University of Tsukuba.
- Efland, A. D. (1990). *A History of Art Education: Intellectual and Social Currents in Teaching the Visual Arts*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Efland, A. D. (2004). Emerging Visions of Art Education. In E. W. Eisner & M. D. Day (Eds.), *Handbook of Research and Policy in Art Education* (pp. 691-701). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eng, H. (1918). *Kunstpædagogik*. Kristiania: Aschehoug.
- Eng, H. (1926). *Barnetegning: med illustrasjoner i sort og farver*. Oslo: Cappelen.
- Eng, H. (1944). *Margrethes tegning: fra det 9. til det 24. året: andre uttrykksformer, fortsettelse av barnetegning*. Oslo: Cappelen.
- Fagrådet for Design og Håndverk. (2009). Organiseringen i Kunst og håndverksfaget. *FORM*, 43(3), 24-25
- Fauske, L. B. (2005). Arkitektur innenfor rammene av Kunst og håndverk. I L. M. Nielsen & I. Digranes (Red.), *DesignDialog - Design og fagdidaktiske utfordringer* (s. 8-16). Oslo: Høgskolen i Oslo.
- Fauske, L. B. (2006). Estetisk kvalitet i våre omgivelser. I L. M. Nielsen & I. Digranes (Red.), *DesignDialog - Kunnskapsløftet og visuell kompetanse* (Vol. HiO-rapport 2006 nr 24, s 21-32). Oslo: Høgskolen i Oslo.
- Forsøksrådet for skoleverket. (1960). *Læreplan for forsøk med 9.årig skole nr.5*. Oslo: Aschehoug & Co.
- Fredbo, H. (1995). Uttalelse om L97 fra fagkonferansen i forming. *FORM*, 29(5/6), 37-39.
- Henriksen, A. (2008, 29.03). - Slutt med kosen. Bård Vegard Solhjell vil sette kunnskap i høysetet. *Aftenposten*, s. 8,
- Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet. (1925). *Normalplan for byfolkeskolen*. Oslo: Stenersen.
- Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet. (1974). *Mønsterplan for grunnskolen*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartement. (1996). *Læreplanverket for den 10-årige grunnskolen*. Oslo: Nasjonalt læremiddelsenter.
- Kjosavik, S., Koch, R.-H., Skjeggstad, E., & Aakre, B. M. (2003). *Kunst og håndverk i L97. Nytt fag - ny praksis?* Notodden: Telemarksforskning.
- Kunnskapsdepartementet. (2006). *Læreplanverket for Kunnskapsløftet. Midlertidig utg. juni 2006*. Oslo: Utdanningsdirektoratet.
- Kyrkje- og skuledepartementet. (1924). *Normalplan for landsfolkeskolen*. Kristiania: J.M. Stenersens forlag.
- Kyrkje- og undervisningsdepartementet. (1939). *Normalplan (mønsterplan) for landsfolkeskolen*. Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Kyrkje- og undervisningsdepartementet. (1987). *Mønsterplan for grunnskolen: M 87* (Nynorsk ed.). Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Kvernbekk, T. (2005). *Pedagogisk teoridannelse insidere, teoriformer og praksis*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Latour, B. (2004). Why Has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern. *Critical Inquiry*, 30(winter), 225-248.
- Lefdal, E. M. (2005). Etisk designperspektiv. I L. M. Nielsen & I. Digranes (Red.), *DesignDialog - Design og fagdidaktiske utfordringer* (s. 47-56). Oslo: Høgskolen i Oslo.
- Lindberg, A. L. (1988). *Konstpedagogikens dilemma - historiska rötter och moderna strategier*. Lund: Institutionen för konstvetenskap.
- Lowenfeld, V. (1947). *Creative and mental growth: a textbook on art and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Lowenfeld, V. & Brittain, L. (1973). *Kreativitet og vækst*. København: Gjellerup.
- Mauren, A. (2006a, 28.11). Skal ikke bety slutten for praktisk arbeid. *Aftenposten Morgen*, s. 19,
- Mauren, A. (2006b, 28.11). Sløydafaget trues av mer teori. *Aftenposten Morgen*, s. 18,
- Moe, E. (2007). Speil - designoppgave 10. trinn. *FORM*, 41(4).
- Nielsen, L. M. (1995). Kunst og håndverk i grunnskolen. *FORM*, 29(5/6), 39.

- Nielsen, L. M. (2008). Art, design and environmental participation. Norwegian research in art and design education 1995-2006. In L. Lindström (Ed.), *Nordic Visual Arts Education in Transition. A research Review*. Stockholm: Svenska Vetenskapsrådet.
- Nielsen, L. M. (2009). *Fagdidaktikk for Kunst og håndverk – i går, i dag, i morgen*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget
- Nielsen, L. M., & Digranes, I. (2007a). *Norwegian Design Education – Developing the Scandinavian Perspective*. Paper presented at the The International Association of Societies of Design Research. Emerging Trends in Design Research, 12-15 November, 2007. from <http://www.sd.polyu.edu.hk/iasdr/proceeding/papers/NORWEGIAN%20GENERAL%20DESIGN%20EDUCATION.pdf>
- Nielsen, L. M., & Digranes, I. (2007b). *User participation - Real influence or hostage taking*. In E. Bohemia, K. Hilton, C. McMahon & A. Clarke (Eds.), *Shaping the future? Proceedings from the 9th engineering & product design education international conference, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom, 13-14 september 2007* (pp. 305-310). Newcastle: Northumbria University, Headleys Ltd.
- Nordström, G. Z., & Romilson, C. (1972). *Skolen, bildet og samfunnet*. Oslo: Pax.
- Olset, M. (2006, 12.04.06). Lærer matte av forming. *Firda*, s. 5,
- Schön, D. A. (1991). *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Solstad, A. G. (1995). Naturligvis bør forming overleve! *FORM*, 29(2), 26.
- Sundvor, I., & Melbye, E. (1995). Behold fagbetegnelsen forming! *FORM*, 29(1), 13-14.
- Tobiasson, T. S. (2009). Bærekraftig perspektiv på designfaget. *FORM*, 43(2), 20-23.
- Trier, H. (1892). Sløjdundervisning. Foredrag ved det 6. nordiske Skolemøde 6. August 1890. I *Pædagogiske Tids- og Stridsspørgsmaal: Pædagogiske strejfflys* (s 289-310). København: Philipsen.
- Trætteberg, S. (1934). *Håndarbeid for piker*. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Trætteberg, S. (1950). Femti år gjennom kikkerten. In A. Bugge, V. Kvaal & H. Engelstad (Red.), *Statens kvinnelige industriskole, 1875-1950* (s. 58-66). Oslo: Aschehoug.
- Vestøl, T. (1995a). Navnefeiden. *FORM*, 29(1), 10.
- Vestøl, T. (1995b). Så er det altså avgjort. *FORM*, 29(3), 4.
- Vestøl, T. (1996). Ikke enten, eller - men både, og! *FORM*, 30(1), 3.

¹ This article is based on the trial lecture I held at the Oslo School of Architecture and Design before defending my doctoral thesis in 2009.

² The subject has had many names throughout the history. At its introduction in 1889 it was three separate subjects; *Drawing, Crafts for girls (Textile), and Crafts for boys (Sløyd)*. Sløyd in the Norwegian tradition refers to crafts related to hard materials such as woodwork or metals. In 1960 it merged into one subject named *Forming*. In 1997 it changed names again to *Art and Crafts*.

³ The quotes from the original Norwegian sources, as well as titles of books and articles in Norwegian, have been translated to English by the author.

⁴ The concept of didaktikk, originally from the German education tradition, here with the Norwegian translation becomes problematic once applied in the English language, as didactics, represented by the English translation of the word – as pointing more directly towards lecture/classroom methods (Westbury, Hopmann, and Riquarts 2000). It is important to establish that this article is located within the German and Scandinavian tradition of didaktikk that is a wider field of expertise and the legitimization of the subject's content and purpose.

⁵ Sweden separates the subject area into 1) *Sløyd* (wood and metal), 2) *Textile sløyd*, and 3) *Bild* (picture/drawing). The two first subjects are craft oriented, while Bild is art oriented, but it also incorporates design and media.