

# Chapter 11

## Conceptualisations of Extra-Curricular Cross-Sector Partnerships in the Context of The Cultural Schoolbag and Physical Activity Health Initiatives in Norwegian Schools



Jorunn Spord Borgen and Bjørg Oddrun Hallås

**Abstract** Over the past decades, cross-sector partnership and collaborations in schools have been embraced and developed in many countries as a form of joint work that requires mutual engagement across boundaries within the education policy and practice nexus. However, the addition of extra-curricular content into the school by external partners can be challenging, as it requires the restructuring of the kind of content and knowledge that should be ground in school. How those involved in the cross-sector partnerships negotiate the knowledge ground for certain extra-curricular content and practices is influenced by the context-dependent relationships within the research-policy-practice nexus. Building on previous empirical research conducted by the authors and a document analysis, this article investigates the conceptualisations and key events of two empirical examples of such extra-curricular cross-sector partnerships in the context of compulsory education in Norway. The chapter contributes new knowledge about the research-policy-practice nexus in these partnerships.

**Keywords** Cross-sector partnership · Extra-curricular · Educationalisation · Curriculum · Didactics

---

J. S. Borgen (✉)  
University of South-Eastern Norway, Vestfold, Norway  
e-mail: [jorunn.s.borgen@usn.no](mailto:jorunn.s.borgen@usn.no)

B. O. Hallås  
Western Norway University of Applied Sciences, Bergen, Norway  
e-mail: [bjorg.oddrun.hallas@hvl.no](mailto:bjorg.oddrun.hallas@hvl.no)

© The Author(s) 2023  
T. S. Prøitz et al. (eds.), *From Education Policy to Education Practice*, Policy Implications of Research in Education 15,  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36970-4\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-36970-4_11)

## Introduction

Over the past decades, cross-sector partnerships and collaborations in schools have been embraced and developed in many countries as a form of joint work that requires mutual engagement across boundaries within the education policy and practice nexus (Ball, 2009; Eyal & Yarm, 2018; Lillejord & Børte, 2016; Penuel et al., 2015). In such partnerships, external partners come into schools to contribute content aimed at addressing various issues in the public sphere (Eyal & Yarm, 2018). The term ‘educationalisation’ (Depaepe, 1998) is a key concept in understanding the basic processes in education when certain issues are introduced into the school through reforms, programmes, partnerships, and interventions (Fendler, 2018; Labaree, 2008). Educationalisation forms the basis of much contemporary thinking about curriculum, schooling and social reform today (Brass, 2016). The argument is that school is where children and young people meet and that introducing certain issues in school can help stimulate individual student’s growth and development (Fendler, 2018). However, the addition of extra-curricular content into the school by external partners poses a challenge, as it requires the restructuring of the kind of content and knowledge that should be ground in school. How those involved in the cross-sector partnership negotiate the knowledge ground for certain extra-curricular content and practices is influenced by the context-dependent relationships in the research-policy-practice nexus (Geschwind & Broström, 2013; Locke, 2009; Ohio, 2008). Locke (2009, p. 122) suggests that a historical approach can be enlightening to gain insight into the policy and practice nexus and uses of research.

Although partnerships have many shapes and forms and can be limited by time, situational, and informal, or become more formalised over time, some characteristics are common (Brinkerhoff, 2002; Ng et al., 2017). For example, it is expected that all partnerships will contribute mutuality, reciprocity and added value, and result in the improvement, development and strengthening of education (Coburn & Penuel, 2016; Duncan & Conner, 2013; Penuel et al., 2015). Cross-sector partnerships aim to mobilise the capacity and resources of private, governmental and non-governmental entities to improve school quality (Eyal & Yarm, 2018). However, the additional content that students encounter through such partnership activities in school is not necessarily described in the curriculum. Further, different partners might have a different ideational basis with regard to the content of the extra-curricular contribution by different stakeholders and the consequences of operationalisation (Carstensen & Schmidt, 2016). Partnership studies report that participants may encounter tensions and problems related to ideas and ideology, and this is evident through asymmetries and unbalanced power relations, lack of formalisation of structures, unclear goals, and unclear systems of implementation and evaluation (Brinkerhoff, 2002; Borgen & Brandt, 2006; Lillejord & Børte, 2016; Ng et al., 2017). While several studies have elucidated the downfalls of such partnerships, there are few descriptions of how they can be operationalised to work well (Coburn & Penuel, 2016). In addition, the research-policy-practice nexus within specific contexts of cross-sector partnerships is rarely addressed (Coburn & Penuel, 2016; Geschwind & Broström, 2013).

Building on previous empirical research conducted by the authors (see for example Borgen, 2008, 2018; Borgen & Brandt, 2006; Borgen & Hjordemaal, 2017; Borgen et al., 2020a, b; Grønningsæter et al., 2007; Hallås et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2022) and document analysis, this article investigates the arts and culture program The Cultural Schoolbag (TCS) and physical activity (PA) health initiatives in school as empirical examples of such extra-curricular cross-sector partnerships in primary education in Norway. TCS and PA initiatives were formally introduced in educational policy at the threshold of the twenty-first century and have over the past 20 years been operationalized into different initiatives and practices in compulsory education in Norway. There are similarities in the policy effort to support the mission of these partnerships, but these cross-sector partnerships have different historic trajectories with regard to policy formation, goals and intentions, formalisation, resources, structures and agency in schools. Here, we have adopted the practice of conceptual history (Koselleck, 1985) to explore conceptualisations of arts and cultural education and PA health initiatives in the research-policy-practice nexus by focusing on TCS and PA cross-sector partnerships in compulsory education over a period of 20 years, that is, from 2000 to 2020.

First, we present TCS and PA as cases. We follow this with a discussion on how arts and PA are both part of educationalisation in modern society and a global trend, and the consequences of bringing issues in society into school. Next, we have discussed of the role of cross-sector partnerships as a form of governance in the research-policy-practice nexus with the potential to bring new resources and change into schools. Subsequently, we present the design and methodology of the study, and follow this with an exploration of conceptualisation in the two cases. The chapter ends with some concluding thoughts on collaboration in cross-sector partnerships in the research-policy-practice nexus and the consequences of educationalisation in the two cases.

## Background

The cases in this study are examples of educationalisation and how new content in school is introduced and argued for in a way that is intentionally and rhetorically oriented towards positive transformation and future expectations for individual and for societal development. Internationally, the rationale for promoting arts and culture and PA/health programmes and initiatives in school is to foster democratic citizenship, art experience and appreciation, and healthy behaviour, as well as to obtain more immediate effects, for example, better academic achievement and well-being (Eisner & Day, 2004; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2019; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2016; Winner et al., 2013; World Health Organization [WHO], 2010, 2020). These ideas are embraced rather widely (Alvarez-Bueno et al., 2017; Bamford, 2006; Borgen et al., 2020a, b; Cook & Kohl, 2013; Hetland & Winner, 2004; Reid, 1998) and constitute the ideational and normative basis for TCS and PA in this study.

### *The Cultural Schoolbag*

TCS is part of the government's cultural policy for students in compulsory education 'to experience, become familiar with and develop an understanding of professional artistic and cultural expressions' (White Paper No. 8. (2007–2008)). It is mandated that the activities be of professional quality and cover the entire cultural spectrum—film, cultural heritage, literature, music, performing arts and visual arts. With regard to student outcomes, cultural policy programmes, such as TCS, are supported by certain discourses on art and the effects that art might have on the children who are exposed to it (Borgen & Brandt, 2006; Breivik & Christophersen, 2013). TCS is built on the tradition that aesthetic experience is independent and valuable on its own autonomous premises and as the precondition for our lives as acknowledging and moral beings (Kittang, 1991) and humanistic Bildung (Reichenbach, 2014). However, the literature on arts and cultural education describes tensions between subjective aspects of knowledge, where student participation and students' aesthetic experiences are at the centre, and objective aspects of knowledge, which are communicated to the students as specific and standardised content (Borgen et al., 2020b; Lindgren & Ericsson, 2013; Schou, 2005; Stavrum, 2013). This is regarded as the dual purpose of cultural policy in many Western countries. That is, instead of merely working for the democratisation of the canonised (elite) culture, one also strives for cultural democracy; this requires one to accept other (ordinary people's) cultural forms and participation and can come through as ambivalent policy and practices in general cultural policy as well as in TCS (Duelund, 2003; Mangset & Hylland, 2017; Ruud et al., 2022). TCS is governed by Kulturtanken, which is the national agency of the Ministry of Culture.<sup>1</sup>

### *Physical Activity Health Initiatives*

PA health initiatives are part of public health policy measures directed at children and young people during their time at school and aimed at increasing physical activity. Health initiatives in schools include strategies for improving the long-term health of children and youth through exercise and are grounded in physiology and biomedical research claiming that PA interventions may be effective in the development of healthy lifestyle behaviours among children and adolescents that will then translate into reduced risk for many chronic diseases and cancers in adulthood (Dobbins et al., 2009). It is widely accepted that PA comprises 'bodily movement produced by skeletal muscles that results in energy expenditure beyond rest level' (Caspersen et al., 1985, p. 126). In 1987, the WHO presented the Ottawa Charter for Action to Achieve 'Health for All' by the year 2000 and beyond (WHO, 1987).

---

<sup>1</sup>For more information about Kulturtanken, see: <https://www.denkulturelleskolesekken.no/english-information/this-is-the-cultural-schoolbag/>

Claiming that its success would depend on the collaboration of all sectors of government, a series of actions among international organisations, national governments and local communities were launched by the WHO. Nordic recommendations based on the WHO's recommendations were published in the 1980s and later revised in 1996, 2004, 2013, 2018 and 2020; they have inspired Norwegian health policy. The recommendation by WHO (2010) that children and young people (5–17 years old) should have at least 60 min of moderate to vigorous intensity PA every day is built on claims that there is evidence of the benefits of this practice for the future health of children and youth (Adab et al., 2018; Heath et al., 2012; Ma et al., 2014; OECD, 2019; Sallis & Owen, 1998; Schenker, 2019; Skrede, 2019). PA initiatives in school are expected to result in good health, long life spans and life-long joy of movement (Bailey et al., 2009; OECD, 2019). However, critics argue that a notion of health and physical activity that is dominated by a physiological and biomedical science perspective overlooks the complexity of health as a phenomenon in society in general, as well as in school and in understandings of human versatile movement activity (Borgen et al., 2020a; Evans, 2003).

### *Transforming Content from 'the World' into Classroom Events*

TCS and PA programmes are examples of how educationalisation of central policy issues takes the form of extra-curricular activities in the school. There is a long tradition of introducing additional content to compulsory education, as education is a site of crucial struggles over authority, identity, the meaning of education, content, and who should control it (Apple, 2018). Differences in education according to contexts, regions and countries (Aasen et al., 2015), as well as contemporary global policy trends (Karseth & Sivesind, 2010; Phillips & Ochs, 2003), affect the relationship between society and school and the actual educational content. However, when TCS and PA, as extra-curricular content that is not part of the curriculum, comes into school, who defines what should be taught and learned, and how it should be taught and why? According to Doyle (2017), the transformation of content from 'the world' into the classroom results in curricularisation of that content: 'Any particular curriculum [...] is first a set of claims about the educative effects of certain contents (i.e. what outcomes can be expected of particular experiences) and the social significance of these effects (i.e. why such outcomes are important for children and youth to acquire)' (p. 222). Consequently, when TCS and PA enter the school as cross-sector partners, the curricularisation of content is closely related to how actors work, interact and develop in the context of varied research-policy-practice relationships and nexuses. When the extra-curricular activity is not part of the curriculum and is, thus, intended to impact the content students encounter in school and their educational outcome, this challenges what we understand as curriculum. Traditionally, one major difference between the curriculum and didactic traditions is the perspective on content (Doyle, 2017, p. 219). Curriculum, in the Anglo-American tradition, describes content that does not need to be analysed and

is based on the expectation that curriculum practice in schools can be determined by national policy, with little room for school and teacher autonomy (Priestley et al., 2021). Within this tradition, educational policy intentions are normatively expected to occur through linear and hierarchical chains of command from policy to practice (Priestley et al., 2021). Particularly in Nordic countries that historically have a tradition of didactics, curriculum objectives and content are more generally described, and there is space for various local practices and teacher autonomy (Aasen et al., 2015; Hopmann, 2015; Telhaug et al., 2006; Wermke & Prøitz, 2019). According to Hopmann (2007), didactics can restrain teaching in a way that provides opportunities for the individual growth of the student. The meaning of different learning experiences emerges within the learning process, based on the meeting of a unique individual with a matter at hand; further, the objects of teaching are based on the educational content the teacher has planned. In Norway, the 2006 curriculum reform, and the renewal of the curriculum in 2020, describes an outcome-based curriculum model with elements of content-oriented and didactic traditions (Støren, 2022). Within this mixed curriculum model, teachers are responsible for the didactics in relation to content. However, if the content is not part of the curriculum, as is the case of TCS and PA in compulsory education, this can leave room for a manifold of practices among the different stakeholders, schools, and teachers, and also result in little interest in such practices in policy and in educational research (Locke, 2009; Ohio, 2008). Variations in understandings of what is at stake in the two cross-sector partnership cases actualise discussions about content in education in this chapter (Apple, 2018; Ng et al., 2017), and we place conceptualisations at the forefront of these discussions.

### *Conceptualisation of Partnerships*

Partnership has a history as a ‘feel good’ universal remedy for governance encompassing a range of value-based principles, but it is often unclear how it makes a difference in a specific context, according to Brinkerhoff (2002, p. 20). Partnerships may be understood on a relative scale of mutuality and institutional identity, and as these dimensions are subjective, partners are dependent on the development of a common language in their partnership approaches and practices (Brinkerhoff, 2002). Following on these perspectives, Eyal and Yarm (2018) argue that cross-sector partnership in the education policy and practice nexus have certain specific features related to institutional identity that impact partnership relations. The essence of these partnerships is the establishment of co-understandings on a political-rhetorical level, and operationalisations and practices in school. External partners in cross-sector partnerships can put forth a delimited and clear ideology and institutional identity, but the school has a more eclectic ideational foundation based on education policy and questions about the school’s pedagogical values, goals and methods, and protection of the public school’s ethos. Consequently, this often poses a challenge to mutuality and institutional identity. Eyal and Yarm (2018)

suggest two categories of cross-sector partnerships in the education nexus: reproductive mutuality, in which schools effectively accept ideology and programmes from external partners via a form of ‘soft coercion’, and transformative mutuality, in which schools and external partners engage in substantial dialogue on pedagogical values, goals and methods, leading to pedagogical innovation and the protection of the school ethos. The conditions for transformative mutuality in cross-sector partnerships rely on substantial dialogues about the history of collaboration (Eyal & Yarm, 2018). Such collaboration could involve conceptualisation that may be controversial in a school context but not controversial for external partners, and vice versa. In the case of TCS and PA, because subject content in school is regulated in the curriculum, it can be particularly challenging when external partners contribute extra-curricular content that is not part of the curriculum.

As mentioned earlier, we build on Koselleck’s argument (1985) when exploring conceptualisation of TCS and PA in the education policy and practice nexus. Instead of considering concepts as a given and constant, Koselleck (1985) argues that concept formation and interpretation are historical and change over time and contexts. In this regard, Koselleck (1985) introduced the concepts of ‘space of experience’ and ‘horizon of expectation’ as historical categories that connect time and space. His argument was that the transformation of concepts occurs at a socio-political, rather than a political, level and draws attention to possible histories and relations between past experiences and future prospects (Koselleck, 2018). This notion is supported by studies on what is perceived as possible and desirable in education reforms and practices in school subjects (Borgen et al., 2020b). Historical conceptualisation is specifically relevant when TCS and PA represent certain issues in society that already have a long history, nationally and globally, before they entered the school in relation to these cross-sector extra-curricular partnerships (see for instance Grydeland et al., 2013; Bamford, 2006; Sefton-Green et al., 2012). In his writings, Koselleck (1985) emphasised that all human experiences are relational. For instance, when we choose a certain concept over others, we establish an imbalance in how these concepts are linked to other concepts (Junge, 2014). That is, asymmetry occurs, and these counter concepts have their strength in historical-cultural references that are both past and present, and constantly repositioned, although they are used to refer to something unique and constant. Koselleck’s practice of conceptual history is more a procedure than a definite method (Tribe, 2004). Therefore, in this study, Koselleck’s (1985) concepts of the space of experience and horizon of expectations, as well as asymmetries, are used as tools for analysing conceptualisation. Thus, we can spot key events, that is, explicit as well as more implicit and typically overlooked events (Taylor et al., 2001) and conditions that would, otherwise, have been overlooked or been unavailable to us when we seek to understand these phenomena within TCS and PA cross-sector partnerships.

Our interest lies in examining how the cases were conceptualised in the research-politics-practice nexus over time and what has changed. To this end, we seek to answer the following research question: *What kinds of conceptualisations and key events may have had significance during the 20-year period spanning 2000 to 2020 in the research-policy-practice nexus of TCS and PA cross-sector partnerships?*

## Design and Method

In this study, we build on data from previous research conducted by the authors, and also build on new data from document analysis. We chose an exploratory design in order to answer the research questions (Hellevik, 1994), inspired by Koselleck's (1985) practice of historical conceptualisation (as mentioned earlier), and focused on metahistorical temporality in written/material sources. Based on our knowledge of the cases from our earlier research, we considered key events as important for the conceptualisation of TCS and PA and, accordingly, searched for key events (Taylor et al., 2001).

We established a timeline of documents through mapping and identification of various influential papers (grey, green and white policy documents) that have proven to be relevant to our two cases (Table 11.1). This gave us an overview of key educational policy events that may have had an impact on the cases over a 20-year period. The governance system in Norway is divided into sectors: the policy areas of arts and culture and sports come under the purview of the Ministry of Culture, and education policy comes under the purview of the Ministry of Education. Official documents on TCS policy, therefore, are available with both two ministries, while documents on PA issues may also be available with the Ministry of Health. We also selected other documents to supplement our analysis, and these specifically included documents on the use of specific conceptualisations to establish co-understandings at a political-rhetorical level. These documents include white papers (Meld. St.), action plans and strategic plans, national reports and evaluations, curriculum for compulsory education, and laws and regulations in the period 2000–2020, and we have tried to gain insight into how the documents stand in relation to further policy formulation necessitated by the curriculum reform The subject renewal introduced in 2020 (LK20) (The Directorate of Education and Training, 2022). See Appendix in this chapter, for *references* to the documents on timeline, Table 11.1.

In this study, we have conducted a practice-oriented document analysis (Asdal & Reinertsen, 2020). Our point of departure is the argument of Asdal (2015, p. 86, 87), who claimed that 'a document is decided by the context of which it is part [and] a document takes part in itself in shaping that context and takes part in modifying it, together with the very issue at hand'. To answer our research question, we started our analysis by reading the influential documents in our established timeline and delineating the research-policy-practice nexus in the two cases. Next, we tried to gain an understanding of how these documents could be viewed in an interaction process where practice was central to the documents' policymaking. We were particularly interested in analysing document locations as an entry point to view the documents' place in the development of our cases over the 20-year period. We also attempted to highlight the kinds of interaction with research that the documents allowed for in the nexus. Asdal (2015) mentions that it would be interesting to identify 'issue-knowers' or 'issue-experts' in policy formation (p. 82); we find this notion important in our cases. We tried to identify those who came to be defined as 'experts', that is, issue-experts in policy formation, and searched for whether 'those



**Table 11.1** Timeline of policy documents identified as relevant for the two cases

Doc./ year	Ministry of Culture	Ministry of Health	Ministry of Education
2020	White Paper No. 18 (2020–2021)	The Action Plan for PA (2020–2029)	The National Curriculum, LK20
2019	White Paper No. 8 (2018–2019)	White Paper No. 19 (2018–2019)	Report from the strategy committee for education
2018		Resolution from The Norwegian Parliament (Stortinget), about 1 hour of PA at school (2018)	
2017	Report no. 2, from the strategy committee for sport		
2016	Report no.1, from the strategy committee for sport	Report from the strategy committee of health (2016–2021)	White Paper No. 28 (2015–2016)
2015	White Paper No. 30 (2014–2015)	White Paper No. 19 (2014–2015)	Official Norwegian Report NOU 2015:8
2014			Official Norwegian Report NOU 2014:7
2013	Official Norwegian Report NOU 2013:4	White Paper No. 34 (2012–2013)	White Paper No. 20 (2012–2013)
2012	White Paper No. 23 (2011–2012) White Paper No. 10 (2011–2012)	White Paper No. 16 (2010–2012) Law of Health	
2011			White Paper No. 22 (2010–2011)
2010			
2009	White Paper No. 49 (2008–2009) White Paper No. 23 (2008–2009)		Professional advisory group for PA at school Regulations to the Education Act § 1-1a. Right to PA
2008	White Paper No. 8 (2007–2008) White Paper No. 35 (2007–2008)		
2007			White Paper No. 16 (2006–2007)
2006			The National Curriculum, LK06
2005	Report No. 1 (2004– 2005) National Budget	The Action Plan for PA (2005–2009)	
2004			
2003	White Paper No. 38 (2002–2003) White Paper No. 48 (2002–2003)	White Paper No. 16 (2002–2003)	White Paper No. 30 (2003–2004) White Paper No. 39 (2002–2003)
2002			
2001			Report No. 1 (2000– 2001) National Budget

who were directly affected’ also became ‘experts’ (p. 83). Documents can reshape a case by redefining, reformulating, reallocating, creating new descriptions, changing concepts, and creating new priorities; thus, they could be considered as modification work that can bring about changes in the characteristics of the case (Asdal & Reinertsen, 2020, p. 114). In our analysis, we tried to understand the policy processes for how, when, why and if research was brought in and used as a basis for document design in relation to the education policy and practice nexus in our two cases. The result section refers to the documents listed in the timeline, (Table 11.1). For *references* to the documents on timeline, see Appendix in this chapter.

## Results

### *A Timeline of Documents on TCS and PA*

The timeline in Table 11.1 indicates key policy documents from three ministries<sup>2</sup> that have had significance during the period of 20 years, from 2000 to 2020, in the research-policy-practice nexus of TCS and PA cross-sector partnerships in education. A first look at the documents revealed that there has been a substantial amount of policy development in relation to TCS and PA in the given period. For TCS, three white papers from the Ministry of Culture and three white papers from the Ministry of Education were released in the introductory phase of the programme, that is, from 2000 to 2008. From 2008 onwards, eight white papers and additional green papers released by the Ministry of Culture mention TCS. The topics of these papers are general cultural policy and specific fields of cultural policy (e.g. film, visual art, theatre, music, library and museums), and TCS is discussed as a distinctive cultural policy instrument for the sector.<sup>3</sup> For PA, there were only a few documents in the first period of study. In the period 2010–2020, four white papers on general health policy were released by the Ministry of Health (in year 2010, 2012, 2014 and 2018), and a separate public health law was passed in 2012. PA is also the subject of two NOUs (green papers), namely, Official Norwegian Report (NOU 2014:7, NOU 2015:8), from the Ministry of Education concerning the curriculum reform The subject renewal (LK20) (The Directorate for Education and Training, 2022). However, TCS is not mentioned in these documents. PA is also a central topic of two strategy documents concerning sports policy from the Ministry of Culture (Fjørtoft et al., 2016, 2017). PA as a health initiative in schools is mentioned in all these documents.

<sup>2</sup>During the period of our study, the names of the ministries changed several times. We have chosen to use abbreviated names that clearly indicate the sector responsibility for each ministry. The full name of the ministries at a given time point can be found in the reference list in Appendix 1.

<sup>3</sup>St. Meld. No. 49. (2008–2009), St. Meld. No. 23. (2008–2009), Meld. St. 23. (2011–2012), St. Meld. No. 10. (2011–2012), St. Meld. No. 30. (2014–2015), NOU 2013:4.

In the same period, three white papers and two official Norwegian reports from the Ministry of Education mention PA health initiatives in schools.

### *The Cultural Schoolbag*

#### **Documents that Laid the Ground for TCS**

The context for TCS is the Norwegian cultural policy of the 1990s, which marked an important investment in art and culture, creativity and aesthetics in society, in general, and for children and young people, in particular, as well as placed new emphasis on the democratisation of culture; it was also a continuation of the dual culture policy from the 1950s (Mangset, 2012). The Prime Minister first suggested TCS in 2000 at a national conference as part of the government's cultural policy for students in compulsory education; however, the programme had already been conceptually established as a metaphor for specific arts and culture programmes in some municipalities and counties since 1995. A key document for the development of these trial programmes was 'The Bridge and the Blue Horse' (Ministry of Church Affairs, Research and Education, 1995), an action plan for aesthetic subjects and the cultural dimension in primary school; this document represented a collaboration between the two ministries that aimed at 'building a bridge between school and culture'. The rhetoric was that of bridge building between the culture and school sectors and collaboration at all levels of government: 'By linking the different areas together in a binding collaboration, one will have a good starting point for creating a more holistic growing up environment for children and young people' (p. 1). Another document that laid the ground for the future TCS was the curriculum reform of 1997 (L97) (Ministry of Church Affairs, Research and Education, 1996) which emphasised democratisation of culture and challenges for the school system with regard to giving students 'cultural experiences.' The document text was supported with pictures of art works and references to canonised culture, and it was edited by an art historian. The metaphors used for TCS were The Cultural Rucksack, which was used in a trial programme in the city of Sandefjord, and Kulturnista (culture lunch bag), which was used by the trial programme in three municipalities in the county of Møre og Romsdal. Both these metaphors are reminiscent of the basic elements of everyday school life.

#### **From Seed Funds for Collaboration and Innovation to Cultural Sector Wealth**

In the National Budget for 2001 (Report no. 1, 2000–2001), the government proposed the allocation of NOK 15 million for TCS to the Ministry of Culture's budget, under the item General Cultural Purposes (p. 125). Municipalities and counties could apply for these seed funds for innovative collaborations under TCS between schools, school

owners, and art and cultural institutions. This paved the way for diverse transformative partnerships (Eyal & Yarm, 2018) around the country. At an 'idea conference' in 2001, the Minister of Culture stated that 'the government wishes to take responsibility for ensuring that all school children, no matter where they live, bring a cultural rucksack on the way into youth and adult life' (Borgen & Brandt, 2006, p. 32).

In 2003, the government launched a national TCS programme through collaboration between the two sectors that was presented in two separate white papers to the Parliament—White Paper No. 38 (2002–2003) from the Ministry of Culture and White Paper No. 39 (2002–2003) from the Ministry of Education. At the launch of the programme, the Minister of Culture proclaimed that TCS is 'unique in the world context' (Kulturtanken, 2022). Yet, collaboration between the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Education was conceptualised differently in the two white papers. The white paper from the Ministry of Culture, which was named *The Cultural Schoolbag*, emphasised how the professional arts and culture sphere should support the school and curriculum (White Paper No. 38 (2002–2003)). According to this document, arts and culture in TCS can inspire students to learn and help them develop creative competence and the ability to be curious and innovate. White Paper No. 39 (2002–2003) from the Ministry of Education has a title that is a quote from the theatre world<sup>4</sup> and can be translated as 'Not purely for pleasure'. It reflects the power of theatre to educate, in addition to providing immediate pleasure. The document text refers to the importance of schools in strengthening their ordering and user competence and emphasize on their responsibility in collaborating with TCS and planning based on the curriculum. Thus, the documents describe different conceptualisations of TCS and the actors responsible for operationalising of the programme.

When TCS found a place in the state budget proposal document, it marked a key event, as national budget resources played a role in the continuation of the programme. The Norwegian state betting company, Norsk Tipping, has contributed to 'social beneficial causes' since its inception in 1948. From 1987, the lottery funding was under the Ministry of Culture, and the profits from the lottery fund were earmarked for cultural purposes. In 2002, amendments to the law on gambling funds from 2003 stated that 40% of the profit should be earmarked for cultural purposes, with adjustments every year. As a result of this amendment, TCS received substantial national funding, and the allocated amount has increased substantially from 2003 to 2020.<sup>5</sup> From 2004, TCS had earmarked funding for 'professional cultural communication to children in primary school and an expanded collaboration

---

<sup>4</sup>*Ei Blot for Lyst*, inscribed on the stage at The Old Stage, the original Royal Danish Theatre built in 1874.

<sup>5</sup>The budget allocated to TCS was NOK 60 million in 2003, and it increased to NOK 288 million by 2019. Additional funding of NOK 260 million was allocated through other culture funding from the Ministry of Culture the same year (Kulturtanken, 2022).

between school and culture' (Report no. 1. (2004–2005)). Within a few years, TCS changed from being a programme where both sectors could together apply for seed funds for mutual collaboration and innovation to a cultural sector with wealth that was managing large resources for TCS—funding over which the school had no influence.

### **From Building Bridges to Balancing Power Between Sectors**

When TCS was announced in 2000 and the scheme was mentioned in the state budget, questions arose about how the pilot schemes worked and which organisational models for TCS would be best suited to the purpose of the programme. At the idea conference in 2001, the school's representatives pointed out the need for participant perspective and student activities, whereas the arts and culture field representatives pointed out the need to ensure high-quality art experiences with a high level of intrinsic value (Borgen & Brandt, 2006). An advisory body under the auspices of the Ministry of Culture initiated research into the TCS model in Sandefjord municipality (Lidén, 2001, 2004) and in Møre og Romsdal county (Lidén, 2004). The Sandefjord model was free for all compulsory schools, and two visits a year were scheduled. According to the report, the challenge in this model was to create a less fixed structure and arrangements that were not 'too pedagogical and one-dimensional' (Lidén, 2004). The Møre og Romsdal county model was a tour organisation model without resources for the schools. According to the evaluation report, the challenges with this program were related to anchoring the Kulturnista programme more in the school's activities, and the recommendation was 'little more pedagogy, but not too much' (Lidén, 2004). This evaluation is a key event, as it confirms an already well-established conceptualisation of asymmetry between arts and culture, represented by artists and cultural institutions, and pedagogy, represented by the school and the teachers. The conceptualisation of an art-versus-pedagogy asymmetry in TCS seems to be established as rhetoric oppositions between art and school, artists and teachers, aesthetics and pedagogy, the extraordinary and the everyday, and celebration and routine in the different document texts.

Other key events related to TCS were the evaluation of TCS in compulsory education in 2006 (Borgen & Brandt, 2006; see also Breivik & Christophersen, 2013, p. 21) and White Paper No. 8 (2007–2008) from the Ministry of Culture. Borgen and Brandt (2006) conducted a national research evaluation of TCS after 3 years of its initiation. The evaluation pointed to opportunities and challenges in the programme and suggested a downgrade of the administrative structure and resources and a closer dialogue between arts and culture and schools to increase the benefits to students. However, in White Paper No. 8. (2007–2008) the Ministry of Culture rejected the evaluation, and more enthusiastic statements from the public

hearing were emphasised. In the white paper, the role of artists in TCS was strengthened, and a clear division of roles between artists and teachers was established. TCS is now described as consisting of different parts or phases, as there is ‘content’ and ‘artistic expression’, and then there are ‘forms of communication’ (Ruud et al., 2022). The paper also clearly differentiated between the tasks of the two sectors by clearly stating how TCS contributes to professional art and professional artists entering the school and mentioning that the role of the school and teachers is to do the pre- and post-work to secure communication with students. In 2013, Breivik and Christophersen conducted a new evaluation and found similar opportunities and challenges in the programme as was reported in the 2006 evaluation.

Certain conceptual asymmetries seem to be strengthened in TCS (Junge, 2014), and this is evident throughout policy document texts (see Table 11.1; e.g. Ministry of Education, 2007, 2019; White Paper No. 8. (2007–2008); White Paper No. 38. (2002–2003); White Paper No. 39. (2002–2003); White Paper No. 18. (2020–2021)). However, reports, research and research-based evaluations express great enthusiasm for the arts and culture sector and a reluctance to debate the weaknesses of TCS. Despite this, a number of improvement measures have been proposed over the years for further work in TCS with regard to collaboration in the partnership between the two sectors (for instance, Bamford, 2012; Borgen & Brandt, 2006; Breivik & Christophersen, 2013; Kleppe, 2009; Lidén, 2001, 2004). The national agency Kulturtanken was established in 2016,<sup>6</sup> and in their first annual report in 2016, they mentioned that the field is in need of coordination ‘between art, culture and school’. According to Kulturtanken (2022), the TCS programme still aims to interact with school curricula, although ‘this does not mean that the content is pedagogical in nature’. Further, TCS should be viewed in relation to the school’s general objectives regarding education. However, any attempt at balancing power between the sectors eventually favours the culture sector, which has control over funding and safeguards the conceptualisation of asymmetry between art and pedagogy.

### *Physical Activity Health Initiatives*

#### **PA—An Important Prerequisite for Development of the Whole Human Being**

The context for PA is the Norwegian health policy and the application of WHO’s global health initiatives from 1987 onwards to education policy and schools during the 1990s. The curriculum from 1997 specified that the school should facilitate versatile PA, and that students should enjoy PA via activities and experiences that are tied to nature appreciation (L97) (Ministry of Church Affairs, Education and

---

<sup>6</sup>Kulturtanken is the national agency responsible for TCS, distributing lottery funding (from profits earned by Norsk Tipping, the Norwegian state lottery operator), obtaining reports, and preparing the national annual report for TCS.

Research, 1996). These are conceptualisations that we also find in the curriculum for physical education, a school subject that has been mandatory for all students in Norway since the 1880s (Borgen et al., 2020c; Reichenbach, 2014).

### **PA—Prescriptions for a Healthier Norway**

In the first few years of the twenty-first century, we find parallel document processes concerning PA within health and education policy, and there seems to be a national commitment in the World Health Report of 2002 titled ‘Reducing Risks, Promoting Healthy Life’ from the WHO (2002). White Paper No. 16. (2002–2003), ‘Prescriptions for a Healthier Norway’, from the Ministry of Health, emphasises the importance of PA for the population’s health and well-being, and the chapters are written like a medical diagnosis and prescription document. This is a key event in health policy in education. The document text focusses on the developmental features of PA related to lifestyle and a conceptualisation of causal relationships between diet, inactivity, cardiovascular disease and cancer, as well as between physical activity and young people’s mental health and healthy lifestyle choices. The prescription is presented under the heading ‘More physical activity in the school’ (p. 31).

White Paper No. 30. (2003–2004) ‘Culture for Learning’ from the Ministry of Education preceded the curriculum reform in 2006, ‘Knowledge Promotion’ (The Directorate for Education, 2022) and contains the headings ‘Room for physical activity and meals’ and ‘The school should facilitate daily physical activity for all students.’ Thus, PA is conceptualised together with dietary recommendations for children and young people and is in keeping with the ‘prescriptions’ of the health policy (White Paper No. 16. (2002–2003)). As a follow-up, a research project invited researchers and schools to plan, implement and evaluate intervention projects on PA and meals in schools (Samdal et al., 2006). This led to diverse partnerships around the country, and by the end of the project period in 2006, 180 schools had applied to the project. The Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Health cooperated on the initiative and an evaluation (Samdal et al., 2006). The ‘Action Plan for Physical Activity 2005–2009’ (Ministry of Health, 2004) served as a cross-sector national mobilisation tool for better public health (Lillejord et al., 2016). Nevertheless, the evaluation report asked the question ‘Interaction without direction and means? Who should activate whom?’ Thus, it seems unclear whether there had been any cross-sector partnership collaboration (Rasmussen et al., 2009).

### **PA—The ‘Right to Regular PA for Health’ in School, outside of Physical Education**

When the Ministry of Education appointed a government PA advisory group in school that comprised researchers, a teacher educator and three former elite sports leaders and athletes in 2009, the policy rhetoric emphasised the right to regular PA

over the health policy concept of individual responsibility. The members in the advisory group were issue-experts in policy formation (Asdal, 2015), and a well-known sports leader, a former successful national team coach for the women's handball national team, was the leader of the group. Their recommendations included providing teachers with more knowledge about PA and ensuring that PA would be facilitated and led by pedagogically qualified staff; further, they stressed on the importance of involving school leaders in the implementation of PA programmes (Breivik et al., 2009).

A regulation introduced in Norwegian schools, in addition to the current L06 curriculum, granted primary school students in grades 5–7 the right to a scheme of 76 school hours per year outside of physical education for the specific purpose of benefitting learning, supporting a learning environment, and maintaining physical and mental health (Ministry of Education, 2009). However, the requirements concerning teacher competence and plans for implementation of the regulation were not established. For instance, there are no requirements for the competence of those responsible for PA initiatives in schools, and the roles of teachers and school leaders are not defined. While researchers were invited to partnerships with primary schools to implement the decision, an evaluation report released 5 years later found that local school authorities perceived the measure very differently and had implemented widely varying practices (Skjåkødegård et al., 2016).

Traditionally, the Ministry of Culture is responsible for sport affairs in Norway and related funding in the state budget. In 2015, the Ministry of Culture established a strategy committee for Norwegian sports policy, with a former successful football player as leader. The committee submitted its first report in 2016 and highlighted the WHO (2010) recommendation of 60 min of physical activity every school day for all students, led by educated teachers (Fjørtoft et al., 2016). In their second strategy report in 2017, they advised that schools and local sports clubs establish partnerships (Fjørtoft et al., 2017). In response to this, extra funding was introduced as financial compensation to sports teams that contributed to activities in collaboration with schools, but this resulted in an asymmetry concerning resources between the partners. The sports advisory group also comprised issue-experts in policy formation (Asdal, 2015), representing elite sports.

Another key event in 2017 was the Norwegian Parliament calling on the Norwegian government to facilitate 'one hour of daily physical activity' for all students in grades 1–10 (The Norwegian Parliament (Stortinget), 2018). The decision led to major debates that were due, in part, to the one-sided randomised controlled trials used as arguments for the decision (Borgen et al., 2020b). It appeared that Norwegian schools' long tradition of *Bildung* was not considered; instead, one-sided physiological and biomedical research findings were used as arguments to implement the measure. These PA health initiatives were mainly based on research related to biomedicine, health and physiology, and did not take into account movement activity for learning, education and gaining experience as a social being.



### **PA—Creativity, Joy and Commitment for Health and Life Skills**

The Ministry of Education delivered a completely new way of conceptualising PA in the strategy document ‘Creative Joy, Commitment and the Urge to Explore Practical and Aesthetic Content in Kindergarten, School and Teacher Education’ published in 2019. In this policy rhetoric, PA is chained to all levels and areas of education policy. However, PA seems to be an ‘alien’ in the context of creativity, joy, commitment and practical and aesthetic content. While PA is separate from curriculum measures, there are no content descriptions, except that it should be part of all subjects in school. This strategy document also links itself to the health policy document ‘Action Plan for Physical Activity’ published in 2020, as well as to the new curriculum LK20 for Norwegian schools, implemented from August 2020, in which health and life skills is one of three interdisciplinary topics that aims to provide pupils with competence, deep learning and an interdisciplinary perspective. Thus, PA as a health initiative is conceptualised as relevant for and part of all education, as well as something other than education.

### **Discussion**

Conceptualisations and key events have played a significant role in the research-policy-practice nexus of TCS and PA cross-sector partnerships in education over the 20-year period from 2000 to 2020. While a document is decided by the context that it is a part of, it also shapes that context and takes part in modifying it, together with the issue at hand (Asdal & Reinertsen, 2020). Within the context of TCS, key events, for example, new white and green papers, are conceptualised differently depending on whether the political context is the Ministry of Culture or the Ministry of Education. An ambivalent cultural policy in the 1990s (Mangset & Hylland, 2017) seems to be an implicit historical reference and a typically overlooked key event (Taylor et al., 2001) for the trial programmes at the threshold of the twenty-first century and the establishment of the national TCS programme in 2003. Aesthetic experience, which is independent and valuable on its own autonomous premises, is another historical reference related to TCS that supports conceptualisations of asymmetry between arts and pedagogy in cultural policy documents. These historical references provide a basis for the expectations of different stakeholders about what TCS may become in the future; however, they are not recognised as a common ground for the exploration of transformative mutuality in TCS cross-sector partnerships. Rather, we find that asymmetry is maintained when the cultural sector has the upper hand ideologically, organisationally and financially. Key policy events seem to support the expectation that facilitating aesthetic experience in school will lead to expected student outcomes in terms of the overall goal—that is, that students should ‘experience, become familiar with and develop an understanding of professional artistic and cultural expressions’ (White paper no. 8. (2007–2008)). Key events within research and evaluation studies on practice in TCS (e.g. Borgen & Brandt,

2006; Breivik & Christophersen, 2013) provide suggestions for the transformation and development of TCS; however, this is reflected only to a small extent in the design of cultural policy through the period.

In the period we have examined, PA seems to have been brought into education policy documents through continual new health policy initiatives and conceptualisations that are agreed upon in society, as well as through targeting daily practices in schools. While there are cross-sector initiatives—for instance, action plans and the establishment of a national centre to support implementation and practices in schools—because of global, Nordic and national health recommendations, the policy documents have a common reference in physiology and biomedical research, and evidence-based studies on school interventions. Within the context of PA, typically overlooked key events that support this discourse and conceptualisations of asymmetries include new WHO reports and new recommendations in national white papers from the Ministry of Health. In the case of PA, too, there are several key policy events including health policy documents that are followed up by education policy documents and action plans. In addition, advisory groups with members from elite sports have recommended PA in schools and provided support to improve the competence of teachers (Breivik et al., 2009); such groups have also recommended that PA be instructed by external partners in sports (Ministry of Culture, 2016, 2017). However, there are few key research and evaluation events that provide empirical insight into how schools, teachers and external partners operationalise PA in everyday practice in school, and potential proposals for the development of such practices.

### ***Balancing Mutuality and Institutional Identity to Create Something New***

In cross-sector partnerships, the construction of mutuality is dependent on those involved and the identification of their institutional identity as a common ground for constructing something new together, and it is also linked to the hope that something will be improved, developed and created together (Brinkerhoff, 2002; Eyal & Yarm, 2018). However, the conditions for transformative mutuality (Eyal & Yarm, 2018) in TCS seem to be weak. In the TCS documents, we see continuation rather than moves that enable action towards exploring new forms of collaboration.

Counter concepts become asymmetrical only when they distinguish between ‘speakers, types of people, their groups or social roles’ and when the use of the concept pair is not approved across the dividing lines they create (Junge, 2014, p. 36). Thus, socially agreed forms of reduction of dissonance could be central to collaboration in the two cases, as the need for agreement is a basis for possibilities

for social interaction in the partnerships. In TCS, the history of collaboration and hope for change is created in a context of tension, where asymmetric counter concepts gain stability. Within the cultural sector in TCS, there seems to be a reluctance to consider the research and evaluations and improvement measures that have been proposed through the years. While research and evaluation reports constantly refer to tensions and conflicts in TCS, they also report that schools accept and welcome artists and other issue-experts (Asdal & Reinertsen, 2020) in TCS as external partners through a form of 'soft coercion', which can be classified as reproductive mutuality (Eyal & Yarm, 2018).

Within the PA context, we see conceptualisations of asymmetry between health policy and research and teachers. That PA is a common good which is necessary for the future health of students is an evidence-based 'truth'; however, teachers need more competence and the guidance of issue-experts to support the implementation of PA practices school.

In the context of PA, there are several initiatives for cross-sector partnerships between external partners, issue-experts, and schools. For instance, the national project for physical activity and meals, established in 2004, was designed to bring researchers and schools together in collaboration, and the scheme for grades 5 to 7 grade, launched in 2009, was a collaboration between the two policy sectors. When the sports advisory group proposed 1 hour of PA every day in schools in 2016, it was expected that this would happen in collaboration with sport clubs and schools. However, while the issue is shared in documents between the two sectors, there are few, if any, research reports that can inform the constructions of the 'history of the collaboration' in these partnerships (Eyal & Yarm, 2018). Rather, there seem to be several projects that are quite informal and time limited in shape and form. Newer documents concerning TCS and PA also seem to refer to well-established understandings rather than bring in new perspectives through transformation and modification work and 'contexting' (Asdal & Reinertsen, 2020). Altogether, there seems to be a good ground for forms of reproductive mutuality rather than transformative mutuality partnership models in the two cases (Eyal & Yarm, 2018).

A common trait of the political documents related to TCS and PA is the rhetoric of change and hope for the future, but there are few explicit references to earlier programmes and initiatives. Without reference to previous experiences with similar programmes and initiatives, the dimensions of time and space seem underestimated when the partners are to formulate expectations for the future in their development of collaboration in the partnerships (Eyal & Yarm, 2018; Koselleck, 1985). The reform rhetoric that TCS and PA contribute something new has been going on for 20 years; however, the measures appear as continuations of previous policies (Datnow, 2002). TCS and PA are rooted in general, as well as very specific, ideas about what topics in modern society are important to bring into the school such that all children can be reached (Depaepe & Smeyers,

2008). For instance, in the latest curriculum reform in Norway, LK20, the general issues of public health and life skills are introduced as something new to be included in all subjects. In keeping with this notion, as we have shown in our PA case, for 20 years, the aim of policymaking based on global health policy trends has been to establish PA initiatives in the schools in a way that reflects health issues in society.

### ***Conceptualisations in the Research-Policy-Practice Nexus in the TCS and PA Contexts***

How actors work, interact and interpret policy to generate practices has not been considered in the TCS and PA policy documents. While documents provide direction, they do not prescribe how this can be operationalised into practices in schools. In addition, partnership collaboration constellations are prerequisites for change. Thus, in the policy-practice nexus, these documents do not provide guidance on the complex balancing act of introducing something new in school and safeguarding the school's ethos in meetings with external partners.

TCS and PA cross-sector partnerships seem to have little room for integrated processes, interaction through all stages of the alliance, partner participation in activities, and equality in decision-making, which are dimensions of transformative mutuality (Brinkerhoff, 2002). Rather, TCS and PA are characterised by reproductive mutuality in which schools effectively accept ideology and programmes from external partners through a form of 'soft coercion' (Eyal & Yarm, 2018).

Research can have different functions in policy formation when measures that involve partnerships between different actors inside and outside the school are translated into practices in different contexts, as is evident from this study on the research-policy-practice nexus in TCS and PA. Biesta (2015) argued that the wide variety of value-laden beliefs about transformation powers competes with the evidence-based discourse within education. When it comes to arts and cultural programmes, as well as physical activity health initiatives, studies refer to the paradox that policy rhetoric is often confused with scientific evidence (e.g. Alvarez-Bueno et al., 2017; Bamford, 2006; Bailey et al., 2009; Borgen & Hjordemaal, 2017; Borgen et al., 2021; Gee, 2004; Winner et al., 2013). At the root of arts and cultural programmes and PA health initiatives in schools is the notion that cultural and sport activities build on traditional practices rather than on research (Eisner & Day, 2004; Lillejord et al., 2016).

Research ambitions in the TCS context seem to confirm existing assumptions rather than explore currently unknown issues; this reflects a strained relationship between policy formation, knowledge in the teacher profession, teaching practices and research (cf. Stavrum, 2013). Similarly, newer PA initiatives seem to be

continuations of known conceptualisations which are based on a physiological and pathological understanding of health and how physical activity can prevent diet, diseases and avoid early death, while studies of practices in school are scarce (cf. WHO, 2010, 2020; White Paper No. 16. (2002–2003); The Norwegian Parliament (Stortinget), 2018; see also Borgen et al., 2021).

TCS and PA are not part of the curriculum, but they are brought in by external partners who have clear perceptions that the school and teachers lack competence in the areas they represent. Thus, these cross-sector extra-curricular partnerships require negotiation about ‘something’. When content is brought from the world into schools, this process of transformation into pedagogical material and enactment as a classroom event is a process of curricularisation (Doyle, 2017). TCS brings with it substantial resources and professional artists and culture mediators, but PA does not bring in such resources. Yet, teachers are expected to bring content from TCS and PA into their subject teaching. Within the didactic tradition, what teachers can do is restrain teaching in a way that provides opportunities for the individual growth of the student, and learning experiences emerge within the learning process via teachers and students as they meet the content (Hopmann, 2007, 2008). However, when there is content that is not supposed to be didactically translated, it becomes disruptive to the teachers’ practice and professional autonomy.

Instead of providing room for the didactisation of content, as described above in relation to TCS and PA, in the documents, new paths and rhetorical moves are constantly attempted to make these cases ‘work’ as something new. Here, asymmetries seem to be powerful conceptual tools. According to Junge (2014, p. 42), there are two criteria for establishing asymmetric counter concepts. First, there must be a status of difference or situation of conflict; second, the relationship in question that is captured in the counter concepts must lack mutual ratification/mutual recognition from the various parties involved in the relationship. In the TCS and PA cases, we have identified different purposes, different dynamics and different centres of gravity and how actors work, interact and develop in varied and intended policy and practice relationships and nexus contexts. TCS and PA are programmes that target something that is related to, but is not part of, the curriculum. This is reflected in the fact that experts from other sectors are the ones who are allowed to speak and be listened to, whereas teachers and schools are the ones who implement and take responsibility for translation into practices. This imbalance in the relationship between professional teachers and external professionals and issue-experts is conceptualised in the asymmetries in these cases.

It is possible that there is silent acceptance in the form of not caring at school. In other words, these measures may be perceived as something that must be present but do not have to be prioritised because they are not part of the formal curriculum. When there are many, overarching aims for the school, distinctions between ideational and operational matters and the criteria for choosing content become blurred. On the other hand, external partners, who are not responsible for the school ethos,

can bring in their content and leave its application in practice to the teachers and school leaders, as described in the key policy documents for TCS. In the education research-policy-practice nexus, it may also appear that educational researchers are not very interested in the application or consequences of extra-curricular content in school. Thus, TCS and PA may be perceived as practices that are supplementary to the curriculum which external partners and issue experts can manage. In such a scenario, when educational researchers do not contribute knowledge about the practices in TCS and PA, the school and the teachers are left without knowledge-based support in their work with the didactisation of such content.

## Conclusion

In this study, we have observed variations in the understandings of what is at stake in different cross-sector partnerships. Such variations actualise discussions about content in education (Apple, 2018), and for our study, we have placed conceptualisations at the forefront of our discussion. Depaepe and Smeyers (2008) argue that the processes of educationalisation construct a child in the manner of 'secularized Christianity' (p. 380). When education is considered as the mechanism for solving social problems, the purpose of education is to 'save' the child from antisocial behaviours and immoral dispositions. In our study, we find that TCS is characterised by substantial use of the counter concepts of arts and pedagogy. The establishment of this asymmetry gives room for a striving towards the liberation of the pedagogically disciplined child who has been deprived of the opportunity for art and cultural encounters by bringing in aesthetic experience, through encounters with professional artists and their art. Similarly, the PA initiatives build on the counter concepts of physical activity and inactivity. That is, by scheduling time for physical activity, dietary information, and so on, the PA policy and initiatives aim to save the undisciplined child from inactivity, ill health and premature death.

TCS and PA initiatives have been under development for 20 years. A special feature of these cases of cross-sector partnerships in schools to enhance extra-curricular activities in particular areas is that in the research-policy-practice nexus, there are many active asymmetries between actors and the understandings of what the purposes of the partnership are. The stories about the collaboration, as we encounter it in the documents and in our earlier research, are largely based on different partners and stakeholder institutional identity and conceptualisations and on understandings of how policy is operationalised and transformed into practices in schools. In these cross-sector partnerships, there is a lack of dialogue about didactics. Thus, the curricularisation of content from the world into didactic practices in the classroom is dependent on a transformative partnership that appears to not yet have been realised in the case of TCS and PA cross-sector partnerships.

## Appendix

Complete references to the White papers (Norwegian Government), Official Norwegian Reports (NOU), Acts, Strategic plans and Action plans from three ministries, listed in Table 11.1.

Year	Ministry of Culture/ Ministry of and Equality
2020	Meld. St. 18. (2020–2021). <i>Experience, create, share — Art and culture for, with and by children and young people</i> . Ministry of Culture. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-18-20202021/id2839455/?ch=1">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-18-20202021/id2839455/?ch=1</a>
2019	Meld. St. 8. (2018–2019). <i>The power of cultural policy. Cultural policy for the future</i> . Ministry of Culture. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-8-20182019/id2620206/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-8-20182019/id2620206/</a>
2015	Meld. St. 30. (2014–2015). <i>A future-oriented film policy</i> . Ministry of Culture <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-30-20142015/id2413867/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-30-20142015/id2413867/</a>
2013	NOU 2013:4 (2013). <i>The cultural investigation 2014</i> . Ministry of Culture. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/nou-2013-4/id715404/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/nou-2013-4/id715404/</a>
2012	Meld. St. 23 (2011–2012). <i>Visual art</i> . Ministry of Culture and Equality. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld-st-23-20112012/id680602/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld-st-23-20112012/id680602/</a> Meld. St. 10. (2011–2012). <i>Culture, inclusion and participation</i> . Ministry of Culture and Equality. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/report-no.-10-2011-2012/id666017/">https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/report-no.-10-2011-2012/id666017/</a>
2009	St. Meld. No. 49. (2008–2009). <i>Museum of the future — Management, research, dissemination, renewal</i> . Ministry of Culture and Equality. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-49-2008-2009/id573654/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-49-2008-2009/id573654/</a> St. Meld. No. 23. (2008–2009). <i>Libraries – Knowledge Commons, Meeting Place and Cultural Arena in a Digital Age</i> . Ministry of Culture and Equality. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/report-no.-23-to-the-storting-2008-2009/id555516/">https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/report-no.-23-to-the-storting-2008-2009/id555516/</a>
2005	Ministry of Finance. Report No. 1. (2004–2005). National Budget.
2008	St. Meld. No. 8. (2007–2008). <i>Cultural schoolbag for the future</i> . Ministry of Culture and Equality. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/Stmeld-nr-8-2007-2008/id492761/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/Stmeld-nr-8-2007-2008/id492761/</a> St. Meld. No. 35. (2007–2008). <i>Aim and meaning — A healthy Norwegian language policy</i> . Ministry of Culture and Equality. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-35-2007-2008/id519923/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-35-2007-2008/id519923/</a>
2003	St. Meld. No. 38 (2002–2003). <i>The Cultural Schoolbag</i> . Ministry of Culture and Equality. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-38-2002-2003/id197053/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-38-2002-2003/id197053/</a> St. Meld. No. 48. (2002–2003). <i>Cultural policy until 2014</i> . Ministry of Culture and Equality. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-48-2002-2003/id432632/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-48-2002-2003/id432632/</a>

Year	Ministry of Health and Welfare/Ministry of Health and Care Services
2020	Ministry of Health and Welfare. (2020). <i>Together for active lives</i> . Action plan for physical activity 2020–2029. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/43934b653c924ed7816fa16cd1e8e523/handlingsplan-for-fysisk-aktivitet-2020.pdf">https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/43934b653c924ed7816fa16cd1e8e523/handlingsplan-for-fysisk-aktivitet-2020.pdf</a>
2019	Meld. St. 19. (2018–2019). <i>Good lives in a safe society</i> . Ministry of Health and Welfare. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-19-20182019/id2639770/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-19-20182019/id2639770/</a>

(continued)

Year	Ministry of Health and Welfare/Ministry of Health and Care Services
2018	The Norwegian parliament (2018). <i>Physical activity in compulsory education. One hour of physical activity every day for pupils in 1st to 10th grade within school hours</i> . The Standing Committee on Health and Care Services. <a href="https://www.stortinget.no/no/Saker-og-publikasjoner/Publikasjoner/Innstillinger/Stortinget/2017-2018/inns-201718-051s/?all=true">https://www.stortinget.no/no/Saker-og-publikasjoner/Publikasjoner/Innstillinger/Stortinget/2017-2018/inns-201718-051s/?all=true</a>
2016	Ministry of Health and Welfare (2016). <i>Strategy (2016–2021). Youth health – the government’s strategy for youth health</i> . Report from the strategy committee of health. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/838b18a31b0e4b31bbfa61336560f269/ungdomshelsestrategi_2016.pdf">https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/838b18a31b0e4b31bbfa61336560f269/ungdomshelsestrategi_2016.pdf</a>
2015	Meld. St. 19. (2014–2015). <i>Mastering and possibilities</i> . Ministry of Health and Welfare. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-19-2014-2015/id2402807/?ch=1">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-19-2014-2015/id2402807/?ch=1</a>
2013	Meld. St. 34. (2012–2013). <i>Public health report – good health – shared responsibility</i> . Ministry of Health and Welfare. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld-st-34-20122013/id723818/?q=fysisk%20aktivitet%20i%20skolen&amp;ch=3#kap3-4-1">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld-st-34-20122013/id723818/?q=fysisk%20aktivitet%20i%20skolen&amp;ch=3#kap3-4-1</a>
2012	Meld. St. 16. (2010–2012). <i>National plan for health (2011–2015)</i> . Ministry of Health and Welfare. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/f17befe0cb4c48d68c744bce3673413d/no/pdfs/stm201020110016000dddpdfs.pdf">https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/f17befe0cb4c48d68c744bce3673413d/no/pdfs/stm201020110016000dddpdfs.pdf</a> Public Health Act (2012). Act-2011-06-24-29. <a href="https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2011-06-24-29">https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2011-06-24-29</a>
2005	Ministry of Health and Care Services. (2004). <i>Action Plan for physical activity (2005–2009)</i> . <i>Handlingsplan for fysisk aktivitet 2005 – 2009</i> – regjeringen.no
2003	St. Meld. No. 16. (2002–2003). <i>Recipe for a Healthier Norway</i> . Ministry of Health and Care Services. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-16-2002-2003/id196640/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-16-2002-2003/id196640/</a>

Year	Ministry of Education and Research/ Ministry of Education
2019	Ministry of Education and Research. (2019). <i>Creative joy, commitment and desire to explore. Practical and aesthetic content in kindergarten, school and teacher training</i> . Strategy document.
2016	Meld. St. 28. (2015–2016). <i>Subjects – Specialization – Understanding – A renewal of the Knowledge Promotion curriculum</i> . Ministry of Education and Research. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-28-20152016/id2483955/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld.-st.-28-20152016/id2483955/</a>
2015	NOU 2015:8 (2015). <i>The School of the Future Renewal of subjects and competences</i> . Ministry of Education and Research. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/da148fec8c4a4ab88daa8b677a700292/en-gb/pdfs/nou201520150008000engpdfs.pdf">https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/da148fec8c4a4ab88daa8b677a700292/en-gb/pdfs/nou201520150008000engpdfs.pdf</a>
2014	NOU 2014:7 (2014). <i>Pupils’ learning in the school of the future – A knowledge base</i> . Ministry of Education and Research. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/NOU-2014-7/id766593/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/NOU-2014-7/id766593/</a>
2013	Meld. St. 20. (2012–2013). <i>On the right track – quality and diversity in the community school</i> . Ministry of Education and Research. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/53bb6e5685704455b06fdd289212d108/no/pdfs/stm201220130020000dddpdfs.pdf">https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/53bb6e5685704455b06fdd289212d108/no/pdfs/stm201220130020000dddpdfs.pdf</a>
2011	Meld. St. 22. (2010–2011). <i>Motivation – Coping – Possibilities – The youth stage</i> . Ministry of Education and Research. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld-st-22-2010%2D%2D2011/id641251/?ch=1">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/meld-st-22-2010%2D%2D2011/id641251/?ch=1</a>

(continued)



Year	Ministry of Education and Research/ Ministry of Education
2009	Regulations to the Education Act § 1-1a. (2009). <i>Right to physical activity</i> . <a href="http://www.udir.no/regelverk-og-tilsyn/finn-regelverk/etter-tema/Innhold-i-opplaringen/Udir-11-2009-Rett-til-fysisk-aktivitet/">http://www.udir.no/regelverk-og-tilsyn/finn-regelverk/etter-tema/Innhold-i-opplaringen/Udir-11-2009-Rett-til-fysisk-aktivitet/</a>
2007	St. Meld. No. 16. (2006–2007). <i>Early efforts for lifelong learning</i> . Ministry of Education and Research. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/a48dfbadb0bb492a8fb91de475b44c41/no/pdfs/stm200620070016000ddpdfs.pdf">https://www.regjeringen.no/contentassets/a48dfbadb0bb492a8fb91de475b44c41/no/pdfs/stm200620070016000ddpdfs.pdf</a>
2003	St. Meld. No. 30 (2003–2004). <i>Culture for learning</i> . Ministry of Education and Research. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-030-2003-2004-/id404433/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-030-2003-2004-/id404433/</a> St. Meld. No. 39. (2002–2003). “ <i>Not just for pleasure</i> ”. Ministry of Education and Research. <a href="https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-39-2002-2003-/id197064/">https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-39-2002-2003-/id197064/</a>
2000	Ministry of Finance. Report No. 1. (2000–2001). National Budget.

## References

- Aasen, P., Prøitz, T., & Rye, E. (2015). Nasjonal læreplan som utdanningspolitisk dokument [National curriculum as an educational policy document]. *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift*, 99(6), 417–433.
- Adab, P., Pallan, M., Lancashire, E. R., & Cheng, K. K. (2018). Effectiveness of childhood obesity prevention programme delivered through schools, targeting 6 and 7 years old: Cluster randomized controlled trial (WAVES study). *The BMJ*. <http://www.bmj.com/content/bmj/360/bmj.k211.full.pdf>
- Alvarez-Bueno, C., Pesce, C., Cavero-Redondo, I., Sánchez-López, M., Garrido-Miquel, M., & Martínez-Vizcaíno, V. (2017). Academic achievement and physical activity: A meta-analysis. *Pediatrics*, 140(6), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2017-1498>
- Apple, M. A. (2018). The critical divide: Knowledge about the curriculum and the concrete problems of curriculum policy and practice. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 4(2), 63–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2018.1492692>
- Asdal, K. (2015). What is the issue? The transformative capacity of documents. *Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory*, 16(1), 74–90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1600910X.2015.1022194>
- Asdal, K., & Reinertsen, H. (2020). *Hvordan gjøre dokumentanalyse. En praksisorientert metode* [How to do document analysis. A practice-oriented method]. Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Bailey, R., Armour, K., Kirk, D., Jess, M., Pickup, I., Sandford, R., & BERA Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy Special Interest Group. (2009). The educational benefits claimed for physical education and school sport: An academic review. *Research Papers in Education*, 24(1), 1–27.
- Ball, S. J. (2009). Privatising education, privatising education policy, privatising educational research: Network governance and the “competition state”. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(1), 83–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930802419474>
- Bamford, A. (2006). *The wow-factor. Global research compendium on the impact of the arts in education*. Waxmann.
- Bamford, A. (2012). Arts and cultural education in Norway. Nasjonalt senter for kunst og kultur i opplæringen.
- Biesta, G. (2015). What is education For? On good education, teacher judgement, and educational professionalism. *European Journal of Education*, 50(1), 75–87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12109>

- Borgen, J. S. (2008). Extraordinary or inevitable? Evaluating The Cultural Rucksack (TCR), a new arts and cultural programme in primary and lower secondary schools in Norway. In C. Albanel & X. Darcos (Eds.), *A European and international research symposium. Evaluating the impact of aArts & cultural education on children and young people* (pp. 221–231). Centre Pompidou La documentation Francaise.
- Borgen, J. S. (2018). International comparative review of physical education. OECD Education 2030. In-depth Analysis of Physical Education (PE) in 12 countries. *Report prepared under the auspices of the OECD Future of Education and Skills 2030 project*. Norwegian School of Sport Sciences.
- Borgen, J. S. & Brandt, S. S. (2006). *Ekstraordinært eller selvfølgelig? Evaluering av Den kulturelle skolesekken i grunnskolen* [Extraordinary or inevitable? Evaluating The Cultural Schoolbag in primary and lower secondary schools in Norway]. NIFU. <https://nifu.brage.unit.no/nifu-xmlui/handle/11250/275575>
- Borgen, J. S., & Hjordemaal, F. (2017). From general transfer to deep learning as argument for practical aesthetic school subjects? *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy Research*, 3(3), 218–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2017.1352439>
- Borgen, J. S., Hallås, B. O., Løndal, K., Moen, K. M., & Gjølme, E. G. (2020a). Problems created by the (un)clear boundaries between physical education and physical activity health initiatives in schools. *Sport, Education and Society*, 26(3), 239–252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2020.1722090>
- Borgen, J. S., Hallås, B. O., Seland, E. H., Aadland, E. K., & Vindenes, N. (2020b). De praktiske og estetiske fagene i skole og lærerutdanning – historisk konseptualisering [The practical and aesthetic subjects in school and teacher training—Historical conceptualisation]. *Acta Didactica Norden*, 14(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.7901>
- Borgen, J. S., Moen, K. M., Hallås, B. O., Løndal, K., & Gjølme, E. G. (2020c). Physical education and sport studies in Norway. In R. Naul & C. Scheuer (Eds.), *Research on physical education and school sport in Europe, Chapter twelve* (pp. 361–391). Meyer & Meyer Verlag.
- Borgen, J. S., Rugseth, G., & Bjorbækmo, W. (2021). ‘Children at Risk’ in public health policy: What is at risk? In E. E. Ødegaard & J. S. Borgen (Eds.), *Childhood cultures in transformation. 30 years of the UN convention on the rights of the child in action towards sustainability* (pp. 178–196). Brill-Sense Open Access.
- Brass, J. (2016). English teaching and the educationalisation of social problems in the United States, 1894–1918. *Paedagogica Historica*, 52(3), 221–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00309230.2016.1151056>
- Breivik, J. K., & Christophersen, C. (Eds.). (2013). *Den kulturelle skolesekken* [The Cultural Schoolbag]. Arts Council Norway/Fagbokforlaget.
- Breivik, M., Waitz, G., By, I.-Å., Bjørneby, O. I., Anderssen, S. A., & Samdal, O. (2009). *Faglige råd om utvikling av fysisk aktivitet og kroppsøving i skolen*. [Professional advice on the development of physical activity and physical education in school]. Ministry of Education. <https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/anbefalinger-fra-radgivingsgruppa-for-fy/id574123/>
- Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2002). Government–nonprofit partnership: A defining framework. *Public Administration and Development*, 22, 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.203>
- Carstensen, M. B., & Schmidt, V. A. (2016). Power through, over and in ideas: Conceptualizing ideational power in discursive institutionalism. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(3), 318–337. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2015.1115534>
- Caspersen, C. J., Powell, K. E., & Christenson, G. M. (1985). Physical activity, exercise, and physical fitness: Definitions and distinctions for health-related research. *Public Health Reports*, 100(2), 126–131.
- Coburn, C. E., & Penuel, W. R. (2016). Research–practice partnerships in education: Outcomes, dynamics, and open questions. *Educational Researcher*, 45(1), 48–54. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16631750>
- Cook, H. D., & Kohl, H. W. (2013). *Educating the student body: Taking physical activity and physical education to school*. National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/18314>

- Datnow, A. (2002). Can we transplant educational reform, and does it last? *Journal of Educational Change*, 3, 215–239. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021221627854>
- Depaepe, M. (1998). Educationalization: A key concept in understanding the basic processes in the history of Western education. *History of Education Review*, 27(2), 16–28.
- Depaepe, M., & Smeyers, P. (2008). Educationalization as an ongoing modernization process. *Educational Theory*, 58(4), 379–389.
- Dobbins, D., DeCorby, K., Robeson, P., Husson, H., & Tirilis, D. (2009). Cochrane review: School-based physical activity programs for promoting physical activity and fitness in children and adolescents aged 6–18. *Evidence-Based Child Health: A Cochrane Review Journal*, 4(4), 1562–1568. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ebch.461>
- Doyle, W. (2017). The didaktik/curriculum dialogue: What did we learn? In M. Uljens & R. M. Ylimaki (Eds.), *Bridging educational leadership, curriculum theory and didaktik. Non-affirmative theory of education* (pp. 219–228). Springer OA. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58650-2>. <https://www.springer.com/gp/book/9783319586489>
- Duelund, P. (Ed.). (2003). *The nordic cultural model*. Nordic Cultural Institute.
- Duncan, J., & Conner, L. (2013). *Research partnerships in early childhood education—Teachers and researchers in collaboration*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Eisner, W. E., & Day, M. D. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of research and policy in art education*. Routledge.
- Evans, J. (2003). Physical education and health: A polemic or ‘let them eat cake!’. *European Physical Education Review*, 9(1), 87–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X03009001182>
- Eyal, O., & Yarm, M. (2018). Schools in cross-sector alliances: What do schools seek in partnerships? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(4), 648–688. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18765268>
- Fendler, L. (2018). Educationalization. In P. Smeyers (Ed.), *International handbook of philosophy of education* (Springer International Handbooks of Education) (pp. 1169–1183). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72761-5\\_81](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72761-5_81)
- Fjørtoft, J. I., Abrahamsen, Aa-K. H., Degerstrøm, J., Gurholt, K. P., Nesteng, A., Pedersen, C. Z., Oguz, M., Sandbakk, Ø., Sverdrup, M., & Tollånes, I. (2016). *Statlig idrettspolitik inn i en ny tid. Rapport fra strategiutvalget for idrett* [State sports policy into a new era. Report from the strategy committee for sport]. Delrapport 1. Kulturdepartementet.
- Fjørtoft, J. I., Abrahamsen, Aa-K. H., Degerstrøm, J., Nesteng, A., Pedersen, C. Z., Tollånes, I., Oguz, M., Sandbakk, Ø., Sverdrup, M., & Tollånes, I. (2017). *Den norske idrettsmodellen inn i en ny tid. Rapport fra strategiutvalget for idrett* [The Norwegian sports model into a new era. Report from the strategy committee for sport]. Delrapport 2. Kulturdepartementet.
- Gee, C. M. (2004). Spirit, mind and body: Arts education the redeemer. In W. E. Eisner & M. D. Day (Eds.), *Handbook of research and policy in art education* (pp. 115–134). Routledge.
- Geschwind, L., & Broström, A. (2013). *Managing the teaching-research nexus: Ideals and practice in research oriented universities*. CESIS electronic working paper series paper no. 316.
- Grønningsæter, I., Hallås, O., Kristiansen, T., & Nævdal, F. (2007). Physical activity in school for 11–12 year-olds. *The Journal of the Norwegian Medical Association*, 127, 2927–2929. <https://tidsskriftet.no/en/2007/11/physical-activity-school-11-12-year-olds>
- Grydeland, M., Bergh, I. H., Bjelland, M., Lien, N., Andersen, L. F., Ommundsen, Y., Klepp, K. I., & Anderssen, S. A. (2013). Intervention effects on physical activity: The HEIA study – a cluster randomized controlled trial. *International Journal Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 10, 17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1479-5868-10-17>
- Hallås, B. O., Herfindal, T., & Wergedahl, H. (2014). Comparison of the physical activity of 11–12 year old pupils in two schools in Norway and Iceland, using pedometer registrations and activity diaries. *Netla—Online Journal on Pedagogy and Education*. <https://ojs.hi.is/netla/article/view/1952>
- Heath, G. W., Parra, D. C., Sarmiento, O. L., Andersen, L. B., Owen, N., Goenka, S., Montes, F., & Brownson, R. C. (2012). Evidence-based intervention in physical activity: Lessons from around the world. *The Lancet*, 380(9838), 272–281. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)60816-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60816-2)
- Hellevik, O. (1994). *Forskningsmetode i sosiologi og statsvitenskap* [Research method in sociology and political science]. Universitetsforlaget.

- Hetland, L., & Winner, E. (2004). Cognitive transfer from arts education to nonarts outcomes: Research evidence and policy implications. In E. Eisner & D. Day (Eds.), *Handbook of research and policy in art education* (pp. 135–161). Routledge.
- Hopmann, S. (2007). Restrained teaching: The common core of Didaktik. *European Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), 109–124.
- Hopmann, S. T. (2008). No child, no school, no state left behind: Schooling in the age of accountability. *Journal of curriculum studies*, 40(4), 417–456. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270801989818>
- Hopmann, S. (2015). ‘Didaktik meets curriculum’ revisited: Historical encounters, systematic experience, empirical limits. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.3402/nstep.v1.27007>
- Junge, K. (2014). Self-concepts, counter-concepts, asymmetrical counter-concepts. Some aspects of a multi-faceted agenda. In K. Junge & K. Postoutenko (Eds.), *Asymmetrical concepts after Reinhart Koselleck* (pp. 9–50). Transcript Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.14361/transcript.9783839415894.9>
- Karseth, B., & Sivesind, K. (2010). Conceptualising curriculum knowledge within and beyond the national context. *European Journal of Education*, 45(1), 103–120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-3435.2009.01418.x>
- Kittang, A. (1991). Estetikk og poetikk: Supplerende kommentarer [Aesthetics and poetics: Supplementary comments]. In K. Gundersen & S. Wikshåland (Eds.), *EST I: grunnlagsproblemer i estetisk forskning* (pp. 71–80). Norges allmennvitenskapelig forskningsråd.
- Kleppe, B. (2009). Kvalitetsvurderinger på kollisjonskurs. Hva skjer når en teaterforestilling for barn vil være mer enn god kunst? [Quality assessments on crash courses. What happens when a theatre performance for children wants to be more than good art?]. *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidsskrift*, 12(2), 110–126.
- Koselleck, R. (1985). *Futures past: On the semantics of historical time* (K. Tribe, Trans.) Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1979).
- Koselleck, R. (2018). *Sediments of time: On possible histories* (S.-L. Hoffmann, & S. Franzel, Trans., Eds.). Stanford University Press.
- Kulturtanken. (2022). *Om Den kulturelle skolesekken* [About The cultural school bag]. <https://www.kulturtanken.no/den-kulturelle-skolesekken/>
- Labaree, D. F. (2008). The winning ways of a losing strategy: Educationalizing social problems in the United States. *Educational Theory*, 58(4), 447–460.
- Lee, E.-Y., de Lannoy, L., Li, L., de Barros, M. I. A., Bentsen, P., Brussoni, M., Fiskum, T. A., Guerrero, M., Hallås, B. O., Ho, S., Jordan, C., Leather, M., Mannion, G., Moore, S., Hansen Sandseter, E. B., Spencer, N., Waite, S., Wang, P.-Y., Tremblay, M. S., & participating PLATO-Net members. (2022). Play, learn, and teach outdoors—Network (PLATO-Net): Terminology, taxonomy, and ontology. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 19(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-022-01294-0>
- Lidén, H. (2001). *Den kulturelle skolesekken. Modeller for kultur-Skole samarbeid, sett “nedenfra”* [The cultural school bag. Models for culture-school cooperation, seen “from below”]. ABM-Utvikling.
- Lidén, H. (2004). “Tørrfiskten stinka, men kahytten var topp”: En oppfølgingsstudie av to modeller for organisering av Den kulturelle skolesekken [“The dried fish stank, but the cabin was great”: A follow-up study of two models for organizing the cultural school bag]. ISF-Rapport. Institutt for samfunnsforskning. <https://samfunnsforskning.brage.unit.no/samfunnsforskning-xmlui/handle/11250/177549?show=full>
- Lillejord, S., & Børte, K. (2016). Partnership in teacher education – A research mapping. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(5), 550–563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2016.1252911>
- Lillejord, S., Vågan, A., Johansson, L., Børte, K., & Ruud, E. (2016). Hvordan fysisk aktivitet i skolen kan fremme elevers helse, læringsmiljø og læringsutbytte. *En systematisk kunnskapsoversikt*. Kunnskapssenter for utdanning. <https://www.udir.no/tall-og-forskning/finn-forskning/rapporter/fysisk-aktivitet-i-skolen/>

- Lindgren, M., & Ericsson, C. (2013). Diskursiva legitimeringar av estetisk verksamhet i lärarutbildningen [Discursive legitimations of aesthetic activity in teacher education]. *Educare. Vetenskapliga skrifter* (pp. 7–40). <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:hh:diva-20191>
- Locke, W. (2009). Reconnecting the research–policy–practice nexus in higher education: ‘Evidence-based policy’ in practice in national and international contexts. *Higher Education Policy*, 22, 119–140. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/hep.2008.3>
- Ma, J. K., Le Mare, L., & Gurd, B. J. (2014). Four minutes of in-class high-intensity interval activity improves selective attention in 9-to 11-year-olds. *Applied Physiology, Nutrition, and Metabolism*, 40(3), 238–244. <http://www.nrcresearchpress.com/doi/pdf/10.1139/apnm-2014-0309>
- Mangset, P. (2012). *Demokratisering av kulturen? Om sosial ulikhet i kulturbruk og –deltakelse* [Democratization of culture? On social inequality in cultural use and participation]. TF-notat nr. 7, Telemarksforskning.
- Mangset, P., & Hylland, O. M. (2017). *Kulturpolitikk. Organisering, legitimering og praksis* [Cultural policy. Organisation, identification and practice]. Universitetsforlaget.
- Ministry of Church Affairs, Research and Education. (1995). *The bridge and the blue horse. Action Plan*.
- Ministry of Church Affairs, Research and Education. (1996). *Curriculum for the 10-year primary school 1997*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270801989818>.
- Ng, S. W., Chan, T. M. K., & Yuen, W. K. G. (2017). Outsourcing extra-curricular activities: A management strategy in a time of neoliberal influence. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 31(4), 470–484. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2016-0150>
- Ohio, S. (2008). The teacher’s role in the research–policy–praxis nexus. *Australian Journal of Education*, 52(1), 95–109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000494410805200107>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *Making physical education dynamic and inclusive for 2030*. OECD Education 2030 Project, OECD.
- Penuel, W. R., Allen, A.-R., Coburn, C. E., & Farrell, C. (2015). Conceptualizing research–practice partnerships as joint work at boundaries. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 20(1–2), 182–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2014.988334>
- Phillips, D., & Ochs, K. (2003). Process of policy borrowing in education: Some explanatory and analytical devices. *Comparative Education*, 39(4), 451–461.
- Priestley, M., Philippou, S., Alvunger, D., & Soini, T. (2021). Curriculum making: A conceptual framing. In M. Priestley, D. Alvunger, S. Philippou, & T. Soini (Eds.), *Curriculum making in Europe: Policy and practice within and across diverse contexts* (pp. 1–28). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83867-735-020211002>
- Rasmussen, I., Grindheim, J. E., & Jorde, B. (2009). *Samspill uten retning og midler? Hvem skal aktivere hvem? [Interaction without direction and means? Who will activate who?]*. Evaluering av Handlingsplan for fysisk aktivitet 2005–2009. Helsedirektoratet. <https://evalueringsportalen.no/evaluering/samspill-uten-retning-og-midler-hvem-skal-aktivere-hvem-evaluering-av-handlingsplan-for-fysisk-aktivitet-2005-2009>
- Reichenbach, R. (2014). Humanistic Bildung: Regulative idea or empty concept? *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 15, 65–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-013-9298-1>
- Reid, W. A. (1998). Systems and structures or myths and fables? A cross-cultural perspective on curriculum content. In B. B. Gundem & S. Hopmann (Eds.), *Didaktik and/or curriculum. An international dialogue* (pp. 11–27). Peter Lang, American University Studies.
- Ruud, L. C., Borgen, J. S., & Engelsrud, G. (2022). «Relevant for livet og skolekvardagen». En analyse av relevansbegrepets inntog i Den kulturelle skolesekken [“Relevance for life and the school day”. An analysis of the introduction of the concept of relevance in the cultural school bag]. *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidsskrift*, 25(1), 95–112.
- Sallis, J. F., & Owen, N. (1998). *Physical activity and behavioral medicine*. Sage Publications.
- Samdal, O., Haug, E., Hansen, F., Bogshes Larsen, T. M., Holthe, A., Manger, M., & Fismen, A.-S. (2006). *Evalueringsrapport fysisk aktivitet og måltider* [Evaluation report physical activity and meals]. HEMIL-senteret, Universitetet i Bergen.

- Schenker, K. (2019). Teaching physical activity—A matter of health and equality? *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 63(1), 53–68.
- Schou, L. R. (2005). Undervisningens æstetiske dimensjon [The aesthetic dimension of teaching]. *Nordic Studies in Education*, 1(25), 44–53.
- Sefton-Green, J., Thomson, P., Bresler, L., & Jones, K. (Eds.). (2012). *International handbook of creative learning*. Routledge.
- Skjåkødegård, H. F., Tjomsland, H. E., Odberg, A.-H., Leversen, I., & Øen, G. (2016). *Kartlegging av forskning og evaluering – Innføring av 76 timer fysisk aktivitet på 5.-7. Trinn* [mapping of research and evaluation – introduction of 76 hours of physical activity in grades 5-7.] Nasjonalt senter for mat, helse og fysisk aktivitet. <https://mhfa.no/kartlegging-av-forskning-og-evaluering-pa-innforingen-av-75-timer-fysak-5.%2D%2D7.-trinn>
- Skrede, T. (2019). *Prospective associations between sedentary time, physical activity and cardio-metabolic health in children: The active Smarter Kids Study* (Doctoral dissertation, Norwegian School of Sport Sciences). <https://nih.brage.unit.no/nih-xmlui/handle/11250/2594047>
- Stavrum, H. (2013). Begeistringsforskning eller evalueringstyranni? Om kunnskap om kunst for barn og unge [Excitement research or evaluation tyranny? About knowledge of art for children and young people]. *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidsskrift*, 16(1), 154–170.
- Støren, K. (2022). Lokalt læreplanarbeid med fagfornyelsen [Local implementation of the National Curriculum]. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Utdanning og Praksis*, 16(1), 40–58. <https://doi.org/10.23865/up.v16.3070>
- Taylor, J. R., Flanagan, A. J., Cheney, G., & Seibold, D. R. (2001). Organizational communication research: Key moments, central concerns, and future challenges. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 24(1), 99–137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2001.11678983>
- Telhaug, A. O., Mediås, O. A., & Aasen, P. (2006). The Nordic model in education: Education as part of the political system in the last 50 years. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 50(3), 245–283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313830600743274>
- The Directorate for Education and Training. (2006). *National curriculum for knowledge promotion in primary and secondary education and training*. Quality framework. <https://www.udir.no/in-english/Core-Curriculum-in-five-languages/>
- The Directorate for Education and Training. (2022). *The subject renewal*. <https://www.udir.no/laring-og-trivsel/lareplanverket/fagfornyelsen/>
- Tribe, K. (2004). Translator's introduction. Koselleck, R. (2004/1985). *Futures past: On the semantics of historical time* (pp. i–xx). Columbia University Press.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2016). *Unpacking Sustainable Development Goal 4: Education 2030; guide*. Document code: ED-16/ESC-PCR/GD/1 REV. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000246300>
- Wermke, W., & Prøitz, T. S. (2019). Discussing the curriculum-Didaktik dichotomy and comparative conceptualisations of the teaching profession. *Education Inquiry*, 10(4), 300–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20004508.2019.1618677>
- Winner, E., Goldstein, T. R., & Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2013). The impact of arts education: From advocacy to evidence. In E. Winner, T. R. Goldstein, & S. Vincent-Lancrin (Eds.), *Art for art's sake? The impact of arts education* (pp. 21–50). Centre for Educational Research and Innovation CERI, OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/20769679>
- World Health Organization. (1987). *Ottawa charter for health promotion*. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/ottawa-charter-for-health-promotion>
- World Health Organization. (2002). *The World health report: Reducing risks, promoting healthy life*. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9241562072>
- World Health Organization. (2010). *Global recommendations on physical activity for health*. <http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/publications/9789241599979/en/>
- World Health Organization. (2020). *World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour*. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2020-103531>

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

