

The Translator's Voice in Norwegian Upper Secondary Education: How Subject Curriculum, Teacher Training, Textbooks and National Examinations Prepare the Reception of Translated Literary Texts at School¹

Cecilia Alvstad

In most parts of the world, schoolchildren read at least some translated texts as part of their first language literature and language classes. In Norway, in addition to reading translated texts, schoolchildren are expected to achieve theoretical and practical competence in translation as part of the subject of Norwegian. This is unique in a worldwide perspective. In this article I analyze the audibility of the translator's voice in Norwegian upper secondary education. I show that the Norwegian curriculum, teacher training, textbooks and national examinations do not have exactly the same approach to translated texts. I suggest that a raised awareness about the translator's voice (and in line with this a raised awareness of translation as a subjective activity) is necessary if the inconsistencies in the approach to translated texts are to be dealt with. The article is relevant for schoolteachers and university professors around the world who train prospective teachers, as well as for authors of new or revised textbooks and subject curricula for both school and teacher training programs.

Key words: translations in schoolbooks, school curriculum, upper secondary education, Norway, Norwegian subject

Dans la plupart des régions du monde, les élèves lisent au moins quelques traductions dans leur première langue dans les cours de langue et de littérature. En Norvège, en plus de lire des œuvres traduites, les élèves doivent acquérir des compétences théoriques et pratiques en traduction. Cela fait partie de leurs cours en norvégien. Cette exigence est unique du point de vue mondial. Dans cet article, j'analyse l'audibilité de la voix du traducteur dans les cours d'études secondaires de niveau avancé. Je démontre que le programme d'études en norvégien, la formation des enseignants, les manuels scolaires et les examens nationaux ne partagent pas tout à fait la même approche aux œuvres traduites. Je suggère qu'il faudrait une plus grande conscience de la voix du traducteur (et de la traduction comme objet d'étude), si on veut réduire les incohérences dans la façon dont les textes traduits sont abordés. Cet article est pertinent pour les enseignants et les professeurs d'université à travers le monde qui forment des enseignants ainsi que pour les responsables de nouveaux manuels scolaires, de révisions de manuels scolaires existants ou de programmes d'études pour les écoles et pour les programmes de formation des enseignants.

Mots clés : traductions dans les manuels scolaires, programme d'études, études secondaires avancées, Norvège, cours de norvégien

Introduction

The aim of this study is to provide a better understanding of the audibility of the translator's voice in upper secondary education. When schoolchildren read world literature, they

generally read it in translation. Nevertheless, national school contexts vary greatly in regard to not only the quantity of translated texts that pupils are expected to read, but also in how translation as an activity and translated texts are presented. It is therefore of utmost importance to study different national contexts.

Translation Studies scholars generally agree that there is always a component of subjectivity in translation.² This subjectivity may be considered to manifest itself in the translated text as the translator's voice.³ When I refer here to the translator's voice, I therefore understand something more than merely mentioning the name of the translator or announcing that the text is a translation from a specific language carried out at a specific point in time. If the translator's voice is to be defined as audible, it is necessary that it may be perceived as different from the author's voice. In a school context the translator's voice may be made audible if the curriculum, a textbook or exam draws attention to the fact that the translated text differs from the source text, that is, that it was not only written by the author, but that a translator has formulated every word of it and that the subjectivity of this human being is inscribed in the translated text. It may also be concealed, which is what happens when a translated text is presented as identical to the source text, and if the tasks invite the pupil to comment on the language of the translation as though it were the author's.

In this article I will focus on the situation in Norway, which is an especially interesting context for two reasons. The main reason is that practical and theoretical perspectives on translation are singled out as competence aims for the subject Norwegian in the national subject curriculum; this is unique in a worldwide perspective. Another reason that makes the Norwegian context interesting is the country's language situation. In Norway, there are two official standards of written Norwegian, and children learn how to read and write both of them in school. The most widely used standard is called Bokmål (lit. "the language of the book") and the less used variant is called Nynorsk (lit. "new Norwegian"). The Norwegian

language situation is thus a bit peculiar, but that does not make it irrelevant, as there are many other odd language situations that teachers around the world have to negotiate.⁴

In order to discuss the audibility of the translator's voice at school, I will focus on the four pivotal factors that condition how the translator's voice may be perceived at school: 1) the subject curriculum for Norwegian; 2) the status of translated texts in the training of prospective teachers; 3) the way translated texts are presented and discussed in textbooks for the subject Norwegian in upper secondary education; and 4) the place of translation in national examinations. These four factors are pivotal in the teaching and learning situation as they frame what actually happens in Norwegian classrooms.

Translation explicitly became part of the national competence aims for the curriculum for the subject Norwegian in 2006 as a result of a major education reform named the Knowledge Promotion. Teacher training, textbooks and national examinations have now had time to adapt to the 2006 curriculum, and it is therefore relevant to study how the four interact. Or more explicitly: To what extent have these competence aims concerning translation become integrated into teacher training, textbooks and national examinations?

This article is important for university professors who train future teachers, for educators working in lower and upper secondary education, for authors of textbooks and national examinations, as well as for people involved in designing and implementing national school curricula. It will help them better understand the consequences of including and presenting translations and translators in certain ways rather than in others in curricula, textbooks, examinations and actual teaching situations. It is also relevant for Translation Studies scholars with an interest in the translator's voice and how this voice may be displayed. Although the focus of the study is on the voice of the translator in Norwegian upper secondary education, the relevance of the study goes beyond the national borders of Norway. Shedding light on the Norwegian situation will help us better understand to what extent the translator's voice is

audible at school in other places, as well as why it may be important that this voice is indeed made audible.

The Language Situation in Norway

Before entering into details about subject curriculum, teacher training, textbooks and national examinations, it is important to provide some general background about the language situation in Norway as well as the Norwegian education system. There are two official languages in Norway, Norwegian and Sami, with Norwegian being the majority language. Only about 20,000 Norwegians speak the minority language Sami. Most of them live in Northern Norway, and in some northern municipalities Sami is an official language with equal legal status to Norwegian.⁵

Whereas Sami is a Finno-Ugrian language, the roots of the Norwegian language lie in the Old Norse language (700–1350). Around 1350 Old Norse was gradually replaced by Middle Norwegian. Between approximately 1500 and 1900, Denmark had a very strong influence over Norway, and Danish was therefore the only written language used. The kingdom of Denmark-Norway was dissolved in 1814, and the fact that Danish was still used in written texts in Norway was increasingly seen as a problem during the nineteenth century. Two competing possible solutions gained terrain: one was to Norwegianize the Danish language, the other was to create a new written standard based on the oral dialects. The first solution has evolved into modern Bokmål and the second into Nynorsk.⁶ Today, about 85-90% of Norwegians write in Bokmål, whereas 10-15% of Norwegians write in Nynorsk.⁷

Norwegian schoolchildren learn how to read and write both Bokmål and Nynorsk at school. One of the two variants is nevertheless taught as the main written language. Bokmål is most widely used as the main language variant in school, especially in the urban centers. About 15% of all Norwegian schoolchildren learn Nynorsk as their first-choice language variant.

Bokmål and Nynorsk are different official written language variants of Norwegian. In English, however, it is not unusual to find references to Bokmål and Nynorsk as different languages. For instance, the official English translation of the 2006 Norwegian subject curriculum for Norwegian first specifies that Bokmål and Nynorsk are different languages and then refers to them as the two “official forms of the Norwegian language” (in the singular). I will quote the whole passage as it sets the background for one of the main arguments made in this article, namely that the subject Norwegian in the 2006 curriculum is conceived as a subject that ought to deal with Norwegian language and culture not only in a strict sense but also in relation to other languages and cultures:

In Norway there are three official languages, “Bokmål”, “Nynorsk” and Sami, in addition to many dialects and sociolects, and other languages than Norwegian. Norwegian language and culture are developing in a situation characterised by cultural diversity and internationalisation in interaction with the neighbouring Nordic languages, other minority languages in Norway and with impulses from English.

It is within this linguistic and cultural diversity that children and young people develop their linguistic competence. Bearing this language situation in mind, we must lay the groundwork so that children and young people can acquire awareness of linguistic diversity and learn to write both the official forms of the Norwegian language, “hovedmål” (the first-choice language, which can be either “Bokmål” or “Nynorsk”) and “sidemål” (the second-choice language, which will then be the opposite of the first choice).⁸

In general, there is hardly any need for translation between Bokmål and Nynorsk, and most texts are published either in Bokmål or Nynorsk, not in both. Textbooks used in schools constitute an exception, however, as they are generally published in a Bokmål edition and a Nynorsk edition. The Bokmål textbooks are used when Bokmål is taught as the first-choice language variant and the Nynorsk textbooks when Nynorsk is taught as the first-choice language variant.

The Norwegian Education System and the 2006 Knowledge Promotion Reform

The Norwegian education system is divided into ten compulsory years of primary and lower secondary education. These ten years are followed by three years of upper secondary education (or four years for vocational study programs), roughly corresponding to high schools in other countries. Though upper secondary education is not compulsory, it is free of

charge and practically everybody follows it. I will focus here on the upper secondary programs that prepare pupils for university studies. These are all three years long.

As part of the Knowledge Promotion Reform, a major reform of the Norwegian education system implemented in 2006, a new core curriculum for primary and secondary education was designed. The Knowledge Promotion Reform furthermore regulates the subject curricula for all subjects that are part of primary and secondary education, as well as the number of teaching hours per subject. It is a legally binding regulation that schools, teachers and pupils must abide by.⁹

If one compares the subject curricula from 2006 with earlier curricula, the most striking change resides in the formulation of very precise competence aims for each subject. These are defined with the standard formulation “The aims for the education are that the pupil shall be able to ...”¹⁰ Before 2006 the emphasis was on what pupils were to do at school, on the contents to be studied and the methods to be used, but in the new curriculum from 2006, it lies on the competence the pupils are to achieve.¹¹

The Subject of Norwegian after the Knowledge Promotion Reform

Even though the main difference between the new curriculum and the older ones is the formulation of clear competence aims, there are also important differences in the contents included in each subject. In this section I will examine the key changes and also report some of the immediate reactions. The 2006 subject curriculum for Norwegian has recently been revised again, and some of the new contents from 2006 are less important in the revised 2013 version of the plan. I will not discuss this 2013 version in detail, however, as the current school year (2013/2014) is the first one in which it has been used, and it has thus not yet influenced textbooks, teacher training or national examinations.¹²

The 2006 new core curriculum clearly stresses the learning of five basic skills, and these are furthermore integrated into all subject curricula. The five basic skills are defined as “the

ability to express oneself orally, the ability to read, numeracy, the ability to express oneself in writing, and the ability to use digital tools.”¹³ For the subject Norwegian this means that numeracy and the ability to use digital tools also become part of the competence aims.

Numeracy includes for example the ability to interpret graphs, and the ability to use digital tools means that “pupils shall be able to [...] use digital tools for presentation and publication of one’s own text” as well as to “collect assess and apply subject material from digital sources in spoken and written work.”¹⁴ With the 2006 reform the subject curriculum for Norwegian also becomes more comprehensive and systematic in the inclusion of “composite texts” such as picture books, film and music videos. The idea of what a text is becomes much wider, and this also has consequences for the kinds of texts that are relevant to work with at school.

Another change is that European literature in translation is much more important in the new curriculum than in the earlier ones. In the previous curriculum (R94), teachers were allowed to include some literary texts from the rest of the world in their teaching, but after the 2006 reform the pupils are expected to achieve a much higher competence in European literature and the interrelations between Norwegian and European culture. This change becomes apparent if one compares the following quotes from the 1994 and 2006 curricula:

[R94:] Pupils shall have a knowledge of different Norwegian literary genres with a main emphasis on literature from the period after 1940. Some texts from other Nordic countries may also be included as well as world literature.¹⁵

[K06, for year 2:] The aims for the education are that the pupil shall be able to elaborate on important lines of development and some major authors in Norwegian and European literature from the Middle Ages to the Romantic period and the relationship between this literature and other European cultural history [...].¹⁶

[K06, for year 2:] The aims for the education are that the pupil shall be able to discuss and elaborate on the modern project as expressed in texts by important authors from the Age of Enlightenment via Realism to the present [and] elaborate on the modernist tradition in Norwegian and international literature from the final half of the 1800s until the present.¹⁷

The new curriculum thus operates with a new understanding of what a Norwegian text is, as translated literature is also included in the contents to be studied under the subject Norwegian.

As Ove Eide points out, this represents a new way of thinking about cultural heritage:

Another point in the Curriculum Group's thinking was the understanding of Norwegian literature as texts in Norwegian. This means that texts translated into Norwegian are considered part of Norwegian text culture. Also former curricula allowed the inclusion of texts by foreign authors, but the division is now in principle eliminated, and translated literature is seen as part of Norwegian text culture.¹⁸

The 2006 formulations also represent a new understanding of what literature is. Whereas the above quotation from the 1994 curriculum is explicitly formulated as an aim for "literature," the 2006 formulations are aims for "language and culture."

The 2006 curriculum introduces not only specific competence aims regarding the reading of translated texts but also theoretical and practical aims related to translating and translation.

Already when the pupils arrive at upper secondary school, they are expected to have some understanding of what translation is and how translation changes texts. One of the competence aims for year ten (the last year of lower secondary school) is that "the pupil shall be able to [...] explain how meaning and expression are rendered and changed when simple stories, cartoons, and pop lyrics are translated into Norwegian."¹⁹

The conception of translation as something that is *rendered* and that produces *changes* is very much in line with recent research in Translation Studies. The formulation foregrounds translation as a subjective activity. Therefore it also opens up for the perception of the translator's voice. The competence aims for upper secondary school are even more advanced:

[K06, year 2:] The aims for the education are that the pupil shall be able to [...] elaborate on a selection of Nordic texts in translation and in the original language.²⁰

[K06, year 2:] The aims for the education are that the pupil shall be able to [...] assess linguistic nuances in translation from other languages mastered by the pupil.²¹

[K06, year 3:] The aims for the education are that the pupil shall be able to compare and assess texts that are transferred from one medium to another.²²

In the updated curriculum, used from the school year 2013/2014, the last two of these aims have been modified. These changes ought to be understood in a wider context in which the international parts of the subject generally have become less important and the Norwegian parts more important.

The 2006 changes in the Norwegian subject curriculum were thus quite dramatic, and they did not pass unnoticed in Norway.²³ The early reactions to the new, broader Norwegian subject were partly positive, partly negative. For example, Frode Helland noted on the one hand that “the globalization of our time means that the subject Norwegian can at last become liberated from its nationalistic heritage,”²⁴ but he also criticized how the concept of culture has replaced literature and how this concept is so broadly used that it has become watered down.²⁵ John André Nergaard, a teacher who took part in the debate, was also ambivalent about the new contents of the subjects. In his opinion the curriculum aspires to achieve many good things, but unfortunately goes in too many directions. According to Nergaard, that teachers will be expected to work with subjects that they are not trained for, such as multimodal texts, creative writing, multilingualism, foreign literature in translation and translation theory, is also a problem.²⁶ Teachers are trained in the research discipline Nordic, and this discipline (which prospective teachers meet at the university level) and the school subject Norwegian have grown apart.²⁷ According to Nergaard, the 2006 Norwegian curriculum is therefore “written for teachers of Norwegian who do not exist, for pupils who do not exist, and for a subject that partly exists and partly does not exist, but that is possibly on its way to being developed.”²⁸ Ove Eide draws attention to the same issue but from a different angle. He does not present it as a problem but stresses instead that the close relationship between the school subject and the university subject needs to become looser.²⁹

The Role and Status of Translated Literature in Teacher Training

Students who wish to become a Norwegian teacher in a Norwegian upper secondary school generally follow a five-year master’s program for teacher training. Five Norwegian universities offer such a program. This program is not organized the same way from one university to another, and the exact content of the courses the student takes can differ substantially. What the programs have in common is that a Nordic minor or major (in

language and/or literature) is combined with a major or minor in another subject, for example, history, English or another foreign language. The students thus achieve teaching competence in two subjects. I will focus here on what they do if they choose to major in Nordic.

One important observation is that the contents of a Nordic major and the competence aims of the subject Norwegian in upper secondary education are conspicuously different. Whereas a Nordic major, as the name suggests, focuses on Nordic literatures and languages, the understanding of the school subject Norwegian is rather more comprehensive as it also stresses the reading of literature originally written in other languages. From the description of the study programs, it thus seems that many of the prospective teachers who in the near future are to help their pupils achieve the competence aims of reading world literature in Norwegian translations have not met any translated literature at all as part of their studies. Most of them only study Nordic literature and not for example Shakespeare or Baudelaire (neither in the original language nor in translation).

A closer look at the individual university programs shows that most courses for Nordic majors at the University of Bergen are mandatory and include courses in modern Nordic language, Nordic literature after 1900, older Nordic literature, Nordic language history and literary theory (with Nordic primary texts). Optional courses on foreign literature are not included in the study plans.³⁰

Similarly, most courses for Nordic majors at the University of Stavanger are mandatory, and there are courses in Nordic literary history, Norwegian grammar, rhetoric, language history and literature theory. Study plans do include some general literary theory, but no foreign literature primary texts.³¹

The study program for Nordic majors at the University of Tromsø also includes a number of compulsory and optional courses in Nordic literature and language. No optional courses on foreign literature are part of the program.³²

The teacher training program at the University of Oslo has a very similar structure. There are mandatory courses in Nordic literature, Norwegian grammar, rhetoric and Norwegian as a second language. Courses on foreign literature are not included.³³

The only exception to this general tendency to not include any components of foreign literature in the study programs is the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), which in addition to compulsory courses in grammar, the history of Nordic literature and Nordic language and rhetoric lets the students choose four or five optional courses from among nine different alternatives. One of these optional courses (LITT2203) corresponds to 15 ECTS credits on general literature after 1800.³⁴

In spring 2013, foreign literature/literature in translation is thus not part of the compulsory part of any of the five master's programs that train prospective Norwegian teachers, and it can only be taken as an optional course in one of five existing programs. There is thus a striking mismatch between the competence aims that the school pupils are to achieve and the training their teachers receive. There was a closer relation between the school subject Norwegian and the university research discipline Norwegian before the educational reform in 2006 – a point that was already made when the curriculum was new. It is remarkable that the university programs that educate future Norwegian teachers have not adapted their subject contents to include courses that more clearly reflect the subject contents of the new Norwegian school curriculum that are not part of the Nordic research discipline, such as translation theory and practice and foreign literature in translation.

Translation(s) in Textbooks

For this study I have examined five textbook series. Four series consist of three volumes each (one for each year) and one series consists of only two volumes (the last volume is for both the second and the third year), making for a total of 14 books.³⁵ According to the national curriculum, teachers are free to choose their own methods and materials and it is not

compulsory to use any of these textbooks. But in a typical Norwegian education context, the Norwegian teacher in upper secondary school will work with one of these five packages, and all pupils will have their own book on loan from school for the whole year.

All five textbooks series are about both language and literature, and all five meet the competence aims as stated in the 2006 national subject curriculum. The textbooks mix instructive, explanatory passages with authentic texts and text excerpts from a variety of genres and time periods (from Ancient Greece to the present). Genres include literary texts (short stories, excerpts from novels, myths and folk tales), poetry, essays, speeches and factual prose (such as articles and other newspaper contributions). The texts normally come with a set of exercises that prompt the student to reflect upon the text content, language, genre and so forth. There are also many short presentations of the author and/or of the text.

As mentioned above, Norwegian textbooks are generally written in either Bokmål or Nynorsk, but textbooks for the subject Norwegian differ in this respect and include parts in both Bokmål and Nynorsk. This is logical, as it is a goal that the pupils should learn how to read and write in both variants. Publishers have come up with two different solutions for organizing this combination of Bokmål and Nynorsk. Some choose to publish one Bokmål and one Nynorsk edition, and include a certain number of texts from the other language variant, while others publish a combined edition that contains the same amount of texts in Bokmål and Nynorsk. Such combined editions are targeted at both groups of pupils, independent of their first-choice language variant.

In addition to alternating between Bokmål and Nynorsk, the five textbook series also contain some texts in other languages, such as Swedish, Danish, Sami, English, Old Norse and sometimes also German and French. This multilingualism matches the broad approach to language and literature of the 2006 Norwegian subject curriculum. It is quite unusual that first-language textbooks are so multilingual.

Norwegian textbooks also include translations into Bokmål or Nynorsk from all the languages mentioned above as well as from other languages. One or several of the textbooks include translated text excerpts from *Beowulf*, *The Song of Roland* and the Bible, as well as translated texts or excerpts of texts by Homer, Boccaccio, Cervantes, Shakespeare, Molière, Voltaire, Rousseau, Marguerite de Navarre, Flaubert, Novalis, Martin Luther, Goethe, Mary Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft, Keats, Jane Austen, Dickens, Petrarch, Dostoyevsky, Kafka, Joyce, Beckett, Rimbaud, Baudelaire, Woolf, Pablo Neruda, Emily Dickinson, Italo Calvino, Haruki Murakami, Douglas Adams, Dan Brown, Mari Boine (Sami), Snorri Sturluson (Old Norse), Mikael Niemi (Swedish), Jonas Gardell (Swedish) and many others.

The position of translated literature in the textbooks matches that of the 2006 curriculum. In other words, the publishers have taken seriously the task of producing textbooks that correspond to the new curriculum. It should be recalled here that providing instruction related to foreign literature in translation may actually be quite a challenge for teachers of Norwegian, since non-Nordic literature is not part of the compulsory parts of their university education.

Another point is that, in an international perspective, these textbooks give quite a lot of importance to translated literature vis-à-vis literature originally written in the language of instruction. However, the audibility of the translator's voice in the textbooks is related not only to the number of translated texts the pupils read, but also to how these texts are presented. The name of the translator may or may not be mentioned together with the texts, and the tasks designed for the text may or may not encourage discussions of the translated status of the text. In the following sections I will therefore comment on how translations are presented, with reference to a few examples of texts and tasks that either ignore/conceal the translator's voice or stimulate the pupils to reflect on the translator's voice.

A first general observation is that the visual presentation of the texts (presentation of the author, text, exercises, etc.) is the same for translations and original texts. However, translated texts are not always presented as such, and the translator of the text is not always mentioned, nor is the source language.

In the *Nettopp norsk* series, for example, the pupils are asked to read an excerpt from Charles Dickens' *Oliver Twist*. The name of the translator, Eivind Hauge, and the year of the translation (1949) are mentioned, but apart from this there is no reflection on the fact that this is a translated text. The first exercise has a direct reference to the author:

- 1) What kind of literary devices does Dickens use to capture the environment and the characters? Give concrete examples.³⁶

The pupil is encouraged here to reflect upon the literary devices that Dickens used. The exercise overlooks the fact that the pupil has read a translated text and that the literary devices probably appear somewhat differently in this Norwegian text than in Dickens' original text.

This is one of many examples of exercises that conceal the translator's voice.³⁷

There is a similar set of exercises related to Lord Byron's poem "Ocean" in the *Spenn* series. The exercises appear with the Norwegian translation ("Osean"), but the formulation is more neutral when it comes to the translator's voice. This is because the questions refer to the form of the poem, not the devices used by the author:

- 1) How is the ocean described? Find at least three characterizations.
- 2) Give an account of the poem's form, by analyzing
 - a. rhyme scheme
 - b. figures of speech (such as metaphors and personification)
 - c. contrasts
- 3) If you agree that "the ocean" is the central motif of the poem, what in your opinion is the theme?³⁸

As a further difference to the Dickens' example given above, these exercises on "Osean" are followed by a few exercises that actually do encourage the pupil to reflect upon changes that may have occurred in translation:

- 1) Compare the Norwegian translation of "Ocean" with the original version in English (see *Spenn's* web pages).
 - a. What linguistic differences do you find?
 - b. Do you think that it is a good translation?

c. If you were to change something, what would you change?³⁹

In this way, the exercises highlight, rather than conceal, the translator's voice.⁴⁰

Another highly interesting example is the treatment of Tristan and Isolde in the *Nettopp norsk* series.⁴¹ Excerpts from two different versions of the medieval legend of Tristan and Isolde are presented, showing that the text has been through several transformations/translations. First, there is a Norwegian translation of Joseph Bédier's interpretation of the story (from 1900) based on the French novel from the twelfth century. The twelfth-century French novel has also reached Norway through other ways. As stated in the textbook, the Norwegian king Haakon IV ordered a translation into Old Norse in 1226. The textbook also includes an excerpt from this translation, in a new translation into modern Norwegian (from 2003, by Magnus Rindal).

One of the exercises that follow the two excerpts invites the pupil to reflect upon this special situation of translation:

In the Middle Ages, translation was understood differently than today. The translator related relatively freely to the original text. Rewritings, omissions and other changes were common. Compare the two versions of the legend about Tristan and Isolde, and give examples of similarities and differences.⁴²

In the exercise, the pupil is asked to reflect upon the translations from the Middle Ages and how we might understand translation differently today. However, in comparing the two translations that appear in the book, the pupils are not comparing a translation from the Middle Ages – they are comparing modern Norwegian translations of those texts, published, according to the information given in the textbook, in 1977 and 2003. This aspect is completely overlooked.

In some exercises, the pupils are encouraged to make own translations. The following example concerns a Sami poem by Risten Stokki, which appears in the *Nettopp norsk* series.⁴³ As is explained in the author/text presentation, the Sami musician Mari Boine has sung the poem on one of her albums. The poem appears together with an English translation, although

there is no mention of the translator (which might be Mari Boine herself, although this is not specified). One of the exercises to this text asks the pupils to make their own translation:

Translate one of the verses into Norwegian. Proceed as follows:

Translate each word.

Try to recreate the rhythm and the feeling of the original text. You might change some words.⁴⁴

To complete this task, the pupils will in fact have to translate from the English translation, because the great majority of Norwegian pupils do not speak or write Sami. Indirect translation is not mentioned at all in the surrounding author and text presentations or exercises. From a Translation Studies point of view, this is highly problematic – the pupils are asked to “recreate the rhythm and the feeling of the original text,” but how can they accomplish this task if they are not able to read and understand the language of what is actually the original text? Instead, the pupils will try to recreate the rhythm and feeling of the English translation, and the changes that might have occurred in the first translation from Sami into English are concealed.⁴⁵

Four of the five book series include a specific chapter dedicated entirely to translation. Hilde Johannesen has written this chapter in the *Nettopp norsk* series. Her chapter is named “Oversettelse og tolkning” (Translation and Interpreting) and provides a thorough outline of translation and interpreting.⁴⁶ The chapter lucidly introduces ideas and terminology from Translation Studies without shunning away from the complexity of the topic. Topics such as subtitling, simultaneous interpreting, consecutive interpreting and the difference between source and target texts and languages are all discussed. Different text genres are taken into account. As a literary example, Johannesen present excerpts of two translations of the same Ibsen text into English and discusses some differences between the two translations and the Norwegian source text, without pointing out correct or incorrect translation solutions. She also provides examples of how false friends can cause interferences and stresses that translators translate texts (and meaning), not individual words. Or as one of the shorter examples says: if one were to translate the English phrase “a red herring” word for word, the

meaning would be lost. The challenges related to words that are used in a double sense are discussed with an authentic example taken from the Norwegian subtitles of one of the Bridget Jones movies. The chapter also provides some historical knowledge about the Rosetta Stone, about the 23 years it took St. Jerome to translate and revise the New Testament and the Psalms from Greek and Hebrew into Latin, and on Étienne Dolet being burnt to death in 1546 for translations that were considered to be too free. Another noteworthy trait of this chapter is that it discursively does not present translation as a problem but as a challenge and a demanding task, all this and more in only eleven pages.

The chapter on translation in the *Tema* series is quite similar in its approach to the one in the *Nettopp norsk* series, although not as comprehensive.⁴⁷ The chapter is called “Oversettelse og gjendikting,” which may be translated literally as ‘translation and poetry reinterpretation,’ the second term being the one generally used when poetry is translated in Norway. The chapter discusses the differences between these two concepts, stating that such “poetry reinterpretation” is generally freer than the translation of prose. It also introduces basic knowledge about interpreting and subtitling, using examples ranging from Shakespeare to J. K. Rowling.

The corresponding chapters in the other two series are quite different from the ones in *Tema* and *Nettopp norsk*. The chapter on translation in the *Panorama* series is much more normative and therefore simplistic. Instead of working with real examples of translations, it presents sentences translated by students and asks the pupil to evaluate which one is the best, as if this would be possible when the sentence is taken out context. It also presents a rather questionable model of the translation process, wherein translators start by identifying words and morphemes and then recreate the meaning in the other language.⁴⁸

The chapter on translation in the *Grip teksten* series is called “Omsetjing – vegen frå framandspråk til morsmål” (Translation: The Way from a Foreign Language to the Mother

Tongue) also differs considerably from the *Tema* and *Nettopp norsk* series presentations.⁴⁹ The first page of the chapter says that the pupils are expected to learn about “the linguistic problems related to the translation of a text in Black English,” about “the problem of false friends” and about “false friends between the Scandinavian languages.”⁵⁰ The main emphasis is therefore on a few contrastive differences between languages, which is a rather limited linguistic approach to translation. Moreover, translation is referred to as a “problem” twice in this short introduction, with the concept of “false friends” also being mentioned twice. This discourse differs considerably from the “challenge approach” of *Nettopp norsk*, and there is a considerable risk that this usage of language may cause the pupils to take a needlessly negative approach to translation.

The exercises on Black English and false friends target what is possible to say in one language and not another. Although it may be interesting to draw the pupils’ attention to contrastive differences between languages, the chapter does not present a very refined understanding of the challenges involved in translation. The approach taken by *Grip teksten* is the opposite to that stated by Roman Jakobson already in 1959, namely that “Languages differ essentially in what they *must* convey and not in what they *may* convey.”⁵¹ Pupils are nonetheless asked to translate texts from Swedish and Danish into Norwegian and discuss how they accomplished this. Finally, the pupils are made aware of the punctuation rule that governs translation in the European Union and are asked to translate a short, formal text about the Language Council of Norway into Norwegian.

The approach to translation varies considerably between the textbooks and also within one and the same book. Many of the inconsistencies would be easy to revise. In terms of the audibility of the translator’s voice, it would make a great difference whether the source language, the name of the translator, the original publication year and the year of translation

were always mentioned. This would help pupils to read the text as part of both Norwegian and international text culture.

National Examinations

School exams in Norway are subject to national requirements. As part of the exams taken on the completion of upper secondary education, all pupils who study Norwegian (and not Sami) as their first school language write exam papers in either Bokmål or Nynorsk, depending on which of these variants they study as their first-choice Norwegian language variant. In addition, some pupils will take an exam also in their second-choice Norwegian language variant. This is decided by a casting of lots.⁵²

The exam papers from earlier years are available at the website of UDIR (the Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training). The exams are password-protected for copyright reasons, but all schools get access and UDIR explicitly encourages pupils in collaboration with their teacher to prepare for their exams by looking at previous versions.⁵³ The exam papers are therefore essential when it comes to pinning down which of the aims from the national curriculum are considered to be the most important ones. In this section I will therefore examine how translation was dealt with in the annual spring semester exams from 2009 to 2013. In total this means five exams of Norwegian as first-choice language and five examinations of Norwegian as second-choice language. The ten examinations are available at the password-protected part of the UDIR website.⁵⁴

All exams consist of text excerpts and tasks to be answered in an essay format. The pupils can choose among several tasks related to different texts, and the most common format is that the pupils answer with one short and one long essay. The pupils generally have five hours to write the exam paper.

As the pupils may choose among several tasks, there are over 50 texts in the ten exams. Only four of these texts are translated from non-Nordic languages. Most pupils will therefore not

write about a translated text in their final exam. Because of the way the tasks are formulated, the few pupils who do have the option to write about a translated text and who choose to do so are not likely to deal with any translational aspects. A task formulated for a text by Charles Baudelaire (in Norwegian translation by Tore Stubberud, taken from *Prosadikt*, 1993) furthermore demonstrates that pupils are not invited to write about the texts as a translation, but to write about its forms and contents and compare it to a Norwegian text.⁵⁵ The text is part of a task on Modernism, and the pupils are asked to interpret and compare the Baudelaire text with a text by the Norwegian author Arne Garborg:

You must write about form and content of both texts [...]. You should compare formal aspects and aspects concerning the texts' content, but you can emphasize what you consider important. To show a high degree of goal attainment, you should give an account of language features in a precise and clear manner.⁵⁶

In other words, the pupils are expected to comment on both form and content, and there is nothing in the formulation of the task (except the name of the translator and the year it was published) to prompt them to take into consideration that one of the texts is a translation whereas the other was originally written in Norwegian. I noted above the gap between the training the prospective teachers get and the broad Norwegian subject curriculum, and furthermore that upper secondary textbooks very much reflect the curriculum but that there are a series of inconsistencies that could be dealt with quite easily. My analysis here shows that the gap between the exams and the curriculum is similar to the one between the curriculum and the teacher training. There is also a gap, though not equally evident, between the exams and the training the prospective teachers receive (as translated literature is not part of their studies).

Conclusions

Ideally there is a connection between recent research and the subject contents pupils learn at school. When one analyzes the subject Norwegian (language and literature) in Norway from a Translation Studies perspective, it is clear that such a connection exists. Both in the national subject curriculum and in the textbooks, translated texts are at least sometimes dealt with in

ways that correspond quite closely to the way translations are conceived in recent Translation Studies research. Translations are included in the various textbooks and are often presented as translations, and although some textbook formulations clearly contribute to concealing the translator's voice, other formulations conversely help make the pupils aware of this voice. The analysis of the teacher training programs and the national exams that take place at the end of upper secondary school have shown a very different approach to translations than the one of the curriculum and the textbooks. Translations are hardly present at all, and hence the translator's voice can neither be heard nor concealed.

The results suggest that some competence aims from the national curriculum are considered to be more important than others, and that neither translation theory nor competence in discussing translated literary texts are the most central ones. The design of the teacher training programs and of the national examinations reveals a hidden curriculum oriented towards those subject contents that were part of the Norwegian subject before the 2006 reform. These are the ones most closely related to the research discipline Nordic studies.

A different interpretation is possible, however. It may be that the people who formulate the exams are in fact aware of the gaps between the curriculum and the teacher training. They may therefore orient the examinations towards the traditional subject contents not because such contents are considered to be more important, but because the exam writers know that these are topics all teachers should master.

Recent changes in the Norwegian subject curriculum, implemented from the 2013–2014 school year, have again made the Norwegian subject in upper secondary school less internationally oriented. These changes narrow the gap, indicated in this article, between the upper secondary curriculum and the textbooks, on the one hand, and the national exams and the teacher training, on the other. From a Translation Studies point of view one could nevertheless have wished for a different way of dealing with the problem. Teacher training

and national exams, and to a certain extent also text books, could for example have included more about translation as a subjective activity. But also if one looks at the curriculum as it is formulated now, some steps in that direction would still be necessary. This would solve some of the inconsistencies in the approach to translated texts that are still there in Norwegian upper secondary education.

Notes:

¹ This work, carried out as part of the Voices of Translation project, was supported by the Research Council of Norway in collaboration with the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Oslo [project number 213246]. I thank research assistant Idun Heir Senstad, for finding and going through the material, as well as for valuable input in the writing process. I also thank Stig Oppedal for copy editing the manuscript, through funds from the Research Council of Norway.

² Sandra Halverson, "Translation," in *Handbook of Translation Studies. Volume 1*, eds. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010), pp. 378-384.

³ Cecilia Alvstad, "Voices in Translation," in *Handbook of Translation Studies. Volume 4*, eds. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2013), pp. 207-210 and Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov, "Voice in the Field of Translation Studies," in *La Traduction des voix intra-textuelles/Intratextual Voices in Translation*, eds. Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov and Myriam Suchet (Montréal: Éditions québécoises de l'œuvre, 2013), pp. 1-10.

⁴ See Peter Trudgill, “Norwegian as a Normal Language” for a discussion of the “normality” of the Norwegian language situation, <http://www.sprakradet.no/Toppmeny/Om-oss/English-and-other-languages/English/Norwegian_as_a_Normal_Language/>. Website last updated on July 14, 2006, accessed on November 19, 2013.

⁵ Lars S. Vikør, “Språk i Norge,” in *Store norske leksikon*, <http://snl.no/spr%C3%A5k_i_Norge>. Published on March 27, 2013, consulted on November 19, 2013.

⁶ Lars Vikør, *The Nordic Languages. Their status and interrelations* (Oslo: Novus Press, 1995), p. 51-55.

⁷ Lars S. Vikør, “Fakta om norsk språk,” <<http://www.sprakradet.no/Politikk-Fakta/Fakta/>>. Last updated July 31, 2012, consulted on November 19, 2013.

⁸ Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, *Norwegian Subject Curriculum in K06*, <<http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-English/Curricula-in-English/>>. Website consulted on December 4, 2013.

⁹ Rolf Mikkelsen, “Læreplaner og Kunnskapsløftet 2006 (K06),” in *Lektor-adjunkt-lærer. Artikler for studiet i praktisk-pedagogisk utdanning*, eds. Rolf Mikkelsen and Henrik Fladmoe (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2009, 2nd edition), pp. 71-88.

¹⁰ Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, *The Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion in Primary and Secondary Education and Training (K06)* (2006), available from <<http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-English/>>. Website consulted on December 4, 2013.

¹¹ Helge Ole Bergesen, *Kampen om kunnskapskolen* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2006), pp. 68-78. Ove Eide, “Frå Kanon til Literacy? Det nye norskfaget i nærlys og perspektiv,” in *Norsklæreren 2* (2006), p. 6.

¹² The revised curriculum is, for the moment, only available in Norwegian. It is available at <http://www.udir.no/kl06/NOR1-05/Hele/>. Website consulted on December 6, 2013.

¹³ Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, *The Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion in Primary and Secondary Education and Training (K06)*.

¹⁴ Competence aim after VG1 (first year of upper secondary school) - program for general studies. See Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, *Norwegian Subject Curriculum in K06*.

¹⁵ The earlier curriculum for upper secondary school, is called R94 and can be found at http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-English/_english/Upper-Secondary-Education-R94/.

¹⁶ See Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, *Norwegian Subject Curriculum in K06*.

¹⁷ See Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, *Norwegian Subject Curriculum in K06*.

¹⁸ Ove Eide, “Frå Kanon til Literacy? Det nye norskfaget i nærlys og perspektiv,” p. 8, my translation. “Eit anna poeng i læreplangruppas tenking var ei oppfatning av at norsk litteratur er tekstar på norsk. Dette betyr at tekstar omsette til norsk vert rekna som del av norsk tekstkultur. Også i tidlegare planar har det vore opna for å trekke inn tekstar av utanlandske forfattarar, men no er skiljet prinsipielt oppheva, og omsett litteratur blir sett på som del av norsk tekstkultur.”

¹⁹ Competence aim after year 10. See Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, *Norwegian Subject Curriculum in K06*.

²⁰ Competence aim after Vg2 (second year of upper secondary school) – programs for general studies. See Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, *Norwegian Subject Curriculum in K06*. In the 2013/2014 update this competence aim has been moved to the next year.

²¹ Competence aim after Vg2 (second year of upper secondary school) – programs for general studies. See Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, *Norwegian Subject Curriculum in K06*.

²² Competence aim after Vg3 (third year of upper secondary school) – programs for general studies. See Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, *Norwegian Subject Curriculum in K06*.

²³ Among other places they were discussed in a special issue of *Norsklæreren* (2, 2006) dedicated entirely to the new curricula, and in the book *Det nye norskfaget*, eds. Arne Johannes Aasen and Sture Nome (Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 2005).

²⁴ Frode Helland, “Norskfaget i globaliseringens tidsalder,” in *Det nye norskfaget*, eds. Arne Johannes Aasen and Sture Nome (Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 2005), p. 57, my translation. “Vår tids globalisering betyr at norskfaget endelig kan bli befridd fra sin nasjonalistiske arv.”

²⁵ Frode Helland, “Litteraturens (manglende) plass i “Læreplan i norsk,” in *Norsklæreren* 2 (2006), p. 30.

²⁶ John André Nergaard, “Å gjere ord til handling er lettare sagt enn gjort,” in *Norsklæreren* 2 (2006), p. 33.

²⁷ John André Nergaard, “Å gjere ord til handling,” p. 33.

²⁸ John André Nergaard, “Å gjere ord til handling,” p. 33, my translation. “Norskplanen [...] er skriven for norsklærarar som ikkje finst, han er skriven for elevar som ikkje finst, og han skildrar eit norskfag som delvis finst og delvis ikkje finst, men som no kanskje held på å bli skapt.”

²⁹ Ove Eide, “Frå Kanon til Literacy? Det nye norskfaget i nærlys og perspektiv,” p. 7.

“Norskfaget i skulen må vere eit skulefag, noko som betyr at det nære sambandet med forskings- og universitetsfaget må løysast opp.”

³⁰ <<http://www.uib.no/studyprogram/MAHF-L%C3%86NO>>. Website consulted on April 19, 2013.

³¹ <<http://www.uis.no/category.php?categoryID=8978>>. Website consulted on April 19, 2013.

³² <http://uit.no/for-studiesokere/programsider?p_document_id=279774>. Website consulted on April 19, 2013.

³³ <<http://www.uio.no/studier/program/lektor/studieretninger/nordisk/>>. Website consulted on April 19, 2013. It should be noted, however, that at the University of Oslo, students can choose as an optional course to take “Literature in a multicultural context” (NOAS2301), a course in which Nordic literary texts about multicultural situations (and questions such as migration, globalization, cultural encounters and identity) are studied.

³⁴ <<http://www.ntnu.no/documents/10234/1068411b-1fcb-467f-a9af-599e4efe3cd1>>. Website consulted on April 19, 2013

³⁵ See Primary sources – Textbooks for the subject Norwegian.

³⁶ Stein Dillevig, Ingeborg Berre, Endre Otto Brunstad et al., *Nettopp norsk: SF vg2/vg3: studieforbredende utdanningsprogram* (Oslo: Aschehoug, 2010), p. 219, my translation. “Hva slags litterære virkemidler bruker Dickens for å fange inn miljøet og karakterene? Gi konkrete eksempler.”

³⁷ Examples of similar presentations and exercises, with no mention of translation, are found in Anne Lise Jomisko, Tommy Moum and Marianne Texmo, *Spenn: norsk for studieforbredende utdanningsprogram vg3* (Oslo: Cappelen, 2008), p. 288-291 (on Walt Whitman), p. 292 (on Charles Baudelaire), p. 352-353 (on Emily Dickinson), p. 393 (on Franz Kafka). Also in Stein Dillevig, Merete Morken Andersen, Ingeborg Berre et al., *Nettopp norsk: SF vg1: studieforbredende utdanningsprogram* (Oslo: Aschehoug, 2009), p. 249 (on Rói Patursson).

³⁸ Anne Lise Jomisko, Christoffer Lindstad, Tommy Moum et al., *Spenn: norsk for studieforbredende utdanningsprogram vg2* (Oslo: Cappelen, 2007), p. 331, my translation.

“1. Hvordan skildres havet? Finn fram til minst tre karakteristikk. 2. Gjør rede for formen i diktet ved å analysere a) rimmønster b) bildespråk (blant annet metaforer og besjeling) c) kontraster. 3. Dersom du er med på at «havet» er det sentrale motivet i diktet, hva mener du temaet er?”

³⁹ Jomisko et al., *Spenn: norsk for studieforbredende utdanningsprogram vg2*, p. 331, my translation. “1. Sammenlign den norske oversettelsen av «Osean» med den engelske originalversjonen (nettstedet til Spenn). a) Hvilke språklige nyanseskjeller finner du? b) Synes du oversettelsen er god? c) Dersom du ville endre på noe, hva ville du gjort?”

⁴⁰ Examples of similar presentations and exercises can be found in Jomisko et al., *Spenn: norsk for studieforbredende utdanningsprogram vg2*, p. 272-273 (on Louise Labé) and in Jomisko et al., *Spenn: norsk for studieforbredende utdanningsprogram vg3*, p. 386-387 (on T.S. Eliot), p. 422 (on William Carlos Williams).

⁴¹ Dillevig et al., *Nettopp norsk: SF vg2/vg3: studieforbredende utdanningsprogram*, p. 188-190.

⁴² Dillevig et al., *Nettopp norsk: SF vg2/vg3: studieforbredende utdanningsprogram*, p. 190, my translation. “I middelalderen forsto man noe annet med oversettelser enn det vi gjør i dag. Oversetteren forholdt seg relativt fritt til den opprinnelige teksten. Omskrivninger, utelatelse og andre endringer var vanlig. Sammenlign de to versjonene av legenden om Tristan og Isolde, og gi eksempler på likheter og forskjeller.”

⁴³ Dillevig et al., *Nettopp norsk: SF vg1: studieforbredende utdanningsprogram*, p. 234.

⁴⁴ Dillevig et al., *Nettopp norsk: SF vg1: studieforbredende utdanningsprogram*, p. 234, my translation. “Oversett et av versene til norsk. Gå fram på denne måten: Oversett først ord for

ord. Prøv å gjenskape rytmen og stemningen i den opprinnelige teksten. Du kan gjerne bytte ut enkelte ord.”

⁴⁵ Other exercises that encourage own translation are found in Dillevig et al., *Nettopp norsk: SF vg2/vg3: studieforbereende utdanningsprogram*, p. 466-467 (on Andersson/Furberg) and in Jomisko et al., *Spenn: norsk for studieforbereende utdanningsprogram vg3*, p. 387 (on T.S. Eliot).

⁴⁶ In Dillevig et al., *Nettopp norsk: SF vg2/vg3: studieforbereende utdanningsprogram*, pp. 424-436, collection of texts, pp. 437-442.

⁴⁷ Per Arne Michelsen, Benthe Kolberg Jansson, Kristian E. Kristoffersen, et al., *Tema: vg2: norsk språk og litteratur: lærebok og tekstsamling* (Oslo: Samlaget, 2007), pp. 19-31.

⁴⁸ Liv Marit Aksnes, Marianne Røskeland, Gunnstein Akselberg et al., *Panorama: norsk vg2: studieforbereende* (Oslo: Gyldendal, 2007), pp. 264-273.

⁴⁹ Berit Helene Dahl, Arne Engelstad, Ingelin Engelstad et al., *Grip teksten: norsk vg2: studieforbereende utdanningsprogram* (Oslo: Aschehoug, 2007), pp. 170-179.

⁵⁰ Dahl et al., *Grip teksten: norsk vg2: studieforbereende utdanningsprogram*, my translation. “I dette kapitlet skal du lære - om spesielle problem i samband med omsetjing av ein tekst på Black English - om falske venner mellom dei skandinaviske språka.”

⁵¹ Roman Jakobson, “On linguistic aspects of translation,” in *Readings in Translation Theory*, ed. Andrew Chesterman (Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura, 1989), p. 58. Jakobson’s italics.

⁵² Utdanningsdirektoratet, *Udir-1-2009 Trekkordning ved eksamen i Kunnskapsløftet*, <<http://www.udir.no/Regelverk/Rundskriv/2009/Udir-1-2009-Trekkordning-ved-eksamen-i-Kunnskapsloftet/>>. Website consulted on December 6, 2013.

⁵³ <<http://www.udir.no/Vurdering/Eksamen-videregaende/Eksamen-Kunnskapsloftet/>>. Website consulted on December 3, 2013. “The pages are password restricted because the exam papers contain material protected by copyright. It is not the Directorate for Education

and Training's intention that the exam papers should be kept secret from the students. On the contrary, we wish that the students use the sample exercises and the exam paper with the exam guide, in cooperation with the teacher, to prepare for the examination." (My translation). "Årsaken til at sidene er passordsikret, er at oppgavene inneholder opphavsrettslig materiell. Det er ikke Utdanningsdirektoratet sin intensjon at oppgavene skal være hemmelige for elevene. Vi ønsker derimot at elevene bruker eksempeleppgavene og eksamensoppgavene med eksamensveiledning, i samarbeid med læreren, til å forberede seg til eksamen."

⁵⁴ See Primary sources – National exam papers.

⁵⁵ In the 2012 spring exam there is a very similar task involving an extract by Goethe.

⁵⁶ 2011 spring exam, my translation. "Du skal skrive om form og innhold i begge tekstene [...]. Du bør sammenlikne både formelle og innholdsmessige sider ved tekstene, men du kan velge hva du vil legge mest vekt på. For å vise høy grad av måloppnåelse bør du gjøre rede for språklige virkemidler på en presis og oversiktlig måte."

Bibliography

Primary sources

Curricula

NORWEGIAN MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND RESEARCH. *The Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion in Primary and Secondary Education and Training (K06)*, 2006. Available from <<http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-English/>>. Website consulted December 4, 2013.

_____. *Norwegian Subject Curriculum in K06*. Available from

<<http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-English/Curricula-in-English/>>.

Website consulted December 4, 2013.

_____. *Norwegian Subject Curriculum in The Old Norwegian Curriculum for the Upper*

Secondary Education (R94). <[http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-](http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-English/_english/Upper-Secondary-Education-R94/)

[English/_english/Upper-Secondary-Education-R94/](http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-English/_english/Upper-Secondary-Education-R94/)>. Website consulted December 4, 2013.

Teacher Training Programs

NORWEGIAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (NTNU). *Nordic (Nordisk) in Study*

Handbook for Humanities 2012-2013 (Studiehåndboka for humanistiske fag 2012-2013).

<<http://www.ntnu.no/documents/10234/1068411b-1fcb-467f-a9af-599e4efe3cd1>>. Website

consulted April 16, 2013.

UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN *Integrated Teacher Program with Nordic Master (Integrert*

lektorprogram med master i nordisk). <[http://www.uib.no/studyprogram/MAHF-](http://www.uib.no/studyprogram/MAHF-L%C3%86NO)

[L%C3%86NO](http://www.uib.no/studyprogram/MAHF-L%C3%86NO)>. Website consulted April 16, 2013.

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO. *Nordic program option in the Master's Program for Teacher Training*

(Lektorprogrammet). <<http://www.uio.no/studier/program/lektor/studieretninger/nordisk/>>

Website consulted April 16, 2013.

UNIVERSITY OF STAVANGER. *Teacher Training Program in Humanities – five year Master's*

Program (Lektorprogram i humanistiske fag – femårig masterprogram).

<<http://www.uis.no/category.php?categoryID=8978>>. Website consulted April 16, 2013.

UNIVERSITY OF TROMSØ. *Nordic – Teacher Training Program in Language and Social*

Sciences – Master (5 Years) (Nordisk – Lektorutdanning i språk og samfunnsfag – Master (5

år)). <http://uit.no/for-studiesokere/programside?p_document_id=279774>. Website

consulted April 16, 2013.

Textbooks for the Subject Norwegian

AKSNES, Liv Marit, Marianne RØSKELAND, Gunnstein AKSELBERG et al. *Panorama: norsk vg2: studieforbereðende*. Oslo: Gyldendal, 2007

Aschehoug, 2008.

DAHL, Berit Helene, Arne ENGELSTAD, Ingelin ENGELSTAD et al. *Grip teksten: norsk vg1: studieforbereðende utdanningsprogram*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 2009.

DILLEVIG, Stein, Merete Morken ANDERSEN, Ingeborg BERRE et al. *Nettopp norsk: SF vg1: studieforbereðende utdanningsprogram*.

AKSNES, Liv Marit, Marianne RØSKELAND, Gunnstein AKSELBERG et al. *Panorama: norsk vg3: studieforbereðende*. Oslo: Gyldendal, 2008.

BERGE, Anne Lene, Anne Lise JOMISKO and Eli Lindtner NÆSS. *Spenn: norsk for studieforbereðende utdanningsprogram vg1*. Oslo: Cappelen, 2006.

DAHL, Berit Helene, Arne ENGELSTAD, Ingelin ENGELSTAD et al. *Grip teksten: norsk vg2: studieforbereðende utdanningsprogram*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 2007.

DAHL, Berit Helene, Arne ENGELSTAD, Ingelin ENGELSTAD et al. *Grip teksten: norsk vg3: studieforbereðende utdanningsprogram*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 2009.

DILLEVIG, Stein, Ingeborg BERRE, Endre Otto BRUNSTAD et al. *Nettopp norsk: SF vg2/vg3: studieforbereðende utdanningsprogram*. Oslo: Aschehoug, 2010.

JOMISKO, Anne Lise, Christoffer LINDSTAD, Tommy MOUM et al. *Spenn: norsk for studieforbereðende utdanningsprogram vg2*. Oslo: Cappelen, 2007.

JOMISKO, Anne Lise, Tommy MOUM and Marianne TEXMO. *Spenn: norsk for studieforbereðende utdanningsprogram vg3*. Oslo: Cappelen, 2008.

MICHELSEN, Per Arne, Benthe Kolberg JANSSON, Kristian E. KRISTOFFERSEN, et al. *Tema: vg2: norsk språk og litteratur: lærebok og tekstsamling*. Oslo: Samlaget, 2007.

MICHELSEN, Per Arne, Jannik KROGH, Jan K. HOGNESTAD et al. *Tema: vg1: norsk språk og litteratur: lærebok og tekstsamling*. Oslo: Samlaget, 2006.

MICHELSEN, Per Arne, Jannik KROGH, Kristian E. KRISTOFFERSEN et al. *Tema: vg3: norsk språk og litteratur: lærebok og tekstsamling*. Oslo: Samlaget, 2008.

RØSKELAND, Marianne, Jannike Ohrem BAKKE, Liv Marit AKSNES et al. *Panorama: norsk vg1: studieforberedende*. Oslo: Gyldendal, 2009.

National Exam Papers

UTDANNINGSDIREKTORATET. *Exam papers for Upper Secondary Education (Eksamensoppgaver for videregående)*.

<<https://pgsf.udir.no/dokumentlager/EksamensOppgaver.aspx?proveType=EV>>. Website consulted December 4, 2013. Password restricted access.

The following exam papers have been examined:

Eksamen 25.05.2009. NOR1211 Norsk hovudmål/hovedmål.

Eksamen 21.05.2010. NOR1211 Norsk hovudmål/hovedmål.

Eksamen 26.05.2011. NOR1211 Norsk hovudmål/hovedmål.

Eksamen 29.05.2012. NOR1211-NOR1231 Norsk hovudmål/hovedmål.

Eksamen 28.05.2013. NOR1211-NOR1231 Norsk hovudmål/hovedmål.

Eksamen 27.05.2009. NOR1212 Norsk sidemål.

Eksamen 28.05.2010. NOR1212 Norsk sidemål.

Eksamen 01.06.2011. NOR1212 Norsk sidemål.

Eksamen 01.06.2012. NOR1212-NOR1232 Norsk sidemål.

Eksamen 31.05.2013. NOR1212-NOR1232 Norsk sidemål.

Secondary Sources

AASEN, Arne Johannes and Sture NOME, eds. *Det nye norskfaget* (The New Norwegian-subject). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 2005.

ALVSTAD, Cecilia. "Voices in Translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies. Volume 4*. Eds. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2013, pp. 207-210.

BERGESEN, Helge Ole. *Kampen om kunnskapsskolen* (The battle about the knowledge-based school). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2006.

EIDE, Ove. "Frå Kanon til Literacy? Det nye norskfaget i nærlys og perspektiv" (From canon to literacy? The new Norwegian subject in detail and perspective). *Norsklæreren* (The Norwegian Teacher) 2 (2006): 6-13.

HALVERSON, Sandra. "Translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies. Volume 1*. Eds. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2010, pp. 378-384.

HELLAND, Frode. "Litteraturens (manglende) plass i "Læreplan i norsk" (The (missing) place of literature in the Norwegian Subject Curriculum). *Norsklæreren* (The Norwegian Teacher) 2 (2006): 30-32.

_____. "Norskfaget i globaliseringens tidsalder" (The Norwegian subject in the age of globalization). In *Det nye norskfaget*. Eds. Arne Johannes Aasen and Sture Nome. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget 2005, pp. 49-63.

JAKOBSON, Roman. "On linguistic aspects of translation." In *Readings in Translation Theory*. Ed. Andrew Chesterman. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura, 1989, pp. 53-60.

LANDSLAGET FOR NORSKUNDERVISNING. *Norsklæreren* (The Teacher of Norwegian) 2.

Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, 2006.

MIKKELSEN, Rolf. "Læreplaner og Kunnskapsløftet 2006 (K06)" (Subject curricula and the knowledge promotion 2006 (K06)). In *Lektor-adjunkt-lærer. Artikler for studiet i praktisk-pedagogisk utdanning*. Eds. Rolf Mikkelsen and Henrik Fladmoe. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2009, 2nd edition, pp. 71-88.

NERGAARD, John André. "Å gjere ord til handling er lettare sagt enn gjort" (To make words become action is easier said than done). *Norsklæreren* (The Teacher of Norwegian) 2 (2006): 33-35.

TAIVALKOSKI-SHILOV, Kristiina. "Voice in the Field of Translation Studies." In *La Traduction des voix intra-textuelles/Intratextual Voices in Translation*. Eds. Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov and Myriam Suchet. Montréal: Éditions québécoises de l'œuvre, 2013, pp. 1-10.

TRUDGILL, Peter. "Norwegian as a Normal Language." *The language council of Norway*. <http://www.sprakradet.no/Toppmeny/Om-oss/English-and-other-languages/English/Norwegian_as_a_Normal_Language/>. Published on July 14, 2006, consulted on November 19, 2013.

VIKØR, Lars S. "Fakta om norsk språk" (Facts about the Norwegian language). *The language council of Norway*. <<http://www.sprakradet.no/Politikk-Fakta/Fakta/>>. Website last updated July 31, 2012, consulted on November 19, 2013.

_____. "Språk i Norge." In *Store norske leksikon*. <http://snl.no/spr%C3%A5k_i_Norge>. Published on March 27, 2013, consulted on November 19, 2013.