European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults, Pre-published, 2026, pp. 1-18

How teachers navigate the challenges of inclusive adult education: The case of local Swedish adult education

Ingela Portfelt
Karlstad University, Sweden (ingela.portfelt@kau.se)

Abstract

There is growing research interest in how adult education can better respond to an increasingly diverse student population as part of realising inclusive education. However, less attention has been given to practice oriented perspectives that examine how inclusion is enacted as a dynamic, situated process in everyday teaching. This study examines how teachers navigate the challenges involved in shaping inclusive adult education in Swedish municipal adult education (SMAE), drawing on the theory of practice architectures. Qualitative survey data were collected from teachers in eight SMAE institutions. The findings show that teachers encounter challenges embedded in cultural-discursive, material-economic, and social-political arrangements within a marketised system. These arrangements both enable and constrain their efforts to realise inclusive education. Teachers respond by adopting different strategies, ranging from disengagement and workaround solutions to market responsive and professionally accountable approaches, illustrating the uneven conditions shaping inclusive practice.

Keywords: teachers, inclusive education, adult education, municipal adult education, theory of practice architecture

Introduction

There is growing international research interest in strengthening adult inclusive education practices to meet the needs of increasingly diverse learners (Eriksson, 2024; Knowles et al., 2020). The increased interest is related to global migration which has produced highly heterogeneous student populations with varied backgrounds, competencies, and learning needs, creating challenges for socio-economic justice and sustainability and highlighting the urgent need for inclusive adult education (Boeren, 2017; Fenwick & Tennant, 2020; Knowles et al., 2020; Merriam & Baumgartner, 2020; Rubenson, 2018). This

ISSN 2000-7426
© 2026 The author
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/
http://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.6009
www.rela.ep.liu.se

development challenges long-standing assumptions within adult education, particularly the traditional view of adult learners as a homogeneous and self-regulated group and raises fundamental questions about how adult education systems can adapt their practices to ensure equitable participation and learning opportunities (Knowles et al., 2020).

The idea of inclusive adult education dates back to United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation's (UNESCO) 1945 Constitution, which called for full and equal educational opportunities for all as a basis for democratic and socially cohesive societies (UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning, 2015). This principle has since been strengthened through key international policies. For example, the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) recommends that member states shape an inclusive education system and lifelong learning for all individuals with disabilities (United Nations, 2006). The Belém Framework for Action (UNESCO, 2009) recognises adult education as a human right and promotes inclusive, integrated lifelong learning, particularly for marginalised groups. UNESCO's (2015) Recommendation on Adult Learning and Education advances inclusion by emphasising participation, equity, accessibility, and quality as core policy areas for adult education systems, and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (SDG4) reinforces these commitments by calling for inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning for all (United Nations, 2015).

To date, research has predominantly focused on the policy enactment of adult inclusive education at the systems level (UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning [UIL], 2022; Wildemeersch & Koulaouzides, 2023). At the same time, adult inclusive education is widely described as fragmented, and the gap between policy ambitions and practice continues to widen (UIL, 2022). Despite this, little attention has been given to practice-oriented research exploring how inclusive adult education is realised in everyday pedagogical work in response to learner diversity and its associated challenges (Bishnoi & Godara, 2024; Knowles et al., 2020; Ngwenya & Makoelle, 2023). This is unfortunate, as teachers are central to transforming inclusive pedagogies in adult education (Bishnoi & Godara, 2024; Ngwenya & Makoelle, 2023).

The present study addresses this gap by examining the conditions under which teachers in Swedish municipal adult education (SMAE) institutions work to realise inclusive adult education in practice. The SMAE context is particularly significant given Sweden's commitments to the international conventions and frameworks outlined above, alongside the compensatory role of SMAE for adults with limited schooling or reskilling needs. Moreover, SMAE operates within a marketised educational system shaped by New Public Management principles (Fejes et al., 2016), which adds further complexity to its inclusive mission. Together, these conditions create considerable practical challenges for teachers to navigate in their efforts to realise inclusive adult education. The study also takes into account broader global trends in adult education and offers a critical case of international relevance.

The present study adopts a view of inclusive education as the development of learning environments that responds on the diversity of all learners, that is inclusive practice (Ainscow et al., 2006; Eriksson, 2024; Knowles et al., 2020), and the concrete actions through which teachers realise inclusive education, that is inclusive practices (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011; Graham, 2020; Mitchell, 2018). Moreover, the study views teachers' practice as socially constructed and interconnected with other practices within the educational landscape of SMAE, shaped by surrounding arrangements (Kemmis et al., 2014).

The aim of this study is to examine how teachers navigate the challenges involved in shaping inclusive adult education in the SMAE context, guided by the following

research questions:1) What challenges do teachers encounter in shaping inclusive adult education? 2) What strategies do teachers use to navigate these challenges in their work? 3) How do contextual conditions shape teachers' possibilities for navigating inclusive practices?

The study contributes to the field by providing an empirically grounded and theoretically informed account of teachers' lived practice as they navigate the challenges of realising inclusive adult education. It deepens understanding of how inclusive education is both enabled and constrained within a marketised educational system.

Background

Conceptualising inclusive education

Although the concept of inclusive education is widely used, its definition remains fluid (Eriksson, 2024). Research tends to define the concept in two principal ways. Ainscow et al. (2006), for instance, differentiate between narrow and broad definitions. The narrow definition emphasises specific groups and the targeted support provided to them, whereas the broad definition highlights systemic change, such as shifts in student populations, and the development of learning environments designed to accommodate diversity, that is, cater to all learners. Similarly, Raffo (2011), Gümüş et al. (2021), and Savvopoulos et al. (2022) distinguish between inclusive education as capacity building and as systemic transformation. Capacity building refers to the practices of individuals and practitioners, while systemic transformation encompasses broader concerns related to social justice, equity, and diversity. Taken together, inclusive education can be understood as a multidimensional concept, ranging from targeted interventions for particular groups to comprehensive reforms aimed at creating equitable and responsive educational systems for all learners.

Relating these conceptualisations to the field of inclusive adult education, international research focuses largely on adult learners' access to learning opportunities, the processes of inclusion and exclusion, how a sense of belonging are shaped for participants, and the ways in which marginalised groups are shaped and reconstructed within the global adult education system (Oviedo & Roitman, 2023; UIL, 2022; Wildemeersch & Koulaouzides, 2023). This means that in the context of inclusive adult education, international research has mainly focused on broader definitions of inclusivity.

In the research field of inclusive education, the terms inclusive practice and inclusive practices are both widely used, yet they refer to distinct conceptual levels. The singular form, *inclusive practice*, denotes an overarching pedagogical orientation grounded in ethical commitments that guide teachers and educational institutions in meeting the diverse learning needs of all students (Ainscow, 2020; Booth & Ainscow, 2011; UNESCO, 2020). In contrast, the plural form, *inclusive practices*, refers to the concrete actions through which practitioners enact inclusive education in their everyday work (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011; Graham, 2020; Mitchell, 2018). These practices should not be conflated with special education interventions directed solely at students with identified support needs, Booth and Ainscow (2011) emphasise. Rather, inclusive practices aim to enhance learning for all students by recognising and responding to the diversity inherent in contemporary classrooms.

Previous research shows that effective inclusive practice depends on strong leadership that establishes organisational structures supporting shared interpretations of inclusive policy, clarifies professional roles, and enables collaboration within and

between professions and institutions (Mann & Whitworth, 2017; Martin & Alborz, 2014; Portfelt, 2023; Östlund et al., 2021). Cultivating a local school culture grounded in a clear pedagogical orientation towards inclusion is therefore essential, as it forms the basis for teachers' development and enactment of inclusive practices in their daily work.

In this study, inclusive education is conceptualised not as a fixed construct but as an idea interpreted and enacted by teachers in their everyday work. Accordingly, the study explores teachers' overarching pedagogical orientations and their concrete actions in everyday practice and examines how these are shaped by contextual conditions.

Inclusive education in the SMAE context

SMAE forms part of the publicly funded education system yet operates within a market-oriented governance model. Its statutory remit includes fostering democratic citizenship, supporting labour-market participation, and providing compensatory education for adults aged 20-64 through a range of pathways, including Swedish for Immigrants (SFI), basic and upper secondary education, vocational programmes, and specialised provision for learners requiring extensive support. Since 2015, the sector has expanded markedly due to increased migration, resulting in a more heterogeneous student population and heightened demands for inclusive pedagogical approaches (Fejes & Henning Loeb, 2021). In 2024, SMAE enrolled approximately 368,000 learners, 48% of whom studied with external providers; 67% achieved a pass, 21% discontinued, and 12% completed without passing (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2025).

The inclusive mandate of SMAE is articulated in the Education Act (SFS 2010:800), the Ordinance on Adult Education (SFS 2011:1108), and the Ordinance on the Curriculum for Adult Education (SKOLFS 2012:101), which collectively emphasise equitable, individually adapted provision within accessible learning environments. These frameworks stress the importance of flexible study pathways tailored to learners' circumstances, including variation in study location, modality, pace, and timing, as well as differentiated instruction, adapted materials, digital tools, and assessment adjustments for students at risk of not meeting course goals (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2024). While international literature often treats notions such as individualisation, personalised learning, and adjustments as interchangeable, SMAE distinguishes between them: *individualisation* refers to organisational flexibility, *individualised learning* to self-directed digital study, and *personalised learning* to pedagogical tailoring based on prior knowledge.

To operationalise individualisation, the individual study plan (ISP) is mandated as a central planning tool across all adult education. Policy guidance stipulates that all relevant teaching staff must have access to the ISP to adapt instruction, and that clear procedures are required when multiple teachers or providers are involved (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2026a). Orientation courses, also regulated by the 2011 ordinance, constitute another mechanism for meeting learners' needs; these must be based on the individual student's circumstances and are not intended to extend study time for national courses (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2026b). Despite their centrality in policy, little is known about how teachers actually use ISPs or orientation courses when enacting inclusive education in practice.

Although flexibility is a core policy principle, its practical meaning remains ambiguous, complicating pedagogical decision-making. Research suggests that initiatives promoting flexibility and individualisation have paradoxically increased standardisation in teaching, thereby limiting learner autonomy (Fejes et al., 2016; Åkerfeldt et al., 2025). These tensions are shaped by conflicting policy demands, financial constraints, and audit

regimes that constrain teachers' professional judgement (Holmqvist et al., 2024; Papadopoulos et al., 2023; Åkerfeldt et al., 2025) and influence principals' strategies to realise inclusive education in local SMAE institutions (Portfelt & Mufic, 2026). Curriculum analyses further indicate a shift in which responsibility for inclusion is increasingly placed on individual learners rather than supported through systemic structures (Eriksson, 2024). This situation is compounded by the exemption of SMAE from statutory requirements to provide student health services, including specialist pedagogical expertise (SFS 2010:800).

Overall, the findings suggest that SMAE's inclusive ambitions are constrained by surrounding arrangements in the educational complex. This highlights the need for empirical research into how teachers navigate these constraints and enact inclusive education in local settings.

Theoretical framework

As the study has a particular interest in teachers' practice in the local SMAE context, it uses a framework from practice theory. More precisely, the study employs theory of practice architecture (TPA) as the conceptual framework since it has been proven as particularly useful in educational settings, including adult education settings, in numerous international studies (see, e.g., Bernhard & Van Daele, 2023; Green et al., 2017, Heimo et al., 2025).

The theory was developed to study and enhance educational practices, given its focus on what constitutes and prefigures practice (Kemmis & Grootenboer, 2008). More specifically, the structures that prefigure practice are both enabling and constraining, which means that the theory can offer insight into how practices may be enhanced (Kemmis et al., 2014).

From a TPA perspective, a specific context, time, and space are defined in relation to what is called the common project to discern a practice from others. In this study, the specific context is teachers' practice within local SMAE institutions, during the time of data gathering and analysis, and the common project is navigating the challenges of shaping inclusive adult education. To separate the social, lived practice analytically, TPA focuses on sayings, doings, and relatings, which refer to different surrounding dimensions, also called arrangements that prefigure practice.

Sayings refer to assumptions, ideas, and understandings of practice that are mediated by language and shaped by the surrounding culture and traditions, called *cultural-discursive arrangements; doings* to actions in practice that use resources such as finances, premises, spaces, and competencies, and are shaped by the access to such resources, called *material-economic arrangements*; and *relatings* to the way policies are interpreted and enacted in practice, the way power, responsibility, and roles are distributed, and the way they are influenced by surrounding power and governmental systems, called *social-political arrangements*.

When the interplay between the surrounding arrangements is analysed and synthesised, teachers' practice architecture and its simultaneously enabling and constraining traits emerge. To understand how teachers' navigation of challenges in shaping inclusive practices can be enhanced, it is necessary to examine practice architectures, their enabling and constraining features, and the interconnections between teachers' practices and surrounding practices within the educational complex which mutually shape one another (Kemmis et al., 2012; 2014).

Method and materials

The study adopts a qualitative approach to correspond to the purpose of the study. The data in this study derive from a survey. In relation to the ongoing critical debate among international researchers employing TPA, the most conservative position, grounded on a site-ontological perspective, would criticise the study for not observing practice as it occurs, arguing that a practice can only be studied *in* practice (Grootenboer & Edwards-Groves, 2023). The more liberal position, however, maintains that practitioners' accounts of their practice can meaningfully reflect practice, and that observations alone may risk underexploring the fundamental values and assumptions that underpin it (Variyan & Edwards-Groves, 2025). Even though a combination of both perspectives would have been preferable, this study relies on practitioners' accounts solely due to financial constraints. While structural surveys and observation protocols have been used in several international studies using a TPA framework (Mahon et al., 2017; Olney & Wood, 2023), the survey used in this study is semi-structural, enabling qualitative analysis.

Data collection and methodology

The data for this study were obtained through a web-based survey to facilitate a broader reach among teachers across eight local SMAE institutions. The survey was designed to encompass various aspects of particular interest that can provide information about the surrounding arrangements that may influence teachers' strategies used to shape inclusive education in practice.

The survey consisted of 45 questions covering the following areas: background information ($n = 5$), teachers' individual efforts to accommodate students' learning needs, including the use of ISP:s ($n = 22$), collegial collaboration regarding how to accommodate students' learning needs ($n = 3$), principals' leadership ($n = 6$), organisational routines and structures ($n = 6$), and continuing professional development, with a particular focus on special education for adults and supervision ($n = 3$). The survey incorporated both quantitative and qualitative response options to varying degrees, to enable different kinds of analyses for different studies. Quantitative responses were captured using Likert scales, while qualitative responses were collected through open-ended text fields. Prior to distribution, the survey was piloted with SMAE teachers to assess its construction.

Ethical considerations

The study was submitted to the university's local ethical research committee to determine whether an ethical review was required. The committee concluded that an ethical review was unnecessary, as the questionnaire did not solicit personal or sensitive information and the study focuses on the structural conditions that shape teachers' practices when realising inclusive education. Prospective respondents were provided with written information detailing the purpose of the study, assurances regarding confidentiality throughout the research process, and their right to withdraw consent at any stage. Participation in the survey required respondents to provide informed consent, which was a prerequisite for accessing the survey. Data have been managed in accordance with good research practice recommended by Swedish Research Council (2024).

The generative AI tool *CoPilot* was used to support the writing process. Prompts were formulated to generate translations between Swedish and English, produce summaries, suggest more concise academic formulations in British English, review grammar, and propose headings. However, these tools were not involved in the study

design, data analysis, or interpretation of findings. The outputs generated were critically assessed before use. The author retains full responsibility for all content presented in the article.

Data gathering

One region in mid-Sweden was selected as the sample, comprising seventeen local SMAE institutions. All principals of these institutions were approached in a face-to-face meeting and asked whether their institutions would like to participate in the study. Eight of the seventeen principals agreed and provided their teachers' email addresses. The web-based survey was disseminated via email to all teachers ($N = 168$) employed in these eight small local SMAE institutions. Two reminder emails were sent to encourage participation. Ultimately, 94 teachers responded to the survey, yielding a response rate of 55.9% (Table 1). These institutions primarily organise their own educational provision, with a minor proportion of courses being outsourced to external providers.

Table 1. Presentation of number and percentages of teachers' responses for each local SMAE institution

	Number of responding teachers	**Number of employed teachers**	**% of teachers' responses at each local MAE**	**% of teachers' responses total**
Local MAE institution				
A	10	17	58	9
B	10	16	62	9
C	8	14	57	12
D	30	58	52	28
E	11	19	58	8
F	7	13	54	13
G	10	17	59	9
H	8	14	57	12
Total	**94**	**168**	**-**	**100%**

Note. Response rates were proportional across the eight local SMAE institutions in relation to their total number of teachers.

Data processing and analysis

This study focuses on teachers' responses in open-ended text fields. The data processing and analysis were conducted in several iterative phases. First, all free-text responses were read closely to gain an overall sense of the material. Second, the data were condensed by sorting and reducing the material according to its relevance to the research focus of this study. In the third phase, the remaining data were coded into *sayings*, *doings*, and *relatings*, corresponding to the cultural-discursive, material-economic, and social-political arrangements outlined in TPA.

To address the first research question; *What challenges do teachers encounter in shaping inclusive adult education?* the initial TPA analysis examined teachers' sayings, doings, and relatings related to challenges, with a particular focus on identifying the surrounding arrangements that shape the conditions of their practice. To address the

second research question; *What strategies do teachers use to navigate these challenges in their work?* the TPA analysis examined teachers' sayings, doings, and relatings connected to their navigation strategies, thematically explored, along with the arrangements that condition these practices. The findings from both analyses were synthesised to answer the third research question; *How do contextual conditions shape teachers' possibilities for navigating inclusive practices?* by analysing how the practice architectures enable or constrain teachers' opportunities to act inclusively.

The trustworthiness of the findings is grounded in the systematic and iterative analysis. Coding and interpretations were repeatedly revisited, and the researcher engaged in continuous reflexivity regarding assumptions, positionality, theoretical engagement, and interpretative choices. As the study does not seek generalisability, its validity and reliability rest on the specific dataset, context, timing, and the analytical judgements made.

Findings

This section presents the findings for each research question and illustrates them with quotations from the empirical material to ensure transparency.

Teachers' challenges in shaping inclusive adult education

Within TPA, cultural-discursive, material-economic, and social-political arrangements configure, enable, and constrain how teachers navigate the challenges associated with shaping inclusive adult education in SMAE. The findings indicate that these challenges are profoundly shaped by the wider marketised educational system.

Systemic and structural challenges

As noted above, SMAE is excluded from statutory requirements to provide student health services, including access to specialist pedagogical expertise (Eriksson, 2024; SFS 2010:800). This omission poses challenges for teachers' practice, as these social-political arrangements influence both material-economic and cultural-discursive arrangements.

In the absence of statutory requirements for student health services, municipalities are responsible for allocating resources to support the development of inclusive practices. Most teachers report that they lack access to specialist expertise due to municipal financial constraints, while only a few have such support. These funding disparities significantly influence pedagogical practices. One example is the reliance on temporary budget decisions or externally funded projects to provide supplementary support outside regular instruction for students with extensive needs. As one teacher (86) explained: 'At times, there have been teachers with the competence and training to provide special support entirely outside regular instruction… but at present, this does not occur at all, as there is no financial capacity whatsoever.'

This quotation highlights how special instruction is treated as an exception rather than a routine component of provision, making it difficult to sustain within current budgetary conditions. It also illustrates the considerable expectations placed on teachers to adapt their teaching for a diverse student population. When teachers are unable to adjust instruction sufficiently within established course structures, students risk becoming excluded from education.

Beyond special instruction, broader funding mechanisms shape teachers' work. Principals' allocation of resources across courses or student groups further influences

what is perceived as possible. One example is SFI, which is organised into three study paths: study path 1 for newly arrived learners with no prior formal education and limited literacy, study path 2 for those with some educational background, and study path 3 for highly educated newly arrived learners. One teacher (24) expressed: 'Study Path 1 receives significantly more resources… weak students in Study Path 2 have a much more challenging situation.' This illustrates how principals' allocation of resources shapes teachers' perceptions of how their inclusive work is enabled or constrained.

Moreover, systemic and structural challenges within the social and material dimensions influence cultural-discursive arrangements that shape how teachers perceive adult learners. In the absence of statutory requirements to provide student health services, and in contexts where resources are perceived as insufficient, teachers express views such as: 'Adults must take responsibility for themselves and should not be coddled' (teacher 90). Such statements reflect a tendency to make students responsible for their own learning and are used to justify maintaining existing teaching practices rather than adapting them.

In summary, teachers must navigate contradictory policy demands and financial disparities, rooted in assumptions about the self-regulating adult learner, as they attempt to realise inclusive practices.

Relational and organisational challenges

Systemic and structural conditions shape the local practice arrangements in SMAE, producing relational and organisational challenges for teachers attempting to implement inclusive practices. Findings show that teachers' work is particularly conditioned by social-political arrangements that define roles, expectations, and professional relations, thereby shaping what is possible in daily practice.

A central challenge concerns leadership ambiguity. Teachers report that principals' expectations regarding inclusive practice are unclear, leaving both roles and role relations uncertain. As one teacher (20) noted: 'There is a great deal of variation in how much support students receive. Equity is severely lacking. Nor are there any directives from the principal regarding what is expected of the teacher.' This reflects a perception of passive leadership that fails to articulate expectations for inclusive practice.

Teachers describe principals as largely absent from the inclusive work and having limited engagement with pedagogical dilemmas. One teacher (19) stated: 'I perceive the school leadership as largely disinterested in participating in, or following up on, the problems and dilemmas that we meet in practice.' Principals are thus experienced as invisible in everyday pedagogical practice.

Some teachers, however, recall instances of more active leadership. One teacher (21) described how the principal's annual engagement was tied mainly to managerial reporting rather than pedagogical development: 'The principal tends to show interest in this only once a year… The qualitative work of examining what these figures indicate is seldom afforded the same level of attention.' This indicates a leadership orientation influenced by the marketised system, shaping an audit culture that may challenge teachers' professional agency. In contrast, one teacher (86) recalled a period of more systematic leadership that created time and space for cross-professional dialogue: 'We previously held regular… student support meetings, but not for the last six months'. Such arrangements supported a shared professional language and coherent understandings of inclusion – conditions that have since weakened.

These leadership patterns shape fragmented role relations and constrain as well as enable collaboration. Teachers report unclear boundaries between their own responsibilities and those of colleagues teaching the same students, special needs

educators (where present), and study and career counsellors. Some teachers work outside any formal group and lack spaces for collegial dialogues. As one teacher (8) explained: ’I am the sole teacher for my student group… There is no regularity to these meetings.’ Others describe working groups with no agenda for inclusive practices, resulting in what one teacher (9) characterised as ‘isolated islands’.

Where collaboration does occur, it is often in smaller, well-functioning teams driven by a shared commitment to inclusive education. As one teacher (81) noted: ’We are a small work team and can therefore support each other daily with common students.’

Access to special needs educators varies. Some teachers value their input for discussing students’ needs, while others report minimal relevance to inclusive teaching. One teacher (18) stated: ‘The school’s provision of special educational support… is non-existent… the person responsible demonstrates both limited competence and a lack of interest.’ Such accounts reveal uncertainties about professional responsibilities, generating mistrust within the social-political dimension. These uncertainties are reciprocal: fragmented role distributions further reinforce cultural-discursive assumptions about one another that undermine collaboration.

Similar ambiguity surrounds study and career counsellors, who initiate ISP:s. Some teachers perceive their role as limited, particularly regarding documentation of students’ needs. As one teacher (19) noted: ’It [the ISP] is primarily written by the study and career counsellor, who has no education in how to plan education or teaching based on students’ needs.’ However, earlier accounts also illustrate contexts where counsellors contributed meaningfully to cross-professional collaboration in shaping inclusive practices.

Taken together, so far, the findings show that teachers are challenged by passive leadership, diffuse role expectations, weak infrastructures for collaboration, variations of trust between professional groups, and minor professional islands.

Teachers are also challenged by the absence of organisational routines and structures that support coherent work around the ISP as a basis for planning, collaboration, and instructional coherence. The findings show considerable variation in how teachers relate to the ISP. Some teachers report using the ISP consistently as the foundation for planning. Others view it as irrelevant. As one teacher (9) noted: ‘We do not have a formal individual study plan for the students. They specify their study goals, but that is all.’ Another explained: ’I do not regard the study plans as individual study plans. They indicate which subjects the students are to take and what they have previously studied.’ (teacher 53)

Some teachers consider the ISP potentially important for inclusive work but unrealistic to use due to structural constraints such as large groups, fast study pace, and short study periods, sometimes as brief as ten weeks. This illustrates how the marketisation governance structures permeate the educational system and influence teachers’ practice. Several teachers also reported lacking access to the digital systems where ISPs are created, making it impossible to use the documents consistently. Overall, the findings show that teachers’ use of the ISP is highly inconsistent, shaped by divergent understandings of its purpose in the social dimension and by material-economic constraints that limit its practical applicability.

A similar variation appears in the documentation of individual adjustments for students. Only a minority of teachers report documenting adjustments regularly, and there is no shared system for recording inclusive actions. As a result, teachers create parallel documentation practices, using, among other tools, ISP systems, OneNote, Teams, PDFs, ‘Student Cards’. Google Drive, or email. Some rely on handwritten notes due to GDPR concerns. Yet teachers’ descriptions also reveal practices that risk violating data protection rules, for example, using emails, which become public documents under Swedish law. While these individual workarounds attempt to compensate for local system

shortcomings, they produce multiple parallel 'mini-systems' within single SMAE institutions. In one setting, teachers reported six different documentation practices in use simultaneously.

What is not documented cannot be evaluated, shared, or developed. Consequently, the lack of coherent systems and infrastructures within the local material-economic arrangements severely limit the possibility of building shared inclusive practices and contributes to enduring inequities across SMAE settings.

Teachers' strategies to navigate the challenges

The findings show that teachers respond to these challenges in varied ways, generating four divergent strategies in relation to the inclusive mission of adult education. These differences stem from how surrounding arrangements shape teachers' interpretations of inclusion, from simplistic to more complex, which in turn reflects distinct relatings and values formed through social-political and cultural-discursive conditions. These configure how teachers understand their responsibilities, their relationships to students, and their sense of professional obligation to shape inclusive practices.

The disengagement strategy

The first strategy – disengagement – treats inclusive education as outside teachers' own practice. As one vocational teacher (11) stated: 'I am providing training for professional drivers… where adaptations are not possible'. Such cultural-discursive assumptions construct vocational education as fixed and non-negotiable, legitimising practices that may exclude learners with diverse needs. Another example of this strategy is teachers that view students as responsible for their learning. One teacher (90) described: 'I feel that there are different views among us teachers regarding how we approach adjustments and support. There are still those who say that 'adults must take responsibility for themselves' and should not be 'coddled''. This illustrates how cultural-discursive assumptions about the adult learner as self-regulative shaped by the contradictions in the governance system influence teachers' practice, constraining the development of inclusive practices.

The workaround rule-bending strategy

The second strategy, workaround rule-bending, involves teachers redirecting students to orientation courses in order to grant extended study time instead of adapting their own teaching. Here, teachers draw on a cultural-discursive assumption that 'more time' is equal to meeting students' needs, while mobilising material-economic arrangements enabled by social-political conditions such as flexible study paths. These workarounds allow teachers' practices to remain unchanged.

The strategy also entails bending the intended purpose of these provisions, which are meant to complement, not replace, inclusive teaching. Some teachers reported that orientation courses lack clear aims, defined content, or a responsible teacher, functioning merely as additional time. As one teacher (10) noted: 'We are not offering orientation courses… that have real content, teaching, and a responsible teacher. It is a huge deficiency.'

This practice extends beyond simple rule-bending; it acts as a compensatory response to governance shortcomings while preserving existing teaching routines and shifting responsibility onto students. It reflects a cultural-discursive assumption that adult learners are self-regulating if only given more time, thereby masking systemic limitations

and undermining the core idea of inclusive adult education as a transformation of teaching practice.

In sum, this interpretation of the inclusive mission constrains the development of inclusive teaching practices, as it positions inclusion outside the sphere of teachers' own practice and inhibits pedagogical change.

The market-responsive strategy

The third strategy, which is market-responsive, rests on the view that inclusive education should be connected to teachers' instructional practice. However, teachers perceive the realisation of inclusive practice as constrained by surrounding arrangements: SMAE is experienced as a market-oriented, efficiency-driven sector in which competing demands shape the conditions of work. Teachers describe themselves as caught between policy expectations to design inclusive teaching for diverse learners and governance logics that require financial efficiency. This tension becomes a defining feature of their everyday practice.

One illustration comes from teacher (9), who highlights how time allocations, course length, group size, and teachers' qualifications, that is, material-economic arrangements shaped by cultural-discursive and social-political dimensions, limit the formation of inclusive teaching: 'We cannot / do not have time to make adaptations for every student in the group' is, unfortunately, a common statement… particularly for those who study in only ten weeks.' The quotation underscores how time, study pace, and staff expertise shape teachers' practices.

Teachers also describe a shift towards standardisation of teaching that further constrains individualised support. As teacher (35) explained:

> Demands for flexibility – rapid course production, multiple admission rounds, and many courses per teacher – push the operation towards pre-planned courses uploaded before students even apply… Preparation time is minimised to increase efficiency, and any additional adaptation is said to be 'already built into' the material.

The teacher continues:

> One would have to ignore one's own professional reasoning to believe that this organisation allows everyone to receive equitable support… SMAE has shifted from a pedagogical, interpersonal practice to one dominated by documents, definitions, and producing evidence that cannot be criticised.

This account illustrates the erosion of pedagogical responsibility and teachers' adaptation to managerial control systems characteristic of audit cultures. Such regimes privilege accountability metrics over professional judgement, narrowing space for relational, discretionary, and inclusive pedagogical work and contributing to processes of de-professionalisation and standardisation.

Market-responsive dynamics also appear in municipalities that procure courses from external providers. As teacher (50) observed: 'We are a small unit that contracts [provider]… The teaching varies greatly in terms of support and assistance, and I have encountered many different teachers' courses through my students.' This example shows how marketised structures fragment teaching practices across providers, hindering the development of shared interpretations of inclusive education, a common professional language, and coherent practices around the same student – ultimately undermining equity.

In sum, the market-responsive strategy reflects how marketised and efficiency-driven arrangements restrict teachers' autonomy and capacity to respond to learners' diverse needs. These constraints make inclusive education increasingly difficult to realise in practice, despite its prominence as a policy aim.

The professional accountability strategy

The fourth strategy, professional accountability, reflects an understanding that inclusive education relies on professional responsibility rather than local institutional arrangements. Teachers who share a stronger commitment to inclusion organise informal support structures that transcend governance and financial constraints, operating across social and material dimensions to advance students' learning. As one teacher (23) reported: 'I do this with certain colleagues… The teachers who have not done so do not participate.' Another (42) described situational collaboration: 'When we know we share pupils and there is a need, we have a productive collaboration.'

Such practices demonstrate how teachers with more complex interpretations of inclusion form local subcultures of support. These micro-arrangements show that inclusive practices emerge from shared professional norms and trust, that is, relational and cultural-discursive conditions, rather than from formal policies alone. Through this agency, teachers create enabling conditions that push back against structural constraints and reconfigure inclusive practice in everyday work.

Contextual conditions that shape teachers' possibilities for navigating inclusive practices

The findings show that teachers' possibilities for realising inclusive practices are shaped by the cultural-discursive, material-economic, and social-political arrangements that constitute their practice architecture. These arrangements create uneven conditions that both enable and constrain teachers' professional agency, resulting in divergent strategies for navigating inclusive practices. While three strategies reproduce existing structures and leave teaching unchanged, one strategy demonstrates how teachers mobilise professional responsibility and collegial collaboration to create micro-level enabling conditions within a marketised system. Ultimately, the realisation of inclusive adult education depends not only on individual teachers' efforts, but on the extent to which local and systemic arrangements support pedagogical responsiveness, shared professional norms, and meaningful collaboration.

Discussion

The aim of this study was to examine how teachers navigate the challenges involved in shaping inclusive adult education in the SMAE context. The findings demonstrate that teachers navigate surrounding arrangements that both enable and constrain their efforts to shape inclusive education in practice. Their strategies emerge within a complex practice ecology embedded in a decentralised and marketised education system that continues to conceptualise adult learners as self-regulating – a view that stands in stark contrast to research emphasising adult learners' heterogeneity and diverse learning needs (Bishnoi & Godara, 2024; Knowles et al., 2020; Ngwenya & Makoelle, 2023) and international as well as national policies to which Sweden have committed. Teachers navigate contradictory policy demands and financial constraints shaped by neoliberal governance, resonating with previous work by Holmqvist et al. (2024), Papadopoulos et

al. (2023), Portfelt and Mufic (2026), and Åkerfeldt et al. (2025). Furthermore, they navigate challenges in their local institutions in terms of fragmented roles in the social dimension and lack of supportive organisational infrastructures in the material dimension. This in turn influences both teachers' overarching pedagogical orientation, *inclusive practice* (see Ainscow, 2020; Booth & Ainscow, 2011), and the concrete actions they take, *inclusive practices* (see Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011; Graham, 2020; Mitchell, 2018), as well as their strategies for navigating challenges. These strategies are shaped by an active, situated process in which teachers navigating these structural and constraining challenges and their professional pedagogical values.

Some teachers use a disengagement strategy towards the inclusive mission, while others adopt a workaround rule-bending strategy to provide students with additional study time. Still others employ a market-responsive strategy that leads to further standardisation in teaching, aligning with earlier findings by Fejes et al. (2016) and Åkerfeldt et al. (2025). These three strategies represent weaker pedagogical orientation towards inclusive practice, keep teaching practice unchanged, and ultimately shift responsibility for inclusion onto individual learners. They consequently challenge the foundational idea of inclusive education as a commitment to meeting all learners' diverse needs (Ainscow, 2020; Ainscow et al., 2006; Booth & Ainscow, 2011; Knowles et al. 2020) and constrain teachers' attempts to realise the inclusive mission. In contrast, the professional accountability strategy involves teachers reconfiguring existing arrangements through deeper engagement with the inclusive mission of SMAE and by creating informal micro-collaborative spaces that enable the development and enhancement of inclusive practices within everyday work. Professional accountability thus emerges as the most influential factor in strengthening teachers' capacity to realise inclusive education in practice.

The study highlights how teachers' practices are interrelated with the surrounding cultural-discursive, material-economic, and social-political arrangements that prefigure their understandings of and actions in relation to inclusive adult education. The practice ecology within these local SMAE institutions appears weakly interconnected, contributing to fragmented realisation of inclusive education. These findings align with UNESCO's report concluding that inclusive adult education is fragmented where the gap between policy and practice is wide (UIL, 2022). The findings of the present study differ from those of previous research on inclusive education that emphasises the importance of strong leadership, the cultivation of a local school culture grounded in a clear pedagogical orientation, clear role distributions, and organisational structures that support collaboration within and between professions around students (Booth & Ainscow, 2011; Mann & Whitworth, 2017; Martin & Alborz, 2014; Portfelt, 2023; Östlund et al., 2021). Ultimately, the findings suggest that individual teachers are made responsible for realising inclusive adult education largely on their own, highlighting the need for structural reforms in the Swedish educational system. Moreover, teachers' diverse strategies raise questions about equity and challenge the overarching mission of adult education to create socio-economic justice and sustainable societies, emphasised by Boeren (2017), Fenwick and Tennant (2020), Knowles et al. (2020), Merriam and Baumgartner (2020), and Rubenson (2018).

Implications for practice, policy, and research

For teachers, the present study underscores the need to understand how their teaching connects to wider practices and to develop strategies that influence constraining arrangements. For policymakers, it highlights the importance of aligning governance and

funding with inclusive adult education principles. For researchers, it points to the need for broader empirical studies and for examining how all practitioner groups within SMAE contribute to the inclusive mission.

Limitations and strengths

A key limitation of this study is its reliance on a relatively small number of teachers from a limited set of local SMAE institutions. Its main strength lies in the theoretically informed analysis, which provides rich insights into the lived practices of SMAE teachers as they navigate challenges related to shaping inclusive education within a marketised adult education system. Although the study does not claim generalisability, the findings hold international relevance, as they mirror broader governance trends and illustrate how such systems may shape teachers' strategies in relation to the inclusive mission in adult education. Furthermore, the study contributes new knowledge on how these governance conditions influence teachers' professional accountability, which emerges as a central enabler of inclusive adult education and a compensatory force in the face of systemic shortcomings.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates how teachers navigate challenges embedded in surrounding arrangements that both enable and constrain their efforts to realise inclusive education, applying different strategies in response to these conditions. The findings reveal the fragmented nature of inclusive education in SMAE, shaped by systemic contradictions that constrain its practical realisation. They show that inclusion cannot be achieved through individual teacher action alone; rather, it is deeply dependent on the governance, funding, and organisational structures that configure teachers' work. Strengthening inclusive adult education therefore requires both local professional agency and systemic alignment of policy, resources, and institutional conditions with the broader ambitions of adult education.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author declares no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship or publication of this article.

Acknowledgements

Two SMAE teacher practitioners, Ingela Lennartsson and Åsa Werme, collaborated in constructing the survey and gathering data.

References

Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy, 6*(1)*,* 7-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587

Ainscow, M., Booth, T., & Dyson, A. (2006). *Improving Schools, Developing Inclusion*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203967157

Bernhard, M., & Van Daele, C. (2023). Practice Architecture in Community Development: Mapping Traditions in Learning and Action. *The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education / La*

revue canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes, 35(2), 75-91. https://doi.org/10.56105/cjsae.v35i02.5672

Bishnoi, S., & Godara, V. (2024). Adult Learners and Inclusive Education. *International Journal for Research Trends in Social Science & Humanities, 2*(6), 808-811. https://ijrtssh.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/ijrtsshvol_2issue6_151.pdf

Boeren, E. (2017). Researching Lifelong Learning Participation through an Interdisciplinary Lens. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 40*(3)*,* 299-310. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2017.1287893

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools* (3rd ed.). Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education. https://prsinstitute.org/downloads/related/education/IndexforInclusion.pdf

Eriksson, D. V. (2024). Discourse(s) of inclusion in adult education curricula – the case of Sweden. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 44*(2), 153-167. https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2024.2422298

Fejes, A., & Henning Loeb, I. (2021). Om Komvux och skolutveckling [About municipal adult education and school improvement]. In Å. Hirsch & A. Olin (Eds.), *Skolutveckling i teori och praktik* (pp. 221-234). Gleerups.

Fejes, A., Runesdotter, C., & Wärvik, G.-B. (2016). Marketisation of adult education: Principals as business leaders, standardised teachers and responsibilised students. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 35*(6), 664-681. https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2016.1204366

Fenwick, T., & Tennant, M. (2020). Understanding Adult Learners. In G. Foley (Ed.), *Dimensions of Adult Learning* (pp. 55-73). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003115366-6

Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal, 37*(5), 813-828. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.501096

Graham, L. (Ed.). (2020). *Inclusive education for the 21st Century: Theory, policy and practice*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003116073

Green, A., Brennan Kemmis, R., Choy, S., & Henning Loeb, I. (2017). Using the Theory of Practice Architectures to Explore VET in Schools Teachers' Pedagogy. In K. Mahon, S. Francisco, & S. Kemmis (Eds.), *Exploring Education and Professional Practice* (pp. 121-138). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-2219-7_7

Grootenboer, P., & Edwards-Groves, C. (2023). *The Theory of Practice Architectures; Researching Practices*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-7350-7

Gümüş, S., Arar, K., & Oplatka, I. (2021). Review of International Research on School Leadership for Social Justice, Equity and Diversity. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 53*(1), 81-99. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2020.1862767

Heimo, S., Pastuhov, A., & Salo, P. (2025). Projectification—an elephant in the rooms of popular education? An action research study of an adult educators' developmental practices. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 44*(6), 631-646. https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2025.2476428

Holmqvist, D., Andersson, P., & Muhrman, K. (2024). Fast Delivery, on Demand: How Flexibility and Individualization Policy Are Enacted in Swedish Municipal Adult Education. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy, 10*(1), 60-72. https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2024.2339402

Kemmis, S., Edwards-Groves, C., Wilkinson, J., & Hardy, I. (2012). Ecologies of practices. In P. Hager, A. Lee, & A. Reich (Eds.), *Practice, learning and change: Practice-theory perspectives on professional learning* (Vol. 8, pp. 33-49). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4774-6_3

Kemmis, S., & Grootenboer, P. (2008). Situating praxis in practice: Practice architectures and the cultural, social and material conditions for practice. In P. Salo & S. Kemmis (Eds.), *Enabling Praxis* (pp. 37-62). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789087903275_004

Kemmis, S., Wilkinson, J., Edwards-Groves, C., Hardy, I., Grootenboer, P., & Bristol, L. (2014). Praxis, practice and practice architectures. In S. Kemmis, J. Wilkinson, C. Edward-Groves, I. Hardy, P. Grootenboer & L. Bristol (Eds.), *Changing Practices, Changing Education* (pp. 25-41). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-4560-47-4_2

Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F. III, Robinson, P. A., & Swanson, R. A. (2020). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (9th ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429299612

Mahon, K., Francisco, S., & Kemmis, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Exploring education and professional practice: Through the lens of practice architectures*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-2219-7

Mann, S., & Whitworth, J. (2017). Responsibilities and Training of Paraprofessionals in Alternative Schools: Implications for Practice. *The Journal of At-Risk Issues, 20*(2), 25-34. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1175699

Martin, T., & Alborz, A. (2014). Supporting the Education of Pupils with Profound Intellectual and Multiple Disabilities: The Views of Teaching Assistants Regarding Their Own Learning and Development Needs. *British Journal of Special Education, 41*(3), 309-327. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8578.12070

Merriam, S. B., & Baumgartner, L. M. (2020). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Mitchell, D. (2018). *The Ecology of Inclusive Education: Strategies to Tackle the Crisis in Educating Diverse Learners*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315110448

Ngwenya, N., & Makoelle, T. M. (2023). Inclusion in Teaching and Learning: An Adult Education Perspective. In D. Hlalele & T. M. Makoelle (Eds.), *Inclusion in Southern African Education* (pp. 41-56). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-43752-6_4

Olney, T., & Wood, C. (2023). Using the Theory of Practice Architectures to establish what it means to "do" learning design, and the arrangements that enable and constrain practice. *Frontiers in Education*, *8*, 1291032. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1291032

Oviedo, A., & Roitman, K. (2023). Adult education and belonging: A view from Ecuador. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, *14*(3), 427-442. https://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.4651

Papadopoulos, D., Lumsden Wass, K., & Wärvik, G.-B. (2023). Individualising Processes in the Making: Policy Complexities and Tensions of Municipal Adult Education in Swedish for Immigrants. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *69*(1), 194-207. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2023.2275805

Portfelt, I. (2023). Principals' influences on teaching and assessment in special education. *Educational Research, 65*(4), 428-443. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2023.2239832

Portfelt, I., & Mufic, J. (2026). Principals' Strategies to Shape Inclusive Education in Local Adult Education Institutions. *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2026.2632778

Raffo, C. (2011). A Long Walk to School – Global Perspectives on Inclusive Education. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 43*(3), 279-281. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2011.590658

Rubenson, K. (2018). Conceptualizing Participation in Adult Learning and Education: Equity Issues. In M. Milana, S. Webb, J. Holford, R. Waller, & P. Jarvis (Eds.), *The Palgrave International Handbook on Adult and Lifelong Education and Learning* (pp. 337-357). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-55783-4_18

Savvopoulos, D., Saiti, A., & Arar, K. (2022). The Role of the School Head in Inclusion and Culturally Responsive Leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 56*(2), 107-131. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2022.2122419

SFS 2010:800. *Skollag* [Education Act]. Ministry of Education and Research. https://rkrattsbaser.gov.se/sfst?bet=2010:800

SFS 2011:1108. *Förordning om vuxenutbildning* [Ordinance on adult education]. Ministry of Education and Research. https://rkrattsbaser.gov.se/sfst?bet=2011:1108

SKOLFS 2012:101. *Förordning om läroplan för vuxenutbildningen* [Ordinance on the curriculum for adult education]. Ministry of Education and Research. https://skolfs.skolverket.se/api/document/SENASTE_LYDELSE/2012:101/pdf

Swedish National Agency for Education. (2024). *Extra anpassningar, särskilt stöd och åtgärdsprogram* [Regulations and accountability in issues regarding extra adjustments, special support and action program]. https://www.skolverket.se/regler-och-ansvar/ansvar-i-skolfragor/extra-anpassningar-sarskilt-stod-och-atgardsprogram

Swedish National Agency for Education. (2025). *Elever och studieresultat i kommunal vuxenutbildning 2024* [Students and study achievements in municipal adult education 2024]. https://siris.skolverket.se/siris/sitevision_doc.getFile?p_id=553894

Swedish National Agency for Education. (2026a). *Individuell studieplan inom kommunal vuxenutbildning* [Individual study plans in municipal adult education]. https://www.skolverket.se/styrning-och-ansvar/anordna-utbildning/anordna-utbildning-inom-komvux/individuell-studieplan-inom-kommunal-vuxenutbildning

Swedish National Agency for Education. (2026b). *Anordna orienteringskurser inom kommunal vuxenutbildning* [Organising orientation courses in municipal adult education]. https://www.skolverket.se/styrning-och-ansvar/anordna-utbildning/anordna-utbildning-inom-komvux/anordna-orienteringskurser-inom-komvux#h-sv-default-anchor-0

Swedish Research Council. (2024). *Good research practice 2024.* https://www.vr.se/english/analysis/reports/our-reports/2025-07-03-good-research-practice-2024.html

UNESCO. (2009). *Belém framework for action: Harnessing the power and potential of adult learning and education for a viable future*. Sixth International Conference on Adult Education (CONFINTEA VI), Belém do Pará, Brazil. https://uil.unesco.org/fileadmin/keydocuments/AdultEducation/en/Belém%20Framework%20for%20Action.pdf

UNESCO. (2020). *Global education monitoring report: Inclusion and education – all means all* (3rd ed.). https://doi.org/10.54676/JJNK6989

UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning. (2015). *Recommendation on adult learning and education*. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000245179.locale=en

UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning. (2022). *5th global report on adult learning and education: Citizenship education: Empowering adults for change*. https://doi.org/10.54675/KPEX8783

United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-persons-disabilities

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development* (A/RES/70/1). https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3923923?ln=en&v=pdf#files

Variyan, G., & Edwards-Groves, C. (2025). The theory of practice architectures and its discontents: Disturbing received wisdom to make it dangerous again. *Critical Studies in Education, 66*(1), 20-37. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2024.2334779

Wildemeersch, D., & Koulaouzides, G. (2023). The paradox of exclusion through inclusion: Interpreting inclusion from a critical pedagogical perspective. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults, 14*(3), 307-323. https://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.4525

Åkerfeldt, A., Paul, E., & Hrastinski, S. (2025). Vuxenutbildningens distansundervisning: En villkorad flexibilitet [Distance Education in Adult Education: A Conditional Flexibility]. *Educare*, (4), 283-311. https://doi.org/10.63310/edu.2025.4.60035

Östlund, D., Barow, T., Dahlberg, K., & Johansson, A. (2021). In Between Special Needs Teachers and Students: Paraprofessionals Work in Self-Contained Classrooms for Students with Intellectual Disabilities in Sweden. *European Journal of Special Needs Education, 36*(2), 168-182. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2021.1901370