Popular education, migration and a discourse of inclusion

Andreas Fejes & Magnus Dahlstedt

To cite this article: Andreas Fejes & Magnus Dahlstedt (2018): Popular education, migration and a discourse of inclusion, Studies in the Education of Adults

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.2018.1463656

© 2018 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

Published online: 25 Apr 2018.
Popular education, migration and a discourse of inclusion

Andreas Fejesa and Magnus Dahlstedtb

aDepartment of Behavioural Sciences and Learning, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden; bDepartment of Social and Welfare Studies, Linköping University, Norrköping, Sweden

ABSTRACT
In this article, we focus on how a discourse on inclusion operates through language learning programmes for migrants. We direct our attention to a new form of activities funded by the Swedish government, Swedish from day 1, organised by popular education institutions. These activities emerged in connection to the migration flows in 2015, receiving large sums in funding from the government. They target newly arrived migrants who are waiting for a decision on their resident permit application, and the aim is to provide an introduction to the Swedish language as well as to Swedish society. Drawing on a Foucault-inspired theorization, we direct our attention to how a discourse of inclusion operate through the way these initiatives are spoken about, how these activities are described, what they are intended to attain, and what kind of citizen is shaped through such a way of speaking. We analyse policy documents produced by different actors involved in the process of Swedish from day 1, as well as case study descriptions of courses. We argue that the discourse on inclusion that emerges encompasses a wider as well as an instrumental notion of inclusion. Migrants are positioned as ‘in deficit’, in need of knowledge in order to become included. Such knowledge does not limit itself to knowledge of the Swedish language and knowledge about Swedish society, but also knowledge of health issues, and knowledge about how the migrants can market themselves and their competencies. We end the article by relating this discourse on inclusion to a wider discussion on neoliberal rationalities of governing.
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Introduction
This article focuses on how a discourse on inclusion operates through language learning programmes for migrants organised by popular education institutions in Sweden. Current migration patterns in Europe, and particularly, the historically high number of refugees coming to Sweden and other member states of the European Union in the period of 2015–2016, are challenging in terms of social inclusion. How can refugees
and migrants be supported in gaining access to the labour market and society more widely? This question comprises of a number of policy challenges and institutional innovations, not only concerning governments, regional organisations and municipalities, but also social partners and in a broader sense, the civil society. Asylum seekers face several challenges and shifting conditions with regard to formal assessment of identity and citizenship, living conditions during the asylum process and thereafter, relations with the local community, social networks and the labour market, welfare and if needed caring and curing institutions. From the point of view of the individuals or families, the asylum procedure is a complex process of life transition and everyday learning about adapting to new living conditions. Educational and occupational background, recognition of prior learning and skills, as well as language training are crucial for inclusion in society and in the labour market (Andersson and Fejes 2010, Delmi 2015). The host society has no means of affecting the resources that the newcomers bring with them, but there is the possibility for more or less successful interventions when it comes to language training and the recognition of prior learning and skills.

In Sweden, adult and popular education has historically been one of the most important tools for adult migrants’ initial language learning. The role of adult and popular education for migrants is of course important to migrants in many other locations, e.g. Canada (Gibb 2015), the UK (Grayson 2014), Austria (Kukovetz and Sprung 2014) and Australia (Webb, 2015). However, Sweden differs compared to many other countries in that the level of participation in adult and popular education is high (Rubenson and Desjardins 2009) and that the institutionalisation of adult, and especially popular education, goes back as far as the mid-1800s (Laginder et al. 2013). With current migration patterns, adult education and particularly popular education has once again come to the fore on the political agenda, and has been proposed to be a central tool in migrants’ inclusion in the labour market and society more widely (Ministry of Education 2015). However, and rather surprisingly, while there have been a large number of studies conducted in Sweden, within different disciplines, relating to the education of migrants as a means for inclusion, these studies have focused on either adult education (Osman 1999, Kemuma 2000, Eriksson 2002), specific initiatives for labour market inclusion (Sibbmark and Åslund 2006, Vesterberg 2016), or on education–labour market transitions (Lundqvist 2010, Behtoui 2013). What is lacking, however, are more critical interrogations on the role of popular education in such initiatives, and what such initiatives ‘do’ to migrants in terms of inclusion and exclusion.

In this article, we focus on how a discourse on inclusion operates through language learning programmes for migrants organised by popular education institutions in Sweden. We direct attention towards a new form of activities funded by the Swedish government, namely Swedish from day 1, organised by popular education institutions. These activities emerged in the wake of the migration situation in Sweden in 2015, receiving large sums in funding from the government. These activities target newly arrived migrants who are waiting for a decision on their resident permit application and the aim is to provide an introduction to the Swedish language as well as to Swedish society. In this article, we direct our specific attention towards the discourse of inclusion emerging through the way these initiatives are spoken about in policy
texts produced by different actors involved in the process, as well as in case study descriptions of courses. How are these activities described? What are they intended to attain, and what kind of citizen is shaped through such a way of speaking?

**Adult and popular education in Sweden**

The adult education system in Sweden is quite unique, providing free education for adults and the possibility to partake in courses providing eligibility to apply to higher education, courses preparing for specific occupations and courses preparing for life as a citizen more generally. Financed by the state and municipalities, adult education is delivered by welfare institutions such as municipal adult education (MAE), which includes Swedish for migrants (SFI), as well as by civil society institutions such as folk high schools and study associations. Adult and popular education has traditionally been a central governmental tool, contributing to the adult population’s possibilities to increase their employability as well as their inclusion in society as democratic citizens (Fejes 2015, 2016, Fejes et al. 2018). The great difference between MAE (including SFI) and popular education institutions is that the former is part of the formal education system governed by state decided curriculum, while the latter are part of civil society, and can be described as ‘free’ and ‘voluntary’, both in terms of participation and in terms of organisation.

In all, it appears as if the adult education system in Sweden, in general, has been quite successful in terms of increasing adults’ knowledge and competencies. While Sweden ranks low in the PISA study (measuring students’ knowledge in compulsory school), Sweden is ranked at the top in the first round of the PIAAC study 2008–2013 (the OECD study on adults’ skills), especially in terms of adults’ problem-solving skills (Statistics Sweden 2013). The PIAAC study also shows that there are great differences in Sweden between those with high and low skills. Among those with low skills, we find the poorly educated and migrants. However, a recent study indicates that the ‘second chance’ provided by adult education in Sweden does have some positive effects, not least for migrants born outside the Nordic countries (Nordlund et al. 2013). Effects identified were improved long-term labour prospects, positive effects on income development, as well as enabling individuals to begin educational trajectories. A similar conclusion can be drawn from a study that focused on analysing the effects of participation in SFI (Kennerberg and Åslund 2010). Those migrants who took part in SFI had a slightly higher rate of employment after 10 years as compared to those who did not participate.

**Popular education and the state**

Zooming in specifically on popular education in Sweden, we can see how there have, more or less, always been, and still are, close relations between the state and popular education institutions. The state has for the last century, to varying degrees, funded popular education at the same time as popular education has been ‘free and voluntary’. Such relations between the state and civil society organisations have been part of the corporatist Swedish welfare model (Micheletti 1995, Premfors 2000). In such a model, relations between the state and civil society organisations have been construed as
important for developing a more democratic society. The idea was that decisions thus would be more embedded in broad layers of the population, at the same time as high levels of participation in the activities of such organisations would contribute to the democratic fostering of the population (Dahlstedt 2009, Edquist 2009). Even though there have been substantial changes in the Swedish welfare model in the last two decades (Larsson et al. 2012), these close relationships between the state and popular education are still quite strong and there is strong support for popular education across political party lines. Popular education in Sweden is thus not a political question in terms of IF there should be state support for popular education or not.

State funding for popular education is distributed through the Swedish National Council of adult education, which is a non-profit association with certain authoritative tasks delegated by the government. The council distributes the state funding for popular education to study associations and folk high schools, and also conducts quality audits in order to report back to the government. Members of the council are the organisations representing the study associations and the folk high schools (FHS) (www.folkbildningsradet.se).

Even though popular education is ‘free and voluntary’, where study associations and folk high schools can decide for themselves what kinds of courses and activities they wish to deliver and how they will deliver them, they still have to adapt to the aims of the state concerning state funding for popular education. However, such aims are quite broadly defined in terms of giving ‘everyone the possibility, together with others, to increase their knowledge and “bildung” for personal development and participation in society’ (SFS 2015:218). Among the more specific aims is that popular education should support activities that contribute to the strengthening and development of democracy, increase people’s influence on their life situation, create engagement to participate in the development of society, and close the educational gaps between individuals and groups in society. The aim of popular education is thus quite broadly formulated in relation to issues of social justice, democracy, citizenship and society in general.

However, besides the direct state funding of popular education, which has been quite stable during the last few decades, the state also commissions specific tasks to popular education institutions, with separate funding. Swedish from day 1, is one such commissioned task and the initiation of this task is partly due to the fact that adult refugees are not entitled to participate in the formal education system until they receive a resident permit. Thus, other means of daily activities for refugees need to be organised (Swedish government 2017). The argument from the government goes that initiatives such as Swedish from day 1 are of high value for migrants in their potential path towards inclusion, i.e. such courses will, on the one hand, provide a relevant day-to-day activity for them during their asylum process, as well as make the transition into Swedish society easier, if they do receive a resident permit. It is further argued that popular education institutions, with their specific kinds of pedagogy, might be better adapted to meet newly arrived migrants as compared to more formal education institutions. In terms of the number of participants, the Swedish from day 1 initiative has been quite successful. During 2016, these activities included 62,000 unique participants (refugees) (Swedish national council of adult education 2017).
Theorisation and questions of method

In order to analyse how a discourse of inclusion operates through the way Swedish from day 1 is spoken about, we draw on a theorisation inspired by the work of Michel Foucault (1972, 1980, 2007), and specifically education scholars who have developed and mobilised such a perspective (Fejes 2006, 2010, Simons and Masschelein 2008, Nicoll et al. 2013, Olson et al. 2015, Sandberg et al. 2016). Concepts such as discourse, and subjectivity, here become central analytical concepts. In this approach, ‘discourse’ includes what is said through speech or writing, but it is more than this. A discourse is not just the signs of language, but a system for the formation of a group of statements that is not limited to what is being said (Foucault 1972). In relation to inclusion, discourses are constituted through statements that emerge as possibilities for speech, events and action-taking at a particular time and location. These statements are considered as entities that allow signs to assign specific and repeatable relations to objects, subjects and other statements. These relations have different features and a vital feature is the construction of (citizen) subjectivity.

Through discourses of inclusion, subjectivity emerges. Here, subjectivity is not pre-defined, nor does subjectivity have any essence. Rather, subjectivity emerges through the way we speak and assign meaning. In other words, this is a decentred notion of subjectivity, and such subjectivity is enmeshed in power relations, which makes these relations possible.

In order to begin identifying the discourse of inclusion that operates in the way Swedish from day 1 is spoken about, we have collected texts of different sorts: four reports describing these initiatives, and two case study descriptions of specific courses. The four reports were selected in order to represent the different actors involved in these activities. Firstly, we selected one of the government documents outlining the funding for these activities (Swedish Government 2017). Secondly, we selected the report on these activities made by the Swedish National Council of Adult Education (2016), which is the government body that allocates the money for these activities to the different study associations. The report is an evaluation report based on interviews with organisers of the courses as well as participants. Thirdly, we selected the report produced by the interest organisation for all the 10 study associations in Sweden (Swedish Adult Education Association 2016). This report describes the background to these kinds of courses, and also provides examples of courses arranged by the study adult education association member organisations. This report also include some quotes from representatives from different course organisers. Fourthly, we selected a report produced by the largest study association in Sweden (ABF, 2017), which reports back on how ABF has used the funding for these kinds of courses.

The above-mentioned reports are of a more formal character, describing rationales for funding decisions as well as reporting on the language learning activities on a more general level. In order to get a little closer to how language learning activities are talked about in terms of content and design, we selected two case studies among the 23 available ones produced within a project funded by the Nordic council of ministers. The project focused on integration activities organised by study associations in the Nordic countries. Five of these 23 cases were from Sweden, and among these, two specifically concerned language learning initiatives. We selected the latter for further
analysis in this article. The two cases illustrate the variety of activities organised by study associations in Sweden. While the activities in case study 1 are financed by a municipality, the activities in case study 2 are financed by the local employment office. And while the activities within case study 1 aim to provide long-term unemployed migrants with knowledge that might increase their chances of gaining employment, activities within case study 2 aim to provide newly arrived migrants with a chance to gain practicum in the labour market and thus increase their chances of gaining employment.

Altogether, the reports and the cases study descriptions provide a basis for identifying how a discourse of inclusion operates in the way Swedish from day 1 is spoken about. In order to analyse this discourse, we have directed our attention firstly at the way the text legitimises Swedish from day 1, and secondly, at what knowledge is deemed necessary for migrants to learn through these courses. By turning our attention towards regularities of descriptions in the text material (Fejes and Nicoll 2008), i.e. descriptions that regularly emerge across the material, the discourse of inclusion takes shape.

A political will for inclusion

Swedish from day 1 is shaped as a key intervention needed in order to include migrants in the labour market as well as society more widely. With increasing migration to Sweden, it is argued that there is a need to find new ways to provide asylum seekers with relevant day-to-day activities. By learning Swedish and gaining knowledge about Swedish society, the idea is that migrants will become better prepared, and have better chances of inclusion. Such a line of reasoning is visible in the following quotation from the Swedish minister of adult education, when elaborating on Swedish from day 1:

Today, a large number of people are coming to Sweden, escaping from war and oppression. It is important for us to work together in order to make their first time in Sweden as good as possible in order to make their inclusion in society and the labour market easier. The Swedish language is the most important tool for inclusion. Thus, the government launched the initiative “Swedish from day one” where asylum seekers and newly arrived migrants living in refugee accommodation can strengthen their skills in the Swedish language and knowledge about Swedish society. (Swedish adult education association 2016, p. 11)

Here, ‘Swedish language’ is positioned as one of the most important tools for migrants in order to become included in the labour market and society more widely. Wider society and the labour market thus emerge as two separate entities in relation to which such skills are construed as important, and they are assigned equal importance. Furthermore, by arguing that this kind of initiative is important to help people who come from ‘war and oppression’, as a way to make ‘their first time in Sweden as good as possible’, a philanthropic notion of inclusion is mobilised.

Regularities of description concerning the importance of Swedish from day 1 in the establishment process, are further supported in the government budget for 2018.

Popular education is an important actor within the government strategy concerning early interventions for asylum seekers… Early interventions are important in order to use the asylum-seeking time in a good way and in order to make a future establishment
in society easier for those who receive a resident permit... Swedish from day 1 has been successful; more than 120 000 unique participants have received basic language skills and knowledge about Swedish society through participation in popular education. (Swedish government 2017, p. 50).

Here, we see how the government construes *Swedish from day 1* as successful in terms of reaching many asylum seekers and providing them with language learning opportunities as well as knowledge about Swedish society. Through such interventions, the transition into becoming established in society is expected to become easier. Similar way to speak about *Swedish from day 1* emerges when focusing on the report from the Swedish national council of adult education (2016). Drawing on the state regulation concerning the initiative of *Swedish from day 1*, the aim of the initiative is described as manifold, in terms of ‘strengthen[ing] knowledge in the Swedish language’ as well as in terms of knowledge ‘about Swedish society’ (p. 51). Such knowledge is expected to facilitate the transition into the labour market and society more widely.

Turning to the report from the Swedish adult education association (2016), it becomes clear that a philanthropic notion of helping others, a will of inclusion, emerges. In the report, the association describes how the 10 study associations in Sweden have worked with asylum seekers for a long time, even before the *Swedish from day 1* initiative. While describing the history of these kinds of courses, the report provides a quote from one of the project leaders in one of the study associations. The project leader states that:

> It’s not human to let people sit and wait. Therefore, we organised study circles in Swedish and social science, as we believe it is a right for all humans to participate, and thus it is an obligation for us to organise it. (p. 6)

Here, the focus is very much on helping people in a tough situation, not only in order to provide possibilities for participation, but also because it is a duty for study associations to provide such opportunities. A philanthropic notion of inclusion thus emerges quite distinctly, not least by arguing that all humans, including asylum seekers, have the right to a meaningful activity, and thus it is described as a duty for ‘us’ to organise such activities for ‘them’. Such a philanthropic notion also emerges when focusing on the way one of the study associations, ABF, describes the reasons they work with asylum seekers:

> ABF should educate about the history and foundation of the asylum process in Sweden... ABF should, in our present time, take advantage of people's solidarity and engagement with asylum seekers... Language and work are two key factors for integration... ABF creates meeting places where people with different backgrounds are provided the opportunity for new meetings where knowledge and culture are at the centre. (ABF 2017, p. 1)

Here, notions such as ‘solidarity’, ‘engagement’, ‘knowledge’ and ‘culture’ become important. The focus is very much on drawing on people's solidarity and engagement with people who are in a tough situation, in order to provide possibilities to meet across cultures, as well as to learn the Swedish language. Metaphorically, adult education here appears as a meeting place, which provides possibilities for inclusion to emerge.
Through the way *Swedish from day 1* is spoken about in texts produced by different actors involved in the process, *Swedish from day 1* emerges as a solution to issues of inclusion. By providing opportunities for asylum seekers to learn the Swedish language, as well as gain knowledge about Swedish society, the idea is that inclusion in the labour market as well as society more widely will become easier. A philanthropic notion of helping others is also mobilised. Providing learning opportunities for asylum seekers is an instrumental task in order to prepare migrants not only for the labour market, but also for life more widely. The task of providing such opportunities for asylum seekers is, however, construed as a moral obligation. Study associations are ‘obliged’ to provide such activities, and the associations should take advantage of people’s feelings of solidarity and engagement with asylum seekers.

All in all, a quite complex discourse on inclusion emerges through the way *Swedish from day 1* is spoken about, containing elements of both a more instrumental notion of inclusion, i.e. to learn what is needed in order to get a job, and a wider notion, i.e. learn what is needed in order to take part in societal life more widely. There is also a strong philanthropic notion of ‘us’ having the moral obligation to help ‘them’. In the next section, we will further elaborate on this discourse of inclusion by turning our attention towards the way language learning initiatives are spoken about in terms of content. What does a migrant need to learn more specifically in order to become included, and thus become a ‘citizen’?

**Knowledge needed in order to become included**

In the following, our analysis turns to the two case studies and the way the specific language learning courses are spoken about in terms of content as well as in terms of what they should achieve.

**Case study 1**

In the course described in case study 1, the target groups are migrants who previously might have been asylum seekers, but who now have a residence permit and have been long-term unemployed. The aim of this particular course is described first and foremost as focusing on strengthening migrants’ language skills and knowledge of Swedish society. In doing so, the hope is for the migrants to gain employment. More precisely, the aim is described as providing knowledge in:

- order for participants to increase their language skills, gain increased knowledge of different functions in society, strengthen their health and provide possibilities to engage in a social community.

Regularity of description here emerges in line with the analysis in the former section concerning the role of language learning and knowledge about Swedish society. However, knowledge, which is construed as necessary in order to become included, is here extended into the area of health, as well as social engagement and activity in a broader sense. On the one hand, this indicates a wider notion of inclusion, i.e. inclusion is not only about employability but also about social activity and engagement in society at large. At the same time, a deficit model is mobilised, where the migrant, is
not only construed as lacking knowledge in the Swedish language, and knowledge about Swedish society, but are also construed as lacking knowledge on health (cf. Osman 1999).

Regularity of description regarding a wider notion of inclusion, as well as a deficit model also emerges when we turn to the way content in the course is elaborated. Content is described as including a wide range of things, such as language learning, geography, mathematics, social sciences, computer knowledge and knowledge of health, in theory and practice, as well as the practising of skills such as CV writing in order for the migrants to be ‘prepared for the labour market’. Thus, not only does a notion of inclusion in the labour market as well as society emerge more widely here, but also, a notion of migrants lacking knowledge in a range of other areas besides language and about Swedish society.

Turning to the way the ‘effects’ of the course are described in the case study text, regularity concerning a more instrumental notion of inclusion emerges. The courses are argued to be seen as being:

...of value for participants, bringing them closer to the labour market, providing training in the Swedish language, better knowledge about Swedish society, and an increase in self-confidence... the project acknowledges, with clarity, how, in every intervention, there is a need to approach the individual at the level she/he currently is, in order to get results, and thus, economically, legitimise the interventions. In order for this to happen, cooperation is necessary, as well as keeping in mind that getting results takes time.

By arguing that the course brings migrants ‘closer to the labour market’, a more instrumental notion of inclusion emerges. This notion is further reinforced through the way the courses are spoken about in relation to results and financial issues, where it is emphasised that there is a need for the results to ‘economically, legitimise the interventions’. In total, case study 1, and the way content in these courses is spoken about, mobilises an instrumental as well as a wider notion of inclusion. Migrants here emerges as in deficit, as ignorant and unhealthy.

**Case study 2**

Turning to case study 2, the target group is described as newly arrived migrants and the aim is described as increasing migrants’ employability. In the case study text, it is argued that the course:

...aims at increasing employability among newly arrived migrants. But it is also about creating understanding of the labour market in Sweden, and about how one’s own initiatives, knowledge and competencies can be used in order to increase the chances of gaining employment, no matter if it is in the form of becoming employed or in the form of starting one’s own business.

With notions such as ‘employability’, the ‘labour market’, ‘gaining employment’ and ‘starting one’s own business’, a rather instrumental notion of inclusion emerges. The focus of the course here is very much on providing newly arrived migrants with the knowledge necessary in order to gain employment. This includes knowledge about the ‘labour market in Sweden’. However, besides being construed as lacking specific
knowledge on the Swedish labour market, migrants are here construed as knowledgeable, i.e. they have knowledge that should be further improved in order for them to become employable. More precisely, the text speaks about how such knowledge should be further improved in the following way:

Often, it is about the participants understanding processes from the initial idea to the selling of a product. The content of the project is also about practising to market yourself and your project work, no matter whether it concerns baking, handicrafts, or personal development within the area of digital competencies. In order to increase employability, skills in sector-specific concepts and the Swedish language are needed.

The focus is here not so much on the knowledge the migrants are already construed as having (handicrafts/producing products), but rather on how such products could be commercialised. The knowledge needed is thus construed to concern learning to ‘market yourself and your project work’, as well as knowledge about the ‘process from the initial idea to selling of a product’. Regularity here emerges in terms of the notion of learning the Swedish language. However, this notion is here directed towards ‘sector specific concepts and language’, i.e. a more instrumental notion of language learning, or rather, language learning as a means for gaining employability (Fejes 2010).

Turning to a description of ‘effects’ of the courses, a wider notion of inclusion emerges. Here, it is argued that:

[w]e can already see effects… where an interest in continuing education for individual participants has emerged. A positive side effect of the project is the will to engage in learning, to have the courage to speak, despite uncertainty in words and concepts, as well as to keep oneself informed.

Although a rather instrumental notion of inclusion is outlined in the course description, here, a wider notion of inclusion is mobilised. This notion emerges through pointing out how participation in the course results in ‘an interest in continuing education’, and ‘a will to engage in learning’, and to ‘keep oneself informed’. In total, case study 2 also mobilises a wider as well as a more instrumental notion of inclusion. Migrant subjectivity here emerges as someone who, on the one hand, is knowledgeable, and on the other, is lacking something needed to become included, i.e. to become productive by selling their products.

**Discussion**

In this article, we have analysed how a discourse on inclusion operates within the way activities targeting newly arrived migrants, organised by popular education institutions, funded by the Swedish government, *Swedish from day 1*, operate. Our focus has been directed at how a discourse of inclusion is shaped through the way these initiatives are spoken about in policy texts produced by different actors, as well as in case study descriptions of courses. Further, our focus has been directed at how the activities are described, what these activities are said to attain, and what kind of citizen is shaped through such a way of speaking. Our analysis of policy documents illustrates how a wider as well as a more instrumental notion of inclusion is mobilised. On the one hand, learning Swedish as well as gaining knowledge about Swedish society is
construed as essential in order to gain employment. Thus, by engaging in activities arranged in the form of Swedish from day 1, an employable citizen is expected to emerge. On the other hand, by gaining such knowledge, as well as by gaining opportunities to engage in society, the hope is that migrants will become prepared for, and active in, life in society more widely. Thus, migrants here emerge as subjects that should become employable as well as active in society more widely, i.e. as subjects lacking something that they need to be compensated in order to become included.

When turning to the case studies, regularities of the discourse on inclusion emerging in policy documents are further supported, and are somewhat nuanced. Through the ways these courses are spoken about, migrant subjectivity emerges as in deficit, as lacking knowledge needed in order to become included. Not only knowledge of the Swedish language and knowledge about Swedish society, but also knowledge about health issues, computers, geography, mathematics and about how to sell oneself and one’s products. Thus, an ignorant and unhealthy migrant subjectivity emerges, characterised as in need of further work in order to become included. In one of the case studies, migrants’ previous knowledge is acknowledged. However, such knowledge should be cultivated in order to become profitable, i.e. employable. However, the mobilisation of a deficit model in discourses on inclusion in relation to migrants is not limited to these specific kinds of courses; such a model has also been identified in other adult and popular education settings, both nationally (Osman 1999, Andersson and Fejes 2010, Dahlstedt and Vesterberg 2017) as well as in other locations in the world (Gibb 2015, Webb 2015). Our analysis has also identified how a notion of philanthropy operates in the texts on Swedish from day 1. Organising these kinds of activities targeting asylum seekers here emerges as a duty, as something civil society organisations, in this case study associations, should organise in order to help those who are in a tough situation. The mobilisation of a philanthropic notion illustrates an ongoing change in the governing of Swedish welfare model, with a shift of responsibility for the welfare of citizens, from public to private and civil society organisations (Larsson et al. 2012). Furthermore, such a shift could be seen in the context of wider discursive shifts regarding the question of how governing operates in contemporary time. Within what has been called a neoliberal governmentality (Rose 1999, Foucault 2007, Fejes and Dahlstedt 2013), the answers to the questions of who should govern and how governing should operate, have shifted over time. Today, rather than governing through the state, governing operates through the individual, something that is also visible in our analysis. Firstly, what was previously (and still is to a large extent) a state institution task, to provide asylum seekers with meaningful daily activities, has now partly become the task of civil society (here, the study associations). Thus, state responsibilities, here in terms of governing and shaping migrants’ subjectivities, are transferred to civil society. Secondly, study associations work through a will to promote inclusion and solidarity. Volunteers who work with migrants are recruited based on such a will, and these volunteers are assigned responsibility to shape migrants into employable citizens who are also prepared to become active in society more widely. Thirdly, through such programmes, migrants are worked upon in order to become capable of gaining and keeping good health (Åkerblom and Fejes 2017), capable of marketing themselves, as well as capable of gaining employment, i.e. becoming
employable (Fejes 2010). In other words, such courses should enable migrants to take responsibility for themselves and their future lives.

The analysis conducted in this article is important in that it sheds light on the fact that these kinds of activities, which operate through a will to promote inclusion and a philanthropic notion of helping others, have quite specific effects in terms of inclusion and exclusion. Power here operates in shaping migrants in certain ways, with intended as well as unintended effects. These questions need to be raised not only in relation to state institutions, policies and practices, but also in relation to wider civil society, particularly since civil society has gained an important role that will increase in the future, the role of providing services and activities previously provided and organised by state institutions. Due to its long tradition of popular education and the corporatist welfare model, Sweden is an interesting case. In Sweden, the self-image of popular education is still reinforced through public discourse (e.g. illustrated through government policies cited in this article), where popular education is positioned as ‘doing good’ and being ‘successful’ in helping people, whether they are migrants or others, to become included in society. But, as always, inclusion has exclusion as one of its effects (Fejes and Dahlstedt 2013). Such effects always need to be made visible and problematised in order to potentially make possible a space for asking questions about how things can be done differently to how discourse prescribes.

**Disclosure statement**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

**ORCID**

Andreas Fejes [http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9916-8705](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9916-8705)

**References**


