

Editorial

This issue contains three research articles that together illustrate the breadth of current mathematics education research, ranging from policy-level analyses of inclusion, via teachers' knowledge for programming in mathematics, to cross-cultural studies of teachers' noticing. The articles also show how mathematics education is shaped by national curricula, professional knowledge, classroom traditions and broader educational cultures. We are pleased to present a new issue that contributes to ongoing conversations about mathematics teaching and learning in both Nordic and international contexts. On to presenting this issue's three articles:

In the issue's first article, Peng, Norberg, Vennberg and Zhou explore commonalities and differences between Chinese and Swedish teachers' noticing in third-grade mathematics classrooms. The study compares two Chinese and two Swedish teachers, using written and oral reflections together with students' worksheets. Through a four-dimensional framework focusing on mathematics, mathematics teaching, mathematics learning and general pedagogy, the authors show that the teachers share several areas of noticing, including mathematical competence, methods, student engagement and time. At the same time, important differences emerge. The Chinese teachers' noticing is more strongly oriented toward mathematical content, exactness of language and speed in calculation, while the Swedish teachers more often notice individual support, students' backgrounds, special needs and general pedagogical issues. The article offers valuable insights into how teacher noticing is culturally situated and suggests how mathematics education in Eastern and Western contexts may learn from one another.

In the second article, Levin and Roos examine discursive prerequisites for inclusion in mathematics education through a comparative analysis of Swedish and Norwegian governing documents. Drawing on discourse analysis, the authors identify four overarching Discourses: Participation in society, Participation in education, Participation in mathematics knowledge, and Participation through perspective. The first three appear in both countries' governing documents, while the fourth is only visible in the Norwegian material. The study shows that both curricula address inclusive mathematics education, but in different ways: the Nor-

wegian curriculum frames inclusion more explicitly and as community-driven, while the Swedish curriculum foregrounds individual participation. These differences point to how neighbouring Nordic countries may create different discursive conditions for teachers' work with inclusive mathematics education.

In the final article, Jeppesen and Rasmussen investigate how lower secondary mathematics teachers perceive their knowledge of pedagogy, programming and mathematics in relation to the TPACK framework. Based on survey responses from 127 Norwegian mathematics teachers and analysed through confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis, the study finds that technology-related knowledge has strong explanatory power when programming is treated as the technological dimension, whereas pedagogical knowledge contributes only marginally. The findings challenge the assumption that programming can be understood simply as a technological component within TPACK. Instead, the authors argue that programming should be considered a distinct or hybrid knowledge domain, drawing on mathematics, computational thinking and linguistic skills. The study has important implications for teacher education and raises questions about what teachers need to know in order to teach programming meaningfully in school mathematics.

The Editors