This is the authors' accepted manuscript of the article published in
Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education
Available at https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2020.1819203

Googling inclusive education: A critical visual analysis

Elizabeth Walton[a]* and Kerryn Dixon[b]

[a]*School of Education, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK; School of Education, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa;* [b]*School of Education, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia*

* corresponding author: Elizabeth Walton, School of Education, University of Nottingham, Jubilee Campus, Wollaton Road, Nottingham, NG8 1BB. Email: Elizabeth.Walton@nottingham.ac.uk

Inclusive education is a global rights-based response to educational exclusion. It is communicated through a range of modalities, but analysis predominantly focuses on discourses constituted in written texts. Systematic research is needed to understand the discursive ensembles constituted by the visual mode. Our interest is in images of inclusive education that are available online and sourced via a Google images search. Using a critical approach to visual analysis, we conducted a visual content analysis and a multimodal discourse analysis (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). Four prominent discourses of inclusive education are evident: discourses of diversity, childhood, connection, and celebration. Education is a discursive absence. Each discourse reflects ideas of the field, but together these images present a distorted view of inclusive education and trivialise its concerns. This raises questions about the extent to which images can adequately capture the complexity and import of notions of access, equity and social justice.

Keywords: inclusive education; critical visual analysis; Google images; discourse; multimodal discourse analysis

Introduction

Inclusive education has gained traction internationally as a rights-based response to educational exclusion. It has developed over the past decades in the academic, professional, policy, and public domains, aided by the rise and spread of digital technologies. One of the affordances of digital technologies is that new texts can be created through a combination of modes (Kress, 2003). Multimodal representations offer a range of possibilities for the ways in which inclusive education's concerns are communicated, and the ways in which it is constructed as a field. Despite its multimodal inhabitance, discursive analyses of inclusive education have primarily focused on written texts and less attention has been given to the workings of other semiotic forms in the field.

In a world dominated by visual media, the literacy practice of sourcing images online to add visual appeal to oral or written texts is commonplace. Image selection is made convenient through presentation software offering online pictures or through search engines. Search engine optimisation (SEO) uses algorithms to rank images in an online search which means that the orchestration (Kress, 2010) of images on a screen is not natural or neutral. Images that get attention, get more attention (Rogers, 2013) and as a result, search engines like Google exert a powerful influence on how the world is perceived (Vaidhyanathan, 2011). Images of inclusive education can be copied and pasted into texts in ways that do not necessarily require engagement with the host website(s), or the text(s), or the image creators with which the images are originally associated. This means that individual images take on their "own effects" (Swan, 2010, p.87) when they become decoupled from the original source. In addition, an online image search produces a combination or bricolage (Kress, 2010) of images which together constitute a new multimodal text. The potential meanings of individual images

are necessarily altered by their proximity and associations with other images in the online space (Davies, 2007). By critically analysing these images individually and as a whole, and considering them in relation to the concerns in the field of inclusive education, it is possible to see the "layering of discourses in texts" (Kress, 2010, p.113).

The aim of this article is to respond to Albers, Vasquez and Harste's (2019) call for the systematic analysis of images and to show how the field of inclusive education is discursively constructed through the visual mode. We advance a critical reading (Janks, 2019) of individual images of inclusive education and the bricolage of images as they are presented to the viewer. Using images from a Google Images search using the term 'inclusive education' we seek to answer the following questions:

- What discourses of inclusive education are constituted by the visual mode?
- To what extent do these discourses accurately reflect the aims and ideals of inclusive education?

Four discourses that constitute inclusive education are identified. We show that they invoke some of the concerns of inclusive education and also how these "discursive ensembles" (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001, p.64) work together to erase education in the representation of inclusive education. Our critical reading points to a version of inclusive education at variance with its aims and an appreciation that not all its issues, practices and processes can be adequately represented through the visual mode (van Winkel, 2005).

Inclusive education

Inclusive education is a critical education project whose priority is to identify and address the pervasive educational exclusion that results from, and perpetuates unequal

social relations (Slee, 2011). It originated in the 1960s as parents challenged segregated educational provision for their disabled children (UNESCO, 2018). Since then, many countries have taken measures to minimise the presumption of the need for separate provisions for disabled children and young people. This has been given impetus by various United Nations (UN) initiatives, including the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994), the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) (UN, 2006) and the Sustainable Development Goals (UN, 2015). Inclusive education is now regarded as "A fundamental human right of all learners" (UN, 2016, p.3). The aims and ideals of inclusive education expressed by the Committee of the CPRD (UN, 2016, p.2-3) include:

- Access to, and progress in high-quality education opportunities at all educational levels;
- Accommodating the differing requirements and identities of individual students;
- Full and effective participation of all students;
- Recognition of diversity and combating discrimination and harmful stereotypes;
- In-depth transformation of the culture, policies and practices of education systems.

Different and competing discourses of inclusive education have been recognised as the field has developed (Dunne, 2009; Walton, 2016). We take 'discourses' to mean ways of organising knowledge that structure social relations (Foucault, 1971). Discourses produced to support the rationalisation and the realisation of inclusive education have been identified by Dyson (1999) as a rights and ethics discourse, an efficacy discourse, a political discourse, and a practical discourse. These discourses are further defined and developed by Artiles, et al (2006) who consider them

with reference to social justice. These authors show that there are “complex interactions” (p.262) among the discourses, and also that there may be contradictory perspectives on social justice across co-existing discourses of inclusion. In the policy domain, contradicting and competing discourses can be identified within and across countries. Some inclusive education policies advocate for and value diversity, while others encode more deficit constructions of students and support assimilation or mainstreaming and traditional special education (Liasidou, 2012; Hardy & Woodcock, 2015). Dunne (2009, p.46) argues for a critical reading of inclusive education discourses in their “visual, textual and spoken representations”.

There has been interest in pursuing visual methods to understand inclusive education (e.g. Prosser and Loxley (2007) and Dunne (2009)) with an acknowledgement that visual resources like photographs, display boards and drawings are valuable data. We build on this and other work, like Brantliner’s (2006) critique of the “visual rhetoric” (p.58) of special education textbooks, and Titchkosky’s (2009) analysis of disability images. Our interest is in images of inclusive education that are available online and sourced via a Google images search.

Establishing the data-set

The data collection process began by clearing cookies and caches on Google to ensure a 'clean' search (Rose, 2016). Following the way in which people typically search for something online (Chatterjee, 2018), we entered the term "inclusive education" in Google Images. Quotation marks were included to get exact matches, rather than synonyms (Rogers, 2013). The first 100 images were identified. Screenshots of each results page were taken to 'fix' the data set, knowing that the SEO process could lead to

changes in images over time and location[1]. Duplicates and text-centred images (word clouds, logos, powerpoint slides) were removed leaving 83 images. A further 10 photographs were eliminated which brought the data-set to 73 images. We eliminated photographs to avoid working across genres but recognise that excluding them limits the conclusions that we can draw, and that further research is required to analyse their role in the visual construction of inclusive education. The final data-set of 73 images was deemed sufficient, given that most search engine users only select from the first screen-page of results (Jacobson, n.d.). We considered the set to be broad enough to provide a range of images and also allow us to analyse each image in depth.

Methods of analysis

The research questions demand an analytical approach that enables us to work at the confluence of the visual, the digital, the discursive, and the ideological. This section describes how a combination of content analysis and a critical visual analysis meets this demand.

Content analysis

Serafini's (2011) Noticings-Meanings-Implications Chart was used as a preliminary means to engage with the data. Together we described and classified the elements that we 'noticed' in each of the 73 images. It was clear that many of the elements recurred across the images and this warranted frequency counts. We constituted variables and values from the descriptions and categories of the noticed elements and conducted a

[1] The authors acknowledge that some of the images have changed since the original search conducted in South Africa in January 2018. We also ascertained that real time search results from across locations in Europe, South Africa and the USA yield minimal differences, which are mostly reflected in the ordering of images.

visual content analysis (Bell, 2002). The first clear distinction was between human and non-human images (watering cans, trees, etc.) and for the purposes of this article, we mostly focus on the 64 images with humans. The content analysis (see Table 1) shows the exact extent of recurring elements, but it is insufficient to comment on the significance or meaning of the images (Bell, 2002). Visual images are not neutral or innocent because they encode ideologies (Rose, 2016; Wang 2014). In turn, their circulation "feed[s] ideological systems" (Thurman, 2018, p.4). A critical approach to visual analysis is required to interpret images.

Variables	**Values**	**Frequency (%)**
Human representation	Naturalistic human	76.56
	Abstract human	23.44
Number of participants	3+	93.15
	1-2 participants	6.85
Lines/ shapes	Line	51.56
	Clustered	20.31
	Simple circular	15.63
	Other	12.50
Age	Children	69.38
	Children and adults	22.44
	Adults	4.08
	Indeterminate	4.08
Diversity*	More than one gender (observed through dress and hairstyle)	64.38
	Disability presence (observed through assistive devices)	58.90
	More than one race/ethnicity (observed through skin colour, facial features, clothing and hair)	52.05
Action*	Smiling	57.14
	Sitting (+other activity)	44.44
	Hugging/holding hands	33.33
	Vigorous activity (jumping, running, cartwheeling)	26.98
	Waving	22.22
	Moving with assistive device	14.29
	Assisting	7.94
	Only sitting	6.35
	Signing	4.76
	Walking	4.76
	Reading	3.17
	Pointing	3.17

Table 1: Content analysis of images with human participants (N=64)

* Diversity and action are counted on each occurrence so the sum is not 100%.

Critical visual analysis

The task of the critical visual analyst is to identify the ways in which the features of visual design work to position both the subject/s of the images and the viewer, and to expose the ways in which dominant and 'taken-for-granted' views of the world are legitimated and habituated. Visual analysis is necessarily a subjective and interpretive exercise (Banks, 2018). It requires reflexivity that accounts for the positionality of the analyst (Rose, 2016) and an acknowledgement that interpretation is both provisional and dynamic (Bateman & Wildfeuer, 2014).

There are a number of possible approaches to critical visual analysis. Following Rose's (2016, p.50) schema of the sites, modalities, and methods for interpreting visual images, we identify the 'image itself' as the focus of our interest. This focus lends itself to methods such as social semiotics and discourse analysis (Rose, 2016). We used Kress and van Leeuwen's (2006) multimodal discourse analysis as an analytical framework. This framework offers a detailed language of analysis for images and has been used by researchers working with digital discourses on platforms like YouTube (Benson, 2015) and Flickr (Barton, 2015). The framework makes it possible to identify the discourses that are layered into images, and enables consideration of these "complex ensembles of discourses in the production of ideology" (Kress, 2010, p.113). For Kress and van Leeuwen (2006, p.14), all images are a means for "the articulation of ideological positions".

Kress and van Leeuwen's multimodal discourse analysis is not without critique. Ledin and Machin (2019) are concerned about its origins in Halliday's (1984) Systemic Functional Linguistics and the assumption that all forms of communication and semiotic systems are underpinned by the same system or grammar. They argue that privileging of the linguistic process cannot capture "material form[s] of expression" (Ledin & Machin,

2019, p. 502). Others have critiqued the framework on the grounds that it lacks empirical evidence, particularly in linking composition to ideology; it offers unnecessarily complex and intricate terminology and analytical categories; and is overly western in its orientation (Bateman, 2008; McCracken, 2000; Forceville, 1999). These critiques make it particularly important that we analyse the images alongside our noticing and content analysis, because noticing what one sees, or observing these semiotic-material expressions, give insights into the ways in which reality is always already discursively constructed (Ledin & Machin, 2019).

Kress and van Leeuwen refer to three configurations of meaning, the representational, interactional and compositional. These are based on Halliday's (1984) metafunctions of meaning that focus on how ideas and experiences are communicated, how social relations are shaped, and how coherence is formed. Using specific tools within these three metafunctions and working recursively with the initial content analysis (Table 1) we analysed each of the images. Additional frequency counts were made to identify metafunctional patterns across the data-set. The analytical process is exemplified in the next section with reference to the image reproduced in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Diversity and disability

This image available here https://www.flickr.com/photos/43541286@N00/9538877714/ by Luigi1066 is licenced for use by Creative Commons under Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.0 GenericType

Findings from exemplar analysis

Representational metafunctions refer to the participants in the image and represent states of being, actions, world views or particular events. Figure 1 has naturalistic human participants who wear clothes and have flesh-toned skin, as opposed to abstract humans (like those in Figure 2). Similar to most (93%) of the images, it has more than three actors. Racial or ethnic diversity is suggested through a range of skin colours or facial features, but unlike the majority of images, these participants are not mostly white[2]. Like many other images, Figure 1 signals disability inclusion with participants in wheelchairs. The wheelchair functions as both a narrative and conceptual representation (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006) in that it works not merely as a mobility device for the participants in the image, but also symbolically. Connections between the participants are created through the use of vectors. In this image, the vectors are the diagonal lines formed by participants' arms. These draw the viewer's gaze to the wheelchairs. Predominant actions include standing, sitting, hand-holding and waving.

The interactional metafunction focuses on social relations between participants who interact with the visual: the reader of the visual and the designer/creator of that visual. We examined the image act, social distance and point of view. The image act deals with participants' gaze. A gaze directed at the viewer is a demand; a gaze away from the viewer is an offer setting up the participants as objects of information or contemplation. Despite their facelessness, the participants in Figure 1 gaze directly at the viewer. This pattern of demand is evident in 72% of images with human participants. The frontal angle used as a point of view in Figure 1 also

---

[2] We counted 264 individual naturalistic human participants across all the colour images. Of these participants, 65.15% appear white.

indicates involvement with participants and is evident across 92% of the images. However, the close relationship between viewer and participants achieved through the image act and point of view is tempered by the long shot which creates social distance (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006).

The compositional metafunction focuses on features that enable structural coherence. Salience, framing and use of colour were examined. Salience deals with the judgements that are made about the importance of visual elements in relation to each other. The greater the weight of an element, the greater its salience. The oversized wheelchairs in Figure 1 are shown as highly salient, drawing attention to disability and the multicoloured wheels symbolise diversity (Berkovich & Benoliel, 2019). Framing refers to the presence or absence of devices that connect or disconnect the elements of the image. There is a relative absence of framing devices in Figure 1. Like most other images, it has white space around the participants. The white space emphasises a group identity, creates a sense of universality and ahistoricity, and renders participants generic (Kress & van Leeuwen 2006). The horizontal composition of the participants in a line-up reinforces this group identity. Colour is a mode and an element of composition (Kress, 2010). The use of diverse, bright, and repeating colours in Figure 1 serves to reinforce the group identity, and to create a 'happy' mood.

The interrelationship between the representation, interaction and compositional metafunctions in Figure 1 foreground a preoccupation with diversity (multiple colours, representation of different races), with a particular emphasis on physical disability (the salience of the wheelchairs). The vectors, participant actions of hand-holding and waving in a horizontal composition, weak framing and use of frontal angle suggest the importance of connection with a demand that invites viewer complicity. The colour palette signals positivity in a context-free universal depiction.

This analytical process was repeated for each of the images and then related to extant literature and discourses in the field of inclusive education (Ledin & Machin, 2019). From this process we identified the operation of four discourses of inclusive education constituted by the visual mode (a discourse of diversity, childhood, connection and celebration), and a discursive absence or erasure (education). Not all discourses operate/can be read in every image, but every image contributes to at least two of the identified discourses. Figure 1 does not offer childhood, but the discourses of diversity, celebration and connection are evident and education is a discursive absence.

Discussion: Four discourses of inclusive education and an erasure

The four discourses are layered in complex ways across the data set and work together to reinforce a particular version of reality. For the purpose of this paper we discuss them separately and with reference to three images from the data set.

A discourse of diversity

The images of inclusive education foreground human diversity as important in the conceptualisation of inclusive education, and disability as being the most significant marker of difference. This could be expected, given the field's history in the critique of separate special education and the advocacy for the inclusion of disabled children into mainstream classrooms. Recently, with an awareness of the intersectional impact of different and devalued identity markers, attention has been given to the inclusion of all children who are vulnerable to marginalisation and exclusion (UNESCO, 2018). As such, we might say that the images accurately reflect the message of inclusive education. But a critical reading of the images suggests that the message is, in fact, one of a superficial inclusion and abstracted notions of diversity.

Able-bodied whiteness is the norm across the images and inclusion is represented as the addition of other identities to this norm. This is evident in the representation of participants where most humans are white and other races are placed as a counterpoint to whiteness. While this could be read empirically as reflecting the racial profiles of some Western contexts, it stands in stark contrast to the global majority who are not white. Although the images suggest a multi-racial or multi-cultural togetherness, the lack of context conveyed by the neutral backgrounds in 83% of the images erases geographical specificities and the realities of schools as sites where social and racial inequalities are reproduced. In other words, racial and ethnic difference appears to be acknowledged but depoliticised (Swan, 2010). The depoliticisation of difference is further evident in images of abstract humans (see Figure 2 as an example). These images create a fantasy land of multi-coloured people in which everyone is equally a different colour in "imagined communities" (Bhabha, 1994, p.xiv) that render inequality invisible.

Figure 2. Multi-coloured abstract humans

This version of the image is sourced via Microsoft Powerpoint online image search (powered by Bing) as: available here http://englisharound.blogspot.com/2009/10/special-students.html by unknown author and licenced for use by Creative Commons under Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported

The presence of a disabled participant becomes the marker for inclusion, where imag(in)ing disability means imag(in)ing the use of a wheelchair (Titchkosky, 2009). Compositionally, the wheelchair is often oversized and positioned in profile, emphasising the wheel rather than the person using it. This makes disability an "easy read" by reducing the lived complexity of embodiment "into a caricature – literally, disability-diversity becomes a stick figure" (Titchkosky, 2009, p.81). Furthermore, disability is hypervisible (Kuppers, 2001), with at least half of the images presenting humans in wheelchairs. In fact, only 10% of disabled people use wheelchairs, and disabled people make up no more than 10% of the population (World Health Organisation, 2010). This hypervisibility works in these images to create an unrealistic world, in turn making inclusive education an improbable event.

Covert taxonomies work to valorise sameness (Janks, 2010; Kress & van Leeuwen, 2006). Although difference appears to be celebrated (see discourse four) through a variety of colours and the presence of disabled children, it is, in fact, homogenised. Features such as facelessness, repeated patterns of cut-out or abstract humans, line-ups on the same horizontal plane and closed circles convey the message that diversity is accepted, so long as it conforms to established norms (McLaughlin, Coleman-Fountain & Clavering, 2016; Liasidou & Ioannidou, 2020). Many of the line-ups of children have everyone at the same height (despite some standing and others sitting in wheelchairs), circles have identically sized and shaped participants, with superficial differences. Swan (2010, p.89) calls this a "repetitive harmony" in which "heterogeneity is controlled and limited". This sameness subverts the ideal of inclusive education as recognition of individual student identities (UN, 2016).

A discourse of childhood

The bricolage of images reflect a particular discourse of childhood that, in turn, constructs a particular version of inclusive education. As a human endeavour it is not surprising to find that the images of inclusive education comprise human participants. What is surprising is that most (69%) of the images comprise only children (see Figure 3). Furthermore, the children are predominantly of preschool or primary school age. From an interactional perspective, the image act in Figure 3 operates powerfully because the demand is so high. Children gaze at the viewer, captured in frontal angles that ask the viewer to take on the world-view presented. This world-view is reinforced by the compositional choices: the simple stick-figures, cartoon-like children, the high colour saturation in a limited colour palette, bodies in sharp focus and linear spatial arrangements.

Figure 3. Happy children
This image © 2016 Clipartbarn by unknown author is available at http://clipartbarn.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Free-children-playing-clipart-pictures-3.png and use is permitted under fair use/dealing law.

Inclusive education is thus represented as being an issue of or for young children. There is a significant body of literature that supports inclusive education’s focus on young children, with increasing attention given to understanding their perspectives (Messiou, 2012; Pearson, 2016). However, the exclusion of older children

and adult learners in the images subverts inclusive education's emphasis on access to all levels of education (UN, 2016). It also glosses the particular struggles for access to secondary, further and higher education experienced by disabled and other marginalised students. The images represent a 'cute' inclusion, an idea reinforced by the naiveté of the children.

This naiveté is underpinned by a discourse of childhood innocence that has its origins in the work of Jean Jacques Rousseau (James & James, 2008). An idealised Western childhood is presented across the images with happy children, smiling and waving, running and playing in decontextualized, unframed settings. Despite the Rousseauian view that nature is a better teacher than 'corrupting' adults, the reality is that children are shaped by the environments in which they live and removing contexts depoliticizes the realities of children's lives. In the same way that the discourse of diversity constructs able-bodied whiteness as the norm, this discourse of childhood is based on white, Western norms that are at variance with other cultural constructions of childhood.

The discursive ensemble presents an idealised world of bright/primary colours in which inclusive education appears as an uncomplicated, unmediated, un-nuanced 'social fantasy' (Estera & Shahjahan, 2019). This world, in which the viewer is made complicit, obscures the entrenched systemic injustices that inclusive education confronts. The naïve representations hide the complexity and challenges that different people face in accessing equitable educational opportunities in different contexts. The discourse of childhood, as constructed in these images, also contributes to caricaturing the field of inclusive education as something childish, facile and trivial when its aims are serious and ambitious.

A discourse of connection

Images that depict hand-holding, hugging, and participants in close proximity convey the importance of human connection in inclusive education. Ideas of belonging and participation reflect the literature in the field with this emphasis (see, for example Sapon-Shevin (2007) and Bucholz and Sheffler (2009)). A critical reading indicates that this connection is subverted in ways that show connection as compulsory, and also conditional.

Compulsory togetherness is conveyed through line-ups which have echoes of regimentation and parade. The discourses of diversity and connection work together here because being present in line-ups appears mandatory for the 'diverse' participants who must show a grateful and happy willingness to participate (Ahmed 2012). Participation is also conditional. In terms of actions, able-bodied actors do something to disabled participants who are usually passive. Disabled participants may be hugged or touched, but seldom reciprocate. These echo the stereotypes of disabled people as objects of pity and as needing help. In some images, participants in wheelchairs are on the periphery, sometimes framed by the shape of the wheelchair and separated from the others. Connection often comes at the expense of bodily integrity. In one image the participant in a wheelchair has to assume an impossible bodily contortion to hold hands with participants on either side of a line up, reinforcing the idea that connection is defined by able-bodiedness. Together, the images obscure the conditions that compromise full participation (cf UN, 2016), particularly for disabled children and young people (McLaughlin et al., 2016).

A discourse of celebration

A celebratory, happy tone is created through highly saturated colours; smiling faces; waving hands; vigorous activity like cartwheeling, skipping and jumping; gazing into the sunrise; and in one image as a procession of children carrying balloons and candyfloss. The message is clear: inclusive education is a ‘good thing’ (cf Dunne, 2009), to be celebrated and aspired to. Literature confirms that inclusive education is “a public and political declaration and celebration of difference” (Corbett & Slee, 2000, p.134). It is also an ideal, a vision and an aspiration (Walton, 2016). The version of inclusive education in these Google images is of a utopian place, full of fun and harmony.

Weakly framed decontextualised images extract inclusive education from the messiness of its realisation in context, and effectively eradicate the pernicious effects of educational exclusion. Inclusive education in these ‘happy’ images loses its “insurrectionary force” as it becomes “tamed and domesticated” (Slee, 2011, p. 153). It is no longer a critical education project, it is a (children’s) party. The circulation of ‘happiness’ in the production of diversity and disability has been well described by Ahmed (2010) and Fritsch (2013) as a way to divert attention from racism, ableism and other axes of oppression. Furthermore, the idea of inclusive education as an ideal, to be achieved in some distant and unspecified time and place undermines the urgent imperative to realise it as a fundamental right of all learners (UN, 2016).

Inclusive ~~education~~

Education is mostly absent from the images of inclusive education. Only 17 of the full data-set of 73 images suggest an educational context or educational activity, through books, a teacher teaching, school buildings, or words (e.g. ‘All children can learn’).

This is significant, given that we searched for 'inclusive education', rather than the more generic 'inclusion'. The absence of education speaks to the ways images are lifted from one context to create a new multimodal text with different effects (Swan, 2010). The image creators may never have intended their original images to illustrate inclusive education, but as the images are taken up in multimodal texts linked to inclusive education, they take on legitimating power. Our concern, though, is the effect of the erasure of education. This erasure establishes inclusive education as being about happiness and belonging while the more challenging aspects of inclusive education, securing equitable learning outcomes for all within systems premised on achievement against standardised norms, are sidestepped. It's as if a veneer of happiness is enough for inclusive education, and learning and educational success are optional extras. Education is incidental in the images, adults are mostly absent, and no-one has to do any of the difficult transformational work in cultures, policies and practices that inclusive education demands (UN, 2016).

Conclusion

We have shown how the four discourses of inclusive education instantiated in Google Images both reflect emphases in the field and subvert the overall aims of inclusive education. This occurs through depictions of disability and other difference that reinforce conservative and hegemonic norms of able-bodied whiteness; through a vision of decontextualised childhoods that erase older children and adult learners, and releases adults from any responsibility to address inequality; through a visual promise of connection that turns out to be both coerced and conditional; and through a trope of celebration whose utopian aspirations negate real world struggles to repurpose education to make it inclusive. Across these visual discourses, education itself is

excised, leaving a 'social fantasy' (Estera & Shahjahan, 2019) of a "repetitive harmony" (Swan, 2010, p.89) among children. This is a far cry from inclusive education as a critical education project that is intended to dismantle exclusionary practices in education (Slee, 2011).

The available images of inclusive education offer a limited range of simplified and stereotypical depictions of the issues, processes and practices of the field. The popular images get reproduced and re-instantiated, which is problematic as it mitigates against the development of more complexified and nuanced conceptions of inclusive education. Merely advocating for more or better images is not a solution. The constraints of the visual mode are unlikely to capture the complexity and import of notions of access, equity, and social justice. We challenge the 'imperative to visualise' (van Winkel, 2005) in a field such as inclusive education, and support critical and cautious approaches taken by those seeking (or expected) to design or to use visual representations of inclusive education.

References

Ahmed, S. (2010). *The promise of happiness*. Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Duke University Press.

Albers, P., Harste, J., & Vasquez, V. (2019). Critical Visual Discourse Analysis, in N.Kucirkova, J. Rowsell & G Falloon (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Learning with Technology in Early Childhood.* (pp. 377-392). Routledge.

Artiles, A., Harris-Murri, N., & Rostenberg, D. (2006). Inclusion as Social Justice: Critical Notes on Discourses, Assumptions, and the Road Ahead. *Theory Into Practice, 45*(3), 260-268.

Banks, M. (2018). Approaches to studying the visual. In Banks, M. (Ed.). *Using Visual Data in Qualitative Research*. (pp. 39-64). SAGE.

Barton, D. (2015). Tagging on Flickr as a social practice. In R. Jones, A. Chik & C. Hafner (Eds.). *Doing discourse analysis in the digital age*. (pp.48-65). Routledge.

Bateman, J. (2008). *Multimodality and genre: A foundation for the systematic analysis of multimodal documents.* Springer.

Bateman, J., & Wildfeuer, J. (2014). A multimodal discourse theory of visual narrative. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *74*, 180-208.

Bell, P. (2002). Content analysis of visual images. In T. Van Leeuwen & C. Jewitt (Eds.). *The handbook of visual analysis* (pp. 10-34). SAGE

Berkovich, I., & Benoliel, P. (2019). Understanding OECD representations of teachers and teaching: A visual discourse analysis of covers in OECD documents. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 17*(2), 132-146.

Benson, P. (2015). YouTube as text: spoken interaction analysis and digital discourse. In R. Jones, A. Chik & C. Hafner (Eds.). *Doing discourse analysis in the digital age*. (pp. 81-96). Routledge.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge

Brantlinger E. (2006). The big glossies: How textbooks structure (special) education. In E. Brantlinger (Ed.), *Who benefits from special education? Remediating (fixing) other people's children* (pp. 45-76). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Bucholz, J. L., & Sheffler, J. L. (2009). Creating a warm and inclusive classroom environment: Planning for all children to feel welcome. *Electronic Journal for Inclusive Education*, *2*(4), 4.

Chatterjee, K. (2018). What can we learn about the female condom online? *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, *26*(3), 149-163.

Corbett, J. & Slee, R. (2000). An International Conversation on Inclusive Education, in F. Armstrong, D. Armstrong & L. Barton (Eds.). *Inclusive Education; Policy, Contexts and Comparative Perspectives*. (pp. 133-146). David Fulton.

Davies, J. (2007). Display, Identity and the Everyday: Self-presentation through online image sharing. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *28*(4), 549-564.

Dunne, L. (2009). Discourses of Inclusion: a critique. *Power and Education*, *1*(1), 42-56.

Dyson, A. (1999). Inclusion and inclusions: theories and discourses in inclusive education. In H. Daniels & P.Garner (Eds.). *World yearbook of education*: *Inclusive education* (pp. 36-53). Kogan Page.

Estera, A., & Shahjahan, R. (2019). Globalizing whiteness? Visually re/presenting students in global university rankings websites. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 40*(6), 930-945.

Forceville, C. (1999). Educating the eye? *Language and Literature*, *8*(2), 163-178.

Foucault, M. (1971). Orders of discourse. *Social Science Information. 10*(2), 7-30.

Fritsch, K. (2013). The neoliberal circulation of affects: Happiness, accessibility and the capacitation of disability as wheelchair. *Health, Culture and Society*, *5*(1), 135-149.

Halliday, M. (1984). *An introduction to functional grammar.* Edward Arnold.

Hardy, I., & Woodcock, S. (2015). Inclusive education policies: Discourses of difference, diversity and deficit. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *19*(2), 141-164.

Jacobson, M. (n.d.). How Far Down the Search Engine Results Page Will Most People Go? Leverage Marketing. Accessed from https://www.theleverageway.com/blog/how-far-down-the-search-engine-results-page-will-most-people-go/

James, A. & James, A. (2008). *Key Concepts in Childhood Studies.* SAGE.

Janks, H. (2010). *Language and power*. Routledge.

Janks, H. (2019). Critical literacy and the importance of reading with and against a text. J*ournal of Adult and Adolescent Literacy*, *62*(5), 561-564.

Kress, G. (2010) *Multimodality: a social semiotic approach to contemporary communication.* Routledge.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse*. Hodder Education.

Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design 2nd edition*. Routledge.

Kuppers, P. (2001). Deconstructing images: Performing disability. *Contemporary Theatre Review*, *11*(3-4), 25-40.

Ledin, P., & Machin, D. (2019). Doing critical discourse studies with multimodality: From metafunctions to materiality. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *16*(5), 497-513.

Liasidou, A. (2012). *Inclusive education, politics and policymaking*. Continuum.

Liasidou, A., & Ioannidou, E. (2020). Disability-related bullying and its discursive formations and enactments in the social ecology of schooling. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 1-14. doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2020.1711514

McLaughlin, J., Coleman-Fountain, E., & Clavering, E. (2016). *Disabled childhoods: Monitoring differences and emerging identities*. Routledge.

McCracken, J. (2000). Review. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, *58*(1), 76-79.

Messiou, K. (2012). *Confronting marginalisation in education*. Routledge.

Pearson, S. (2016). *Rethinking children and inclusive education*. Bloomsbury.

Prosser, J., & Loxley, A. (2007). Enhancing the contribution of visual methods to inclusive education. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, *7*(1), 55-68.

Rogers, R. (2013). *Digital methods*. The MIT Press.

Rose, G. (2016). *Visual methodologies (4th Edition)*. SAGE.

Sapon-Shevin, M. (2007). *Widening the circle: The power of inclusive classrooms.* Beacon Press.

Serafini, F. (2011) Expanding perspectives for comprehending visual images in multimodal texts. *Journal of Adult and Adolescent Literacy, 54*(5), 342-350.

Slee, R. (2011). *The irregular school*. Routledge.

Swan, E. (2010). Commodity Diversity: Smiling Faces as a Strategy of Containment. *Organization*, *17*(1), 77–100.

Thurman, X. (2018) Digital Discourse: Locating Language in New/Social Media, in J., Burgess, A., Marwick, A., & Poell, T. (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of social media*. (pp. 135-145). SAGE.

Titchkosky, T. (2009). Disability images and the art of theorizing normality. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 22*(1), 75-84.

UNESCO. (2018). Concept note for the Global Education Monitoring Report 2020 on inclusion. Paris: UNESCO. Accessed from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265329

UNESCO. (1994). The Salamanca Statement and Framework for action on special needs education: adopted by the World Conference on Special Needs Education; Access and Quality. Salamanca, Spain, 7-10 June 1994. Paris: UNESCO.

United Nations (UN). (2016). General comment No. 4 on the right to inclusive education. Accessed from https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CRPD/C/GC/4&Lang=en

United Nations (UN). (2015). Sustainable Development Goals, United Nations, New York. Accessed from http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/summit/

United Nations (UN). (2006). *Convention on the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities.* Accessed from http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf

Vaidhyanathan, S. (2011). *The Googlization of everything*. University of California Press.

van Winkel, C. (2005). Essay: The Regime of Visibility. *Open! Platform for Art, Culture & the Public Domain* Accessed from https://www.onlineopen.org/the-regime-of-visibility.

Walton, E. (2016). *The language of inclusive education*. Routledge.

Wang, J. (2014). Criticising images: critical discourse analysis of visual semiosis in picture news, *Critical Arts, 28*(2), 264-286.

World Health Organisation. (2010). Factsheet on wheelchairs. Accessed from: http://www.searo.who.int/entity/disabilities_injury_rehabilitation/wheelchair_factsheet.pdf