

Research Article

Revised Paper: AMLE-2014-0104-RES.R1

‘What’s going on?’ Developing reflexivity in the management classroom: From surface to deep learning and everything else in between

Suzette L Dyer (Corresponding author)

Department of Strategy and Human Resource Management

Waikato Management School

The University of Waikato

PO Box 3015,

Hamilton,

New Zealand

Fiona Hurd

Dept of International Business

AUT University

Private Bag 92006

Auckland 1142

fiona.hurd@aut.ac.nz

Suzette Dyer, , The University of Waikato,.

Email: sdyer@waikato.ac.nz

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgments go to Angelo Fanelli and Mary FitzPatrick for their invaluable insight on early drafts of this paper. Thanks also to Professors’ Bobby Banerjee,

Kenneth Brown, and Holly Brower, for their comments on the draft manuscript, and to the reviewers who provided detailed advice to improve the paper.

What's going on? Developing reflexivity in the management classroom: From surface to deep learning and everything else in between

ABSTRACT

'What's going on?' Within the context of our critically-informed teaching practice, we see moments of deep learning and reflexivity in classroom discussions and assessments. Yet, these moments of criticality are interspersed with surface learning and reflection. We draw on dichotomous, linear developmental, and messy explanations of learning processes to empirically explore the learning journeys of 20 international Chinese and 42 domestic New Zealand students. We find contradictions within our own data, and between our findings and the extant literature. We conclude that expressions of surface learning and reflection are considerably more complex than they first appear. Moreover, developing critical reflexivity is a far more subtle, messy, and emotional experience than previously understood. We present the theoretical and pedagogical significance of these findings when we consider the implications for the learning process and the practice of management education.

Key Words: Critical management pedagogy, surface and deep learning, reflexivity, learning process

INTRODUCTION

‘What’s going on?’ We understand the difference between surface and deep learning, and that particular teaching practices, learning styles, classroom processes, and assessment techniques foster different learning experiences (Entwistle, 2000). We have endeavoured to inform ourselves about critical pedagogy (Friere, 1972; Giroux, 1997) and the social reformist perspective of teaching (Pratt, 1998). The first author even earned a Post Graduate Certificate in Tertiary Teaching, with an emphasis on developing critically-informed teaching practice. Armed with this knowledge and a personal commitment to make a difference, we have attempted to imbed critical insight within the context of a business management degree. We strive to create a democratic, dialogic classroom space and to take the ‘nettles’ out of critical education experience (Reynolds, 1999). We do so with the short-term intent of developing the analytical and reasoning skills of our management students, and with the long-term hope that some will be empowered to make inclusive managerial decisions in their future work environments.

We are not alone in our attempt to foster deep learning by critically rethinking the process and content of management education (e.g., Bisman, 2011; Boyce, 1996; Boje & Avkoubi, 2009; Currie and Knights, 2003; Dyer, 2003; Dyer et al., 2014; Elliott, 2003; Fenwick, 2005a & b; Gabriel, 2008; Mayo, 2003; Reynolds, 1999). Like many others, we explicitly challenge managerialism by questioning the philosophical positioning, apparent neutrality, and functionality of managing and organizing (Alvesson & Wilmott, 1992). We challenge the assumption that organizational

efficiency and profit maximisation should take priority over all other socio-political considerations (Currie & Knights, 2003). We also highlight ethical and moral implications of managing and organizing (Currie & Knights, 2003; Grey, 2004). Thus, our classroom critique is an inquiry into the politics of everyday life (Deetz, 1992) with an emancipatory aim of creating fairer societies (Perriton, 2007). We agree that critical pedagogy, by definition and in practice, offers the possibility of a liberatory and emancipating educational experience (Boyce, 1996).

Indeed, within the context of our critically-informed teaching practice, we certainly witness moments of deep learning and critical reflexivity in classroom discussions and assessments. More puzzling, however, is that these moments are interspersed with surface learning, as well as with reflective accounts of course material. These mixed outcomes are intriguing; at times we have responded emotionally ('The students' just don't get it!'), with considered reflection ('What do other educationalists do in these situations?'), and reflexively ('What is going on here?'). How might this seeming paradox of moments of criticality interspersed with paraphrasing course content and reflection be understood? Our puzzlement has led us to become 'suspicious' of our own assumptions (Grandy & Mills, 2004:1158). Have we uncritically adopted critical pedagogy in our work? In this paper we reflectively and reflexively explore 'what is going on' in terms of our short-term intent to develop the analytical and reasoning skills of our students so they might engage in deep learning.

The qualitative research presented here was conducted over three consecutive years, within the context of an elective undergraduate course in a human resource management degree. The course, entitled 'Women and Management', is taught once a year, either over a 14-week semester or over a six-week summer school semester.

The 62 participants comprised three cohorts, two that were enrolled in the 14-week semester and one that was enrolled in the shorter summer school program. Both formats involve 12 three-hour lectures; presented as one lecture per week in the 14-week semester and two lectures per week in summer school. We used the same PowerPoint slides, illustrative examples, and supportive reading material throughout the duration of the three-year study. We also set the same assessments, including a reflexive learning journal, which provided the empirical material for this study.

While we standardized the course content and delivery as much as possible, we agree with Vince (2010: 36) that presenting the same material or exercises in different years does not necessarily 'produce the same learning outcomes each time'. Classroom dynamics too may affect learning outcomes for students. In addition, as Cunliffe (2002) reminds us, students experience information in quite different ways. Learning, some suggest, is also affected by nationality and culture (e.g., Hardy & Tolhurst, 2014) and time (Epp, 2008). Our sample composition of 20 international Chinese and 42 domestic New Zealand students, and the inclusion of both the 14-week semester and summer school provide a unique opportunity to examine learning differences among our participants.

In the next section, we begin by reviewing surface and deep learning and the teaching approaches that educationalists consider that foster them. We include a review of Pollner's (1991) distinctions between reflection and mundane reasoning, and radical reflexivity and critical reasoning. This is followed by a brief discussion of surface and deep learning as dichotomous outcomes (Entwistle, 2000), as elements of a progressive linear developmental process (Hardy & Tolhurst, 2014), or as moments within a complex messy learning process (Cunliffe, 2002). We draw on Pollner's distinctions between analytical and reasoning approaches and the three

understandings of learning processes to analyze the material, as discussed in depth in the method section.

Our reflective analysis of the students' learning journals revealed that indeed, a small number of participants displayed dichotomous learning. The majority of the participants, however, developed their analytical reasoning skills, and some did so through a linear process, while others engaged in a messy process. Our reflexive analysis of the material revealed a number of paradoxes within our data, as well as contradictions between our findings and what others have found. We consider the theoretical implications of these contradictions in terms of the subtlety and complexity of developing reflexivity. We also consider the pedagogical implications of our findings and discuss how these insights have informed the redesign of the reflexive learning assignment. Our reflexive analysis leads us to conclude that developing radical reflexivity and critical reasoning skills is a far more subtle, complex, disorderly, and emotional process than is currently implied. To set the scene, we now turn to a brief review of surface and deep learning.

SO WHAT IS SURFACE AND DEEP LEARNING, AND HOW ARE THESE FOSTERED?

Entwistle (2000) defines surface learning as the process of students memorizing information and reproducing course material. He contends that surface learning is often founded on the simple epistemological assumption that knowledge is absolute. In harmony with this, teaching practices that are considered to particularly foster surface learning include designing highly structured curricula, teacher-centred

classroom relationships, and assessment techniques aimed at testing knowledge attainment (Entwistle, 2000).

These teaching-learning approaches associated with surface learning also seem to support the development of reflective analysis and mundane reasoning (Pollner, 1991). Reflective analysis requires the application of existing theories, practices, or processes to demonstrate mastery of course material. This results in mundane reasoning because the analysis is both informed by and constrained within the parameters set by existing knowledge or practice. Therefore, the assumptions, norms, values or beliefs embedded in frameworks go unquestioned. Friere (1970, 1972) termed this pedagogical approach the banking model, and argued that such methods create passive learners who are ill-equipped to question wider hegemonic socio-political and economic arrangements. Currie and Knights (2003) argue that within the context of management education, reflective analysis and mundane reasoning validates, rather than questions, existing management theories and practices. Thus management educators have been accused of preparing future leaders who can reliably act in system-serving ways (Clegg & Dunkerley, 1980) and, in extreme cases, to engage in unethical and fraudulent behaviour (Learmonth, 2007).

In contrast, Entwistle (2000) suggests that deep learning involves the process of students drawing on personal experience and course material to create new meaning for themselves. Deep learning has been linked to complex epistemological beliefs of understanding that knowledge is situated, relative, and constructed over time (Perry, 1970). In harmony with this, teaching practices that are considered to foster deep learning include purposefully locating curricula within the socio-political and economic context; student-centred, democratic and dialogic classroom

relationships (Kek & Huijser, 2011); and assessment techniques that encourage reflexivity and meaning-creation (Bisman, 2011; Gray, 2007).

The teaching approaches associated with deep learning also seem to support the development of radical reflexivity and critical reasoning (Pollner, 1991). Radical reflexive analysis involves the questioning of ontological assumptions, norms, values, and truth claims implicit in discourse, theory or practice. Critical reasoning is evident when deconstructing existing frames of reference generates new insights, and when personal experience is situated within structural arrangements. In terms of management education, radical reflexivity and critical reasoning locate managing within the historical, socio-political and economic context (Boje & Al Arkoubi, 2009). The intent is to empower students to consider inclusive ways of managing; for example, by challenging theory (Alvesson & Wilmott, 1996), making changes to organizational processes (Spicer, Alvesson & Karreman, 2009), or by talking and acting in new ways (Cunliffe, 2002).

There is general agreement about what constitutes surface and deep learning and the teaching techniques that are considered to foster them. However, there are differing views about whether these forms of learning are dichotomous, phases within a linear developmental learning process, or moments within a messy learning process. We now turn to a brief exploration of these three views of learning processes.

SURFACE AND DEEP LEARNING: DICHOTOMOUS, LINEAR, OR MESSY PROCESS?

Entwistle (2000) points out that surface or deep learning cannot be fully explained by, or situated within, specific pedagogical processes. Rather, he suggests that students might adopt surface, deep, or strategic learning styles. He also contends that students adopting surface learning who focus on memorizing and reproducing a syllabus have simple epistemological beliefs. In contrast, students adopting deep learning who are concerned with making sense of the world and developing as a person, hold complex epistemological beliefs. Strategic approaches are underpinned by an intention to achieve the highest possible grades. This dichotomous view suggests that learning is informed by choice or shaped by existing epistemological belief. If this is so, then even within a critically-informed classroom, we should expect that some students will display surface while others display deep learning.

Others argue that it takes time to develop critical reflexivity (Epp, 2008) and that learning is experienced as a hierarchical linear or sequential developmental process that begins with surface and culminates in deep learning (Hardy & Tolhurst, 2014; Marton & Saljo, 1997; Perry, 1970). Marton and Saljo (1997) summarize this hierarchical process as acquiring information, building knowledge, application, understanding, experiencing a change in worldview, and developing as a person. Pratt, Kelly and Wong (1999) describe sequenced learning as beginning with memorizing material, understanding content, application, and then questioning and modifying information. Sequential learning has been linked to Chinese students in particular (Hardy & Tolhurst, 2014). This view of learning suggests that rather than being inferior, surface learning techniques are the foundation of and integral aspects to deep learning (Hardy & Tolhurst, 2014; Pratt et al. 1999). Thus, for some students, memorizing curricula is perhaps an important step to developing reflexivity and complex epistemological beliefs (Entwistle, 2000; Hardy & Tolhurst, 2014; Perry,

1970). These insights also suggest that we might expect more evidence of linear development with the international Chinese and 14-week semester participants, compared to the New Zealand and summer school participants.

In contrast, Cunliffe (2002) argues that learning and sense-making are far more complex and much messier than either the dichotomous or linear processes imply. Drawing on Wittgenstein (1980), Cunliffe (2002: 42) contends that learning is an embodied process involving a spontaneous ‘physiological, emotional, [or] cognitive’ response to being ‘struck’ by something that moves us to ‘change our ways of talking and acting’. These ‘something’s’ could be an event, a relationship, or new information. The initial reflex response might be an exploration of how the experience made us feel, and perhaps we might leave it at that. Referring to Pollner (1991), Cunliffe suggests we might also be moved to draw on existing frames of reference to reflect on and make sense of the experience. She suggests that it is through dialogue with others, the self, or in written accounts, that we may be moved to reflexively make sense of the experience and come to see something in a new light or act in different ways. It is these moments of being struck that provide an opportunity to learn; and our sense-making of these moments explains the fluidity of movement between reflex, reflection, and reflexivity.

Certainly, others have found students experience critical pedagogy emotionally, including grappling with feelings of anxiety (Vince, 2010), discomfort (Fenwick, 2005b), ethical dilemmas (Elliott, 2003), and disruptions in their home and work settings (Reynolds, 1999). To suggest reflexive engagement is only a cognitive and intellectual endeavour limits our understanding of the processes involved in analytical and reasoning skill development. In the context of our ‘Women and Management’ course, it is reasonable that students be emotionally struck by different

topics and at different times throughout the semester. Because of this, we might expect to see a range of unique, moment-by-moment expressions of memorizing, reflection, and reflexivity. We draw on the insights from the literature on learning processes to analyze the reflexive learning journals, as discussed in the method section below.

METHOD

We begin with a description of the Women and Management course. Next, we discuss reflexive learning journals as a technique for fostering deep learning and as a source of empirical material, followed by an overview of the sample. We conclude this section by discussing the analytical approach and the limitations of this research.

The Research Setting: The Women and Management Course

In the Women and Management course, we analyze New Zealand women's disparate employment outcomes and reflexively ask why this situation persists. Over the three years of the study, the course topics were presented in the following order. First, a typical introductory lecture was presented (e.g., a welcoming exercise and review of course expectations). Students were then introduced to liberal, radical, and post-colonial feminist theory (Calás & Smircich, 1996), and the nature, nurture, and social construction positions on gender formation (Mclean & Unter, 2010). These theoretical positions, which are embedded in various ontological assumptions and epistemological traditions (Calás & Smircich, 1996), provide different lenses to explore, analyze, and make sense of the course material. As such, these different positions offer the possibility for students to consider new ways of thinking and acting (Fenwick, 2005a).

Next, we discussed sexual harassment (Human Rights Commission, 2011). This was followed by a review of statistical data detailing New Zealand women's greater contribution to unpaid work (Statistics New Zealand, 2011), their concentration in certain occupations (Department of Labour, 2010), low representation in senior management (Human Rights Commission, 2010), the gendered wage gap (Statistics New Zealand, 2006), and experiences of working mothers (Liu & Dyer, 2014). Equal employment opportunity (Hurd & Dyer, 2012), mentoring (Ortiz-Walters, 2009), and networking (Neergaard, Shaw, & Carter, 2005) were considered as methods to improve women's employment outcomes. The anti-discrimination legislative framework (Hurd & Dyer, 2012) and the government emphasis on voluntary measures to redress women's employment status were critiqued in light of the New Zealand neo-liberal political-economy (Kelsey, 1999). The New Zealand legal and voluntary framework was then compared to approaches adopted by other nations and the course concluded with a review of women's disparate outcomes at the international level (OECD, 2013; Schwab et al., 2013).

Each new topic was considered in light of previous material and in relation to the New Zealand political-economy and the organizational and socio-cultural context that shape women's employment status. We used small group discussions to foster deeper analysis and to enhance the development of critical analytical and reasoning skills (Hamann, Pollock, & Wilson, 2011). In these small groups, students draw on their prior experiences to consider the personal, organizational, and societal implications of the issues presented. Thus, these discussions provide students with an opportunity to engage in dialogue with others (Cunliffe, 2002).

The Research Instrument – Reflexive Learning Journals

Reflexive learning journals are a common assessment technique used by critical and feminist educationalists to develop criticality (Gray, 2007). Journaling involves writing a series of entries over the duration of a course. In these entries, students are to reflexively analyze course material in relation to their feelings, thoughts, values, and lived experiences (Hubbs & Brand, 2010; Varner & Peck, 2003). In Cunliffe's (2002) terms, journals offer a space for students to engage in a written dialog with the self. Because of this process, journaling is regarded as a record of student learning over time, and for this reason is considered a source of empirical material detailing their learning process (O'Connell & Dymont, 2011; O'Rourke, 1998).

Journaling fosters reflexivity (Varner & Peck, 2003) by deepening class discussions (Ramsey, 2002), and by promoting self-disciplined, active (Hancock, 1999), and autonomous learning (Rué, Font, & Cebrian, 2013). Journals also offer an authentic educational experience because students make sense of material in relation to their lived experiences (Zahra, 2012). Importantly, journals provide a safe, therapeutic space for students to tease out emotional responses to contradictions between the curriculum and their personal understandings, values, beliefs, or experiences (O'Connell & Dymont, 2011).

Journaling is thought to reflect women's ways of learning and knowing because of the emphasis on thoughts, feelings, and emotions (O'Connell & Dymont, 2011). The technique is also considered useful for students learning in a second language, and for those less familiar or comfortable with dialogic classroom practices and challenging the views of others (Hancock, 1999). This is because journaling enables students to take the necessary time to develop entries and can avoid publically

challenging others. Both of the previous issues are believed to be common for international Chinese students according to Hardy and Tolhurst (2014). Because the majority of our participants is women and one-third is international Chinese students, journals are particularly appropriate as a document of learning for this study.

In the Women and Management course, the reflexive learning journal is a formal assessment. As educationalists advise, written instructions were given (see Appendix A) stating the purpose of the journal, what constitutes reflexivity (O'Connell & Dymont, 2011), and the frequency of entries (Hubbs & Brand, 2010). These written instructions were supported by in-class discussions and an offer to provide personalized formative feedback on the first entry (McHann & Frost, 2010). In addition, some students made use of office hours to discuss the assignment.

In the 14-week semester, students were required to make eight 400-word entries and, reflecting their shortened time frame, the summer school students were required to make five 500-word entries. All entries were submitted as one assignment at the end of semester (an issue we revisit later in the Implications section). Students personalized the journal by choosing their topics; therefore, each Entry 1, Entry 2, and so on, did not necessarily relate to the same topic, as illustrated in the findings. Ethics Approval for this research was gained. In accordance with this, all 86 students enrolled in the course over the three years were invited to submit their journals once the graded assignments had been returned. In all, 62 students volunteered to participate, giving us a 72% response rate. We now describe these 62 participants.

Data Set and Sample Description

Table 1 below details the number of students enrolled in each year of the study and the number of students who agreed to participate in this research. As can be seen, 35 participants were enrolled in summer school and 27 were enrolled in one or other of the two 14-week semesters. This provided 391 journal entries for analysis; 216 from the 14-week and 175 from the summer school semesters. Demographically, 53 participants were women and nine were men, and two-thirds (42) were domestic New Zealand students (NZ). In line with New Zealand Government policy initiatives to attract international students (Merwood, 2008), one-third (20) of the participants were from China (OS), 15 of whom were enrolled in summer school. Summer school attracts significantly more enrolments and particularly from international students, because the program enables them to complete their studies sooner. Where appropriate, throughout the text we identify and describe participants by noting their gender and nationality, and the journal entry we are referencing. For example, 'Participant 1 F NZ, e1', is a New Zealand (NZ) woman (F), and 'e1' denotes entry one.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Analysis

Searching for paraphrasing, reflection, and reflexivity: In the first stage, the two authors independently performed a deductive thematic analysis of the 391 journal entries (Braun & Clarke, 2006). To do so, we developed three analytical and reasoning descriptions informed by the literature. These were 1) 'no analysis and no reasoning', 2) 'reflective analysis and mundane reasoning', and 3) 'radical reflexivity and critical reasoning'. Each journal entry was analyzed as an example of one of these descriptions. Entries that were examples of 'no analysis and no reasoning'

paraphrased the lecture or an article. Examples of ‘reflective analysis and mundane reasoning’ drew on existing frames of reference to analyze and make sense of the topic. Examples of ‘radical reflexivity and critical reasoning’ either showed a systematic analysis of the topic; located the discussion within the socio-political, cultural or economic context; questioned previously held assumptions, beliefs or values; deconstructed lived experience; or reconsidered perceived futures should the status quo remain intact.

The independent analysis resulted in 249 entries being identically classified. We were immediately struck by the messiness of our divergent results. What were we to make of this? Together, we randomly reviewed 20 of the 142 other entries, and found various aspects of analytical and reasoning descriptions embedded in them. For example, we found some entries paraphrased a lecture and included a reflective question without developing a response. Other entries reflected on an issue, but also posed a reflexive question, without developing this further. This variation in aspects of analytical and reasoning skills explained the divergence in our analyses.

Our reflexive response was to ‘honour the data’ by developing four additional analytical and reasoning skill descriptions (as summarized in Table 2 below). These included ‘paraphrasing and mundane reasoning’ (i.e., paraphrasing accompanied by an unexplored reflective question), ‘mundane and critical reasoning’ (i.e., reflection accompanied by an unexplored reflexive question), ‘paraphrasing, mundane and critical reasoning’ (i.e., paraphrasing coupled with a small reflection and reflexive account), and ‘paraphrasing and critical reasoning’ (i.e., paraphrasing coupled with some reflexivity). We drew on these descriptions to independently re-analyze the 142 entries. In the most part, we were in agreement, with the exception of 15 entries. Through discussion, we agreed these entries were examples of ‘paraphrasing and

mundane reasoning’, or ‘mundane reasoning and critical reasoning’. This information was coded in MS Excel enabling a descriptive analysis of surface and deep learning.

INSERT TABLE TWO HERE

As can be seen in Table 3 below, nearly half of the entries were examples of paraphrasing (127 entries) or paraphrasing with an unexplored reflective question (69 entries). However, we also see that nearly one-quarter of the entries are examples of either reflection (57 entries) or reflection with an unexplored critical question (41 entries) , and 65 entries are examples of reflexivity. We discuss these learning outcomes and present journal extracts illustrating these forms of reasoning later in the Findings section.

INSERT TABLE THREE HERE

Searching for patterns: Surface and deep learning as dichotomous, linear

developmental, or messy processes: The journals where the majority of entries had the same learning outcome were considered examples of dichotomous learning. Journals that were considered examples of linear development had two or more analytical and reasoning descriptions and displayed an upward movement between the first and final entry. The examples of a messy learning process similarly had two or more analytical and reasoning descriptions, but there was fluid to-and-fro movement across the journal. However, we also found journals that had a unique pattern where participants reverted back in some way in their final entries, suggesting a ‘very messy learning process’. Overall, 17 participants displayed dichotomous learning, 11 displayed linear developmental learning, 23 engaged in messy learning, and 11 experienced ‘very messy’ learning. A closer inspection reveals some interesting differences between the summer school and 14-week semester, and the New Zealand

and Chinese participants, as summarised in Table 4 and Table 5 below. We explore these differences and discuss them in more detail later in the paper. We now review the limitations of this study.

INSERT TABLE FOUR HERE

INSERT TABLE FIVE HERE

Limitations

A number of pragmatic concerns raised about the usefulness of journaling pose limitations to our research. First, recognition that it takes time to develop reflexivity (Epp, 2008) suggests including summer school data would skew the results. However, our purpose for including both semester formats was to enable us to examine the impact of timeframes on analytical and reasoning skill development. Similarly, 15 of the 20 Chinese participants were enrolled in summer school. While this enabled us to compare those enrolled in summer, we could not make meaningful comparisons between them and the five Chinese participants enrolled in the 14-week semester.

Second, while Hancock (1999) found journals to be particularly useful for international students, she also observed that the depth and quality of journals is affected by nationality. Her observation, coupled with the assertion that Chinese students adopt sequential learning (Hardy & Tolhurst, 2014; Pratt et al., 1999), suggests that the expectation to engage reflexively contradicts their ways of knowing. We examine these assertions, and revisit this point when we discuss the implications of our research.

Third, as with critical pedagogy (Dehler, et al., 2001), journaling requires students to take significant responsibility and time to write entries (Langley & Brown, 2010). While students are expected to make regular weekly entries, we have no way of knowing if some write the entire assignment in one sitting. This is a common issue (Anderson, 1992). This would be a significant limitation if we were considering the journals as longitudinal data documenting skill development over time. Regardless, in the present case, our analysis of the journals provides evidence of analytical and reasoning skill development. We address such pedagogical issues when we discuss the implications of our findings in relation to the redesign of the reflexive learning journal assignment.

Finally, prior research shows that only a small number of students demonstrate criticality, with the majority of journal entries being simple commentaries (Dyment & O'Donnell, 2011; Brown, McCracken & O'Kane, 2011; Thorpe, 2004). This was also evident in the journals we analyzed. However, our interest is to make sense of this within the context of our critically-informed teaching practice. We now turn to our findings.

FINDINGS

We begin by providing examples of the analytical and reasoning skill descriptions found in the journal entries. We then present the journals as examples of dichotomous, linear developmental, messy, and very messy learning processes.

Journal Extract Examples of the Analytical and Reasoning Skill Descriptions

Examples of ‘no analysis and no reasoning’: Approximately one third of all entries were examples of no analysis and no reasoning where participants simply repeated the lecture (e.g., 127 entries, made by 48 participants as presented in Table 3). These entries typically opened with phrases such as ‘Today we watched a video on working mothers (Participant 4, F NZ, e7), ‘Today we covered lots of academic information’ (Participant 11, F OS, e1), ‘As a female, I think it is a good suggestion that women ... network’ (Participant 20, F OS, e5), or ‘Today [we] discussed women’s careers’ (Participant 26, F NZ, e5). Significantly, the Chinese participants frequently summarized the extant literature in these entries (and in light of this finding, we have embedded this practice into the redesign of the assignment).

However, like other researchers (Cunliffe, 2002; O’Connell & Dymont, 2011; Vince, 2010), we found 12 participants stating their emotional response to a topic but refraining from analyzing the issue or their emotions. Emotional expressions included being ‘shocked’ (Participant 82, F NZ e3), ‘stunned’ (Participant 19, F NZ, e2), and ‘feeling physically sick to my stomach and angry’ (Participant 49, F NZ e5). The topics that struck these participants emotionally varied, but included discovering the extent of women’s horizontal and vertical segregation in employment and the gender pay gap (e.g., Participants 19, 25, 29, 43, 63, 66, 70, and 82) and, to a lesser extent, sexual harassment (Participant 2, 7, and 42), lowering of birth rates amongst tertiary educated women (Participant 82), and women’s position in the global economy (Participant 49). A typical emotional response is illustrated below:

When looking at the pay differences between males and females I was stunned... As an independent female management student this horrified me as I was expecting to [enter] the workforce and earn the same and progress ... equally as the male students in my classes. (Participant 19, F NZ, e2)

Examples of ‘reflective analysis and mundane reasoning’: Fifty-seven entries made by 28 participants were examples of reflective analysis and mundane reasoning. In these entries the participants demonstrated their understanding of the topic. However, their analysis and reasoning appeared to have the primary function of restoring their personal sense that gender equality exists. As Grandy and Mills (2004) suggest, this could have enabled them to hold on to a fantasy of control over their life choices. These participants clearly were not persuaded that the material presented in class was evidence of institutionalized sexism. Rather, they reasoned the gendered differences were the result of individual choice, market forces, or custom. As such, they deemed the disparate outcomes as fair, reasonable, natural, or to be expected. This is illustrated in the extract below:

Obviously the All Blacks [the New Zealand national men’s rugby team] are paid a lot more than the Silver Ferns [the New Zealand national women’s netball team]. This ... is true...[but this is not] an example of women being oppressed...It [is a] result of economic demand...Rugby generates so much more money and support from the population ... I think the sex of the team is irrelevant. (Participant 1, F NZ, e2)

Some participants explored their prior experiences or drew on their existing frames of reference and reflected that a focus on women, in itself, results in double standards and inequality for men. Their reasoning remained mundane as they did not locate their discussion within the socio-political context or consider substantive evidence that challenged their position. This is illustrated in the two examples below:

It is good that society is finally including women in the workforce but it is not very fair to label a job as a 'woman's job', or only concentrate on recruiting women; maybe a male can do the job better...So I do not believe recruiting based on gender agrees with Equal Employment Opportunity beliefs.

(Participant 8, F NZ, e5)

I witnessed a young woman physically attacking her fleeing boyfriend. I phoned the police, and the couple was known to them. The police response was 'Don't worry, they will calm down soon'. If this had been a male inflicting injury upon a female I am certain the outcome would have been quite different. (Participant 18, F NZ, e1)

Examples of 'radical reflexivity and critical reasoning': In these 65 entries, the 35 participants systematically analyzed an issue and reflexively questioned assumptions embedded in their existing frames of reference. A common theme here was an explicit rejection that disparate employment outcomes can be explained solely by women's choices. These participants deconstructed the notion of choice, and critically reasoned that employment outcomes are also shaped by structural constraints; for example, 'stereotyping' (Participant 21, F NZ, e3), 'patriarchy' (Participant 73, F OS, e4), 'media advertising' (Participant 71, F NZ, e2), and 'religion and migration status' (Participant 27, F NZ e2).

Fourteen participants deconstructed the notion of gender, and argued that new framings of humanity and new socio-political and economic structures are needed to support and value all members of society. Some participants also deconstructed the processes that had shaped their own assumptions about gender, and teased out how

their implicit beliefs informed their actions, thoughts, feelings, and worldviews. Importantly, these participants began to recognize that by unwittingly ‘doing gender’ (West & Zimmerman, 1987), they were reproducing disparity in their personal lives. These themes are encapsulated in the extract below:

Today I got home from class and sat down to organize some work when my boyfriend called to say he was coming round... I considered making him some lunch (like I often do)... and then I thought... ‘no. That’s not my job’. He’s a grown man, older than I am, and capable of feeding himself (plus he has a lot more money in his account compared to my growing overdraft!). He never makes me lunch. So why do I always cook for him? This is the first time that I can ever remember questioning my behavior in such a way... But I guess a life of watching my mum cook for [the family]...has rubbed off on me and I have ... this notion embedded in me that ... I’m supposed to cook. I feel bad, or feel like it’s a real treat if he ... ever cooks for me. (Participant 18, F NZ, e5)

Examples of mixed-coded entries: While 249 entries were clear examples of no, mundane or critical reasoning, it was the 142 entries that did not neatly ‘fit’ these descriptions that inspired us to reflexively reconsider what was going on. In these entries, the participants often were struck emotionally by the material and class discussions; for example, feeling ‘overwhelmed’, ‘violated’ or ‘confused’. However, they moved beyond their reflex response by either reflecting on or reflexively inquiring about the issue. The following extract is an example of a combination of ‘paraphrasing and mundane reasoning’. In this example, the majority of the entry was dedicated to repeating the lecture on women’s disparate incomes, but the closing

comment indicates she is beginning to draw on her existing frames of reference to make sense of the gender wage gap:

The statistics of women's lower income earnings to men were overwhelming and the laws of equality and equity that I had been taught through law classes came to mind. (Participant 46, M NZ, e1)

The examples of 'mundane and critical reasoning' typically applied a reflective analysis and were imbued with mundane reasoning, but ended with comments that were more suggestive of a reflexive inquiry. In the following extract, the participant begins with a mundane analysis of stereotyping. She then critically reflects on the media portrayal of women and the effect this has on reproducing gendered stereotypes and on her own role in this process.

Shifts in management theory now consider feminine traits as useful to managers. After watching '*Killing us Softly*' [Kilbourne, 1987], I felt violated by the media for portraying me, almost categorising me into something that I am not. Now I sit here questioning my own past and current behaviours. I cannot blame the media for everything. (Participant 17, F NZ, e2)

An example of all three forms of analysis in one entry is offered below:

I believe women should be independent from men and capable in their own rights; but then on the other hand I enjoy playing the role of a "female" and being dependant on males for some things... [this] certainly doesn't make [female] jobs any less important.... This belief of mine, that I enjoy playing

the ‘female’ role, has now been questioned though and leaves me feeling confused; am I only happy playing this role because it is the only way that I have ever known? (Participant 24, F NZ, e1)

So far, we have provided illustrations of the forms of reasoning embedded in the journal entries. We now present our second stage of analysis to demonstrate that the majority of the participants developed their analytical and reasoning skills.

Searching for Signs of Developing Analytical and Reasoning Skills

To search for signs of development, we assessed each journal in terms of the combination of analytical and reasoning skill descriptions embedded in the entries. As can be seen in Table 6 below, only eight participants paraphrased the course content in all their entries; seven included paraphrasing and reflection and mundane reasoning across their entries; 31 had a mixture of paraphrasing, reflection and reflexivity; 11 engaged in paraphrasing and reflexivity, and three included reflection and reflexive accounts in their entries. At this level, it appears that 54 participants developed their analytical and reasoning skills because they included various combinations of paraphrasing, reflection, and reflexivity across their journal entries. These aggregate figures, however, do not show the individual participant’s learning process. Here, we turn to the findings that illustrate this.

INSERT TABLE SIX HERE

Learning as a Dichotomous Process for 17 Participants

Seventeen participants displayed a dichotomous learning process because the majority of their entries were examples of the same analytical and reasoning skill description. Thirteen of these participants were enrolled in summer school and four in the 14-week semester; nine were New Zealand and eight were Chinese. We found that eight of these participants' entire journals were examples of paraphrasing, paraphrasing with a reflective question, or a combination of both. Another five participants primarily paraphrased throughout their journals but also included one reflective or one reflexive entry. The topics that struck these participants to engage more deeply included the nature nurture debate (Participant 65), sexual harassment (Participants 30 and 34), gendered employment outcomes (Participant 54), and deconstructing femininity (Participant 82).

Only Participant 49 applied a reflective analysis throughout, with the exception of her description of the course in her fourth entry. Three participants mainly displayed reflexivity in their entries; but even here, Participant 57 included a reflection on working mothers; Participant 22 engaged in paraphrasing and critical reflection about feminist theory, and Participant 50, both critically engaged in the material and drew on a combination of all three analyses in her entries.

Learning as a Linear Developmental Process for 11 Participants

Eleven participants demonstrated a linear developmental process. Surprisingly, nine of these students were enrolled in summer school, and only two were Chinese. While the starting point differed among these participants, they all

progressed throughout their journals and engaged in reflexivity by their final entry. Participants 19 and 42, for example, began with paraphrasing, progressed to paraphrasing with an unexplored reflective question, and concluded with critical reflexivity. Participants 18 and 47 began with mundane reasoning and progressed to critical reflexivity by their final entries. The other seven participants opened with paraphrasing, gradually progressed to engage in reflective analysis and mundane reasoning, and concluded with a reflexive final entry. Four of these participants do revert back to paraphrasing in one entry along the way; however, overall they show a linear developmental process (e.g., Participant 18 on advertising; Participants 28 and 35 on gendered work, and Participant 47 who makes a general statement about the course). We consider these reversions in the discussion.

Learning as a Messy Process for 23 Participants

Twenty-three participants' learning can best be described as a messy process. This included nine in summer school and 14 in the 14-week semester; and seven Chinese and 16 New Zealanders. These participants display surface, reflective, and critical reflexivity across their entries. However, there is no particular pattern to this; rather, their analysis moves to-and-fro throughout the journal. Similarly, there is no particular pattern in terms of what topics struck them to engage in paraphrasing, reflection, or reflexivity. The variations in this messiness are too numerous to recount here, but we provide three examples. The first relates to the 15 participants in this group who responded to the introductory lecture. Here we might expect paraphrasing given that it is the first lecture, and indeed, 11 did so. However, Participant 11 was

struck enough to apply a reflective analysis, and Participants 14, 24, and 45 reflexively considered this lecture.

In the second example, 15 participants responded to Lecture 5 on sexual harassment. Given that the 53 of the 62 of the participants are women, and the serious consequences of sexual harassment to victims, their families, and organizations, we might expect the topic to strike deeply. Yet, four participants still describe the lecture, and only four reflexively analyzed sexual harassment (e.g., as a manifestation of power, as an outcome of the sexual portrayal of women in the media). What strikes us is that seven apply a mundane analysis to make sense of sexual harassment (e.g., the laws need to be applied or amended, women should dress more appropriately, or women should avoid dangerous situations).

In the third example, 21 participants responded to Lectures 6 and/or 7 featuring women's work. Here, we might also expect participants to be struck by the disparities, and given the timing of these lectures, be able to engage in deep analysis. Even so, six participants still paraphrased the lecture (e.g., women do more housework, get paid less, are concentrated in teaching and nursing, and rarely make senior management levels). Thirteen drew on their existing frames of references to make sense of these anomalies (e.g., jobs are appropriately valued, but women choose different kinds of work, or women work fewer paid hours); and only three engaged in a reflexive analysis (e.g., these outcomes are evidence of patriarchy).

Learning as a Very Messy Process: Reverting Backwards for Eleven Participants

Eleven participants reverted back to less developed analytical and reasoning in their final entries, compared to their previous entries. These final entries addressed quite diverse lectures including working mothers (Participants 2, 51, and 70), advertising (Participant 3), women's careers (Participants 20, 26, 64, and 85), and women in the global economy (Participants 9, 16, and 29). These 11 participants drew on surface learning, reflection, and reflexivity across their journals; and initially, six show linear development and five display messy learning. However, nine participants revert back to paraphrasing, and Participants 26 and 29 revert back to reflective accounts. More puzzling is that this reversion in the final entries was more pronounced in the 14-week semester (seven participants) and the New Zealand students (eight).

Summary thus Far

So far, we have presented extracts from the journal entries to illustrate surface learning and paraphrasing, reflection, and reflexivity engaged in by the participants. At the aggregate level, the evidence points to the majority of participants developing their analytical and reasoning skills. At the individual level, we also find evidence of dichotomous, linear, messy, and very messy learning processes. However, the comparison between summer school with the 14-week semester and between the Chinese and New Zealand participants uncovered paradoxes that we were not prepared for. We now discuss the findings and consider 'what's going on'.

DISCUSSION

In this paper we have attempted to understand what is going on in relation to the mixed results we witnessed in class discussions and assessments with respect to

our short-term intent of developing students' analytical and reasoning skills. We have done so by analyzing the reflexive learning journals of 62 participants who were enrolled in the Women and Management course over three consecutive years. So, what can we make of our findings? At the aggregate level, and echoing Entwistle's (2000) assertion, we did find 17 participants presenting the same depth of analysis across all their journal entries. Thus, even within the context of our critically-informed teaching practice, eight participants displayed surface learning throughout all their journal entries, while four students came already equipped to engage more deeply with course material. However, five of these participants embedded deeper questions in their paraphrasing; a point we explore a little further on in the discussion.

The remaining 45 participants drew on various analytical and reasoning skills; the most common combination of which was the inclusion of surface, reflection, and reflexivity. The least common combinations were paraphrasing and reflection, paraphrasing and critical reflexivity, and reflection and critical reflexivity. Thus, in the context of this course, some participants developed their ability to engage in reflection, and others developed their ability to reflexively engage in the material. While this result is quite pleasing, what is more intriguing is the differences at the individual level in terms of dichotomous, linear developmental progression, messy, and very messy learning. In the context of these learning processes, paraphrasing seems to take on specific meanings.

In the examples of linear developmental progression, moments of paraphrasing and reflection formed the early phase in these participants' personal journey to developing reflection and reflexivity (Hardy & Tolhurst, 2014; Marton & Saljo, 1997; Pratt, 1998). In the context of the messy learning journals, the fluidity of movement between surface, reflection, and critical reflexivity, suggests that

paraphrasing takes on another meaning. Here we draw on Cunliffe (2002), who points out that there are multiple moments in the learning process when we are struck by something. In the context of the Women and Management course, students evidently were struck in quite unique ways and at quite different moments by the novelty, complexity, and sometimes quite disturbing nature of the content. Here then, while a participant might engage in a reflexive analysis in one entry, subsequent topics are perhaps more uncomfortable or address an issue that the student personally does not relate to. The response seems to be a reengagement with paraphrasing, presenting a reflex emotional response, or reflection.

Our analysis also suggests the examples of paraphrasing with the addition of either a concluding reflective statement (69 entries) or concluding reflexive statement (23 entries), are more complex than they first appear. In these entries, paraphrasing seems to enable the participant to showcase their understanding of the content. However, through the process of writing their recollection, that is, in their written dialog with the self (Cunliffe, 2002), it appears that the participants become struck by something. While they do not engage in a deeper analysis, the posing of a deeper question does demonstrate that they are trying to make sense of being struck. This suggests too, that the 41 entries of mundane reasoning coupled with a reflexive closing statement are also more complex. Here though, it seems that through the process of writing, the participant is struck by the inadequacy of their existing frames of reference as a means to make sense of something. These entries might be better understood either as an early phase in the linear developmental process, or as moments of reversion in the messy learning process.

Overall, we found evidence showing that the majority of participants developed their analytical and reasoning skills. However, we also found important

differences in learning processes between the New Zealand and Chinese participants, and between the summer school and 14-week semester participants. Significantly, all seven Chinese participants who displayed surface learning were enrolled in summer school. This accounted for nearly half of the Chinese summer school enrolments and approximately 40% of the total number of Chinese participants. In contrast, six New Zealand participants (or 15% of all New Zealand participants) displayed surface learning; four of whom were enrolled in the 14-week semester program. Even though many of these participants included deeper questions, this finding demonstrates that the shortened summer school time-frame poses particular challenges for developing analytical and reasoning skills for those learning in a second language.

Paradoxically, the three New Zealand and one Chinese participant who displayed mundane or critical reflexivity were also enrolled in summer school. Evidently the shortened timeframe does not affect those already equipped with deep analytical and reasoning skills. More surprising, nine of the 11 participants displaying linear development were also enrolled in summer school. Here then, the concentrated teaching-learning favoured their linear analytical and reasoning skill development. Perhaps the institutional regulations restricting enrolment to two summer school courses combined with attending two lectures per week enabled these participants to remain focused and to develop their skills.

Significantly, and in contrast to what others suggest, only two Chinese participants, also enrolled in summer school, engaged in a linear learning process. Instead, we found a further seven Chinese participants (or 40% of all Chinese participants) engaged in messy learning; and were spread across both semester formats. Perhaps this should not come as a surprise, given that the syllabus is embedded in the New Zealand socio-political context. Thus, it seems, the Chinese

participants more frequently encountered information that they personally could not relate to, and therefore engaged in paraphrasing or reflection in their entries.

Messy learning was the most common process evident amongst the domestic cohort; accounting for 16, or 38% of all New Zealand participants. Eleven of these 16 students were enrolled in the 14-week semester. While we expected that these participants would have some prior understanding of the issues, it was clear that at many times they were shocked by the extent of gender disparity in New Zealand. Because of this, their previously held assumptions and frames of reference were frequently challenged. Their reversion to reflex emotional responses, paraphrasing, and reflection remind us that developing reflexivity is both an emotional and an intellectual journey.

The discovery of the 'very messy learning' process came as a surprise. More puzzling was that the majority of these journals was written by New Zealanders and accounted for nearly one quarter of all 14-week semester participants. Intuitively, we might expect that because these participants displayed linear or messy processes, they would continue to do so through to their closing entries. Their reversion to paraphrasing or reflective analysis in the final entries might signal end-of-semester fatigue, as well as strategic decisions in their efforts to manage competing final assessment demands across all courses. In the context of Women and Management, this also suggests that there might be simply too many journal entries required over the 14-week semester.

In summary, while the extant literature suggests that Chinese students are more likely to engage in linear developmental processes (Hardy & Tolhurst, 2014; Pratt et al., 1999), our findings do not support this. Unsurprisingly, we found that the

majority of participants who displayed surface learning were enrolled in summer school; paradoxically, this was also the case for those displaying linear developmental processes. Most surprising of all, was the significant number of New Zealand participants who displayed very messy learning in the 14-week semester. We now turn to the theoretical and practical implications arising from our findings.

IMPLICATIONS

Our discovery of dichotomous (Enwhittle, 2000), linear developmental (Pratt et al., 1999) and messy (Cunliffe, 2002) learning patterns within our data is not new. However, our comparison between Chinese and New Zealand students, and between the two semesters revealed a number of paradoxes within our data and contradictions between our findings and existing understandings of learning processes. The implication of these contradictions is that we cannot assume that surface or deep learning or specific learning processes are related to the nationality of the student, or to having more or less time, as a number of educationalists and scholars suggest. We were also reminded that information that contradicts personal expectations, beliefs, or current understandings can be a shocking experience; consequently, developing reflexivity can be an emotional journey. This poses us, as management educators, with the ethical dilemma of balancing student feelings, while still raising the awareness of management students about the complexity of organizational life.

Insights from our findings also have pedagogical implications for the design of the learning journal. To address these, we have redesigned the journal by creating two separate assignments. The first 'Mini Assignment' (see Appendix A), involves three 500-word written responses to be submitted one week after the lecture. These

responses require students to draw on the extant literature to demonstrate their understanding of the topic, to consider how the issue might affect them or their family, and to consider managerial and organizational implications of the issue. Students still personalise the assignment by choosing which three topics to write about.

Requiring students to demonstrate their understanding provides a specific space for and acknowledgement of the importance of paraphrasing in the process of developing deep learning. This also reflected our finding that the Chinese participants, in particular, drew on extant literature in their journals. Relating the issue to the self and family provides space to reflect on or engage reflexively with the issue. Considering organizational issues serves to remind students that the topics covered are not abstract or indeed, shocking ‘women’s issues’. Rather, the topics have significant legal, ethical, moral, and pragmatic implications for managers and managing. Pedagogically, the regular submission requirement enables us to assess if deep learning occurs over time.

The second 500-word ‘Self and Course Evaluation’ assignment is due at the end of semester (see Appendix A). Students are to consider their engagement in terms of preparedness (e.g., reading), attendance, and involvement in class discussion, and to reflect on the course content, process, and assessments. This assignment was specifically designed to honour our pedagogical commitment to provide a reflexive space for students to tease out and express their feelings and experiences. Importantly, the end-of-semester submission enables students’ to draw on their accumulated understanding in their reflexive accounts. Finally, the overall reduction in size of these two assessments (from the original eight 400-word or five 500-word entries to

four 500-word assignments) was to address the pragmatic considerations of student fatigue and competing end-of-semester demands.

We have used these revised assignments with two new cohorts and have observed that the student accounts appear to differ to the reflexive learning journals in two ways. Our first observation is that the structure of the Mini Assignment seems to enable students to shift from being ‘stuck’ in their emotional response and move on to consider the implications of the issues for themselves and for organizations. Formative feedback received from students during class discussion confirms that many appreciate the opportunity to consider the organizational and managerial implications of course material. Our second observation, however, is that this ‘movement’ seems to be at the expense of deeper exploration of how the material challenges personal feelings, beliefs, values, or practices. Thus, perhaps we have unwittingly removed a significant aspect in the learning journey that fosters the development of reflexivity and seeing the world and the self in new ways. While it is too early to tell if this is so, we are certainly watching what’s going on.

CONCLUSION

We set out to understand ‘what’s going on’ in relation to our short-term intent to develop the analytical and reasoning skills of students in the context of our critically-informed teaching practice. We drew on reflection and radical reflectivity (Pollner, 1991) and processes of learning to analyze the participants’ reflexive learning journals. However, these existing frames of reference hid more than they revealed. Our reflexive reconsideration of the analytical and reasoning skill descriptions helped reveal that expressions of learning are far more subtle and far

more complex than notions of surface learning, reflection, and reflexivity imply. Significantly, our research also demonstrated that nationality or timeframes do not adequately explain learning processes or the development of reflexivity. What we can conclude with full confidence, however, is that in the context of our critically-informed teaching practice, our management students do develop their analytical and reasoning skills.

APPENDIX A: ASSIGNMENT INSTRUCTIONS

Reflexive Learning Journal Instructions

The following description of the reflexive learning assignment is presented in the course outline:

This journal is a reflexive record of your learning throughout the paper (not a diary or a step-by-step description of what happened in class). You need to draw upon theory, class material, or reading material when writing your reflections. The assignment goal is to help you articulate your views and to develop your ideas over time, and to link course material to your personal life experiences, work places, and to wider social processes.

You are required to respond to eight lectures, and each response is to be 400 words (NOTE: This instruction is modified to five 500- word entries for summer school). These entries are to be submitted as one assignment on the due date. Please note, I am happy to review your first journal entry to offer guidance. Please feel free to raise this assignment in class to discuss the requirements further.

Mini Assignment Instructions

A mini assignment is your considered response to a lecture. You must submit three mini assignments. Each mini-assignment is to be 500 words and include four literature references that support the topic for each assignment submitted. You can respond to Lectures One through to Lecture 10, but you can decide which three of these lectures you wish to respond to. The submission date for each assignment is the Monday immediately following the lecture at 9 a.m.

In each mini-assignment you are to demonstrate your understanding of the topic you have chosen to write about (use the references to support this), comment on how the issue might affect you, your family, or work colleagues, and comment on why the issue is of concern for managers and organizations, wider society and government. Give each section equal consideration.

Self and Course Evaluation Instructions

For this assignment, you must reflect upon what you have gained from this course. Reflect upon your participation, preparedness, and involvement in the course and how this influenced what you have gained. You may highlight aspects of the course that were more (or less) interesting, helpful, or enlightening, and how these aspects influenced your development and learning around your understanding

of the complexities of women’s lives. Write this reflection in no more than 500 words. We will discuss this assignment closer to submission.

(Note the submission date is set in the final week of semester).

Table 1: Sample Composition

Year	Total Enrolled	Participants
Year 1, 14-week semester	16	12 (11 NZ, 1 OS)
Year 2, 6-week summer school	44	35 (20 NZ, 15 OS)
Year 3, 14-week semester	26	15 (11 NZ, 4 OS)
Total number of students	86	62

Table 2: Summary of Analytical and Reasoning Skill Descriptions

Theme	Analytical and Reasoning Skill	Description
1	No analysis and no reasoning	Paraphrases or repeats lecture content
2	Paraphrasing and mundane reasoning	Paraphrases or repeats lecture content accompanied by an unexplored reflective question.
3	Reflective analysis and mundane reasoning	Applies an existing frame of reference to analyze and reflect on material.
4	Mundane and critical reasoning	Paraphrases or repeats lecture content accompanied by an unexplored reflective question.
5	Radical reflexivity and critical reasoning	Systematic or deconstructive analysis of material.
6	Paraphrasing, mundane and critical reasoning	Paraphrases content accompanied by a small reflection and reflexive account
7	Paraphrasing and critical reasoning	Paraphrasing accompanied by some reflexive account

Table 3: Forms of Analytical and Reasoning Skills by Number of Entries and Participants

Theme	Analytical and Reasoning Skill	Number of Entries	Number of Participants
1	No analysis and no reasoning	127	48
2	Paraphrasing and mundane reasoning	69	37
3	Reflective analysis and mundane reasoning	57	28
4	Mundane and critical reasoning	41	25
5	Radical reflexivity and critical reasoning	65	35
6	Paraphrasing, mundane and critical reasoning	9	8
7	Paraphrasing and critical reasoning	23	16

Table 4: Number of Students per Learning Process by Semester

Semester	Dichotomous	Linear	Messy	Very Messy	Total
Summer school	13	9	9	4	35
14-week semester	4	2	14	7	27
Total	17	11	23	11	62

Table 5: Number of Students per Learning Process by Nationality

Nationality	Dichotomous	Linear	Messy	Very Messy	Total
--------------------	--------------------	---------------	--------------	-------------------	--------------

New Zealand	9	9	16	8	42
International Chinese Students	8	2	7	3	20
Total	17	11	23	11	62

Table 6: Combinations of Analytical and Reasoning Skills by Participants

Analytical and Reasoning Skill Combinations	Number of Participants
No analysis and no reasoning only	8
Combination of ‘no analysis and no reasoning’ and ‘reflective analysis and mundane reasoning’	7
Combination of ‘no analysis and no reasoning’, ‘reflective analysis and mundane reasoning’ and ‘radical reflexivity and critical reasoning’	31
Combination of ‘no analysis and no reasoning’ and ‘radical reflexivity and critical reasoning’	11
Combination of ‘reflective analysis and mundane reasoning’ and ‘radical reflexivity and critical reasoning’	3

References

Alvesson, M., & Wilmott, H. 1992. Critical theory and management studies: An introduction. In M. Alvesson, & H. Wilmott (Eds.), *Critical management studies*. 1-20. London, UK: Sage.

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. 1996. *Making sense of management: A critical introduction*. London: Sage.

Anderson, J. 1992. Journal writing: The promise and the reality. *Journal of Reading*, 36(4): 304-309.

Bisman, J. 2011. Engaged pedagogy: a study of the use of reflective journals in accounting education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(3), 315-330.

Boje, D. M., & Al-Arkoubi, K. 2009. Critical management education: Beyond the siege. In S. Armstrong, & C. Fukami (Eds.), *Handbook of management learning, education and development*: 104-125. London, UK: Sage.

Boyce, M. 1996. Teaching critically as an act of praxis and resistance. *Electronic Journal of Radical Organisation Theory*, 2(2): 1-10.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2): 77-101.

Brown, T., McCracken, M., & O'Kane, P. 2011. 'Don't forget to write': How reflective learning journals can help to facilitate, assess and evaluate training transfer. *Human Resource Development International*, 14(4): 465-481.

Calás, M., & Smircich, L. 1996. From the woman's point of view: Feminist approaches to organization studies. In S. Clegg, C. Hard, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies*: 218-257. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Clegg S., & Dunkerley, D. 1980, *Organization, class and control*. USA: Routledge.

Cunliffe, A. L. 2002. Reflexive dialogical practice in management learning. *Management Learning*, 33(1), 35-61.

Currie, G., & Knights, D. 2003. Reflecting on a critical pedagogy in MBA education. *Management Learning*, 34(1): 27-50.

Deetz, S. 1992. *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Dehler, G., Welsh, M. A., & Lewis, M. W. 2001. Critical pedagogy in the 'New Paradigm'. *Management Learning*, 32(4), 493-511.

Department of Labour. 2010. *Female Labour Market Factsheet* – December 2010. Department of Labour: Wellington, NZ.

Dyer, S. 2003. Government, public relations and lobby groups: Stimulating critical reflections on information providers in society. *Journal of Management Education*, 27(1), 78-95.

Dyer, S., Humphries, H., Fitzgibbons, D., & Hurd, F. 2014. *Understanding management critically: A student text*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Dyment, J. E., & O'Connell, T. S. 2010. The quality of reflection in student journals: A review of limiting and enabling factors. *Journal of Innovative Higher Education*, 35(4):233-244.

Dyment J. E., & O'Connell, T. S. 2011. Assessing the quality of reflection in student journals: A review of the research. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16(1): 81-97.

Elliot, C. 2003. Representations of the intellectual: Insights from Gramsci on management education. *Management Learning*, 34(4): 411-427.

Entwistle, N. 2000. Promoting deep learning through teaching and assessment: A conceptual frameworks and educational contexts. Paper presented at the *TLRP Conference*: Leicester: November.

Epp, S. 2008. The value of reflective journaling in undergraduate nursing education: A literature review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 45: 1379-1388.

Fenwick, T. 2005a. Conceptions of critical HRD: dilemmas for theory and practice. *Human Resource Development International*, 8(2), 225-238.

Fenwick, T. 2005b. Ethical dilemmas of critical management education within the classroom and beyond. *Management Learning*, 36(1): 31-48.

Freire, P. 1970. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, USA: Continuum.

Freire, P. 1972. Education: domestication or liberation? *Prospects*, 2: 173-181.

Gabriel, Yiannis. 2008. Against the tyranny of PowerPoint: Technology-in-use and technology abuse. *Organization Studies*, 29(2): 255-276.

Giroux, H. A. 1997. *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture and schooling*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Grandy, G., & Mills, A. J. 2004. Strategy as simulacra? A radical reflexive look at the discipline and practice of management. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(7): 1153-1170.

Gray, D. E. 2007. Facilitating management learning: Developing critical reflection through reflective tools. *Management Learning*, 28(5): 495-517.

Grey, C. 2004. Reinventing business schools: The contribution of critical management education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3(2):178-186.

Hamann, K., Pollock, P., & Wilson, B. 2011. Learning through discussions: Comparing the benefits of small-group and large-class settings. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 7(1), 48-64. doi:10.1080/15512169.2011.539913

Hancock, P. 1999. Reflective practice: Using a learning journal. *Nursing Standard*, 13(17): 37-40.

Hardy, C., & Tolhurst, D. 2014. Epistemological beliefs and cultural diversity matters in management education and learning: A critical review and future directions. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 13(2), 265-289.

Hubbs, D., & Brand, C. F. 2010. Learning from the inside out: A method for analyzing reflective journals in the college classroom. *The Journal of Experiential Education*, 33(1): 56-71.

Human Rights Commission. 2010. *New Zealand census of women's participation*. Human Rights Commission: Wellington, New Zealand.

Human Rights Commission, (2011) *Tracking equality at work*. Human Rights Commission: Wellington, New Zealand

Hurd, F. & Dyer, S. 2012. Legislation and voluntarism: Two approaches to achieving EEO outcomes for women in New Zealand. In S Groschl and J Takagi (Eds), *Diversity quotas, diverse perspectives: The case of gender, perspectives on gender and diversity*, Farnham, UK: Gower Publishing Ltd, pp. 41-58

Kek, M., & Huijser, H. (2011). Exploring the combined relationships of student and teacher factors on learning approaches and self-directed learning readiness at a Malaysian university. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(2), 185-208.

Kelsey, J. 1999. *Reclaiming the future: New Zealand and the global economy*. Bridget Williams Books.

Kilbourne, J. 1987. *Still killing us softly: Advertising's image of women*. Kinetic, Incorporated.

Langley, M. E., & Brown, S. T. 2010. Perceptions of the use of reflective learning journals in online graduate nursing education. *Nursing Education Perspectives*, 31(1): 12-7.

Learmonth, M. 2007. Critical management education in action: Personal tales of management unlearning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(1): 109-113.

Liu, X, & Dyer, S. 2014. Revisiting radical feminism: Partnered dual-earner mothers' place still in the home? *Women's Studies International Forum*, 47, A, 1-10.

Marton, F., & Saljo, R. 1997. Approaches to learning. In F. Marton, D. Hounsell, & N. Entwistle (Eds.). *The experience of learning* (2nd ed.). Scottish Academic Press: Edinburgh.

Mayo, P. 2008. A rationale for a transformative approach to education. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 1(1): 38-57.

McHann, J. C., & Frost, L. A. 2010. Integrating experiential learning into business courses: Using learning journals to create living case studies. *American Journal of Business Education*, 3(8): 1-12.

Mclean, W., & Unter, K. 2010. Sex role stereotyping and requisite management characteristics. An examination of the think manager-think male

phenomenon among public administration students. *Economics, Management, and Financial Markets*, 5(4): 127-132.

Merwood, P. 2008. *Migration Trends 2005/2006*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Labour.

Neergaard, H., Shaw, E., & Carter, S. 2005. The impact of gender, social capital and networks on business ownership: a research agenda. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 11(5): 338-357.

OECD. (2013) *How's Life? 2013: Measuring Well-being*. Geneva: OECD Publishing.

O'Connell T. S. & Dymont, J. E. 2011. The case of reflective journals: Is the jury still out? *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 12(1): 47-59.

O'Rourke, R. 1998. The learning journal: From chaos to cohesion. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 23(4): 403-413.

Ortiz-Walters, R. 2009. Mentorship collaborations: A longitudinal examination of the association with job performance and gender. *The Journal of Business and Economic Studies*, 15(1): 26-49.

Perriton, L. 2007. Really useful knowledge? Critical Management Education in the UK and the US. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 23(1), 66-83.

Perry, W. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme*. Holt, Rinehart & Wilson: New York.

Pollner, M. 1991. Left of ethnomethodology: The rise and decline of radical reflexivity. *American Sociological Review*, 56(3), 370-380.

Pratt, D. 1998, *Five perspectives on teaching in adult and higher education*.
Florida: Krieger

Pratt, D., Kelly, M., & Wong, S. 1999. Chinese conceptions of “effective teaching” in Hong Kong: Toward culturally sensitive evaluation of teaching. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 18:241-258.

Ramsey, V. 2002. Learning journals and learning communities. *Journal of Management Education*, 26(4), 380-400.

Reynolds, M. 1999. Grasping the nettle: Possibilities and pitfalls of a critical management pedagogy. *British Journal of Management*, 10(2): 170-184.

Rué, J., Font, A., & Cebrián, G. 2013. Towards high-quality reflective learning amongst law undergraduate students: analyzing students’ reflective journals during a problem-based learning course. *Quality in Higher Education*, 19(2): 191-209.

Schwab, K., Brende, B., Zahidi, S., Bekhouche, Y., Guinault, A., Soo, A., Hausmann, R., & Tyson, L. 2013. *The Global Gender Gap Report*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Economic Forum.

Spicer, A., Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2009). Critical performativity: The unfinished business of critical management studies. *Human Relations*, 62(4), 537.

Statistics New Zealand. 2006. *Census Data*, Wellington, New Zealand, Statistics New Zealand

Statistics New Zealand (2011). *Time use survey 2009/2010*. Wellington, New Zealand, Statistics New Zealand.

Thorpe, K. 2004. Reflective learning journals: From concept to practice. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 5(3): 327-343.

Vince, R. 2010. Anxiety, politics and critical management education. *British Journal of Management*, 21(s1), s26-s39.

Varner, D., & Peck, S. 2003. Learning from learning journals: The benefits and challenges of using learning journal assignments. *Journal of Management Education*, 27(1): 52-74.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D.H. 1987. Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, 1(2): 125-151 doi: 10.1177/0891243287001002002

Zahra, A. 2012. Learning journals: An authentic learning approach to education in a hospitality context. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 12(3): 277-294.