Drawing and knowing: An approach to encouraging critical thinking in the classroom
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Abstract

Recognizing that the world into which students emerge upon graduation is characterized by constant change, we embrace a critical pedagogy that can be implemented in the classroom through the use of freehand drawing. Our aim is to create a learning environment where students develop their capacity for critical self-reflection. We use freehand drawing to: facilitate our ability to ‘see’ how we understand a topic and that there are multiple ways of understanding; challenge theories, orthodoxies and truths considered common; scrutinize what are often tacit assumptions; and ponder other possibilities. We conclude that in democracies it is vital educational institutions foster critical thinking to impel students to contemplate societal structures and that this can be achieved by means of critical pedagogies that create participative learning environments. Freehand drawing can stimulate a critical stance as visual representation allows us comprehend the world differently while permitting us see how others comprehend the world.
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**Introduction**

Arum and Roksa (2011) note that stakeholders in the United States (US) higher education system are increasingly questioning undergraduate learning amid concerns students are not developing capacities for critical thinking considered the principal aim of a collegiate education. Former Harvard president Bok (2006: 8) points out that many US seniors graduate without the capacity to ‘reason clearly or perform competently in analyzing complex, non technical problems.’ However, Arum and Roksa (2011: 2) observe that critical thinking and complex reasoning are the cornerstone of ‘effective democratic citizenship and economic productivity.’ Anecdotal evidence suggests Arum and Roksa (2011) would find similar outcomes in Ireland. What does this say about maintaining a vibrant democracy, with an engaged citizenry? Are universities mass-producing unreflective automatons that readily accept the status quo?

In our teaching, we do not subscribe to the dominant neo-liberal paradigm, which sees the market as a morally and politically neutral entity, considers big government bad, and regards education as there to provide enhanced human capital for the market. This conceptualization absolves students of any requirement to reflect critically. Instead, we argue that a politics education should seek to build a more just society based on fairness, democracy and empowerment, while questioning the assumptions embedded in both theory and practice (Perriton and Reynolds, 2004: 66). In seeking to broaden students’ perspectives and contribute to their development as ‘critical beings’ (Barnett, 1997), our aim is to challenge the dominant orthodoxy and present students with political, social, moral, and philosophical questions. This requires overcoming an enduring bias in instructional pedagogies toward simplification (Dehler, Welsh and Lewis, 2003: 168).

We see knowledge, not as a commodity to be transferred from academic to student (Freire, 1971, 1974), but the outcome of a dialectical relationship (Reynolds and Vince, 2004). The aim, through
critical reflection, is to create a learning space oriented towards helping students construct a more sophisticated understanding of the world (Dehler, Welsh and Lewis, 2003).

**Beyond Critical Thinking to Critical Pedagogy**

Ennis (1991: 6) defines critical thinking as ‘reasonably reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do’. However, universities, through reinforcement of the neo-liberal perspective, have encouraged competitiveness and individualism in the pursuit of wealth, status and power (Reedy and Learmonth, 2009). Indeed, Grey (2002: 496, 509) notes ‘a pervasive silence … concerning the realities of work in the global economy’. In response, faculty should be encouraged to include critical thinking as an outcome of the learning process because ‘[w]e do not want students to accept blindly what they are told; we expect them to challenge assumptions, conduct research, and form their own opinions’ (Stepanovich, 2009: 725).

‘Critical pedagogy is a radical approach to education that seeks to transform oppressive structures in society using democratic and activist approaches to teaching and learning’ (Braa and Callero, 2006: 357). Smith (2003: 21), in line with a critical pedagogy, argues for affording students the opportunity to develop a skeptical and inquiring mind-set so they become ‘more conscious of the ideological assumptions entrenched in Western culture’. Critical intellectuals are in a unique position to counter the status quo, as they possess the pedagogical and theoretical tools, as well as the cultural capital, to do so (Bourdieu, 1998).

Developing students as ‘critical beings’ means broadening critical thinking beyond disciplinary competence to include mastering critical self-reflection and action (Barnett, 1997). However, we recognize this is not easy, as human beings are not by their nature critical thinkers (van Gelder, 2005). We are story-telling animals that like familiar patterns/narratives we can easily understand (Shermer, 2002). Barnett (1997: 111) enumerates a number of levels of critical education equating to an expanding horizon of understanding, noting that ‘as the epistemic level rises, the object is viewed against an ever-wider context’.
Looking at political science education from the perspective of a critical consciousness, the question is 'what is the scope of critical thinking that informs the study of politics?' Is it elementary critical thinking skills of knowing how argument works, of forming valid inferences from the available, often incomplete and rudimentary data? Is the study of politics to be limited to basic structures, or will it draw on the broader social sciences? As Barnett (1997: 111) questions:

And yet more fundamentally, are the students offered an educational experience that challenges them to develop their own critical stances in a non-threatening environment, so that they acquire the dispositions of critical thinking to sustain them beyond their immediate educational framework into their future careers?

Enacting critical pedagogy necessitates redefining the roles and responsibilities of faculty and students, requiring faculty invert their self-understanding as educators (Barnett, 1997: 112), moving from 'sage on the stage' to 'guide on the side'. It 'challenges students and teachers to be aware of their own position in the larger structure of power and the role they are supposed to play in reproducing it' (Malott, 2011: 159). For faculty, this requires openness to critiquing one’s own field and being comfortable in a hybridized environment (Giroux, 1997) where disciplines overlap, and creating a space in which students can acquire the dispositions of critical thinking. For students, it means assuming responsibility for their own learning.

Affording students the space to develop critical dispositions means learning cannot simply be cognitive; rather, the experience becomes an unfolding process of inquiry. A critical approach requires students consider where their discipline comes from, how it is structured, what social functions it serves, and how it affects society (Freire, 1971; Reynolds, 1999). This not only requires building competence so students become adept at appraising their discipline and its knowledge foundations, but it also requires students examine assumptions, recognize power relationships, and engage in critical reflection with a collective focus (Reynolds, 1999). If they are to become adept at questioning assumptions, students need
to be exposed to not just a broad range of topics, but to critical expositions on those topics. With faculty and students recognizing the contestability of all knowledge claims, a learning space is created.

**Doing Critical Pedagogy**

For critical pedagogy, the educational institution is where ‘hegemonic constructions of individual, group, and national identities are buttressed’ (Leeman and Rabin, 2007: 307). Here students must be enabled to question social and political hierarchies. An underlying theme in critical pedagogy is that education is ‘a form of intervention in the world’ (Freire, 1998: 90). For Giroux (1997), critical pedagogy is purposely transformational as it adopts the position that teaching and learning are dedicated to broadening, as opposed to narrowing, the possibilities for students to be social, political, and economic agents. However, existing treatments of critical pedagogy are criticized for their dearth of discussion on how to implement such learning in the classroom (Braa and Callero, 2006). As Reynolds (1997) reflects, how can spaces be created in the classroom that prompt students to (1) examine assumptions, (2) identify power relationships, and (3) participate in collaborative efforts to critically reflect on such embedded relationships and to think through other, less exploitative, possibilities for their transformation?

Dehler, Welsh and Lewis (2003: 176) note three themes within critical pedagogy literature to help address Reynolds’s (1997) question: displacing faculty as the ‘expert in knowing’ (Raab, 1997); contesting disciplinary boundaries; and raising issues in a probelamitzing way. Deposing the all-knowing faculty is about positioning faculty and students on the same epistemologic ground, where everything is contestable (Fobes and Kaufman, 2008), and engaging in a shared journey to attempt to understand the other out of mutual respect (Barnett, 1997: 55). The resultant dialogue, breaking the tradition of classroom silence, permits the development of a critical consciousness among students (Freire, 1974). Raab’s (1997) ‘expert in not knowing’ sees the role of faculty move from imparting knowledge to encouraging students to rely on their own knowledge and experience as they endeavor to acquire more of each, creating space to engage in critical self-reflection. Contesting disciplinary
boundaries exposes students to a range of understandings beyond the managerialist through incorporating historical, philosophical, social and political treatments of organizations, business and society. Broadening their understanding affords students a 'greater breadth of reflection’ (Steffy and Grimes, 1986: 326) in developing their ‘quality of thinking’ (Grey, Knights, and Willmott, 1996: 104).

Exposure to a broader array of understandings facilitates the work of problematizing, which leads to accepting differences in place of compromising, or favoring one perspective. When engaging in problematization, students tease through interests and agendas, in the process becoming active producers, as opposed to passive recipients, of knowledge. Students move from conveying an understanding of extant theories to theorizing their own experience within the context of the broad array of understandings to which they are exposed. When they problematize, students exhibit 'intentional learning, i.e., they activate prior knowledge, relate old to new in reflective ways, reach conclusions, and assess those conclusions before settling upon them’ (Dehler, Welsh and Lewis, 2003: 177), in the process developing as 'emancipated’ learners.

We now consider freehand drawing as a means of implementing a critical pedagogy. We see freehand drawing as a way of engaging in problematization, in the process creating a learning space that encourages critical self-reflection.

**Enter Freehand Drawing**

Critical self-reflection is a rare commodity. Yet, without time for and practice in self-reflection we may not develop the capacity to recognize our own assumptive frameworks. Deep change is possible, however, when we take time to explore our own understandings and others’ viewpoints. We have found the use of freehand drawing in the classroom to be an immediate, yet non-threatening, way to focus students' attention on critical self-reflection and developing understanding of their own and others' deeply held frames.

Zuboff (1988) employed freehand drawing in a study on the diffusion of information technology, where she asked clerical workers to illustrate how they felt about their jobs before and after conversion.
to a new computer system. Zuboff (1988: 141) observed that the drawings ’functioned as a catalyst, helping them to articulate feelings that had been implicit and were hard to define’. However, visual data have found limited use in research to date (Kearney and Hyle, 2004; Kellman, 1999; MacLure, 2003; Meyer, 1991; Stiles 2004).

Noting that the opportunity to produce visual data for research purposes has been overlooked, while visual imagery is often used in published research, Meyer (1991) observes that data gathering is almost always limited to subjects’ writing, talking or counting. This observation seems as true today, with Stiles (2004: 127) contending ’the academic orthodoxy still regards images as a subjective, inferior or even eccentric form of data compared to words and numbers’. Yet, Nossiter and Biberman (1990: 15) discovered that drawings, as a research methodology, focus a person’s response and lead to ‘respondent honesty’. Art therapists (see Kellman, 1999) have used drawings for decades, recognizing this as a useful tool for examining unspoken thoughts and feelings (Kearney and Hyle, 2004). Drawings provide an insight into the psyche that written or spoken texts cannot, as there are some things that cannot easily be put into words.

Stiles (2004) posits that academics’ reluctance to embrace the pictorial form, as a means of understanding their world, could be due to subjectivity in interpretation, extreme variations in drawing ability, technical publishing difficulties and uncertainties about using the medium. Meyer (1991: 220) argues that, while it has been customary to use visual data where subjects have lacked verbal or literacy skills, research subjects not lacking in such skills frequently possess more meaningful information than they can convey verbally. It is in helping respondents access this information, and sometimes even previously unrecognized insights, that visual methods are highly effective (Butler-Kisma and Poldma, 2010). Kearney and Hyle (2004: 380) point out that visual data enhances research subjects’ capacity to make sense of things through the use of a ‘whole brain approach to accessing information and understanding organizational dynamics’. Meyer (1991) adds that drawings encourage active participation in the research process and that integration of visual with verbal data provides for a useful
form of data triangulation. In all, Meyer (1991: 232) suggests, ‘visual instruments seem uniquely suited to situations where a researcher … prefers not to force informants into his or her cognitive framework prematurely.’

Employing freehand drawing in the classroom provides a means of exploring taken-for-granted assumptions that may influence students as critical beings. Indeed, freehand drawing permits students create what they see/think. In so doing, it sharpens their observation skills, enables rapid and accurate recording of data and requires students make explicit and tangible their understanding of abstract/complex ideas/processes (Ridley and Rogers, 2010: 1). Appropriating Weick (1995: 207), ‘how can I know what I think until I see what we draw?’, freehand drawing facilitates students in building a multi-perspective take on the political, while being encouraged to maintain a skeptical, inquiring attitude.

From a social constructionist perspective, freehand drawing is a means through which to construct a shared sense of experience. Drawing pictures in response to such a question as ‘What is politics?’ is an enjoyable activity, yet deceptively revealing. By sidestepping our cognitive, verbal processing routes we tend to produce clearer, more holistic images than we do with words. These images are universally understandable, integrative, and rich with content and metaphor. When we step back from the picture we can see our taken-for-granted assumptions, particularly when juxtaposing our images with those of others. Another plus to drawing as an educational activity is it is an equalizer and icebreaker, an activity that produces laughter, humility, and rapport.

Thus, through the use of freehand drawing we are seeking to encourage liberation of the mind by allowing students the freedom to express themselves in a non-traditional manner. Additionally, freehand drawing provides the freedom to adopt a cross-disciplinary approach so as to facilitate students in ‘seeing’ our world and what it is that we do in multiple, paradigmatically challenging ways.

The use of freehand drawing, therefore, is intended to meet the calls by Bartunek, Gordon and Weathersby (1983) for ’developing complicated understanding’ and by Dehler, Welsh and Lewis (2003)
for ‘creating richer complexities’ in critical thinking that serve to question what is presented as ‘the one true way’ (Stepanovich, 2009: 726). In this respect, images possess great value, as they have the potential to economically encode significant quantities of complex information (Ridley and Rogers, 2010: 2).

Seeking to create a space for nuance and ambiguity, we complicate students’ understanding through moving away from certainty toward an acceptance of ambiguity and paradox, complexity rather than simplicity (Zohar, 1997: 9). This requires innovative pedagogies that encapsulate/communicate complexity. In this context, the advantage of using drawing, and the analogic and higher order thinking that comes from visualization, is its contribution to our ability to problem solve (Marshall, 1995).

Methodologically, freehand drawing fits with collaborative inquiry: a process of co-inquiry, where ‘doing research with people, rather than on them, is the defining principle’ (Bray, Lee, Smith and Yorks, 2000: 7), thereby shifting the emphasis from observation towards interaction. In seeing teaching as part of the research process (Dehler, Welsh and Lewis, 2003), employing freehand drawing is as much about research as about teaching. Thus, we use freehand drawing to:

- Facilitate our ability to ‘see’ how we understand a topic and that there are multiple ways of understanding;
- Question and challenge theories, orthodoxies and truths;
- Identify and scrutinize tacit assumptions; and
- Ponder other possibilities.

What We Did

We lead a semester-long Introduction to Irish Politics module with 150 first year students. The cohort is divided into three class groups, each of which meets for an hour at a time twice per week. What follows are our reflections on how we sought to encourage students to become more critically engaged. First, we outline the ‘how to’ of using freehand drawing in the classroom. Then we look at what happened.
Following introductions in the first class, we informed students that we would be engaging in a drawing exercise. We provided each with an A4 sheet, on both sides of which were printed instructions: one side said ‘Through a drawing answer the following question: What is Irish Politics?;’ the other side said ‘Now, in your own words, describe/explain what you have drawn’. They could use pens, pencils, markers or whatever drawing tools they had available. We had no prescriptions as to what they should draw other than that they use a drawing to answer the question.

These students were new to college; their only experience to this point having been a weeklong induction program and some introductory sessions for other modules. Therefore, their experience of the classroom was of the controlled secondary school environment. While they would also encounter many ‘experts in knowing’ throughout their time in college, we were interacting with them during a fluid time, when they did not know what to expect.

We gave students 15 minutes to create their drawings. As they did so, we walked around the room to get a sense of what they were producing, not stopping to look at any student’s drawing so as not to create anxiety that they were not drawing ‘what we wanted’. We were conscious they had come from a classroom environment where there was an expectation of a ‘right’ answer. We then asked the students to turn the sheet over and address the instruction on the reverse – to describe/explain in their own words what they had drawn. We allowed 10 minutes for this part of the exercise.

We then divided students into groups of five and asked that they look at all the drawings in the group and make notes on what each drawing said to them, comparing and contrasting, etc. We asked them to discuss each drawing in turn within their group, with each group member refraining from discussing their own drawing and listening to, and noting, what the others in the group were seeing in their work. We asked that one member of the group act as rapporteur, such that we had a record of the discussion for feedback to the entire class afterwards. We left it to the group to decide how the rapporteur was selected, with the selection process part of the reflection to be engaged in later. We allowed 25 minutes for this part of the exercise.
We then collected the drawings, making sure students had written their names on the narrative side of the sheet, as we would redistribute the drawings at the next class. Having the drawings allowed us look for general patterns and themes, differing perspectives, and underlying assumptions. Through this review, we generated questions to guide the discussion. It also gave us the opportunity to scan in particular drawings for possible use as examples to prompt discussion during the next class session.

We started the second class session with the rapporteurs providing an account of what their group had observed, which we noted on flipchart sheets. We refrained from commenting on any of the accounts, save for asking clarification questions. With all accounts voiced and documented, we opened the floor to reflection/discussion, asking what the exercise told us about perspectives and assumptions relating to Irish politics, about what we pay attention to and ignore, what we take for granted and do not question, etc. We were beginning the process of engaging in critical self-reflection, creating a learning space where we were all on the same epistemologic ground. This allowed us create an environment where students would not only develop in disciplinary competence, but we would ‘challenge prevailing worldviews and assumptions’ (Smith, 2003: 21).

**What Happened**

In terms of a general context, our students arrived at a time when Ireland was two years into the fallout from a burst property bubble, a banking crisis and a resultant sovereign debt crisis (in 2008 the state guaranteed the banks’ debts), all of which was precipitated and compounded by the global financial crisis. Trust in Irish business and government was the lowest of all 22 countries surveyed in Edelman’s 2010 Trust Barometer (Edelman, 2010), with just 31 per cent of respondents trusting business and 28 per cent trusting government (against a global average of 50 and 49 per cent respectively). However, trust in the political establishment had also been undermined by revelations of payments by businessmen to politicians, including to a former Taoiseach (Prime Minister), in return for favors. There were also widespread accusations of cronyism in the upper echelons of Irish society.

Lewis (2011) observed that having become one of the richest countries in the world and, with
cheap money in abundance, the Irish decided to buy their country, from one another, cheered on by the politicians and their property developer backers and enabled by the bankers. However, the party came to a jarring end, precipitated by the global financial crisis and compounded by a failed banking system. Lewis (2011) notes it took two years for the Irish public to fully appreciate the implications of the 2008 decision by a handful of politicians to guarantee the debts of the country’s biggest banks. He explains that Anglo Irish Bank, facing losses of €34 billion, would be the equivalent of $3.4 trillion in the US context, and that Anglo was only one of the banks in trouble.

The banking system had imploded and the taxpayer was being left with an increasingly expensive tab. People were stunned by the socialization of private sector losses and the inversion of capitalist philosophy. The budget, which had been in surplus up to the crisis, became a deficit, with austerity the new norm. In the boom years, Ireland could borrow money at lower interest rates than Germany; however, the bust saw bond yields rise above 6 per cent by September 2010 (The Irish Times, 2010). Unemployment, which stood at just over 4 per cent in 2006, climbed to 14.7 per cent by March 2011 (O’Brien and Cassidy, 2011). Emigration returned, with some 100,000 forecast to leave the country in 2010 and 2011 (Barrett, Kearney, Conefrey and O’Sullivan, 2011).

In this context, the drawings created were not entirely surprising. Amongst other things, we saw:

- happy bankers/politicians with lots of money, unhappy taxpayers/public with no money;
- banks being fed public money, which they burn through, with a long queue of people outside the dole office;
- politics serving business interests;
- politicians torn between serving the public and enriching themselves;
- politicians accepting backhanders in brown envelopes in return for favors;
- loyalty to political party/self interest taking precedence over public/national interest;
- government literally screwing the taxpayer;
• the Taoiseach drinking and burning the country’s money;
• the Taoiseach sunning himself on a desert island, saying ‘ah sure, it’ll be grand’, with Jaws nearby and the IMF flying past;
• the Taoiseach/government/politicians as thieves robbing the public;
• fat and wealthy politicians vs. thin and ragged public;
• the Dáil (lower house of parliament) surrounded by a high wall/railing, with politicians inside and protestors outside (See Appendix 1 for a sample of drawings).

We were seeing negative perspectives on politics. Interestingly, protest was absent in all but a couple of drawings. The drawings portrayed a sense of powerlessness and inaction, which seemed to reflect the mood of the time, unlike the violent protests in Greece. People, though unhappy, seemed to accept the status quo. This raised questions about the conservatism of Irish society, and the cronyism in the upper echelons of society, as well as in whose interest democracy functions.

With rare exception, the accounts of what they saw in their drawings demonstrated the similar and different beliefs/truths students’ observed in each other’s drawings and there was recognition of different perspectives. However, critique was superficial, limited to regarding politicians and bankers as bad. There was little in the way of identifying and questioning assumptions underlying each perspective; understanding was uncomplicated. However, as experts in not knowing, when we began to push students in their thinking, they began to identify and tentatively question their and others’ assumptions.

The following is illustrative of what we experienced during the debrief. A number of drawings showed the then Taoiseach, Brian Cowen, with a pint of Guinness in his hand or in front of a bar. The day before class, the Taoiseach was interviewed on *Morning Ireland*, a national news radio program, and a controversy erupted that he was either drunk or hung-over (Siggins and Doyle, 2010), this at a time of increasing austerity, with news emerging that a budget cut greater than initially signaled would be needed to go some way towards resolving the country’s massive deficit. The Taoiseach’s
performance raised questions about his leadership and competence to handle the economic crisis.

The drawings allowed us question perceptions/assumptions regarding leaders. During the debrief, no one questioned the depiction of the Taoiseach as someone who drinks, but neither did anyone question the assumption that he was an alcoholic, or incompetent, because of his affinity for alcohol. Rather, the perception was that he was an alcoholic and, thus, should not be Taoiseach. We then introduced the following exercise:

It is time to elect the world leader, and yours is the deciding vote. Here are facts concerning the three leading candidates:

- Candidate A: Associates with crooked politicians, and consults with astrologers. Had two mistresses. Chain smokes and drinks up to ten Martinis a day.
- Candidate B: Was ejected from office twice, sleeps until noon, used opium in college and drinks large amounts of whiskey every evening.
- Candidate C: Is a decorated war hero, a vegetarian, doesn't smoke, drinks an occasional beer and has not had any extra-marital affairs.

Many selected Candidate C, observing he seemed conscientious and the sort of person who should be a leader because of the good example he would provide. Those who drew the Taoiseach as an alcoholic all selected C. However, there was shock when we revealed Candidate C to be Adolf Hitler (A was Franklin Roosevelt and B was Winston Churchill). Those who selected Candidate C said they would not have elected him had they known more, while one student noted that we were highlighting the worst qualities of two candidates and the best of one, saying you could do that with almost anyone. This highlighted a number of lessons: the potential that we never have the full picture; to question where a partial/distorted picture is coming from; to question in whose interests a partial/distorted picture works; viewing the world as socially constructed; the importance of research; the potential partiality of and to one’s
perspective; the potential we only take on board what we want, while ignoring what we do not like, etc. We were not saying the Taoiseach was not incompetent, or a good leader; rather, we were using the drawings relating to him as an opportunity to encourage skeptical, inquiring attitudes necessary for critical self-reflection.

We used drawings to engage in a dialectical exchange with students about the political and so begin to complicate their understanding and develop their capacity for critical self-reflection. Freehand drawing helps students put into words what may be difficult to voice, including some who may be silenced through those who dominate classroom discussion, thus ‘enabling their multiple voices to be better represented/performed through the technique of “native image making”’ (Warren, 2005: 861).

**Conclusion**

We argue that in democratic societies it is vital educational institutions establish critical pedagogies that challenge the structures of those societies. The objective of universities should be to develop students not alone capable of critical thinking in their future careers, but as critical beings capable of self-reflection and willing to question widely held beliefs. This will involve students questioning their discipline, its social function and impact on society, and in the process assuming responsibility for their own learning. This approach challenges professors to reflect on their roles in the power structures in society, how they reproduce these, and, along with their students, it asks that they contest the dominant social structures. The ultimate objective of critical pedagogies should be to create questioning human beings.

Our approach to critical pedagogy is to create a participative learning environment, where students actively engage with module content, while developing as critical beings. We believe in an orientation to education as an ongoing process of learning to learn and in students engaging with that process. A critical stance may be stimulated through the use of freehand drawing because visual representation allows us comprehend how we and others ‘see’ the world. Discussing the drawings as a group encourages interpretations from multiple perspectives and gives students and professors an
opportunity to challenge theories and beliefs. Moreover, through group discussion, we can raise
questions about what is being said, listened to or viewed, in the process uncovering taken-for-granted
assumptions and aiding reflection, not just on how we come to knowledge, but on ourselves and the
wider social, institutional and political context in which we are embedded.

Designed to create a learning opportunity for students, and to complicate understanding,
freehand drawing serves to illustrate the variety of ways in which topics are understood. At the same
time, freehand drawing addresses the challenge to ‘make management education more personally
meaningful for students of management’ (Willmott, 1994: 107). Freehand drawing helps in expanding
horizons through exposing students to other worldviews, having them test those views, and encouraging
them to question their own assumptions. In so doing, freehand drawing assists in illustrating that
meaning making is a problematic process and that meaning is an emergent property (Linstead, 1996:
17).
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