

## 1. Background

I am a doctoral candidate at Jönköping International Business School (JIBS), affiliated with the Media, Management and Transformation Centre (MMTC). My academic background spans audiovisual communication, informatics, and marketing management, with studies in Colombia, Spain, and Sweden. My research examines how digital platforms shape institutions, influence, and ethical boundaries, and it directly informs my teaching across digital marketing, AI, information systems, and digital ethics. Before entering academia, I spent over fifteen years in digital marketing and technology consulting, running my own agency and working primarily with purpose-driven organisations. I also chair The Ethical Move, a nonprofit focused on ethical communication practices, and led the Digital Corps programme at Out in Tech, coordinating pro-bono website builds for LGBTQ+ activist organisations globally.

As a doctoral student my journey as an academic teacher is just beginning, but within the scope available to me, I have had a range of teaching and supervision experiences that I believe are worth reflecting on, and that is what this portfolio sets out to do.

## 2. Education

### 2.1. Subject specialisation

My academic background spans communications, marketing, informatics, and business administration. I studied Audiovisual and Multimedia Communications in Colombia, completed an MA in Marketing Management at the University of Barcelona and a BSc in Informatics with a specialization in New Media Design at Jönköping University School of Engineering (JTH). I am currently a PhD candidate in Business Administration at JIBS, with a dissertation on platform responsibility through a Complex Adaptive Systems lens and a planned defence in November 2026. I also bring nearly two decades of professional experience in digital marketing, technology consulting, and ethical communication. A full account of my qualifications is provided in Appendix A.

### 2.2. Higher education courses in teaching and learning

I am currently completing the Academic Teaching and Learning (ATL) programme at the Educator Centre for Academic Teaching and Learning (EDUCATE) at JU, with the first two modules and the portfolio course completed in 2025–2026 and the remaining three modules planned for autumn 2026.

#### Completed / In Progress:

- Designing a Teaching Portfolio, JU Educate, 2025
- Conditions and Pedagogical Perspectives (ATL1), 1.5 credits, JU Educate, 2026
- Student Active Learning (ATL2), 1.5 credits, JU Educate, 2026

#### Planned (Autumn 2026):

- Broadened Participation (ATL3), 1.5 credits, JU Educate
- Online Education (ATL4), 1.5 credits, JU Educate
- Examination and Assessment (ATL5), 1.5 credits, JU Educate

Course certificates are provided in Appendix B.

### **3. Teaching and supervision experience in higher education**

#### **3.1. Teaching**

Since joining JIBS in 2022, my teaching load has been approximately 20%; resulting in approximately 1,460 hours of work across 27 course instances at both first-cycle and second-cycle level. My first assignments were grading roles in autumn 2022. From 2023, my involvement expanded into lecturing, workshop facilitation, and course development across courses in marketing, digital business, supply chain management, and sustainable project management. The course where my role has developed most is *Digital Marketing*, where I progressively took on responsibility for most of the teaching and course design. I have also designed and delivered content for *Understanding Digital Business*, *IT-Enabled Changes in Supply Chain Management*, *Leading Change through Sustainable Projects*, *Marketing Theory*, and the *Competence Development Course*, where I developed the digital innovation module in a fully online format. I have additionally held lecturing, tutoring, and grading roles in several other courses.

All courses use a standardised student survey as the primary evaluation instrument. Full details are provided in Appendix C.

#### **3.2. Supervision at first and second cycle level**

In spring 2025, I supervised and co-graded four master's thesis teams (eight students, 30 credits each) in Business Administration, guiding them from topic selection through research design, methodology, writing, and defence. I also served as defence chair and co-grader for four additional teams. In total, I was involved in the examination of eight master's theses in my first semester of supervision. I am currently supervising two bachelor's thesis teams (five students, 15 credits) with defence planned for June 2026. Details of individual projects, including student names and titles, are provided in Appendix D.

### **4. Pedagogic activities reflection and development**

#### **4.1. My teaching philosophy**

When I started teaching at JIBS in 2022, I was working from instinct and conviction. I knew what kind of classroom I wanted to create, I had strong views about ethics and responsibility, and I had years of industry experience with training and facilitation. What I lacked was a theoretical vocabulary for understanding why certain things worked, why others did not, and how I might approach my teaching more deliberately.

I modelled my teaching after my experiences as a student with some amazing lecturers across Colombia, Spain, and Sweden. An early influence was a PhD course called CSR in the Nordics, where I became acquainted with the Principles for Responsible Management Education (PRME) and, perhaps more importantly, saw exceptional teachers modelling how critical perspectives can be taught in business schools. It gave me a template before I had the language to describe it.

My teaching is guided by a set of beliefs about what education is for and how learning happens. I arrived at these through practice rather than theory, shaped by nearly two decades of

experience as both a student and an instructor. It was only through engaging with pedagogical literature during my formal training that I found the language to articulate what I had been doing instinctively.

**Education as a tool for systemic change.** When we equip students with curiosity, ethical grounding, and the willingness to question the status quo, we prepare people who can push back against harmful practices and shape how their industries operate. Cunliffe's (2004) work on *critically reflexive practice* gave this belief theoretical depth. Her argument that management education should go beyond instrumental skill-building toward questioning assumptions, considering unintended consequences, and aligning with ethical commitments spoke directly to how I had been teaching. Her insistence that reflexivity means asking "for what and to whom are we accountable?" captures the ethical dimension I try to bring into every course. Engaging with her work opened a new understanding of pedagogy for me. It moved me from a position of instinct and conviction toward an established, informed set of concepts and tools that I could engage with, learn from, and use to enrich my practice.

**The teacher as guide and co-learner.** I see my role as guiding students through the course content while they bring forward their own lives and experiences as useful expertise in the classroom. We construct knowledge together, challenge each other, and learn from one another. Cunliffe and Eriksen's (2011) emphasis on *intersubjectivity*, the idea that we learn in relation to one another and that this brings a moral responsibility to think "we" rather than "I," captures this well. This guidance role has two complementary sides, one is about making the learning opportunities visible to students and providing enough guidance to nudge them towards learning, the other about providing them enough space to come to their own conclusions and make up their own minds. Biggs' (2014) constructive alignment framework has been particularly useful in helping me think about how learning objectives, teaching activities, and assessment need to work together coherently. Applying it to my own courses revealed gaps I had not noticed, places where what I was assessing did not fully align with what I was asking students to do in class. The revised Bloom's taxonomy (Anderson et al., 2001) gave me a more precise vocabulary for thinking about levels of learning, and for designing assignments that deliberately move students toward analysis, evaluation, and creation.

**Learning as experiences grounded in practice.** What I teach should be closely connected to the reality of the work our students will engage in when they graduate. In digital business and marketing, that reality is shifting rapidly. Automation, artificial intelligence, and platform volatility mean that tactical skills have a short shelf life. What endures is strategic and systemic thinking, parsimony, and the critical judgment to evaluate new tools and practices as they emerge. I want students prepared for the world as it will be, equipped to adapt. The best way I have found to do this is to give them the kinds of problems they will encounter and the space to work through them. Eriksen's (2012) work on *facilitating authentic becoming* extended this further by integrating the embodied and experiential dimensions of learning. His model frames learning as a continuous process that happens through doing and being, not just through cognition. This helped me understand why my practice-grounded approaches seemed to resonate with students, and gave me a foundation for developing them further based on established scholarship rather than intuition alone. Through Eriksen I found Kolb's (1984) experiential learning cycle, which gave me a reference point for the rhythm of how I teach:

students encounter something concrete, reflect on it, connect it to broader principles, and test those principles in new contexts. The active learning literature (Wallace et al., 2021; Stetson-Tiligadas, 2018) provided a framework for approaches I had arrived at through instinct: scaffolding assignments into progressive parts, using analogue exercises, letting students lead discussions.

**The classroom as a welcoming space.** I believe the classroom should be an environment where everyone feels welcome to bring their whole self, along with their experiences, their perspectives, and their questions. I model this by presenting myself authentically, honestly and humbly, and I strive to create the conditions where my students can do the same. By setting aside rigid distinctions between teacher and student, expert and novice, we create room for creativity, playfulness, and the kind of honest exchange that produces real learning. This also means actively making space for different identities, experiences, and ways of engaging. Hooks' (1994) vision of engaged pedagogy, where education is a practice of freedom and teachers are committed to the growth of everyone in the room, provides a framework to support this belief. Students respond to that authenticity, and our conversations become richer as a result.

These beliefs are interconnected; a classroom built on mutual learning and guided exploration creates space for critical thinking. Students grounded in real practice and encouraged to question are better equipped to become agents of change. And a teacher who leads with passion and humility models the kind of engagement they hope to see in their students.

By connecting my beliefs and experiences with pedagogical literature I feel I've become a more deliberate teacher. I have a richer set of concepts to draw on when something in my classroom is working or failing, and a clearer sense of where to go next. In the sections that follow, I show how these perspectives play out in specific teaching contexts.

## 4.2. Teaching in practice

In the following sections, I present four cases from my teaching that illustrate how the beliefs and theoretical perspectives described above play out in specific contexts. Each case tells a different story: iterative course development driven by student feedback, designing AI literacy for non-technical students, teaching outside my own field, and creating space for analogue, discussion-based learning in a digital age. Student evaluation quotes are drawn from the course evaluation reports included in Appendix E.

### 4.2.1. Hands-On Work in Digital Marketing

Digital Marketing is a second-cycle course where students develop a complete marketing audit and strategic brief for a real company of their choosing, working through eight modules covering different aspects of digital marketing. There are no predetermined cases or expected answers; students choose their own companies and arrive at their own conclusions. I have been involved since 2023 and have progressively taken on responsibility for most of the course design, teaching, and assessment.

The first time I taught in the course, in 2023, I had three hands-on sessions and an individual assignment. From the start, my instinct was to ground the teaching in practice, to bring an ethical angle into the content, and to give students autonomy over their work. Students chose their own companies. I did not set a page limit on the assignment, trusting them to judge what

their argument required. Some of this worked. One student wrote that the sessions *"were very good sessions. The teacher explained everything in detail and it was easy to understand."* Another described me as *"a fantastic lecturer"* and asked for *"more lectures with her on her topics."* But the autonomy I gave on the assignment backfired; several students struggled with the open scope and the workload felt unmanageable relative to three sessions. One wrote that the assignment *"was 45 points however we only had 3 workshops that went through the content just briefly."* In hindsight, I was asking students to be autonomous without giving them enough structure to succeed. The course scored 4.6/7, consistent with its historical scores.

The following year, the examiner and I expanded my role to eight sessions. I developed five new modules and took on most of the teaching and evaluation. I participated in the revision of the syllabus alongside the examiner and the program director. With more sessions, I could better connect the practical exercises to the assignment and give students the support the previous year had lacked. Students highlighted *"the freedom on working on things I really like and get an amazing support from her"* and described the course as *"refreshing and enjoyable."* One student wrote: *"as a person who has always questioned marketing knowledge and was confident that I WOULDN'T DO GOOD IN THIS SKILL, I was proved wrong. Her support encouraged me to believe in the work I did."* The assignment scope remained a challenge; students wanted it more focused and asked for more time per topic. One suggested replacing pre-reading articles with videos, noting that *"it would be more interesting and useful to have videos before every lecture explaining the content."* The course scored 5.5/7.

In 2025, the biggest change was breaking the single large assignment into weekly submissions aligned with each module, so students built their brief progressively rather than delivering one large report at the end of the semester. Students responded well. One called it *"the best course I have had ever in my 4 years of uni, fun content, a lot of practical knowledge."* The learning environment was described as *"inclusive, very engaging."* One student highlighted, without prompting, that *"we had the opportunity to learn not only the what to do but also to think about ethical implications and or responsibility on it."* The course scored 5.8/7.

But the scaffolding solved one problem and surfaced new ones. With 53 students submitting weekly, grading became unmanageable and I could not provide the quality of feedback students deserved. One wrote: *"I wish the feedback was clearer on how to improve. Sometimes I would receive a 7.5/9 and a comment that says 'well done' and I wish I could've known how to improve."* There was also too much content to properly discuss in class; if I wanted students to participate and think critically while also covering core skills, I was always rushing.

For 2026, I made changes informed by student feedback, my own reflection, and the scaffolding and constructive alignment literature I have since engaged with through the ATL programme (Biggs, 2014; Stetson-Tiligadas, 2018). The weekly structure that students responded well to was something I arrived at intuitively in 2025; now that I have the theoretical grounding, I can approach it more deliberately, reworking the assignments to better align each week's teaching, activity, and assessment with the same learning objectives while making the workload more sustainable. I am developing text and video content to cover foundational skills, in response to a suggestion first raised in 2024, which frees classroom time for discussion and critical engagement without needing to rush through it. I added a session and introduced lab hours for technical questions. I am reworking the rubrics, so they function more clearly as feedback

instruments, addressing the gap students identified. And I am publishing my own take on each assignment, how I would approach it and what grade I would give myself, so students can see what different levels of performance look like. This is part of working alongside students rather than above them; if I ask them to be transparent about their reasoning, I should model that transparency myself.

This course is where I can most clearly trace my development as a teacher. In 2023, my beliefs about grounding teaching in practice, giving students autonomy, and integrating an ethical perspective were already present, but I lacked the pedagogical tools to implement them well. The mismatch between three sessions and an extensive assignment was a constructive alignment problem I could now name but at the time only felt. The scaffolding I introduced in 2025 out of practical reasoning turned out to be well supported by the literature I encountered later through the ATL programme. And the ongoing tension between breadth of content and depth of engagement is one I am still learning to navigate.

### **4.2.2. Teaching AI to non-technical students**

I have taught AI-related content in two different courses to students with very different backgrounds, and the contrast has been one of the most instructive experiences in my teaching.

#### **4.2.2.1. Understanding Digital Business**

The first was the AI module in Understanding Digital Business, a second-cycle course in the Digital Business Management programme. I started in 2023 with a single introductory session shared with the program director. The feedback was mixed; one student described us as "really passionate and knowledgeable," while another wrote that the AI session "had so much potential, but did not deliver it." That was fair. The session was split between a slower first half and my own half which was rushed, too technical, and tried to cover too much ground in too little time. In 2024 I was given the full session on my own, with more autonomy over content and delivery. By 2025 it had expanded into a full module with two teaching sessions.

The subject changes so rapidly that the module requires significant redesign every year; what was cutting edge in 2023 was baseline knowledge by 2025. Furthermore, the content needs to be tailored to the knowledge and needs of each cohort of students; in the case of this course, they tend to be more apprehensive about software and tools, so the sessions lean on discussion, case analysis, and exploring implications together. A recurring starting point is getting students to think about what we mean by AI; I use a quiz format where students evaluate whether specific examples are AI or not, which surfaces the distinction between automated rule-based systems and actual machine learning. The 2025 evaluation scored 6.3/7, with students describing the lectures as "fun and engaging." One student, however, noted that "the course had a negative view of algorithms and AI, instead of showing more on how to utilize them." This is a tension I think about carefully. I bring a critical perspective to AI because I believe it is part of my responsibility as an educator, but I need to ensure the critical angle does not come at the expense of students also understanding how to work with these tools effectively. Getting that balance right is an ongoing challenge.

#### **4.2.2.2. IT-Enabled Changes in Supply Chain Management**

The second context was IT-Enabled Changes in Supply Chain Management, where I was invited as a guest lecturer in 2025 and returned in 2026 with an expanded role. This course sits outside my area of expertise; I have no background in supply chains. I give these students an introduction to information systems as a field and the logic of systems, and then move into AI as a system within that context. These students come from a different starting point: many have backgrounds in data or engineering, they work with Enterprise Resource Systems (ERP) in labs, and they are more interested in applied, hands-on work. For them I designed a lab using Jupyter notebooks and synthetic datasets, which felt natural given their technical orientation. The initial case material I developed for the digital business course inspired this fuller lab, so each experience has fed into the other. The 2025 feedback was encouraging; one student wrote: *"include more sessions from Maria Arango Kure. With a single session she impressed me a lot with her knowledge in this field."*

The overlap between the two courses is significant; both groups need to understand what AI is and how organisations use it. But the delivery is entirely different. What works in one classroom does not transfer directly to the other, and learning to read the room, to adapt the same core content to different audiences and different expectations, has sharpened my teaching considerably.

#### **4.2.3. Teaching beyond my comfort zone**

Two teaching experiences have pushed me outside my comfort zone and encouraged me to question my assumptions and procedures and grow in different ways. In one I taught content that was new to me; in the other I experimented with a teaching method I had not used before.

##### **4.2.3.1. Teaching change and sustainability**

I was invited into a first-cycle course on change management for sustainability, and asked to design a *Theory of Change* workshop based on materials from Stanford University. The content was outside my academic training, so I leaned on additional resources I had at hand: my professional experience, a critical thinking orientation, and the ability to walk students through the material rather than lecture at them. I built the workshop around two examples; a real case from my work with a nonprofit that coordinates pro-bono digital projects for LGBTQ+ organisations globally, a case that was chosen by the students during the session. We followed the steps of the workshop together with these two examples as guides.

Students described the teaching as *"more a discussion compared to a monologue"* and noted that *"neither teacher made you feel stupid for giving your thoughts or opinion."* However, one student described my use of examples from LGBTQ+ organisations as *"propaganda."* I include these examples in the course material because they are genuine cases from my professional practice and because I believe discussing human rights and inclusion belong in business education. But the experience taught me something about audience; I had mostly taught second-cycle students and perhaps treated this first-cycle group with the same assumptions, it was a good reminder to engage sensitive subjects with more nuance and adapted to the audience.

Throughout my time teaching the examiner made a point of providing written feedback after my sessions, noting strengths in interaction and energy, and offering constructive suggestions on

questioning techniques and managing participation. It was a great opportunity to learn from a more experienced lecturer and identify suggestions for improvement, which I have tried to incorporate since. One student in 2025 wrote that *"the lectures with especially Maria were really insightful."* I will return to the course in 2026.

#### **4.2.3.2. The analogue classroom**

In a second-cycle Marketing Theory course, I was asked to lead a four-hour seminar where students would discuss three academic papers on branding. On the day, I was having technical difficulties and decided to go fully analogue. I raided the supply room for sticky notes and designed an exercise based on a format I remembered from a product development workshop in industry.

Each student wrote four core ideas from their paper on the sticky notes. Then they paired up and reduced their eight to four, debating which concepts overlapped or should win out. Pairs found pairs and repeated the process, then groups of four found groups of four, until the whole class converged. The walls ended up covered in sticky notes and we walked the room listening to how the process had unfolded. In the second half, each group presented their paper through the four concepts they had converged on and led a discussion.

Students described the seminar as *"interactive"* with *"a lot of good perspectives"* and noted that *"it was more fluent and not only sit still in groups and then discuss."* One wrote: *"Everyone talks about how great she is."* The first year I ran the exercise in this analogue format out of necessity, the second year I deliberately brought it back because I had seen its potential. With two groups per year, I ran the exercise four times in total, which gave me the chance to finetune the format with each iteration. The following year under a different examiner, a student listed *"the seminar with Maria"* as a highlight of the course.

This experience taught me to think on my feet. Despite coming from a technology-oriented background, my teaching does not depend on digital tools, and I can deliver with whatever tools I have at hand. Sometimes shaking things up leads to new insights and genuinely enjoyable moments, both for students and for me. Letting students take the lead in presenting, discussing, and battling it out with each other produced a richer conversation than I could have led from the front of the room. The format has its roots in my industry experience rather than in pedagogical theory, but I have since recognised it as an example of active learning and peer instruction, approaches I later encountered through the ATL programme.

What both experiences share is that they forced me to teach from my core rather than from expertise or habit. When I cannot fall back on deep subject knowledge or on my usual digital tools, what remains are my principles: creating a space where students feel safe to engage, building knowledge together, and trusting the process. These experiences have made me a more flexible and, I think, a more honest teacher.

#### **4.2.4. Supervision at different levels**

My first supervision experience was in spring 2025, when I supervised and co-graded four master's thesis teams and served as defence chair and co-grader for four more. Eight teams in total taught me more about my teaching than I expected. As a supervisor, each team required me to find a completely different balance between encouraging and challenging them; learning

when to intervene and when to let students work through difficulty on their own has been the central challenge for me. The experience also taught me a practical lesson about boundaries; early on, I had not set clear expectations about my availability, which led to messages and requests outside of regular channels and hours. I now know to address this explicitly at the start of every supervision relationship. As defence chair, I had to read and evaluate work I had not followed from the inside, run the seminar, and give constructive feedback in a formal setting, a different skill entirely, with a fair amount of overlap in terms of knowing when to challenge and when to encourage. Later, in spring 2026, I was assigned the role of supervisor for two bachelor's thesis teams. The shift from second-cycle to first-cycle has been noticeable; these students need more structure, more explicit guidance on academic writing, and more help being realistic about what they can accomplish in the time they have. Overall, these processes have allowed me to work with students very closely and to put my teaching philosophy and approach to the test in small groups with close interactions. It has challenged me and led to making connections with my students, that I hope will last beyond the completion of their degree.

But supervision has also surfaced a tension I had not anticipated. Many of my students, at both levels, struggled to understand the thesis as academic research. Their problem statements read like consulting briefs, their contributions were framed as recommendations for companies, and their research designs resembled corporate reports more than scholarly inquiry. They did not seem to see the difference, and I have had to ask myself whether my own practice-oriented teaching contributed to that confusion. I believe deeply in grounding education in real-world application, but supervision has made me reckon with the possibility that an emphasis on practice, without enough scaffolding of what makes academic work distinct, can leave students unprepared for the shift a thesis demands. This is not a resolved tension. It has made me more deliberate about distinguishing between practical relevance and academic rigour in all my teaching, and about naming that distinction explicitly rather than assuming students will find it on their own.

Another significant and perhaps ironic challenge has been around AI tools. The university permits their use for tasks like grammar correction, but what I see in practice is students who lack the discernment to use them well. They paste in paragraphs of sensational language and conceptual soup generated by LLMs without recognising that it sounds impressive but says nothing. They "coin" terms that are simply established concepts discussed in new language. For example, one group proudly presented their newly invented concept and methodological contribution of "emotional temperature," which turned out to be what we have always known by the name of sentiment analysis. The AI had convinced them they had invented something revolutionary, and they didn't know any better. This is precisely the gap between tool use and critical thinking that my teaching philosophy is built around, and supervision has shown me how wide that gap can be when students have not yet developed the academic judgement to question what a tool gives them.

I have learned the importance of showing the path to the students and going back to basics with respect and even a hint of humour. My goal is to help them consider and reflect on the mission of the dissertation and their use of tools, so they come to their own conclusions. Supervision, more than any other part of my teaching, has tested my belief in walking alongside students

rather than above them. Eriksen's (2012) notion of facilitating authentic becoming has been a useful anchor; the goal is not to produce a perfect thesis but to support a process through which students develop as thinkers and researchers.

### 4.3. Personal pedagogical development and future plans

The teaching cases in the previous sections trace my pedagogical development from 2022 to the present: from instinct-driven teaching to a more deliberate, theoretically informed practice. The most significant shift has been learning to name what I was already doing and then using that vocabulary to identify what I was doing poorly and improve it. Engaging with pedagogical literature through the ATL programme transformed not just how I design courses but how I think about what happens in my classroom.

Looking ahead, I plan to complete the remaining ATL modules in autumn 2026 and pursue supervision-specific training, having seen first-hand how much engaging with pedagogy improved my teaching and wanting to bring the same deliberateness to my supervision practice. Furthermore, I want to continue creating teaching materials, cases, and resources that are useful not only for my own students but for other teachers working in similar areas.

More broadly, I want my pedagogical work to contribute to bridging the gap between academia and society. I believe education and communication are the most powerful tools we have for making research matter beyond the university, and I intend to focus on developing approaches that do exactly that, whether through responsible management education, public engagement, or the kinds of discovery-based learning I have begun to build in my courses.

## 5. Development of teaching and learning material

I have developed teaching materials in response to specific pedagogical needs in my courses. In each case, the motivation was the same: existing resources were either unavailable, not suited to the students I was teaching, or did not align with how I wanted them to learn.

**AI exploration lab.** A synthetic dataset and annotated Jupyter notebook designed for non-technical business students to explore AI model performance and limitations through hands-on analysis. The lab grew out of my AI teaching across Understanding Digital Business and IT-Enabled Supply Chain Management, where I found that existing AI teaching materials either assumed technical backgrounds or stayed at a purely conceptual level. I wanted students to encounter real analytical problems without needing programming skills. The lab has been developed into a formal teaching case with teaching notes, in collaboration with the course examiner, and a student survey has been designed to collect empirical data on learning outcomes.

**Pre-recorded video lectures.** Produced for the digital innovation module of the Competence Development Course, which was delivered fully online. The module required self-contained content that could stand on its own without live interaction, covering key concepts in digital innovation through short, structured videos paired with discussion prompts.

**Pre-recorded foundational video materials.** In development for Digital Marketing, covering foundational skills ahead of each session. This responds directly to student feedback from 2024

requesting video content alongside reading materials and supports a shift toward using classroom time for discussion and application rather than introducing basics.

Links to resources are provided in Appendix F.

## **6. Collegial collaboration for learning**

Much of my pedagogic development has happened outside of my own courses, through contributions to the broader teaching and learning environment at JIBS and JU. This section describes those activities, organised by theme. Supporting documentation is provided in Appendix G.

### **6.1. Pedagogic contributions at the university**

Beyond my teaching, I have contributed to the broader pedagogic environment at JIBS and JU in several ways, drawing on expertise developed through my industry and nonprofit experience. I have also co-supervised student interns developing a digital communications audit and strategy for MMTC.

I have a longstanding commitment to accessibility and inclusion, rooted in my industry work and personal experience. At JIBS, I have held two sessions on accessibility and inclusion for administrative staff and one for students in connection with Leading Change through Sustainable Projects, outside of the regular course assignments. I have been invited to present on inclusion among doctoral students in research education at a national meeting of doctoral programme administrators hosted at JU in April 2026, alongside guests from the Swedish Higher Education Authority (UKÄ).

On the AI side, I gave an informal presentation on ChatGPT and its implications at an MMTC research centre dinner in December 2022, shortly after the tool's public launch, followed by a session at a JIBS pedagogical event. I presented an overview of machine learning and computational methods at the JIBS "AI Days" internal seminar and contributed to the development of JIBS guidelines for student AI use as part of a working group.

I am a co-organiser of the Data Methods Initiative (DMI), a seminar series and workshop programme aimed at empowering social scientists to apply computational methods in their research. The DMI brings together scholars from business, sociology, communication, and information systems for collaborative, practice-oriented methodological inquiry. This work sits at the intersection of research and pedagogy; it is fundamentally about teaching and learning, but among colleagues rather than students.

### **6.2. Leadership, administration, and development experience**

I was invited to participate in the programme revision meetings for the Digital Business Management and AI programme, where I contributed to the development of intended learning outcomes and course descriptions for several courses. I also contributed to the syllabus development for a course in the International Marketing master's programme. This involvement was informal, as programme development is not typically a responsibility held by PhD candidates, but it gave me insight into programme-level coordination and the relationship between individual courses and broader programme design.

## 7. Development, research and dissemination

This is an area I am actively developing. The AI exploration lab described in Section 5 includes a student survey designed to collect empirical data on learning outcomes, and I am working with the course examiner to develop it into a scholarly publication on discovery-based AI pedagogy for non-technical students. I am also preparing a conference track proposal on responsible management education, focused on how critical and ethical perspectives can be integrated into business school teaching through experiential methods.

These are early steps, but they reflect a deliberate intention to contribute to the scholarship of teaching and learning alongside my subject-area research. Supporting documentation is provided in Appendix H.

## 8. Pedagogical activity outside the university

My teaching practice did not begin at JIBS. My earliest teaching experience was as a teaching assistant at Universidad de La Sabana in Colombia in 2009–2010, where I supported undergraduate courses in audiovisual communication. Before entering academia, I held roles across industry and the nonprofit sector that involved significant training, facilitation, and knowledge sharing.

As the owner of a digital marketing agency, I developed training materials and ran workshops for clients on digital marketing strategy, tools, and best practices. Additionally, I have supervised and mentored student interns, guiding them through practical projects in digital marketing and ethical communication with my clients. This work required adapting complex technical content to non-technical audiences, a skill that has directly informed my university teaching.

Through Out in Tech's Digital Corps programme, which I lead as head of the committee, I coordinate website-building events for LGBTQ+ activist organisations globally. This involves training core team members, teaching volunteers on event days how to build websites, and training the activist organisations on maintaining their online presence safely and effectively.

As chairperson of The Ethical Move, I have developed popular science materials, workshops, seminars, and clinics on ethical communication practices. I have also delivered seminars based on my bachelor's thesis research in collaboration with the Ethical Design Network.

I regularly teach marketing in collaboration with Violant, a nonprofit organisation in Spain that works with entrepreneurs coming from situations of financial violence, helping them build sustainable businesses.

Supporting documentation is provided in Appendix I.

## 9. Other pedagogical qualifications

I am a Distinguished Toastmaster (DTM), the highest designation awarded by Toastmasters International. The programme involves years of public speaking, structured evaluation of other speakers, mentoring newer members, and leading clubs. While not a formal pedagogical qualification, it has directly shaped how I communicate in the classroom, how I give feedback, and how I create space for others to develop confidence in presenting their ideas.

---

## 10. References

- Anderson, L.W., Krathwohl, D.R., Airasian, P.W., Cruikshank, K.A., Mayer, R.E., Pintrich, P.R., Raths, J. and Wittrock, M.C. (2001) *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York: Longman.
- Biggs, J. (2014) Constructive alignment in university teaching. *HERDSA Review of Higher Education*, 1, pp. 5–22.
- Cunliffe, A.L. (2004) On becoming a critically reflexive practitioner. *Journal of Management Education*, 28(4), pp. 407–426.
- Cunliffe, A.L. and Eriksen, M. (2011) Relational leadership. *Human Relations*, 64(11), pp. 1425–1449.
- Eriksen, M. (2012) Facilitating authentic becoming. *Journal of Management Education*, 36(5), pp. 698–736.
- Hmelo-Silver, C.E., Duncan, R.G. and Chinn, C.A. (2007) Scaffolding and achievement in problem-based and inquiry learning: A response to Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark (2006). *Educational Psychologist*, 42(2), pp. 99–107.
- hooks, b. (1994) *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Kolb, D.A. (1984) *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Stetson-Tiligadas, S. (2018) *Activity Design for the Active Classroom*. CAST Professional Publishing.
- Wallace, M.L., Walker, J.D. and Dougherty, M. (2021) *Active Learning in College Science: The Case for Evidence-Based Practice*. Springer.

## 11. Appendices

- Appendix A: Subject specialisation
  - A1: Transcript of Records BS degree in Informatics New Media Design (JTH)
  - A2: Diploma, description and records MA degree in Marketing Management (IL3)
  - A3: Transcript of Records PhD in Business Administration (JIBS)
- Appendix B: Pedagogic specialisation
  - B1: Certificate of Completion ATL Courses Educate Jönköping University
- Appendix C: Teaching experience
  - C1: Course Syllabi
  - C2: Director of Studies Certificate
- Appendix D: Supervision experience
  - D1: Supervision Course Syllabi
- Appendix E: Supporting documents
  - E1: Course evaluation reports
  - E2: Course coordinator letters
- Appendix F: Teaching materials and resources
  - F1: AI exploration lab
  - F2: Pre-recorded video lectures on digital innovation
  - F3: Pre-recorded foundational video materials on digital marketing
- Appendix G: Course and programme development
  - G1: Programme development contributions letter
- Appendix H: Research on teaching and learning
  - H1: AI exploration lab student survey instrument
  - H2: Conference track proposal on responsible management education
- Appendix I: Pedagogic activities outside the university
  - I1: TA recommendation letter, Universidad de La Sabana, 2009–2010
  - I2: Out in Tech Digital Corps
  - I3: The Ethical Move
  - I4: Violant collaboration
- Appendix J: Other pedagogical qualifications