

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Stoten, David (2020) Practical heutagogy: Promoting personalised learning in management education. Adult Learning. ISSN 1045-1595 (In Press)

Published by: SAGE

URL:

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/41997/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



**Northumbria
University**
NEWCASTLE



UniversityLibrary

Practical heutagogy: Promoting personalised learning in management education.

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to highlight the benefits to both organisations and individuals in adopting heutagogy within management education in order to develop individual capability. This conceptual paper is based on a systematic review of the literature relating to heutagogy and learning theory. This paper calls for the adoption of heutagogic learning within management education alongside traditional pedagogy and andragogy. It provides a number of practical examples of how heutagogy may be implemented in a variety of contexts, ranging from undergraduate study to senior leadership positions within organisations. This paper contributes to the growing interest and literature related to new forms of student-centred learning and, in particular, heutagogy. This paper is an original contribution to the discourse on student-centred learning and the contribution that heutagogy may make to the professional development of individuals.

Keywords

Heutagogy; Capability-based learning; Management education; Curriculum innovation.

The need to revise how we educate managers is widely acknowledged within the management education community. The key issue looking forward is then- how should we approach the reform of management education? The purpose of this paper is to articulate the case for the adoption of heutagogic practices in management education, with a view of promoting individual capability. In his important paper, Teece (2011) called for a broader curriculum that was concerned with meeting changing expectations of management practice within a ‘dynamic capabilities framework’. For others, such as Grey (2002), the reform of management education should extend beyond the content of the curriculum to include wider social agendas that resonate with giving voice to a wider range of stakeholders. All too often, the discourse on *what* management education should aim for is conducted at the expense of *how* we should reform educational practice. This preoccupation with content over process is myopic and misleading as both are mutually reinforcing and integral to effective management learning.

This paper offers a way forward that is predicated on the adoption of heutagogic principles that provides a meaningful amalgam of content and process within management education. Heutagogy has been defined as the ‘study of self-determined learning.... [with] emphasis on developing capability, self-reflection, and metacognition... double-loop learning, and non-linear learning and teaching processes’. (Blaschke & Hase, 2016, p. 27). Heutagogy originated in developments within the Australian military to promote professional learning through an emphasis on student ownership and has attracted interest from those who wish to diversify the range of learning opportunities for professional practice. Although Halsall, Powell and Snowden (2016) prefer to describe heutagogy as an approach or a framework for learning, others (Hase, 2009; Blaschke & Hase, 2016) see it as having a theoretical grounding in constructivist thought with particular applications in a work-based context. According to

Blaschke (2012, p.57) ‘heutagogy has the potential to become a theory of distance education, in part due to the ways in which heutagogy further extends the andragogic approach and also due to the affordances it offers when applied to emerging technologies in distance education’. If we accept that heutagogy can usefully inform curriculum design, then how can we apply heutagogic principles in practice? This conceptual paper draws from the literature on management education and learning theory to argue for the adoption of heutagogic approaches in management education.

The changing context to management practice and education

The traditional didactic model of knowledge transmission that has characterised much of management education in the past is increasingly viewed as being inadequate in preparing learners for their future careers (Gray, 2004; Bennis & O’Toole, 2005; Marques, 2013; Chai & Kong, 2017). As developed economies move from the post-industrial to an information-based and knowledge management epoch, expectations of managers are changing and being redefined by a range of concerns, not least as the result of globalisation. Moreover, notions of what future management will involve is complicated by the changing nature of organisations, with increasingly fluid structures with varied forms decision-taking fora and shifting topographies of organisational behaviours and culture. Beyond organisations as Lyons (2012) alludes to, the increasingly complexity associated with the management of information will require new skills sets for particular individuals as we engage in ‘fast markets’. For Lyons (2012, p.413):

Our world economy is on a number of paths that simply cannot continue the nearly straight-line continuations they have been on over recent decades. A straight line will hit a wall... Key to getting this right is having the right human capital to bend those paths. Path-bending leaders are not just CEOs,

but people working at all levels in all kinds of organizations.

In a world characterised by volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity [VUCA] (Bennett & Lemoine, 2014; Chai & Kong, 2017) managers are therefore required to be adaptable to changing contexts and demands as ‘path-benders’, each of who because of their personal professional context will have individual learning goals (Jones, 2010; Richardson, McGowan & Styger, 2017; McPhee & Przedpelska, 2018; van Laere & Lindblom, 2018; Neck & Corbett, 2018). Consequently, those who devise management education programmes have engaged in discourse on how to refashion approaches to teaching and learning within Business Schools in order to develop future skills sets. In particular, a number of specific challenges in relation to the facilitation of enquiry-based and collaborative learning. One notable approach in this search for a better understanding of how students learn as individuals is evidenced in the literature relating to ‘Self- Regulated Learning’ (Pintrich & de Groot, 1990; Zimmerman, 1998; Boekaerts & Cascallar, 2006) ‘Self-Determined Learning’ [heutagogy] (Hase & Kenyon, 2000; Hase & Kenyon 2007; Canning & Callan, 2010; Hase, 2011; Blaschke, 2011; Blaschke, 2012) and ‘Self- Directed Learning’ [andragogy] (Knowles, 1984; Neck & Corbett, 2017). This conceptual paper contributes to the discourse related to the reform of management education.

Literature review:

Changing conceptions of the Business School curriculum

As alluded to above, the professional development of future managers has come under scrutiny for a number of reasons. The Great Financial Crisis post 2008 intensified the debate over what we should teach future managers and how learning should be facilitated. In

particular, Business Schools were criticised as being divorced from wider society (Grey, 2002), pre-occupied with parochial research and having little direct contact with business organisations (Bennis & O'Toole, 2005; Ghoshal, 2005; Khurana, 2007; Mintzberg, 2004; Pfeffer & Fong, 2002; Podolny, 2009; Nisula & Pekkola, 2018). Underpinning these concerns were issues relating to the relevance of the curriculum and the way students were taught as well as the value-system upon which the curriculum was predicated.

Henry Mintzberg has been at the forefront of those who have criticised the curriculum of Business Schools arguing that they 'train the wrong people in the wrong ways with the wrong consequences (Mintzberg, 2004, p. 6). Mintzberg (2004) argued that to set out to 'teach' management is not only impractical but profoundly undesirable. Furthermore, Gosling and Mintzberg (2006, p. 420) argue that 'management education should be restricted to practising managers.... Since management is a practice, not a profession'. The thesis presented by Gosling and Mintzberg (2006) claims that managerial skills are learnt through experience and reflection, not through abstract theorisation. This critique is predicated on a desire to address business problems through socially-situated and responsible management. Management education is therefore concerned with identifying those managerial skills necessary for future work-place environments, and in devising a curriculum that can deliver this vision. This critique generates questions of how we conceive what should be taught to aspiring managers, when and how.

In order to deliver change, greater emphasis upon the idea and realisation of individual capability in the workplace is required, and that entails a shift from cohort-based notions of education to the idea of a personalised curriculum. In recent decades, competency-based approaches to management education and development have dominated ideas of curriculum design. Management competence is defined by Albanese (1989, p. 66) as being 'a skill and/or personal characteristic that contributes to effective managerial performance'. Draganidis and

Mentzas (2006, p. 56) state that, ‘competencies are the building blocks of competency models’ and ‘the model can provide identification of the competencies employers need to develop in order to improve performance [and]... be useful in a skills gap analysis’. However, Sharma (2017, p. 11) argues that ‘there is a need for providing an alternative paradigm for management education which integrates principles of managing self, people and business and the various management functions with integrity and social responsibility’.

Business Schools have responded to criticism that they do not teach responsible management practice. According to Greenberg, Deets, Erzurumlu, Hunt, Manwaring, Rodgers and Swanson (2017) over 600 institutions in 85 countries have signed-up to the ‘Principles of Responsible Management Education’ (PRME) project. The PRME principles are viewed as statements of intent in reshaping the curriculum. In particular, the first three principles outline a commitment to change (Godeman, Haertle, Herzig & Moon, 2014, p. 17):

‘Purpose: “We will develop the capabilities of students to be future generators of sustainable value for business and society at large and to work for an inclusive and sustainable global economy”. (Principle 1)

‘Values: “We will incorporate into our academic activities and curricula the values of global social responsibility as [portrayed in international initiatives such as the United Nations Global Compact”. (Principle 2)

‘Method: “We will create educational frameworks, materials, processes and environments that enable effective learning experiences for responsible leadership”. (Principle 3).

Christopher, Laasch, & Roberts (2017) argue that Business Schools should teach those principles- such as PRME- that associated with socially responsible and ethical practice as part of their curriculum. If Business Schools are to rise to the challenge presented by and Christopher et al. (2017), a future curriculum should be predicated on a set of new values and expectations that individuals share. In particular, Business Schools must address a number of key issues in their redesign of their curriculum, which relate to the development professional capability and identity, the embedding of ethics and responsible management into practice, as well as the recognition wider societal concerns such as environmental sustainability and social justice. In this sense, we should look to inculcate values as well as competencies within our understanding of management capability.

The traditional, narrowly defined competency-based approach is then inadequate for our future needs. A focus on identifying those core professional skills may be foundational to an understanding of management education but this must also be supplemented with a focus on the development of the capability of individuals. This focus on the individual and the development of their personal capability can be promoted through heutagogic practices that place responsibility on the learner to develop professional values as well as skills. This could be facilitated, for example, through negotiated project work on possible positive and negative externalities of business in society, as well as an exploration of corporate social responsibility. This shift towards a broader understanding of capability must prepare future managers to be able to respond to a volatile and uncertain world in a transparent and responsible manner.

Changing conceptions of learning within Business Schools and the potential for heutagogy

Theories of future learning are changing how we envisage the design of the curriculum from one of knowledge acquisition to one that is concerned with adaptive intelligence. Future learning is increasingly associated with creativity, collaboration and capability rather than knowledge of a subject domain and attendant skills. The capability to manage one's own learning is key to a person's long-term potential professional advancement. As Nilson (2013, p. 1) recognises, 'only lifelong learners will be able to keep with the explosive growth of knowledge and skills in their career and to retool'. Moreover, as Quinn and Wenness (2008, p. 353) allude to 'the ever-increasing pace of change affecting social, political, economic and organisational spheres means that our knowledge, understanding and skills require constant augmentation and reframing...by engaging in critical thinking about the purposes and practices of their work'. In short, future lifelong learning will necessitate the development of adaptable learners who are able to demonstrate analytical skills, reflexivity and critical insight.

Heutagogy (Hase & Kenyon, 2000) is seen as providing a suitable theoretical framework within which to conceptualise how the goal of promoting adult learning within a professional or training context. It may be viewed as an evolutionary development from the pioneering work of Knowles (1984) in the sense that both represent a shift from teacher-led pedagogy towards greater learner-centred conceptions of learning. Hase and Kenyon (2000) differentiate between heutagogy from pedagogy where students are viewed as being led by their teacher to a defined body of knowledge, and andragogy in which the learner works with the support of a mentor to tackle a topic. Luckin, Clarke, Garrett, Whitworth, Akass, Cook, and Robertson (2011) present heutagogy as being part of a continuum, with teacher-led pedagogy at one pole and student-led heutagogy at the opposing pole, with andragogy mediating a position between these two poles (see Table 1). This notion of a continuum is

useful for a model of learning as it infers that a number of approaches may be appropriate at different points within a curriculum.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Table 1. A summary of pedagogy, andragogy and heutagogy.

Described as a child of complexity theory, heutagogy offers an approach to learning in which is:

An extremely complex process that occurs within the learner, is unobserved and is not tied to the curriculum. Learning is associated with making new linkages in the brain involving ideas, emotions, and experience that leads to new understanding about self or the world. Thus, learning occurs in random and chaotic ways and is a response to personal need, and often, occurs to solve some ambiguity (Hase, 2011, p. 2).

The defining characteristics of heutagogy are: the empowerment of learners to negotiate their own learning journey through a bespoke curriculum that meets their individual goals and is assessed by those criteria established by the learner. Heutagogy therefore represents an attempt to personalise a curriculum that is focussed on the development of professional capability.

Hase (2011, p. 4-7) points out:

There are a number of implications of heutagogy for designing the educational or training experience.... We need to find the guru within the learner rather than the teacher. This points to a whole new set of skills for teachers/facilitators/educators that involve working with learners to work through and solve problems, finding resources, being empathetic, listening, collaborating with the learner.

For Blaschke (2011, p. 3) 'by teaching and guiding learners in the development of their reflective skills, educators thus support students in developing their capacity to learn and better prepare for lifelong learning'. Although the 'directional' role of the educator is substantially redefined and minimised in heutagogy, the role of the teacher as a 'collaborator' is still relevant in engaging the student in learning. In an echo of Socratic methodology,

Bergman (2009) suggests that educators should focus on asking students open-ended questions that promote reflection and higher order thinking skills. This practice may be achieved through prompting students' thoughts through enquiry-based questioning and involving students in collaborative discussions. For example, Narayan, Herrington and Cochrane (2019, p. 99) describe how they applied heutagogic principles in the design of an undergraduate degree in journalism. These heutagogic principles were centred on encouraging learner participation; facilitating learning tools that were owned by students; situating learning within authentic contexts that enable student inquiry; placing formative assessment within authentic personal contexts; and providing technical support when using information technology. Although the role of the teacher is substantially redefined in heutagogy, their role as a 'critical friend' who is able to support a student during a learning journey remains important.

The literature offers a number of practical suggestions on how heutagogic principles may be implemented by educators. For example, Snowden and Halsall (2016) describe two possible strategies to promote heutagogic learning in practice. The first strategy is predicated on developing a problem solving approach to learning. As Barrows and Tamblyn (1980) describe, problem-based solving supports student-centred, individualised learning, although it can also be usefully deployed in teacher-led activities. It is also highly relevant in vocational preparation as it presents the learner with grounded, real-life challenges that promote phronesis- that is practical wisdom. In this sense, we can think of wisdom as experiential in origin, and differentiate this from expertise that is based on subject knowledge. So, for example, undergraduate students adopt the role of a business consultant and engage with organisations through a 'Digitally Enabled Business Clinic' (DEBC) at Northumbria University. According to Coates and Cottam (2019, p. 20) 'of the 57 students surveyed, 93% felt the DEBC helped prepare them for the graduate job market. Moreover, 89% of

respondents felt the experience was enjoyable'. A second strategy is mentor-assisted learning in which a student is guided by a mentor in order to 'negate anxieties, assist in the familiarisation of university and life as well as motivate and encourage.... And construct their own leaning landscape' (Richardson, McGowan & Styger, 2017, p. 4). Such an approach is particularly well-suited to postgraduate coaching programmes and in-house training in interpersonal conflict management, which is an important skill in management development. Both these strategies adhere to a fundamental concern within heutagogy that an individual's learning should be placed in a real-world, work-related context.

Accessing the literature

A number of scholars have reported on how they undertook a systematic review of the literature in order to produce a conceptual paper (Arghode, Brieger & McLean, 2017; Hallinger, 2012; Lee, Chamberlain & Brandes, 2017; Mangiaracina, Song & Perego, 2015; Manhart & Thalmann, 2015). There is some consensus on what constitutes a suitable approach to undertaking a systematic review that involves three stages: planning, conducting and reporting (Tranfield, Denyer & Smart, 2003). For Lee, Chamberlain and Brandes (2017) the identification of key terms and parameters of research are essential as a first step in the planning process. According to Rowley and Slack (2004), this involves a building blocks approach that establishes the scope of relevant literature and possible lines of enquiry. It is within the second stage that early decisions relating to useful concepts and thematic development are formulated. Hallinger (2012) distinguishes between relatively narrow selective, focussed bounded, and exhaustive searches. This paper is the outcome of a bounded approach in which the search terms were aligned to heutagogy. Although heutagogy served as the primary search term, other key terms used were capability-based training, reflexivity and

metacognition, as well as responsible management. Apart from seminal works, such as Schoen (1983), most of the literature was time-limited and aligned to the period during since 2000 in which heutagogy has influenced the discourse on learning. As the author has published widely on learning theory, it was not deemed necessary to define a significantly wider boundary for the search. Internet search engines as well as the university Library were used to search for relevant sources and 85 journal papers and books were used to generate notes. The range of useful journals was wide, and included *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *Management Learning*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Journal of Management Education*, *Journal of Management Development*, *European Journal of Training and Development*, as well as Higher Education journals, such as *Studies in Higher Education*. Once research notes reached what was believed to be a saturation point, the key themes were organised through a mind-mapping exercise (see figure 1) that identified important conceptual links. The final stage of the literature search- reporting- represents the outcome for this systematic literature review.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

Figure 1. A summary of the key concepts included in the mind-mapping exercise.

There are, of course, limitations in any review of the literature, not least ‘buying into’ the boundaries of the dominant discourse with its attendant value-system. A number of procedural frameworks have been developed in order to structure the review process, the most prominent of which is the PRISMA model (Liberati, Altman, Tetzlaff, Mulrow, Gotzsche, Ioannidis.... Moher, 2009) that involves defined stages of filtering that are centred on search, screen, appraise and synthesis processes. However, Haddaway, Woodcock, Macura and Collins (2015, p. 1596) recognise that even highly structured reviews of research literature ‘are susceptible to a number of biases during the identification, selection, and synthesis of individual included studies’. So, for example, those papers selected for reading were drawn from journals that are ranked by the British Confederation of Business Schools in *their* listing of influential research publications. These journals implicitly drive research through their publication of what they see as important. The practice of publishing what is viewed as new knowledge or innovative research methods may militate against the further development of existing understanding or drive the research agenda in a distorted way. This propensity works against some forms of research in the grey literature, such as unpublished papers or practitioner reports that could hold possess useful insight (Haddaway et al., 2015, p. 1602). This ‘publication bias’ may inhibit a truly representative view of how the wider research field (Barrego, Foster & Froyd, 2014), so that so ‘claims that systematic literature reviews provide a general and superior approach to literature review are highly questionable’ (Boell & Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2015, p. 170).

Discussion:

To what extent can heutagogy address criticism of management education?

Management education has come under increased scrutiny for a number of reasons. Although the concerns relating to responsible and ethical practice have intensified since the Great Financial Crisis post 2008, many of the criticisms of management education originate in the discussion of the relevance of post-war Business School curriculum (Pfeffer & Fong, 2002; Marques, 2013; Spender, 2017), dissonance from wider society (Khurana, 2007; Marques, 2019) and an over reliance on competency frameworks. Mintzberg's (2004) invective to shift the emphasis within management education towards practice rather than abstract theory chimes with heutagogy and its emphasis on authentic, work-based learning and the development of practical wisdom (Kemmis, 2012). Heutagogic learning is grounded in practical solutions to the complex challenges that adults face on a daily basis in their working environment. Moreover, the shift in emphasis to the development of individual capability is evident in the design of heutagogic learning (Blaschke & Hase, 2016). The personalisation of the curriculum to fit the needs of the learner, the idea of negotiated forms of assessment and a coaching/supporting role for the mentor indicate a commitment to the realisation of individual potential. And, finally, the emphasis placed on the principles of responsible management and an individual acceptance of this ethical commitment is linked with the promotion of a more authentic form of management practice (Amann, Pirson, Dierksmeier, von Klimakowitz, & Spitzack, 2011; Jarvis & Logue, 2016).

What steps can be taken in implementing heutagogy principles in management education?

This discussion offers three possible examples of how heutagogy may be introduced within the curriculum- through the use of learning journals, reflection-oriented discussions and curriculum innovation.

The value of reflective thought in professional learning is widely recognised (Schoen, 1983). Canning and Callan (2010, p. 74) call upon management educators to ‘facilitate a space where reflective thinking, questioning theory and being critical of practice could take place to explore students’ values and attitudes and to develop a process of students engaging with the concept of heutagogy’. For Canning and Callan (2010) learning can be conceptualised as a spiral of interpreting experience in order to make meaning of that experience and to draw wider conclusions about their behaviours. In this sense, heutagogy learning is iterative in nature in that it requires the learner to revisit experience, context and performance continually. This representation of heutagogy is predicated on two precepts. The first precept views the learner as an autonomous person capable of identifying their aspirations and learning goals independently. Such an approach could be facilitated through work journals that record how effectively daily challenges are dealt with and how these could feed-forward through metacognition into future professional learning. The second precept is that the learner should be able to develop both their emotional and cognitive resources in order to understand how their approach to learning, and how they behave as autonomous learners. This second precept is tied to the promotion of personal and professional reflexivity.

The maintenance of learning diaries is an established and widespread practice internationally and across occupational groups. Rausch (2013) reported on the use of learning diaries as a method of workplace learning in a variety of business contexts in Germany, including in the telecommunications industry, the banking and automotive sectors, and Orpen

(1994) reported on the use of diaries in training within Australian manufacturing companies. In the United Kingdom, professions, such as the Royal Pharmaceutical Society, The Royal College of General Practitioners and the Nursing and Midwifery Council in the United Kingdom also require the maintenance of learning diaries as evidence of professional development. Professional learning diaries can promote immediate reflection on a professional crisis at work and act as a cathartic process, as well as supporting reflection following training, or wider professional concerns. Amabile and Kramer (2011) suggest that keeping a work diary may facilitate focus, patience, planning and personal growth and, as such, are of value for organisational leaders as they meet the daily challenges presented in an increasingly volatile and competitive business environment.

Although Prinsloo et al. (2011, p. 36) recognise the value of learning journals, they ask whether ‘future work is needed to determine whether learning diaries are not only valuable, but essential’ in developing aspiring managers. From a heutagogic perspective, this paper argues that the practice of keeping a learning journal should be embedded within those study programmes that lead directly to the workplace or professional accreditation, such as those referred to above. Canning and Callan (2010, p. 76) emphasise the importance of students having a ‘voice’ and being able to articulate their concerns. However, the true value in keeping a journal is not simply in its facility to record a personal standpoint but to listen to work colleagues and others in a professional context. It is only through the process of iterative reflection on an individual’s actions that meaningful professional development can take place. In this sense, we should view journals not solely in terms of their metacognitive benefits, but also as part of a wider agenda of professional growth and maturity.

For Barnett (2009, p. 440):

‘Knowledge and skills are not redundant but they need to be augmented with dispositions and qualities, both of which- given principled curricula and pedagogies- may be enhanced through adept processes of knowing and understanding.

Knowing and being (and becoming) are linked- but in ways that we have barely begun to comprehend.’

The call from Barnett (2009) for a reconceptualization of learning points to a broader view of learning and individual growth. In short, the reference to ‘dispositions’ infers that educators need to reappraise how we, our students and the curriculum engage with the wider world and those ‘qualities’ that relate to character that we wish to promote. This transformative aspect of the curriculum is discussed by Petriglieri and Petriglieri (2010) in terms of the work of Business Schools as ‘identity workspaces’ in which students are inducted into business culture and their attendant value systems, and within which open discussion can take place. It is within such ‘identity workspaces’ that we are able to engage with students in discussion that relate to moral and ethical issues in an authentic and meaningful manner. Colville, Pye and Brown (2016) discuss the importance of sense-making as part of the learning process and debating complex issues. For Colville et al. (2016), sense-making is tied to reflection in action and to think openly, and this dialogic approach would facilitate socially-responsible management practice. Cunliffe, (2002, p. 42) views learning ‘as an embodied reflexive dialogical process in which we are struck and moved to reflect on and/or reflexively question’. This idea of dialogue and reflexive thought shifts much of the cognitive process from the mastery of theoretical concepts to self-concepts and learning from within. Such a departure from past practices would as Dehler, Welsh and Lewis (2001, p. 498) necessitate a

new paradigm of learning that would ‘focus on contradictions and move away from naïve functionalism’. It is within this new paradigm of ethical management learning that heutagogy could make a contribution.

Implementing curriculum change in an instrumental environment

Heutagogic approaches have in various measures been implemented across the globe, most notably in Finland and Australia. In general, three approaches seem evident. The first is the ‘radical’ curriculum model in which students are empowered to devise their own learning and work in teams in order to tackle practical problems. Examples of this team-based, collaborative learning approach are evident in entrepreneurial management programmes at Jyväskylä University of Applied Sciences in Finland (Team Academy Finland, 2011; Kappasi & Grekova, 2017), as well as at Nottingham Trent and Northumbria Universities in England (Blackwood, Round, Pugalis & Hatt, 2015). A second approach aims to ‘embed’ heutagogic learning opportunities within a work-oriented curriculum through placements within businesses, as in the British ‘sandwich degree’. The third approach is the ‘insight’ experience, which can be either in the form of an individual consultancy project or similar short-term activity that supplements the main subject content of the degree. Although these approaches vary in their intensity, they all aim to introduce management students to the challenges that can exist in business.

However, the embedding of heutagogy in practice is not without challenges, both for academic staff and students. Winter, McAuliffe, Hargreaves and Chadwick (2009, p. 2) argue that not only is heutagogy ‘seen primarily as applicable to vocational education and training not necessarily for university education, especially in terms of assessment’. Moreover as

Adams (2014) recognises, ‘performative measures throughout the education system in the United Kingdom certainly, but elsewhere as well, could potentially place heutagogy practitioners in somewhat of a contradictory position.... Would I want to be heutagogical, given the performance-driven system in which we find ourselves?’ This concern is mirrored by Halsall, Powell and Snowden (2016, p. 8) who point to the ‘fear’ of poor survey results from students as a result of adopting new ways of learning. The issue of how universities judge the value of heutagogy and what criteria they adopt in doing so is a complex matter and one that asks questions as to the prevailing belief-systems and loci of sovereignty over such policy decisions that exist within large bureaucratic organisations that are subject to a marketised environment. Furthermore, although students may welcome greater autonomy over their learning, Kapasi and Grekova (2017) report that some students enrolled on a team-based degree that prioritised practice over abstract theory were concerned about how such an innovative study programme would be viewed by large corporations who were more familiar with traditional curricula. This reluctance on behalf of some students to embrace heutagogy points to the difficulties associated with launching innovative study programmes. Not only is ascertaining the views of potential students problematic (Matlay, 2009), but changing expectations outside of Higher Education may be a more demanding endeavour. If we are to develop heutagogic practices more widely in Higher Education, then we must engage with wider society and advocate the benefits of self-determined learning for the learner, academics, educational institutions, and employers.

Given the instrumental and societal challenges associated with the introduction of heutagogy, it may be purposeful to contemplate how heutagogy could be implemented in differing contexts for particular categories of learner.

INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE

Figure 2. Conceptualising the proportion of learning methodologies with the curriculum.

Key: P= pedagogy; A= andragogy; H= heutagogy

Figure 2 describes a conceptualisation of different forms of curriculum that are designed to meet the needs of different learners. Heutagogy can be applied to differing groups of learners in a range of contexts. A number of conditioning factors may influence how we approach the design of future curricula, not least the time available within which to learn. If we accept that many senior executives may be ‘time-poor’ but ‘resource-rich’, then a bespoke curriculum can be designed around the specific needs as defined by the learner in the manner that they determine and that align to a particular organisational context. It is in such a scenario that heutagogic forms of learning may be particularly apposite. In the case of managers, a more structured form of study that is aligned to operational goals may be chosen. In such an eventuality, a formal curriculum with defined modes of assessment as in the MBA, would be appropriate albeit imbued with ideas drawn from andragogy. The prevalence of constructive alignment and structured curriculum (Biggs, 2003) as defining features of undergraduate study is likely to persist in the foreseeable future. However, the example of the ‘teampreneur’ heutagogic model suggests that heutagogic approaches may be integrated more extensively within the undergraduate curriculum, if only incrementally and tied to collaborative forms of learning.

Conclusion:

Management education must respond to the changing context of the world we live in. Future managers will need to develop new skills sets that develop their professional capability, not least in relation to the management of technology and people. A key part of this future skill set is the ability to reflect on professional practice through reflexivity and metacognition.

There are a number of ways that this may be facilitated. For example, learning journals provide a means of promoting metacognitive awareness and personal development, and are as such invaluable in heutagogical learning where critical reflexivity is key to wider professional growth. Although heutagogy re-orientates the work of an educator more to facilitation and support instead of the transmission of information, university teachers in particular still have an important role to play as we move towards a more personalised curriculum. One practical step that the ‘facilitating’ educator can take is the promotion of a learning journal that scaffolds learning during a student’s initial weeks at university. Once students have established the rudimentary skills required for study, then they will be better able to master their own learning and develop as lifelong learners.

Although heutagogy may appear far-fetched as a model of the future curriculum, this theory of learning does provide us with new insights into what we can aim for from professional education and training. The Finnish model of collaborative ‘teampreneurial’ management education offers us the opportunity to engage students in practical problem-solving, whilst working collectively in a responsible manner, and in doing so develop their professional capability. In addition, Higher Education is already offering personalised learning opportunities albeit through a less intensive form through consultancy projects and ‘pro bono’ advice clinics, where students can interact with a range of stakeholders and prepare for their future professional practice in a much more autonomous way. Future research could usefully explore how heutagogy may develop into a ‘net-centric’ theory of

learning (Blaschke, 2012, p.57), where learners benefit from the flexibility that online technologies provide. In advancing personalised learning for individuals, heutagogy poses questions as to how learners and their coaches interact in a community of learners. Further research could explore the idea of a heutagoc community of learning and how this changes the nature of interaction between participants. Perhaps, the first step that should be in future research to ascertain how educators respond to the ideas and practices of heutagogy presented above. If we are to develop a more varied and personalised curriculum that meets the needs of senior executives, middle managers as well as university students, then we must start with the re-education of educators and develop their understanding of learning. A useful future research project would be to explore the concerns and possible lack of understanding that exists in Business Schools before we set out to revolutionise teaching and learning. Failure to engage proactively with those responsible for facilitating innovations in teaching and learning may well produce disappointing outcomes both for faculty and students. In contributing to the literature on professional learning, this paper invites colleagues to consider how heutagogical approaches may be implemented in practice in order to meet the needs of learners.

References:

Adams, P. (2014). Self-determined learning: Heutagogy in action. *British Journal of Educational Studies*. 62(4), 476-478. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2014.970798>

Albanese, R. (1989). Competency-based Management Education, *Journal of Management Development*, 8(2), 66-76. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000001343>

Amann, W., Pirson, M., Dierksmeier, C., von Klimakowitz, E., & Spitzeck, H. (Eds.), (2011). *Business schools under fire: Humanistic Management Education as the way forward*, New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Amabile, T., & Kramer, S. (2011). Four reasons to keep a work diary, *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2011/04/four-reasons-to-keep-a-work-diary>

Arghode, V., Brieger, E. W., & McLean, G. N. (2017). Adult learning theories: Implications for online instruction, *European Journal of Training and Development*, 42(7), 593-609.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-02-2-17-0014>

Barrego, M., Foster, M.J., & Froyd, J. E. (2014). Systematic literature reviews in engineering education and other developing interdisciplinary field, *Journal of Engineering Education*, 103(1), 45-76.

Barnett, R. (2009). Knowing and becoming in the higher education curriculum”, *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(4), 429-440.

Barrows, H.S., & Tamblyn, R.M. (1980), *Problem based learning: An approach to medical education*, New York: Springer.

Bennett, N. & Lemoine, J. (2014). What VUCA really means to you. *Harvard Business Review*, 92, No. 1/2.

Bennis, W.G. & O'Toole, J. (2005). How business schools lost their way. *Harvard Business Review*, 96-104. <https://hbr.org/2005/05/how-business-schools-lost-their-way>

Bergman, D. (2009). Quality questions. *New Teacher Advocate*, 16(4), 4-5

Biggs, J.B. (2003). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Blackwood, T., Round, A., Pugalis, L. & Hatt, L. (2015). Making sense of learning: Insights from an experientially-based undergraduate entrepreneurial programme, *Industry and Higher Education*, 29(6), 445-457.

Blaschke, L. M. (2011). Establishing a foundation for reflective practice: A case study of learning journal use". http://eurodl.org/materials/special/2011/Blaschke_Brindley.htm

Blaschke, L. M. (2012). Heutagogy and lifelong learning: A review of heutagogical practice and self-determined learning. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 13(1), 56-71.

Blaschke, L. M. & Hase, S. (2016). Heutagogy: A holistic framework for creating twenty-first-century self-determined learners. In G. B. Kinshuk & M. Maina, (Eds.), *The future of ubiquitous learning: Learning designs for emerging pedagogies* (pp. 25-40). Berlin: Springer.

Boekaerts, M. & Cascallar, E., (2006). How far have we moved toward the integration of theory and practice in self-regulation? *Educational Psychological Review*, 18, 199-210.

Boell, S. K., & Cecez-Kecmanovic, D. (2015). On being 'systematic' in literature reviews in IS, *Journal of Information Technology*, 30, 161-173.

Canning, N. & Callan, S. (2010). Heutagogy: Spirals of reflection to empower learners in Higher Education, *Reflective Practice*. 11(1), 71-82.

Chai, S., C. & Kong, S-C. (2017). Professional Learning for 21st century education, *Journal of Computer Education*. 4(1), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40692-016-0069-y>

Coates, N. & Cottam, E. (2019). The digitally enabled business clinic: Final report, Newcastle upon Tyne: Newcastle Business School, Northumbria University.

Colville, I., Pye, A., & Brown, A.D. (2016). Sensemaking processes and Weickarious learning, *Management Learning*, 47(1), 3-13.

Christopher, E., Laasch, O., & Roberts, J. (2017). Pedagogical innovation and paradigm shift in the introduction to management curriculum. *Journal of Management Education*, 41(6), 787-793. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562917714553>

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

Dehler, G.E., Welsh, A. & Lewis, M.W. (2001). Critical pedagogy in the ‘New Paradigm’, *Management Learning*, 32(4), 493-51.

Draganidis, F. & Mentzas, G. (2006). Competency based management: a review of systems and approaches, *Information Management and Computer Security*, 14(1), 51-64. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09685220610648373>

Ghoshal, S. (2005). Bad management theories are destroying good management practice. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 4, 75-92.

Godeman, J., Haertle, J., Herzig, C., & Moon, J. (2014). United Nations supported Principles for Responsible Management Education: Purpose, progress and prospects. *Journal of Cleaner production*. 62, 16-23. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.07.033>

Gosling, J. & Mintzberg, H. (2006). Management education as if both matter, *Management Learning*, 37(4), 419-428. <https://doi.org.10.1177/1350507606070214>.

Gray, H. (2004). Older people and the process of learning: New needs and discredited approaches, *Development and Learning in Organization: An International Journal*, 18(2), 3-5. <https://doi.org/10.1108/147772804105119572>

Greenberg, D.N., Deets, S., Erzurumlu, S., Hunt, J., Manwaring, M., Rodgers, V., & Swanson (2017). Signing to living PRME: Learning from a journey towards responsible management education. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15, 205-218. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2017.02.007>

Grey, C. (2002). What are business schools for? On silence and voice in management education, *Journal of Management Education*, 26(5), 496-511. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105256202236723>

Haddaway, N.R., Woodcock, P., Macura, B., & Collins, A. (2015). Making literature reviews more reliable through application of lessons from systematic reviews, *Conservation of Biology*, 29(6), 1596-1605.

Hallinger, P. (2013). A conceptual framework for systematic reviews of research in educational leadership and management, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51, 126-149.

Halsall, J.P., Powell, J.L. & Snowden, M. (2016). Determined learning approach: Implications of heutagogy society based learning, *Cogent Social Sciences*, 2, 1223904.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2016.1223904>

Hase, S. (2009). Heutagogy and e-learning in the workplace: Some challenges and opportunities, *Journal of Applied Research in Workplace E-Learning*.

Hase, S. (2011). Learner defined curriculum: Heutagogy and action learning in vocational education. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254664050>

Hase, S. & Kenyon, C. (2000). *From andragogy to heutagogy*. UltiBase Articles.
<http://ultibase.rmit.edu.au/Articles/decoo/hase2.htm>

Hase, S. & Kenyon, C. (2007). Heutagogy: A child of complexity theory. *Complexity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education*, 4(1), 111-119.

Jarvis, W. P. & Logue, D. M. (2016). Cultivating moral-relational judgement in business education: The merits and practicalities of Aristotle's phronesis, *Journal of Business Ethics Education*, 13, 1-23.

Jones, E. (2010). A Professional Practice Portfolio for Quality Learning. *Higher Education Quarterly*. 64(3), 292-312. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2010.00458.x>

Kapasi, I. & Grekova, G. (2017). What do students think of self-determined learning in entrepreneurial education? *Education + Training*, 60(7/8), 841-856.

Kemmis (2012). Phronesis, experience and the primacy of praxis. In E. Kinsela and A. Pitman (Eds.), *Phronesis as professional knowledge: Practical wisdom in the professions*, (pp. 147-162). Boston: Sense Publishers,

Khurana, R. (2007). *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession*. Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press.

Knowles, M. (1984). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*, New York: Cambridge Books.

van Laere, J. & Lindblom, J. (2018). Cultivating a longitudinal learning process through recurring crisis management training exercises in twelve Swedish municipalities. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12230>

Lee, N., Chamberlain, L. & Brandes, L. (2018). Welcome to the jungle! The neuromarketing literature through the eyes of a newcomer, *European Journal of Marketing*, 52(1-2), 4-38.

Liberati, A., Altman, D.G., Tetzlaff, J., Mulrow, C., Gotzsche, P.C., Ioannidis, J.P., Moher, D. (2009). The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: Explanation and elaboration. *BMJ (Clinical Research Education)*, 339, b2700. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b2700>

Luckin, R., Clarke, W., Garrett, F., Whitworth, A., Akass, J., Cook, J..... Robertson, J. (2011). Learner-generated contexts: A framework to support the effective use of technology to support learning. In M. J. W. Lee, & C. McLoughlin, (Eds.), *Web 2.0-based learning: Applying social informatics for tertiary teaching*: (pp.70-84). New York, NY.: Information Science Reference.

Lyons, R.K. (2011). Curriculum reform: getting more macro, and more micro, *Journal of Management Development*, 31(4), 412-423.

McAuliffe, M., Hargreaves, D., Winter, A., & Chadwick, G. (2009). Does Pedagogy Still Rule? *Australasian Journal of Engineering Education*, 15(1) 13-18.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/22054952.2009.11464018>

McPhee, S. & Przedpelska, S. (2018). Experiential learning, community engagement, and student experience: Undergraduate field school course in rural British Columbia. *The Canadian Geographer*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cag.12436>

Marques, J.F. (2019). Flawed organizational purpose? Changing the narrative in management education and practice, *On The Horizon*, 33(5), 24-26.

Matlay, H. (2009), Entrepreneurship education in the UK: A critical analysis of stakeholder involvement and expectations, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 16(2), 355-368.

Mangiaracina, R., Song, G. & Perego, A. (2015). Distribution network design: A literature review and a research agenda, *International Journal of Physical Distribution & logistics Management*, 45(5), 506-531.

Manhart, M. & Thalmann, S. (2015). Protecting organizational knowledge: A structured literature review, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 19(2), 190-211.

Marques, J. (2013). Got the MEMO? Management education is moving on, *On the Horizon*, 21(1), 304-311. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OTH-10-2011-0027>

Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers not MBAs*. London: Pearson.

Moon, J. (2010). *Learning journals and logs*. UCD Teaching and Learning Resources. <https://www.ucd.ie/t4cms.ucdtla0035.pdf>

Narayan, V., Herrington, J., & Cochrane, T. (2019). Design principles for heutagogical learning: Implementing student-determined learning with mobile and social media tools, *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 35(3), 86-101. <https://doi.org/10.14742/aject.3941>

Nilson, L. B. (2013). *Creating self-regulating learners: Strategies to strengthen students' self-awareness and learning skills*. Sterling, VA.: Stylus, LLC.

Nisula, K. & Pekkola, S. (2018). How to move away from the silos of business management education? *Journal of Education for Business*, 93(3), 97-111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2018.1425283>

Orpen, C. (1994). The effect of time management training on employee attitudes and behaviour: A field experiment. *The Journal of Psychology*, 128(4), 393-396.

Petriglieri, G. & Petriglieri, J.L (2010). Identity workspaces: The case of business schools, *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9(1), 44060.

Pfeffer, J. & Fong, C.T. (2002). The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 1, 78-95.

Prinsloo, P. Sharon, S. & Galpin, F. (2011). A phenomenographic analysis of student reflections in online learning diaries. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, 26(1), 27-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680513.2011.538562>

Pintrich, P.R. & De Groot, E.V., (1990). Motivational and Self-Regulated Learning Components of Classroom Academic Performance, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 33-40.

Podolny, J.M. (2009). The buck stops (and starts) at business school. *Harvard Business Review*, 62-67. <https://hbr.org/2009/06/the-buck-stops-and-starts-at-business-school>

Rausch, A. (2013). Task characteristics and learning potential- empirical results of three diary studies on workplace learning. *Open Learning: The journal of Open, Distance and E-learning*, 26(1), 27-38.

Richardson, L. P., McGowan, C., & Styger, L. E. J. (2017). Heutagogy- An updated approach to masters education. Presented at *Excellence in Services 20th International Conference*, 7-8 September 2017, United States: Emerald.

Rowley, J. & Slack, F. (2004). Conducting a literature review, *Management Research News*, 27(6), 31-39.

Quinn, B. & Wennes, G. (2008). Mind-sets, mirrors and mid-career education: The why, what and how of promoting critical enquiry among managers, *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 21(4), 353-367.

Schoen, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. United States of America: Basic Books, Inc.

Sharma, R.R. (2017). A competency model for management education for sustainability. *Vision*, 21(2), 10-15.

Snowden M. & Halsall, J.P. (2016). Self-determined approach to learning: A social science perspective, *Cogent Education*, 3, 1-9.

Spender, J-C. (2017). BSchools and their business models, *Humanist Management Journal*, 1, 187-204.

Team Academy Finland (2011). Team learning through starting a business at Tiimiakatemia (Team Academy) https://www.ub-cooperation.eu/pdf/cases/N_Team_Academy.pdf

Teece, D.J. (2011). Achieving integration of the business school curriculum using the dynamic capabilities framework, *Journal of Management Development*, 20(5), 499-518.

Tranfield, D., Denyer, D. & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review, *British Journal of Production Economics*, 38(2-3), 225-243.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1998). Academic Studying and the Development of Personal Skill: A Self-Regulatory Perspective, *Educational Psychology*, 33, 73-8