

Application Of The Kano Model To Management Pedagogy: A Conceptual Framework To Enhance Students' Learning Experience

Abhilash Ponnamm*

Department of Management, Central University of Andhra Pradesh, Anantapuramu, India, 516001

ABSTRACT

Management education has witnessed a paradigm shift from the instructor-centric transmission of knowledge toward learner-centric competency-based education emphasizing experiential learning, critical thinking, collaboration, and digital literacy. In response to the evolving expectations of students and employers, business schools are continually challenged to assess and redesign pedagogical strategies. Although numerous innovative teaching methods have emerged, the effectiveness of various pedagogical interventions in generating learning value remains a subject of contention. The Kano Model, a theory of quality management, provides a structured approach to analyze how different attributes of products or services affect customer satisfaction. Applying this framework to higher education in general and management education in particular can provide a systematic tool for educators and administrators to understand student satisfaction from the perspectives of various pedagogic practices. Different from other approaches, the Kano Model allows categorisation of educational attributes in to must-be, one-dimensional, attractive, indifferent, reverse, and questionable qualities, facilitating the efficient and effective prioritization of instructional interventions based on their impact on student experience and satisfaction. This article examines the theoretical perspectives of the Kano Model and discusses how these may be leveraged for innovative pedagogical practice in management education by informing curriculum development, classroom pedagogy, assessment approaches and technology utilization.

Keywords: Kano Model, management education, pedagogy, student satisfaction, higher education, experiential learning.

INTRODUCTION

Over the last two decades, management education has undergone profound transformation owing to such forces as globalization, advanced information technology, changing demand in workforce skills and the requirement for employees' multidisciplinary competence. Enterprises today value managers with advanced competencies in solving complex problems, international communication, adaptability, and information-driven decision making rather than just subject expertise. As a result, traditional instructional paradigms of rote memorisation and lecturer-dominated approaches have gradually shifted towards student-centred pedagogies with an emphasis on experiential learning, reflecting on practice, cooperation, and capacity building (Biggs & Tang 2011; Kolb 2015). Management faculties have responded by incorporating a wide array of innovative

teaching methods such as case analysis, flipped classroom, simulation-based learning, business games, problem-based learning, project-based learning, design thinking, field consulting projects, blended learning, and even artificial intelligence-enabled learning technologies.

Numerous empirical studies indicate that active learning pedagogies improve the acquisition of conceptual learning, critical thinking ability, engagement, and long-term retention compared with passive learning techniques (Prince 2004; Freeman et al. 2014). In parallel, experiential learning is widely lauded as offering a dynamic platform where students connect theory with actual managerial practice and integrate disciplinary knowledge with genuine experience for the purpose of developing higher order competencies (Kolb 2015). Despite such broad adoption of active learning pedagogies and

Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

curriculum changes, business schools continually struggle with a crucial dilemma: Which innovative pedagogies effectively improve the student learning experience? Numerous programmes and resources are invested in the development of innovative educational initiatives and teaching methods by universities and other business schools worldwide; however, many institutions have yet to develop tools for systemically determining which instructional practices genuinely make a difference for students.

Conventional student questionnaires usually assess student satisfaction using Likert scales, which tend to assume a linear relationship between teaching efforts and student satisfaction: a more effective teacher results in higher satisfaction. However, student learning and satisfaction with learning experiences are more complex and differ depending on the types of pedagogies; thus, each pedagogy generates variable levels of satisfaction, some of which prevent dissatisfaction, others proportionally result in satisfaction, while some exceed customer expectation, a concept articulated through the Kano Model of quality (Kano et al., 1984). Student satisfaction has emerged as a critical factor in higher education because of increased competition among universities, expansion of higher education into global markets, accreditation standards, and greater public and private accountability demands to educational providers (Harvey 2003). Student satisfaction affects university reputation and its position on university ranking and ratings. Student retention, engagement in the classroom, lifelong commitment to alumni relations, and success after graduation can largely be measured in terms of student satisfaction. Nevertheless, satisfaction should not be indiscriminately conflated with educational quality since sometimes rigorous pedagogical environments designed for preparing future competent leaders demand more efforts from students.

In such cases, initial discomfort caused by challenges may eventually contribute to the achievement of higher competencies and readiness for the workplace (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Therefore, educational institution needs tools capable of evaluating pedagogical initiatives beyond traditional measures and helps institutions allocate scarce resources effectively in promoting relevant teaching practices and curriculum development. One suitable analytical

framework for evaluating pedagogy is the Kano Model. Originally conceptualized and tested by Noriaki Kano and his associates in Japan to classify product attributes based on how they affect customer satisfaction, it was applied to quality management in both manufacturing and service contexts. The Kano Model challenges the basic assertion that improvement in quality leads to an increase in customer satisfaction on a one-dimensional scale (Kano et al., 1984).

Based on the concept of customer delight, the model posits that product features can be classified into three basic categories: must-be or basic qualities (a basic functionality that causes dissatisfaction if lacking but merely brings users back to a neutral state if present), one-dimensional (performance-dependent and are proportional in increasing customer satisfaction if well executed and in decreasing it if not) and attractive or exciting (unexpected quality features that give great satisfaction when provided but are not really expected and may bring little or no dissatisfaction even if absent)(Matzler & Hinterhuber, 1998). Though its original application and development were related to product development and service, the application of the Kano Model has expanded over the past decades to areas of healthcare, hospitality, tourism, software engineering, public administration, and a wide variety of quality development initiatives, such as the development of educational websites, learning materials, curricula, online learning platforms, institutional research projects, student support services, etc.(Shahin et al. 2013). Higher education has generally seen growing application of the Kano Model because students are recognized as the end-users and the feedback provided by students on learning environment, instruction and curricula represents critical indicators for institutional evaluation and continuous improvement.

When applied in the context of management pedagogy, the Kano Model can translate student expectations regarding pedagogical approaches into strategic priorities. The rise of digital revolution and artificial intelligence in recent years further adds to the importance of adapting new pedagogies and teaching approaches that resonate with today's generation of students. As learners, students today anticipate the learning experience to be technology-

supported, personalized, engaged with external stakeholders, culturally rich and focused on the development of both technical and soft skills. Those aspects which used to be novelties like online teaching platforms, learning resource websites, or even flipped classrooms have slowly become standard expectations; therefore, we must identify continuously how to provide novel pedagogical solutions to provide a superior learning experience as well as maintaining academic standard. In view of this, the current article aims to review existing literature and discuss on the theoretical underpinning of the Kano Model with a focus on the ways it can be applied to management education for pedagogical innovation as well as curriculum development to provide a student-centric, technology enabled and industry responsive management education.

2. THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE KANO MODEL

Proposed in 1984 by Noriaki Kano, Nobuhiko Seraku, Fumio Takahashi, and Shinichi Tsuchi, the Kano Model provides an alternative approach to viewing customer satisfaction within the framework of product and service development. Based on the Two-Factor Theory of motivation by Herzberg, Kano postulates that customer satisfaction is not a linear measure and has multiple dimensions. In opposition to the common practice of assuming that any increase in product performance led to increased customer satisfaction, Kano illustrates that distinct psychological mechanisms are activated with certain product features (Kano et al., 1984). At the heart of the Kano Model is the idea that the customer measures the product/service along with a baseline expectation that it will satisfy. Hence, the presence of many quality features does not create customer satisfaction, and the opposite is also true: Some quality features need to be delivered, else customer is dissatisfied. Some other features will delight customers by their presence because such features come as an unforeseen extra quality beyond expectation (Matzler & Hinterhuber, 1998).

There are six categories of quality dimensions, within the Kano Model of Quality: must-be quality, one-dimensional quality, attractive quality, indifferent quality, reverse quality, and questionable quality. “Must-be quality characteristics are taken for granted

by the customer. They are often unseen as a minimum standard by the customer and result in dissatisfaction when not achieved” (Kano et al., 1984, p. 147). In the context of educational institutions, they should provide well-informed teachers, fair and transparent assessment system, clear learning outcomes, well-organized and easily accessible course materials, as well as, timely feedback. Usually students do not feel very satisfied when those features of education are met, though they will get extremely dissatisfied when a flaw is made in it. “The one-dimensional quality characteristics provide either positive or negative satisfaction to the customer depending on whether or not they are met” (Kano et al., 1984, p. 147). An example is the helpfulness of a tutor in education; they will not create huge satisfaction among the student if he is “only” somewhat helpful; to some extent an increase in satisfaction is correlated to an increase in a product features. As in “the more helpful the tutor is, the greater the user's satisfaction with the service provided” (Matzler & Hinterhuber, 1998). “attractive quality characteristics create a positive emotional response” (Kano et al., 1984, p. 147). These are innovation drivers. An excellent instructor’s sense of humor, a surprise research project assignment, a creative new digital textbook or in business/management program perhaps a student visit at a Silicon Valley firm, can significantly boost student engagement with their studies. These features are beyond customer expectations and lead to the feeling of surprise that increases satisfaction. “When these characteristics are present, satisfaction is proportional to their existence (and the performance of the company to deliver it)” (Kano et al., 1984, p. 147) and the opposite for their absence, leading to very satisfied students or students who are not satisfied when they are not present. Some quality characteristics do not result in significant satisfaction with either their presence or their absence. These characteristics (indifferent quality characteristics) have very little impact upon the satisfaction of the users. They waste institutional resources. Reverse quality characteristics result in increased dissatisfaction when they are present; e.g. The over use of collaborative projects (Berger et al., 1993). Questionable quality characteristics indicate responses are neither satisfactory nor unsatisfactory, the inconsistency in data suggests further investigate on the feature(s). (Berger et al., 1993)

One significant strength of the Kano Model is its method of analysis. Rather than using traditional multi-point Likert-scale questions typical of conventional satisfaction surveys, Kano analysis measures customer attitudes towards each feature through the use of paired functional and dysfunctional questions. Customer respondents indicate whether they feel positive or negative regarding the presence and absence of each feature. From these paired answers, the classification of each attribute (must-be, one-dimensional, attractive etc.) is derived through a standardized evaluation matrix (Kano et al., 1984). This technique permits researchers to capture the non-linear and disparate manner in which various attributes contribute to customer satisfaction, better than the use of simply a range from “very satisfied” to “very dissatisfied.” Furthermore, dynamic aspect of the Kano Model is another theoretical aspect of the approach. The premise by Kano and his followers is that customer expectations and quality attributes are not constant and will change over time (Matzler & Hinterhuber, 1998). Attractive qualities become one-dimensional features, and one-dimensional quality characteristics become must-be characteristics as customers gain new experiences with those features over time and/or as competitors offer the same quality level and innovations.

Hence, within management/business education innovative features like fully online courses, digital textbooks, learning management systems and recorded lectures have quickly moved from an attractive to the current must-be state. As educational institutions cannot be static on this aspect and should revisit students and business stakeholders on a regular basis to understand their current expectations on quality of education. Ultimately, the Kano Model allows us to move beyond a linear, surface-level view of educational satisfaction to a more sophisticated and strategy-driven approach to enhancing quality in higher education. By segmenting quality into these categories, managers are able to prioritize resource allocation and invest in initiatives that drive the most significant positive impact on stakeholder satisfaction.

3. THE KANO MODEL IN MANAGEMENT PEDAGOGY

Providing a systematic tool for responding to student expectations The application of the Kano Model to management pedagogy, illustrated with numerous examples in *The Kano Model in Business School Education* by the authors who introduced the technique into the field in the early 1990s¹ is designed to provide a coherent approach for planning and implementing student-centric educational designs. While modern management education has long encouraged the adoption of learner-centred pedagogical approaches, institutions tend to implement new strategies without clearly questioning the degree to which these interventions address student's basic expectations, influence perceived educational quality or generate exceptional learning experiences. By recognizing that the impact on students of various pedagogical attributes differ (Kano et al., 1984; Matzler & Hinterhuber, 1998), educators can use the Kano Model as a prioritization technique – rather than a blanket attempt to improve every facet of instruction, they can invest resources and effort on specific pedagogy initiatives which have high impact potential. In other words, “institutions cannot afford to be the best in all possible instructional areas but are encouraged to invest in their 'core competitive instruction'”.

3.1 Curriculum Design

Curriculum design is one of the most prominent pedagogical domains affected by the application of the Kano Model in the management education sphere. Contemporary business curriculum content needs to be re-evaluated regularly as organizations grapple with technological change, globalisation, the challenge of developing sustainability initiatives and increasingly rapid change processes (AACSB, 2020). Thus, business schools must develop and design competency based curricula where knowledge, attitudes, skills and values integrate in meaningful ways to achieve this objective (Biggs & Tang, 2011). For example, within the traditional structure of a MBA, it is important to identify where and how the use of the Kano model can serve to differentiate the institution and ensure that course content is relevant.

Within the Kano frame, certain curricula qualities or elements that will satisfy basic expectations for any

business school program and thus represent a 'must-be' quality are a clearly articulate programme learning outcomes, that programme outcomes, assessments, programme content, delivery, faculty expertise and grading procedures remain up to date and the programme continues to meet any applicable accreditation standards. These aspects if present may have no or minimal additional satisfaction beyond fulfilling those basic expectations but their absence will inevitably lead to dissatisfaction as the overall confidence in programme quality and integrity may decrease dramatically (Kano et al., 1984; Shahin et al., 2013). However beyond basic expectation, certain curricula changes will increase overall student satisfaction proportionally (i.e., 'one dimensional attributes').

For example adding modern business cases to analyse in a course, enhancing learning activities where the students learn about multidisciplinary, analytical, and social considerations when addressing business sustainability, entrepreneurial opportunities and digital challenges are viewed positively by students, as they perceive clear relevance to practice and their future careers (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2020). The potential for programmes to develop a significant competitive advantage lies in 'attractive quality' aspects of the curriculum, features for which student may not even anticipate yet a provide very high levels of satisfaction. This is achieved through live industry based project work, innovative global learning opportunities, interdisciplinary centres for innovation, executive mentorship programmes, and startup incubator programmes, along with specialised programme pathways and tailored learning based on adaptive technology (Kolb, 2015; AACSB, 2020). Such activities result in higher satisfaction levels and also have the power to differentiate the institution's offerings significantly.

It is important to note in regard to curricula design using the Kano Model that educational environments, due to their rapidly changing nature are volatile regarding student's expectations. For example technologies such as learning management systems, online educational modules, digital learning resources and virtual learning are moving from what were in some instances highly sought-after 'attractive' features to what are becoming increasingly 'must-be' requirements for all programmes of study (Dhawan,

2020). Thus it's critical to re-evaluation the expectations associated with particular features on a recurring basis.

3.2 Classroom Instruction and Teaching Strategies

Education in the classroom can be critically improved using the framework of the Kano Model for distinguishing between critical aspects of instruction, or must-be's, as opposed to more innovative pedagogical choices. Essential qualities which one has come to expect in the classroom as a baseline feature are pedagogical excellence: expertise in the subject matter taught; clarity in explanation; punctuality; efficiency in managing a classroom, fair evaluation processes and respectful communication will usually be classified as 'must-be' aspects of good teaching.

While students rarely enthuse over this form of instruction, their absence creates significant loss of confidence in the instruction and institutional quality (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Once these have been addressed the other areas where an educator can further enhance educational quality using the Kano framework is in those features which act as 'one-dimensional' characteristics, where an increase in the effectiveness of such pedagogical factors will be mirrored by an increase in overall student satisfaction and perceived teaching quality. For example adding and utilizing business cases; utilizing group discussions, active teaching, questioning methods for students, classroom projects and classroom presentations have clearly been shown to elicit significant pedagogical improvement in students as far as their learning and the instructor ratings go (Prince, 2004).

Research findings suggest that active learning methods which include collaborative, problem-solving, inquiry-based learning techniques are positively related with higher levels of students' learning gains, conceptual understanding, engagement than student who attend more passive lecture approaches (Freeman et al., 2014). The other area to address is where innovative pedagogical strategies may attract a higher level of satisfaction or 'attractive features'. The business simulation, role play, case study (a 'must-be' for some) but with creative variations such as the use of negotiation skill development techniques, case studies followed by

practical workshop application of new tools/techniques, in classroom team challenge type activities, individual based 'case creation' assignment, gamified classroom learning or interactive digital environments that simulate 'live' industry interaction have the capacity to transform the student learning experience (Kolb, 2015; Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2020) as they provide an opportunity to learn theory by actually applying it in 'real-life' managerial context and stimulate students intrinsically. The role of technology – particularly AI - is also being continually refined. The development of smart teaching systems, personalized, computer-based tutoring, automated learning platforms, personalized adaptive systems, automated tutors and analytics provide students with personalised and often very enriching and targeted support – none of which will directly replace meaningful interaction with faculty per se, but have significant potential for adding depth to individual learning (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). The 'Kano' category where AI might at present appear 'attractive' may swiftly translate to 'one dimensional' and then 'must-be' as the technology advances.

3.3 Experiential Learning and Industry Integration

Experiential learning is one of the core tenets of management education today. While much has been discussed about developing core intellectual competencies through knowledge, effective managerial practice however requires that these be complemented with practical experience and insights derived from interaction with business organizations. Thus, colleges of business often integrate academic work with internships, cooperative educational assignments, field-based consulting projects, entrepreneurial initiatives, and other forms of experiential learning (Kolb, 2015). The Kano model can be employed to effectively evaluate and structure different levels of these initiatives.

Basic expectations around practical aspects of a programme often include internships in a business organisation and/or engagement in case-based learning, thus, these may represent the more 'one-dimensional' aspect as more quality is added they are well received. However, deeper forms of experiential learning such as live consulting projects undertaken to

work with, and develop real solutions for existing, contemporary business challenges, live field research or fieldwork in organisations that give rise to authentic experiences of working within an organisation will be 'attractive features' (Kolb, 2015; AACSB, 2020). Such experiences will not necessarily be expected by all students and offer greater learning value by demonstrating 'real work.' Moreover, when graduates can cite specific examples of having encountered real issues, worked with them, and resolved them they will invariably make more competitive candidates. An increasing facet of programmes relates to the ability to secure 'real-world' connections which have a greater potential of adding 'attractive value' by directly linking student learning with employer expectations, through providing insights into both the nature of workplace practices and organizational structures as well as building stronger industry collaboration with academic institutions. (Petriglieri & Petriglieri, 2020).

3.4 Assessment & Feedback

Assessment and Evaluation is the other major area for Management pedagogy where the Kano Model has meaningful applicability. Conventional assessment frameworks are largely focused on summative tests primarily aimed at assessing knowledge retention. For competency-based education however, assessment needs to encompass analytical skills, communication and leadership attributes, team playing, creativity, and ethical judgment skills in addition to knowledge-based understanding (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Students tend to perceive the provision of fair and transparent assessment criteria and immediate positive feedback on ongoing assessment performance as a must-have. Non-compliance is likely to be a source of dissatisfaction irrespective of how good the teaching, the subject matter and so forth. Hence an endeavor to introduce modern methods of assessment should be preceded by an organization of sound evaluation methodology. Typical one-dimensional features include frequent formative quizzes, case study analysis, reflective writing journals, role play, presentation skills, participation, etc. Satisfaction increases proportionally with improvements in such measures, as students are presented with frequent opportunities to gauge themselves and improve their performance accordingly.

Features that can enhance the level of student satisfaction significantly include the use of authentic assessment forms which will be able to mimic actual managerial activities (Boud & Falchikov, 2007) such as Consulting project, Business Plan competitions, Simulated environments, Evaluation of executives, peer assessment within an MBA program, AI-enabled personalization and the like. Assessment in these forms is transformational because it is not just a summative method, but part of the learning experience per se.

4. IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

The application of the Kano Model extends beyond improving student satisfaction; it contributes to a broader philosophy of learner-centred educational design. Management educators frequently face competing demands related to curriculum expansion, technological innovation, accreditation requirements, employability, and student engagement. The Kano framework assists decision-makers by distinguishing between pedagogical attributes that simply maintain acceptable educational quality and those capable of transforming the learning experience.

Importantly, the Kano Model should not be interpreted as encouraging institutions to satisfy every student preference. Higher education differs fundamentally from commercial service industries because its ultimate objective is learning rather than customer gratification. Academic rigor, intellectual challenge, ethical reasoning, and critical reflection occasionally require learning experiences that students initially perceive as demanding. Therefore, Kano analysis should complement rather than replace pedagogical judgment and outcome-based curriculum design. When integrated thoughtfully, the model provides a balanced framework that supports continuous innovation while preserving academic excellence and educational integrity (Biggs & Tang, 2011).

Overall, the Kano Model offers management educators a structured and evidence-based approach for designing pedagogical interventions that align with evolving learner expectations. By distinguishing between essential requirements, performance-enhancing practices, and delight-generating innovations, business schools can create educational

environments that simultaneously improve student engagement, learning outcomes, institutional reputation, and graduate readiness for an increasingly complex managerial world.

5. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Although the Kano Model has gained considerable attention in quality management, healthcare, hospitality, and service industries, its application within management education remains relatively underexplored. Existing studies have primarily focused on evaluating institutional services, online learning systems, or student satisfaction with higher education rather than examining pedagogical practices themselves (Shahin et al., 2013). More recently, researchers have begun applying the Kano framework to teaching management from a student-centred perspective, demonstrating that students clearly distinguish between pedagogical attributes that are essential, performance-enhancing, and delight-generating. These findings suggest that the Kano Model has substantial potential for informing curriculum development and instructional decision-making in higher education.

One promising direction for future research involves integrating the Kano Model with Outcome-Based Education (OBE). Most contemporary management programmes are designed around programme learning outcomes, graduate attributes, and competency frameworks. However, these approaches rarely distinguish between competencies that students simply expect to acquire and those that create exceptional educational value. Combining OBE with the Kano Model could enable curriculum designers to prioritize learning activities that simultaneously improve competency attainment and student engagement. Such an integrated framework would assist curriculum committees in identifying which learning experiences deserve greater investment while ensuring that fundamental educational standards are consistently maintained.

A second avenue for future investigation concerns the integration of the Kano Model with learning analytics and educational data mining. Modern learning management systems generate extensive information regarding student participation, assessment performance, engagement patterns, and resource utilization. These behavioural data can complement

Kano survey findings by revealing whether pedagogical features classified as attractive also lead to measurable improvements in learning outcomes. Integrating perceptual data obtained through Kano questionnaires with behavioural analytics would provide a richer understanding of the relationship between student expectations, engagement, and academic achievement. Such multidimensional analysis could support evidence-based curriculum redesign while reducing reliance on end-of-semester satisfaction surveys alone.

Artificial intelligence represents another area where future research can substantially extend the Kano framework. Generative AI, intelligent tutoring systems, adaptive learning platforms, automated formative feedback, and predictive learning analytics are transforming higher education by enabling increasingly personalized learning experiences. However, institutions still possess limited understanding of which AI-enabled pedagogical features students perceive as essential and which continue to function as attractive innovations. As AI technologies become more widely adopted, features that currently delight students may gradually evolve into basic institutional expectations. Longitudinal Kano studies could therefore examine how technological innovations migrate across Kano categories over time, thereby providing valuable guidance for strategic investments in educational technology.

Cross-cultural research also represents an important opportunity for extending Kano-based educational research. Student expectations are influenced by cultural values, institutional traditions, disciplinary norms, and socioeconomic conditions. Consequently, pedagogical attributes classified as attractive in one educational context may function as must-be qualities in another. Comparative studies across countries, institutional types, and management programmes would enhance understanding of these contextual differences while contributing to the development of globally relevant pedagogical frameworks. Recent cross-country applications of the Kano Model within higher education have already demonstrated that students from different educational systems prioritize institutional attributes differently, highlighting the importance of contextualizing educational quality rather than assuming universal expectations.

Another promising research direction involves examining the dynamic evolution of pedagogical attributes throughout students' academic journeys. Kano originally proposed that quality attributes change over time as customer expectations evolve (Kano et al., 1984). This proposition has particular relevance within management education. For example, online learning platforms, recorded lectures, and digital resource repositories were once considered innovative educational features. Today, they have become standard institutional expectations. Similarly, current innovations such as immersive simulations, virtual reality environments, AI-supported coaching, and personalized learning pathways may eventually transition from attractive qualities to basic educational requirements. Longitudinal studies examining these transitions would contribute significantly to both quality management theory and educational research.

Future studies should also explore relationships between Kano classifications and established educational theories. Integrating the Kano Model with Constructive Alignment (Biggs & Tang, 2011), Experiential Learning Theory (Kolb, 2015), Self-Determination Theory, the Technology Acceptance Model, Expectation-Confirmation Theory, and Service Quality (SERVQUAL) frameworks could provide a more comprehensive understanding of student engagement and educational quality. Such theoretical integration would strengthen the explanatory power of Kano-based educational research while expanding its applicability within management education.

From a methodological perspective, future investigations should move beyond descriptive Kano classifications toward more sophisticated analytical approaches. Combining Kano analysis with structural equation modelling, importance-performance analysis, multi-criteria decision-making techniques, fuzzy Kano analysis, and machine learning algorithms would enable researchers to investigate complex relationships among pedagogical innovation, student satisfaction, engagement, learning outcomes, and employability. Mixed-method research combining Kano surveys with qualitative interviews and classroom observations would further enrich understanding of why students perceive particular pedagogical attributes differently.

Finally, future research should evaluate the long-term organizational implications of Kano-informed pedagogical innovation. Most existing educational studies measure student satisfaction immediately following course completion. However, management education aims to produce graduates capable of sustained professional success. Longitudinal research examining whether Kano-based curriculum redesign improves graduate employability, leadership development, organizational performance, entrepreneurial intention, and lifelong learning would substantially strengthen the evidence base supporting the application of the Kano Model within management education.

REFERENCES

1. AACSB International. (2020). 2020 guiding principles and standards for business accreditation. AACSB International.
2. Berger, C., Blauth, R., Boger, D., Bolster, C., Burchill, G., DuMouchel, W., Pouliot, F., Richter, R., Rubinoff, A., Shen, D., Timko, M., & Walden, D. (1993). Kano's methods for understanding customer-defined quality. *Center for Quality Management Journal*, 2(4), 3–36.
3. Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). Open University Press.
4. Boud, D., & Falchikov, N. (2007). *Rethinking assessment in higher education: Learning for the longer term*. Routledge.
5. Dhawan, S. (2020). Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 49(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239520934018>
6. Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(23), 8410–8415. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111>
7. Harvey, L. (2003). Student feedback. *Quality in Higher Education*, 9(1), 3–20.
8. Kano, N., Seraku, N., Takahashi, F., & Tsuji, S. (1984). Attractive quality and must-be quality. *Journal of the Japanese Society for Quality Control*, 14(2), 39–48.
9. Kolb, D. A. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
10. Matzler, K., & Hinterhuber, H. H. (1998). How to make product development projects more successful by integrating Kano's model of customer satisfaction into quality function deployment. *Technovation*, 18(1), 25–38.
11. Petriglieri, G., & Petriglieri, J. L. (2020). The return of the MBA: Business education in the age of disruption. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 19(4), 621–635.
12. Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93(3), 223–231.
13. Shahin, A., Pourhamidi, M., Antony, J., & Hyun Park, S. (2013). Typology of Kano models: A critical review of literature and proposition of a revised model. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 30(3), 341–358.
14. Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—Where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(39). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>

HOW TO CITE: Abhilash Ponnamm*, Application Of The Kano Model To Management Pedagogy: A Conceptual Framework To Enhance Students' Learning Experience, *Int. J. Sci. R. Tech.*, 2026, 3 (8), 730-738. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21991339>