1-1-2023

Chapter 8 : Evaluating Intentional Education Practice in Graduate Programs

Abeni El-Amin Ph.D.
Fort Hays State University, aelamin@fhsu.edu

Recommended Citation

El-Amin, A. "Evaluating Intentional Education Practice in Graduate Programs." Elevating Intentional Education Practice in Graduate Programs, edited by Abeni El-Amin, IGI Global, 2023, pp. 160-176. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-4600-3.ch008

Chapter 8
Evaluating Intentional Education Practice in Graduate Programs

Abeni El-Amin
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7506-1658
Fort Hays State University, USA & Shenyang Normal University, China

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this chapter was to examine whether the six variables of graduate educational quality predict intentional education practice (IEP) (teaching style) in United States graduate university programs. The issue is that graduate student engagement, student satisfaction, and matriculation diminish without IEP. Consequently, current performance measures of graduate higher educational programs illuminate issues in processes within instruction, quantity of trained instructor mentors, professional support networks, and existing programming, which may need improvement. Indeed, past researchers have noted limitations in higher educational and graduate school environments. Performance measurement variables impact long-term institutional effectiveness and remain largely unknown within educational institutions. However, some studies have noted IEP may be used as a variable to impact teaching effectiveness.

INTRODUCTION

As currently applied within instruction, higher education (HE) variables for foundational improvement include six determinants of service quality of HE (educator quality, educational services, activities, technology, continuous improvement, and

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-6684-4600-3.ch008

educational leadership) and IEP as the criterion variable (Latif et al., 2019). Additional variables for teaching effectiveness include strategic objectives of the institution, the importance, variables, and hindrance of implementing professional development network and support systems (Lu et al., 2017). As a result, the central theme of this research is to strengthen the application and foundation of Intentional Education Practice (IEP) utilizing Intentional Change Theory (ITC) (Boyatzis, 2008). Study findings may add to the body of knowledge that currently exists to determine what improvements can occur if educational institutions incorporate intentional education practices in graduate educational leadership programs (El-Amin, 2021a).

Research Paradigm

The quantitative method is appropriate for this study to validate findings. As a result, a quantitative survey methodology was administered by querying graduate higher education leaders and instructors. The quantitative method is appropriate for this study as it provides useful information regarding the psychometric properties of specific variables (Neuman, 2019). The method rationale is based upon the Latif et al. (2019) study, which noted quantitative analysis is the best approach to analyze this research because correlating the variables yield Pareto data, which delineates which variables are most applicable to intentional education practice.

Research variables strongly influenced by each variable may strongly influence other items intended to measure the same construct suggest that variables may be affectively capturing their intended construct (Neuman, 2019). The generalized results of the participants may be that their responses will have a cross-sectional outcome based on individual and institutional experiences. The dependent variable is known as the outcome variable, IEP. The six predictor and one criterion variable were measured by survey responses.

This study highlights a paradigmatic perspective used for the development of a transformative research paradigm for this study. As a result, the nature of this study necessitates a paradigmatic perspective that involves a compilation of rationally linked theories and propositions that provide a conjectural perspective to guide the research methodology (Neuman, 2019). Additionally, the transformative research paradigm permits a methodical worldview for the measures of the research design (Hurtado, 2015). The study paradigm consists of meta-theoretical assumptions such as axiological, epistemological, methodological, and ontological. The theoretical framework for this study includes the principles of andragogy, intentional change theory, transformational learning theory, and innovation theory. Additionally, Hein (1991) and Piaget's (1950) models of constructivism with relation to how and why learners apply information support the theoretical constructs of this study. The theoretical framework enhances the transformative paradigmatic perspective in

accordance with the phases enumerated within this study. Thus, a transformative worldview justifies the research problems within this study.

Further, the transformative worldview provides a basis that educational institutions need alternative or different institutional development practices to improve performance (Hurtado, 2015; Neuman, 2019). Ethical implications in quantitative methods studies pivot on the counsel of The Belmont Report, expressed by federal regulations, as "systematic investigations including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalized knowledge" (National Commission, 1979, p. 1). However, regardless of federal regulations, the researcher has accountability to maintain integrity and validity in conducting research.

The aim of this chapter addressed the nature of the study. The study involved six predictor variables of service quality of higher education include educator quality (P1), educational services (P2), activities (P3), technology (P4), continuous improvement (P5), and graduate educational leadership (P6) are associated with or predict the criterion variable, IEP (teaching style) using the pre-validated HiEduQual scale (Latif et al., 2019). Data analysis for hypothesis testing employed Pearson's correlation and linear regression analysis.

ANALYSES OF INTENTIONAL EDUCATION PRACTICE

The purpose of the IEP quantitative correlation study was to examine whether the six variables of graduate educational quality predict IEP in United States graduate university programs. Six predictor variables of service quality of higher education include educator quality (P1), educational services (P2), activities (P3), technology (P4), continuous improvement (P5), and graduate educational leadership (P6) are associated with or predict the criterion variable, IEP (teaching style) using the pre-validated HiEduQual scale (Latif et al., 2019). The target population was the 250 U.S. graduate faculty at two research sites in the United States of America: (Graduate School 1) (Muncie, Indiana) and (Graduate School 2) (Hays, Kansas). Study findings are based on probability as the sampling method and a minimum sample size calculation for regression analysis with a minimum sample size of 48 with a (α= .05; power= .80; effect= .25) (Cohen, 2013; Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012; Statistics Kingdom, 2021).

The problem is graduate education teaching effectiveness needs improvement due to the failure of institutions to identify process improvements, ascertain appropriate stakeholders to accomplish institutional goals, and implement streamlined classroom processes to ensure instructors have the appropriate professional support needed (Arif & Ilyas, 2012; Lu et al., 2017; White, 2018). The specific problem is graduate student engagement, student satisfaction, and matriculation diminish without IEP

(Al-Ali, 2017; Arif & Ilyas, 2012). The theoretical framework for this study is Hein's (1991) constructivism.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this quantitative correlation study was to examine whether the six variables of graduate educational quality predict IEP (teaching style) in Unites States graduate university programs. The study problem is that graduate student engagement, student satisfaction, and matriculation diminish without intentional education practice (IEP) (Al-Ali, 2017; Arif & Ilyas, 2012). Additionally, graduate faculty must be cognizant of the different learning preferences of auditory, visual, and haptic to help students achieve comprehension of topical matter (Merriam et al., 2007).

The problem related to teaching effectiveness includes failure of institutions to identify process improvements, ascertain appropriate stakeholders to accomplish institutional goals, and implement streamlined classroom processes to ensure instructors have the appropriate professional support needed to apply Intentional Educational Practices in graduate programs. Consequently, current performance measures of educational programs illuminate issues in processes within instruction, quantity of trained instructor mentors, professional support networks, and existing programming which may need improvement, yet is not being addressed in educational environments. Performance measurement factors that impact long-term institutional effectiveness service quality of HE (educator quality, educational services, activities, technology, continuous improvement, educational leadership, and teaching style).

Further, the ability of education leaders to implement improved performance within education provides insights into the success rates of educational organizations. Moreover, organizational performance is a critical aspect of effective and efficient management. Further, educational leadership factors as appropriate for organizational performance within higher education are determined. Likewise, the role of education leaders is to improve organizational performance, identify stakeholders to develop, and execute quality initiatives of performance within graduate programs.

Participants and Research Setting

The target population was comprised of 250 U.S. graduate faculty and administrators at two research sites in the United States of America: (Graduate School 1) (Muncie, Indiana) and (Graduate School 2) (Hays, Kansas). The survey was distributed to 250 graduate faculty and administrators for a final sample size of 91 respondents for a 36.4% return rate. This final sample size exceeded the minimum sample size

of 48 as determined by a G*Power analysis for a rigorous regression study (α= .05; power= .80; effect= .25) (Cohen, 2013; Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012; Statistics Kingdom, 2021).

The final sample (N=91) consisted of a majority of doctoral-level graduate faculty (36%) who largely did not report race/ethnicity (51%). Of participants who did report race/ethnicity, the majority reported race/ethnicity as Asian (20%), followed by African American (15%), and White (10%). Additionally, participants reported preferential teaching styles, which indicated a predilection towards Andragogy (8%), followed by Pedagogy (7%), Self-Directed Learning (SDL) (42%), Transformative (14%), Experiential (16%), Embodied (1%), Spiritual (4%), and Narrative (2%).

Analyses of Research Questions

Following the closure of the survey, data were downloaded to Excel for cleaning and preparation for analysis. Data cleaning required the removal of unnecessary typos from the dataset. As such, structural errors were ascertained to correct abnormal naming conventions or typos or improper capitalization. The data revealed no outliers. Missing data were coded as null values and accuracy was achieved by ensuring the data matched the true values represented in the survey scale. Completeness and consistency of the data occurred by ensuring the data were consistent within the same dataset and across multiple variables. Uniformity was achieved by determining the degree to which the data was itemized using the equivalent unit of measure.

Following data cleaning, the survey data were used to compute the study's six predictor variables of graduate educational quality and the criterion variable of IEP (teaching style). Once variables were computed, data assumption tests for parametric correlation and regression analysis were conducted (Laerd, 2021b). Normality was assessed to ensure normal distribution and linearity and homoscedasticity were evaluated. The data followed an approximately normal distribution, and the assumption was met. Linearity was evaluated by scatterplots to demonstrate linearity and the assumption was met. Homogeneity of variances was assessed using the Levene's test for the six predictor variables and the criterion variable ($F = 4.093$, $p < 0.05$) and the assumption was met.

Research Question 1

Q1. Do associations exist among the six variables of graduate educational quality: (a) educator quality, (b) educational services, (c) activities, (d) technology, (e) continuous improvement, and (f) educational leadership based on graduate faculty perceptions at United States universities?

A descriptive analysis of the seven study variables was conducted prior to hypothesis testing (see Table 1).

Table 1. Descriptive analysis: Seven study variables

Variable	*M*	*SD*	Range
C. IEP (teacher style)	3.77	1.75	1-5
PV1. Educator Quality	4.74	0.90	1-5
PV2. Educational Services	4.41	0.91	1-5
PV3. Activities	4.44	0.86	1-5
PV4. Technology	4.55	0.96	1-5
PV5. Continuous Improvement	4.33	1.01	1-5
PV6. Graduate Educational Leadership	4.38	0.97	1-5

Note. $N = 91$.

Hypothesis 1

Analysis for hypothesis 1 was conducted using Minitab statistical software. Hypothesis 1 was tested for associations between the seven variables using the Pearson's correlation coefficient. Six significant correlated pairs resulted from Pearson correlation analysis (see Table 2). Six significant correlated pairs were found between educational services (PV2) that indicated a significant moderate correlation with activities (PV3) ($r = 0.660^*$; $p < .05$); educational services (PV2) also indicated a significant moderate correlation with continuous improvement (PV5) ($r = 0.714^*$; $p < .05$), and educational services (PV2) indicated a significant moderate correlation with graduate educational leadership (PV6) ($r = 0.703^*$; $p < .05$). Further, in activities (PV3), which indicated a significant moderate correlation with continuous improvement (PV5) ($r = 0.726^*$; $p < .05$) and activities (PV3) also had a significant moderate correlation with graduation educational leadership (PV6) ($r = 0.752^*$; $p < .05$). Finally, continuous improvement (PV5) had a significant moderate correlation with graduate educational leadership (PV6) ($r = 0.740^*$; $p < .05$). As a result, there were significant correlations found between the criterion variable (IEP) and the six predictor variables ($p < .05$). These significant correlated pairs suggested that as one predictor variable increased, the other predictor variable also increased.

Table 2. Pearson correlation: Six domains of quality instruction

Variable	PV1	PV2	PV3	PV4	PV5	PV6	C
PV1. Educator Quality	–	. 0.404	0.578	0.583	0.387	0.393	-0.009
PV2. Educational Services		–	0.660*	0.287	0.714*	0.703*	0.092
PV3. Activities			–	0.573	0.726*	0.752*	0.122
PV4. Technology				–	0.500	0.439	-0.054
PV5. Continuous Improvement					–	0.740*	0.268
PV6. Graduate Educational Leadership						–	-0.007
C. IEP (teacher style)							_

Note. $N = 91$; * $p < .05$.

Therefore, null hypothesis 1 was rejected as evidence existed for alternate hypothesis 1.

Research Question 2

Q2. Do the six variables of graduate educational quality: (a) educator quality, (b) educational services, (c) activities, (d) technology, (e) continuous improvement, and (f) educational leadership predict intentional education practice (IEP) based on graduate faculty perceptions at United States universities?

Hypothesis 2

Analysis for hypothesis 2 was conducted using Minitab statistical software. Linear regression analysis was used to test hypotheses 2. The six predictor variables of graduate educator quality were used as predictors of the criterion variable IEP (teaching style). Three predictor variables were found to be a significant individual predictor of IEP (teaching style) (see Table 3). Technology ($p = .039$), continuous improvement ($p = .000$), and graduate educational leadership ($p = .008$).

One regression equation was returned that explained 26.1% the variance of IEP (teaching style):

IEPGRADED (teaching style) = 52.87 + 9.22*TECH (P4) + 8.07*CONTIMPROV (P5) + 8.77*GRADEDLEAD (P6)

The regression equation indicated, when combined, technology (PV4) (9.22%), continuous improvement (PV5) (8.07%), and graduate education leadership (PV 6) (8.77%) explained 26.1% of the variance of IEP (teaching style). About 73.9% of the variation is unexplained and is due to chance or other unknown variables. Three

Table 3. Multiple regression analysis: Predictors of IEP (teaching style)

	β	SE	*t*	*p*	95% Confidence	
Variable					**LL**	**UL**
P1. Educator Quality	9.51	0.23	42.16	0.987	4.53	4.98
P2. Educational Services	8.64	0.23	37.79	0.370	4.10	4.55
P3. Activities	8.66	0.21	40.38	0.213	4.12	4.54
P4. Technology	9.22	0.24	38.18	0.039*	4.37	4.85
P5. Continuous Improvement	8.07	0.25	32.91	0.000*	3.80	4.28
P6. Graduate Educational Leadership	8.77	0.24	35.99	0.008*	4.15	4.63
R^2	0.261					
F	-0.01					

Note. $N = 91$; $p < 0.05$*.

predictor variables were excluded from the significant model returned: educator quality (PV1), educational services (PV2), and activities (PV3) as they did not contribute to IEP (teaching style) ($p < .05$). Therefore, null hypothesis 2 was rejected as evidence existed for the alternate hypothesis 2.

The study examined graduate education faculty and administrator's willingness to implement the criterion variable of IEP (teaching style) in U.S. graduate university programs based on six predictor variables (a) educator quality, (b) educational services, (c) activities, (d) technology, (e) continuous improvement, and (f) educational leadership based upon (Latif, et al., 2019). The survey was administered voluntarily to faculty and administrators at two institutions of higher education in Muncie, Indiana, U.S. (Graduate School 1) and Hays, Kansas, U.S. (Graduate School 2). The final sample size was 91 and participant demographics included a diverse group of educators who encompassed an array of instructional or administrative positions, educational levels, teaching experience in the academy, academic disciplines, teaching style preferences, racial, and gender attributes.

Analyses of findings indicated null hypothesis 1 was rejected as six significant moderate correlated pairs were found between educational services and activities; educational services and continuous improvement, educational services and graduate educational leadership, activities and continuous improvement, activities and graduation educational leadership, and continuous improvement and graduate educational leadership ($p< .05$).

Analyses of findings indicated null hypothesis 2 was rejected as the multiple regression analysis indicated technology, continuous improvement (PV5) (8.07%), and graduate education leadership were significant individual predictors of IEP

(teaching style) ($p < .05$). One regression equation was returned that explained 26.1% of the variance of IEP (teaching style). Chapter Five provides the study summary, discussion, and implications of IEP (teaching style).

Discussion and Implications of Intentional Education Practice

The purpose of this quantitative correlation study was to examine whether the six variables of graduate educational quality predict IEP (teaching style) in United States graduate university programs. The problem is graduate education teaching effectiveness needs improvement due to the failure of institutions to identify process improvements, ascertain appropriate stakeholders to accomplish institutional goals, and implement streamlined classroom processes to ensure instructors have the appropriate professional support needed (Arif & Ilyas, 2012; Lu et al., 2017; White, 2018). The specific problem was graduate student engagement, student satisfaction, and matriculation are diminished without IEP (teaching style) (Al-Ali, 2017; Arif & Ilyas, 2012). The chapter concludes with a discussion of the practical assessment of research questions, limitations of the study, implications for future study, and a summary.

Six predictor variables of service quality of higher education included educator quality (P1), educational services (P2), activities (P3), technology (P4), continuous improvement (P5), and graduate educational leadership (P6) are associated with or predict the criterion variable, IEP (teaching style) using the pre-validated HiEduQual scale (Latif et al., 2019). This chapter includes a discussion of major findings related to graduate educational quality, IEP (teaching style), and what implications may be valuable for use by U.S. graduate instructors. Also integrated is a reflection on correlations to this study and IEP (teaching style).

This study was conducted utilizing a quantitative, Pearson's correlation linear regression analysis method. Further utilized was a transformative research paradigm. Key finding from chapter 4 indicated that the null hypothesis 1 was rejected because significant correlations exist among educator quality, educational services, activities, technology, continuous improvement, graduate educational leadership, and IEP (teaching style) as reported by United States graduate faculty. Further, analyses of the research findings indicated null hypothesis 2 was rejected as a result, technology, continuous improvement, and graduate education leadership were highly significant individual predictors of IEP (teaching style). Moreover, educator quality, educational services, activities were not as significant predictors of IEP (teaching style) as reported by United States graduate faculty.

Practical Assessment of Research Questions

Next, what follows is supported discussion and interpretation from a practical application perspective to elucidate why IEP (teaching style) as a methodology may be utilized to decrease process variation for service delivery. In the end, improves graduate educational quality.

Research Question 1

Q1. Do associations exist among the six variables of graduate educational quality: (a) educator quality, (b) educational services, (c) activities, (d) technology, (e) continuous improvement, and (f) educational leadership based on graduate faculty perceptions at United States universities?

Based on research findings aligned with the research questions, there are four approaches to providing consistent quality and performance via IEP (teaching style) within graduate educational programs to achieve improved performance (Antony, 2014). Considered is the impact of each approach as well as the practicality of the approach. The analysis of this study specifies that IEP (teaching style) could be utilized as a theory to determine graduate faculty perceptions and predict the utilization of IEP (teaching style) at United States universities. The IEP (teaching style) theoretical process focuses on the ideal function of graduate programming and designing programs to correlate and predict student and industry demands. IEP (teaching style) graduate program administrators must correlate and predict uncertainty, realizing that to produce a program that meets student satisfaction, variations will occur. The goal is to systematically correlate and predict graduate program variations by understanding programmatic issues and then eliminating variations.

Research Question 2

Q2. Do the six variables of graduate educational quality: (a) educator quality, (b) educational services, (c) activities, (d) technology, (e) continuous improvement, and (f) educational leadership predict intentional education practice (IEP) (teaching style) based on graduate faculty perceptions at United States universities?

Determining nominal values of graduate program performance predicts a program design insensitive to variations. Moreover, eliminating variations requires identifying performance parameters, ascertaining variations, and eliminating the cause of variations (Antony, 2014). As a result, IEP (teaching style) graduate program design improves the capabilities of faculty and administrators to improve upon graduate programming and processes (Kok & McDonald, 2017). Therefore, administrators

must examine graduate program outputs annually and adjust graduate programs accordingly. A robust graduate program design allows administrators to determine inherent weaknesses by identifying proactive approaches to avoid reactive responses. In this way, graduate programming that does not meet graduate educational quality requirements can be modified or scrapped, which is non-preferential as modifications are costly and wasteful (Mezirow, 2009).

Limitations of the Study

Possible limitations and ergo threats to internal and external validity for the correlational design and procedures were not challenging for the research objectives. The study was delimited to U.S. graduate universities, so findings may not be generalizable to other educators and higher education institutions in other geographical areas.

Moreover, identified are potential barriers to implementing IEP (teaching style) in graduate programs (Lu et al., 2017). For each barrier, described are ways that barriers can be mitigated or removed. The first barrier to implementing IEP (teaching style) requires removing process barriers by integrating additional technology to streamline processes, allotting the appropriate planning time and financial resources to improve flow (Latif et al., 2019) as indicated by key findings of the study where technology, continuous improvement, and graduate education leadership were highly significant individual predictors of IEP (teaching style). A probable solution to this barrier is to reduce processing time and improve flow by utilizing a standardized system of graduate program production, which will reduce the time and cost it takes to develop, modify, implement, evaluate, and adapt graduate programming (Abubakar et al., 2019). A second barrier to implementing IEP (teaching style) is that scope creep when developing graduate programming. As a result, graduate education leadership must provide more focus on staying aligned with the mission and curriculum of the program. A probable solution to this barrier is to narrow the scope of graduate programming or to develop interdisciplinary program areas to meet student interest and increase student satisfaction.

A third barrier to implementing IEP (teaching style) is the lack of a strategic targeting plan to enlist leaders, administrators, faculty, and students to participate in a specific graduate program (Lu et al., 2017). As noted from the Research Question Two findings, continuous improvement is a highly significant individual predictor of effective graduate education. A probable solution to this barrier is supporting stakeholders to ensure graduate programming quality and performance (Abubakar et al., 2019). A fourth barrier to implementing IEP (teaching style) is that too many processes and individuals are part of efficiently developing, implementing, or modifying graduate programs. A probable solution to this barrier is to minimize the number of administrators who develop, implement, or modify specific graduate

programming by standardizing the process and ultimately incorporating IEP (teaching style) theory. Based on the findings from Research Question Two, educational leadership is solely responsible and held accountable for managing the process.

Implications for Future Study

Based on metrics of graduate educational quality, IEP (teaching style) as an adult training theory is based on Intentional Change Theory (ITC), which asserts that fundamental social, political, economic changes occur through intentional instruction; but first contemplation must transpire concerning instructional ethos and its structure (Boyatzis, 2008). In context, IEP (teaching style) as a theory is not restricted to a specific field. It involves reflection upon the premises, ideas, and innovations utilized in various graduate programs of business, liberal studies, history, political theory, science, and technology (Merriam et al., 2007; Mezirow, 2009). In this way, IEP (teaching style) is interdisciplinary, valuable as a teaching technique (Latif et al., 2019). In contrast, instructors encourage discourse that presents complex issues. Students engage and even lead discussions, which does not restrict learning and creates equity in the instructional environment (Kok & McDonald, 2017). Based on the findings from Research Question 2, institutions and graduate program leaders must consistently examine the multifaceted perspectives of technological advancement, doctoral student voice, agency, academic identity, and dissemination of graduate student research (El-Amin, 2021ba; Rigler et al., 2021).

Further, based on research findings in Research Question One and Two, students likewise assume a vast responsibility regarding what happens in the learning process. Students select, manage, and assess their individual learning assignments, which can be obtained when the training structure permits, through any method, at any age. Instructors emphasize graduate student abilities, processes, and developed frameworks instead of simply assigning substantive assessments and tests (Steelman & Wolfeld, 2018). Graduate education may include preliminary self-assessment of personal characteristics to create relevant assignments. IEP (teaching style) is dynamic; in this manner, instructors intertwine numerous modalities such as andragogy, self-directed learning, transformative, embodiment, experiential, and spiritual learning as teaching strategies to make learning relevant (Clark & Rossiter, 2008; Knowles, 1984; McLeod, 2017; Merriam et al., 2007; Mezirow, 2009; Smyrnaiou et al., 2016; Guiter et al., 2021).

Conclusively, and based on findings from Research Question One and Two, IEP (learning styles) as a theory links an important evaluative component, providing an assessment of graduate instructors that guarantees competency in the instructional environment (Latif et al., 2019; Pearson, 2017). As noted by Pearson (2017) and Latif et al. (2019), performance measurement impact long-term institutional, program, and

departmental effectiveness and linked the study's findings that technology, continuous improvement, and graduate education leadership are key indicators of establishing world-class graduate programs. Notwithstanding, assessment measurements of IEP (teaching style) contrasts with customary instructor assessments in that it enables instructors to concentrate on student progress and professional development rather than only facilitation. The study's contributions to theory suggested how practical application and intentionality implementation in graduate programs enhances institutional and student performance. Therefore, future study needed to develop IEP (teaching style) is an assessment and training program with measurable outcomes to evaluate graduate educators.

CONCLUSION

The ability of instructors to implement improved graduate educational performance provides insights into the success rates of instructors to connect with students (Kok & McDonald, 2017). This research aimed to determine graduate educational quality outcomes correlated to IEP (teaching style). Moreover, teaching effectiveness is a critical aspect of efficient class management (Abubakar et al., 2019). As currently applied within instruction, graduate educational quality factors included six determinants of service quality of HE (educator quality, educational services, activities, technology, continuous improvement, and educational leadership) (Latif et al., 2019). Additional factors for graduate educational quality include strategic objectives of the institution, the importance of intentionally developing graduate programs, continuous improvement measures, and implementation of instructor professional development to improve graduate education quality (Lu et al., 2017). As a result, the central theme of this research was to strengthen the application and foundation of IEP utilizing ITC (Boyatzis, 2008). Next is a call for future research.

The theoretical framework provided in this study examined graduate education based on the (Latif et al., 2019) study. The primary goal of this study was to build a theoretical model by proposing methods to improve graduate education performance. Recommendations for future research are to: Test IEPT as a conceptual and theoretical framework with individual graduate programs nationally and globally, develop IEP (teaching style) as an assessment and training program with measurable outcomes to evaluate graduate educators, administrators, and programs.

REFERENCES

Al-Ali, A. A., Singh, S. K., Al-Nahyan, M., & Sohal, A. S. (2017). Change management through leadership: The mediating role of organizational culture. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *25*(1), 723–739. doi:10.1108/IJOA-01-2017-1117

Antony, J. (2014). Readiness variables for the Lean Six Sigma journey in the higher education sector. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *63*(2), 257–264. doi:10.1108/IJPPM-04-2013-0077

Arif, S., & Ilyas, M. (2012). Creating a Quality Teaching Learning Environment. *International Journal of Learning*, *18*(6), 51–70. doi:10.18848/1447-9494/CGP/v18i06/47647

Boyatzis, R. (2008). Competencies in the 21st century. *Journal of Management Development. 27.* doi:1 doi:0.1108/02621710810840730

Clark, M. C., & Rossiter, M. (2008). Narrative learning in adulthood. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, *2008*(119), 61–70. doi:10.1002/ace.306

Cohen, J. (2013). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Academic press. doi:10.4324/9780203771587

El Amin, A. (2021b). Utilizing technology to elevate online graduate education. International. *Journal of Online Graduate Education*, *4*(2).

El-Amin, A. S. T. (2021a). *A Correlation Study of Intentional Education Practice Theory for United States Graduate Programs* [Doctoral dissertation, University of the Cumberlands, USA].

Fabrigar, L. R., & Wegener, D. T. (2012). *Exploratory variable analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Guiter, G. E., Sapia, S., Wright, A. I., Hutchins, G. G., & Arayssi, T. (2021). Development of a remote online collaborative medical school pathology curriculum with clinical correlations, across several international sites, through the Covid-19 pandemic. *Medical Science Educator*, *31*(2), 549–556. doi:10.100740670-021-01212-2 PMID:33495717

Hein, G. (1991). *Constructivist learning theory.* Institute for Inquiry. http://www. exploratorium. edu/ifi/resources/constructivistl earning.htmlS

Hurtado, S. (2015). The transformative paradigm. *Critical approaches to the study of higher education: A practical introduction*, 285.

Knowles, M. S. (1984) *Andragogy in action. Applying modern principles of adult education.* Jossey Bass. http://www.instructionaldesign.org/theories/andragogy/

Kok, S. K., & McDonald, C. (2017). Underpinning excellence in education–an investigation into the instruction, governance and management behaviors of high-performing academic departments. *Studies in Education*, *42*(2), 210–231.

Laerd. (2021b). *Linear Regression using Minitab*. Statistics. https://statistics.laerd.com/minitab-tutorials/linear-regres
sion-using-minitab.php

Latif, K. F., Latif, I., Farooq Sahibzada, U., & Ullah, M. (2019). In search of quality: Measuring education service quality (HiEduQual). *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, *30*(7-8), 768–791. doi:10.1080/14783363.2017.1338133

Lu, J., Laux, C., & Antony, J. (2017). Lean Six Sigma leadership in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *66*(5), 638–650. doi:10.1108/IJPPM-09-2016-0195

McLeod, S. (2017). Kolb's learning styles and experiential learning cycle. *Simply psychology, 5*.

Merriam, S., Caffarella, R., & Baumgartner, L. (2007). *Learning in adulthood* (3rd ed.). Jossey Bass.

Mezirow, J. (2009). Transformative learning theory. In J. Mezirow, and E. W. Taylor (Eds), *Transformative Learning in Practice: Insights from Community*. Learning Theories. https://www.learning-theories.com/transformative-learning-theory-mezirow.html

National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. (1979). *The Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of research.* HHS. www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance

Neuman, L. W. (2019). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Pearson Education.

Pearson, G. (2017). National academies piece on integrated STEM. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *110*(3), 224–226.

Piaget, J. (1950). *The Psychology of Intelligence*. Routledge.

Rigler, K. L. Jr, Anastasia, C. M., El-Amin, A., & Throne, R. (2021). *Scholarly voice and academic identity: A systematic review of doctoral student agency. Handbook of Research on Developing Students' Scholarly Dispositions in Higher Education*. IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-7998-7267-2.ch004

Smyrnaiou, Z., Sotiriou, M., Georgakopoulou, E., & Papadopoulou, O. (2016). Connecting embodied learning in educational practice to the realization of science educational scenarios through performing arts. *Inspiring Science Education, 31.*

Statistics Kingdom. (2021). *Sample size calculator linear regression, ANOVA (F distribution).* Statistics Kingdom. https://www.statskingdom.com/sample_size_regression.html

ADDITONAL REFERENCES

Tucker, E., & Lam, S. (2014). Dynamic leadership – a leadership shortage solution. *Strategic HR Review, 13(*4/5), 199-204. doi:10.1108/SHR-06-2014-0035

Uhl-Bien, M., & Arena, M. (2018). Leadership for organizational adaptability: A theoretical synthesis and integrative framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *29*(1), 89–104.

Ullah, W., Jan, S., Iqbal, K., & Jehan, N. (2019). SERVQUAL reborn: Does faculty members' quality approach fosters academic performance? A case of eight local higher education institutes. *City University Research Journal, 9*(3), 513-538. doi:10.1177/2158244016676294

Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (1992). Towards a theory of informal and incidental learning in organizations. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *11*(4), 287–300.

Woodley, X. M., & Parra, J. (2019). (Re) framing and (Re) designing instruction: Transformed teaching in traditional and online classrooms. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal, 12*(1).

Xiong, Y., & Suen, H. K. (2018). Assessment approaches in massive open online courses: Possibilities, challenges, and future directions. *International Review of Education*, *64*(2), 241–263.

Xudong, Z., & Li, J. (2020). Investigating 'collective individualism model of learning': From Chinese context of classroom culture. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *52*(3), 270.

Zheng, W., Qu, Q., & Yang, B. (2009). Toward a theory of organizational cultural evolution. *Human Resource Development Review*, *8*(2), 151–173.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Intentional Education Practice: Higher education (HE) variables for foundational improvement include six determinants of service quality of HE (educator quality, educational services, activities, technology, continuous improvement, and educational leadership) and IEP as the criterion.

Performance Measurement: Performance measurement impact long-term institutional, program, and departmental effectiveness and linked the study's findings that technology, continuous improvement, and graduate education leadership are key indicators of establishing world-class graduate programs.

Professional Support Networks: Professional Support Networks are a critical aspect of effective and efficient management. Further, educational leadership factors as appropriate for organizational performance within higher education necessitate providing equitable recruitment practices, onboarding, mentor support, and succession management. Likewise, the role of education leaders is to improve organizational performance, stakeholder support, and execute quality initiatives of performance within graduate programs.