Submitted: 17/07/2023 - Accepted: 16/08/2023 - Published: 29/09/2023

Examination of the Blue Ocean Leadership Levels of Academic Staff According to Demographic Variables

Ahmet Tılfarligil[1]

Hacı Mustafa Paksoy[1]

[1]Gaziantep University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Business Administration, Turkey
*Email: atilfarligil@gmail.com

DOI: 10.26417/a1gsh075

Abstract

This study analyzed the blue ocean leadership orientations of academic staff at universities in Gaziantep, Turkey using the validated Blue Ocean Leadership (BOL) scale. It examined BOL scores according to demographic factors including gender, age, education level, academic rank, university status, seniority, and administrative roles. A survey methodology was adopted, with 452 faculty members completing the BOL instrument which measures visionary thinking, trust-building, and motivational communication capacities. Bayesian quantitative analyses evaluated group differences and the multivariate impacts of covariates on leadership scores. The findings revealed no substantive BOL differences based on gender or employment at state versus private institutions. However, age and experience showed important linkages to leadership orientations, with academic staff in their mid-40s and those with 11-15 years seniority exhibiting significantly higher blue ocean leadership scores indicative of stronger capabilities in conveying inspirational vision, building trust, empathy, and fostering innovation. Doctorate qualifications also robustly predicted higher leadership scores compared to master's education, highlighting potential benefits of advanced expertise. But lack of variation across academic ranks suggested motivational leadership qualities are not necessarily hierarchical. Additionally, formal administrative duties did not translate to higher visionary leadership strengths. These novel insights address a need to understand connections between personal/professional attributes and multidimensional leadership specifically among higher education faculty and administrators. The patterns related to career stage, education level and experience can inform policies

tailored to support different demographic subgroups. Fostering blue ocean leadership across diverse academic staff profiles can catalyze cultures of inspiration, innovation and exponential value within universities regionally and globally. Study limitations include localized scope and cross-sectional design; longitudinal tracking and comparative analyses can reveal further connections between academic demographics and strengths in empathy, trust-building and visionary communication.

Keywords: Blue ocean leadership, Academic staff, Demographic factors, Visionary capabilities

Introduction

Leadership is crucial for organizations of all kinds, including universities, to achieve their goals and drive positive change (Dumulescu & Muţiu, 2021; Lawton-Misra & Pretorius, 2021). An innovative approach to leadership that has gained attention in recent years is the concept of "blue ocean leadership" (Loh et al., 2019). Blue Ocean Leadership developed by W. Chan Kim and Renée Mauborgne (2014b) applies the principles of Blue Ocean Strategy to leadership. Blue ocean leadership focuses on identifying new leadership styles, orientations and strategies that can motivate organizations and people to rise to their full potential (Noordiana et al., 2016). This study aims to examine blue ocean leadership within an academic context by evaluating the blue ocean leadership levels of academic staff at Gaziantep city according to key demographic variables.

Academic institutions rely heavily on their faculty and administrators for leadership to set strategy, foster talent, enable research, and prepare students to meet societal needs (Smith & Wolverton, 2010). Understanding the blue ocean orientation and capabilities of academic staff can reveal opportunities for unleashing staff potential and lifting institutional performance (Abu Hasan et al., 2017). Demographic variables provide insights into which subsets of academic staff exhibit higher or lower levels of non-traditional, motivational leadership qualities (Ekman et al., 2018).

This study will survey academic staff at Gaziantep city across faculties and roles using a standardized instrument for measuring blue ocean leadership on key dimensions including empathy, insight, trust-building, innovative thinking, and vision-setting (Noordiana et al., 2016). Scores will be analyzed according to demographic variables including gender, age, academic rank, and years of service in their university.

Findings will enable the universities to tailor professional development, training interventions, and human capital strategies to the needs of different demographic groups when it comes to strengthening non-traditional leadership skills (Hassan et al., 2013). Insights from the blue ocean leadership analysis can help create a culture and climate at the universities that empowers all academic staff to reach their full

motivation and performance potential. The study will contribute valuable insights about blue ocean leadership specifically in higher education institutions (Dumulescu & Muţiu, 2021; Lawton-Misra & Pretorius, 2021).

Literature review

Leadership in Higher Education

Leadership in higher education is a multifaceted concept that has been extensively explored in various academic studies. The theoretical foundations of leadership in this context often revolve around different leadership styles and their impacts on institutional performance. One significant aspect of leadership in higher education is the influence of different leadership styles on job satisfaction among academic staff. A meta-analysis highlighted that spiritual leadership strongly impacts academic staff job satisfaction ($r = 0.894$), followed by servant ($r = 0.658$), other ($r = 0.632$), and transformational leadership styles ($r = 0.569$) (Kasalak et al., 2022). These findings suggest that leadership approaches that emphasize empathy, personal development, and the well-being of employees are particularly effective in academic settings.

Further, the role of leadership in shaping educational policy and practice is crucial, especially in facing structural challenges in higher education. Steele and White (2019) emphasize that higher education leadership often relies on corporate logics, which can exacerbate existing problems. They argue for the inclusion of academic advisers in decision-making processes, as advisers possess unique perspectives and expertise in dealing with students and educational policies at various levels (Steele & White, 2019). This approach suggests a need for more inclusive and consultative leadership practices in higher education.

In addition, the impact of leadership styles on faculty performance is another area of interest. Various leadership styles have been found to affect employees' performance differently in higher education institutions (Steele & White, 2019). This highlights the importance of understanding and implementing leadership styles that are conducive to enhancing faculty performance, which in turn can positively impact the overall performance of higher education institutions.

Moreover, a study focusing on the potential of academic leadership, experiential learning, and student employability emphasized the significance of academic leadership in improving the performance of higher education providers (Pandita & Kiran, 2023). This study suggests a correlation between effective leadership and enhanced educational outcomes, including student learning and employability.

Overall, the research indicates that effective leadership in higher education is not monolithic but varies according to the context and the specific needs of the institution and its stakeholders. The impact of leadership styles on job satisfaction, faculty performance, and overall institutional performance underlines the importance of

adopting leadership approaches that are empathetic, inclusive, and responsive to the changing dynamics of the higher education landscape.

Blue Ocean Leadership Theory and Concepts

In current markets characterized by intense competition, the strategies developed by organizations to operate effectively are known as "Red Ocean strategies." The term "Red" is used to describe the fierce and cutthroat competition among rivals. The Red Ocean represents all existing industries where industry boundaries are well-defined and accepted, and the competitive rules of the game are known. In these oceans, organizations adopt a traditional approach of racing to outcompete rivals by establishing a defendable position within the existing industry order (Alam & Islam, 2017). On the other hand, "Blue Oceans" represent markets and industries that have not yet emerged due to competition. Instead of battling with rivals, organizations can move to Blue Oceans where there are vast opportunities for both profit and rapid growth (Mızrak & Baykal, 2019).

Blue Ocean Leadership is a unique framework that diverges significantly from traditional leadership models (Noordiana et al., 2016). Unlike conventional approaches that focus primarily on the development of a leader's character and behavior, Blue Ocean Leadership emphasizes actionable leadership practices directly tied to organizational performance(Kim & Mauborgne, 2014a).

One of the core principles of Blue Ocean Leadership is focusing on acts and activities rather than just personal traits (Wan Hanafi et al., 2016). This approach is action-oriented, centering on specific actions leaders need to undertake to motivate their teams and achieve business results. It contrasts traditional models that emphasize self-awareness, self-regulation, and empathy, which are often challenging to measure and do not always translate into effective leadership or high performance (Kim & Mauborgne, 2014b).

Blue Ocean Leadership also stresses the importance of aligning leadership with market realities (Kim & Mauborgne, 2014b). This involves engaging people who face these realities daily and enabling them to contribute to defining the leadership acts and activities that will enhance their performance and satisfaction. This approach is rooted in the understanding that effective leadership cannot be generic but must be tailored to the specific challenges and needs of an organization and its market environment (Hanafi et al., 2018; Zakaria et al., 2017).

Another fundamental aspect of Blue Ocean Leadership is the distribution of leadership across different management levels (Kim & Mauborgne, 2014b). Recognizing that leadership is needed at all levels – senior, middle, and frontline – this approach aims to unlock the potential and energy within an organization by empowering leaders at every level. This distributed leadership model acknowledges that the responsibilities and challenges at each level are distinct and require different leadership profiles to be effective (Hanafi et al., 2018).

Finally, Blue Ocean Leadership advocates for high-impact leadership acts and activities at a low cost (Kim & Mauborgne, 2014b). This means focusing on actions that drive high motivation and engagement while reducing time-consuming and less effective practices. The goal is to maximize the impact of leadership on organizational performance without overburdening leaders with additional tasks that detract from their primary responsibilities (Hanafi et al., 2018; Zakaria et al., 2017).

The implementation of Blue Ocean Leadership involves tools and methodologies such as the Leadership Canvas, the Leadership Profile, and the Blue Ocean Leadership Grid. These tools are designed to be easily understood and communicated, engaging more people within an organization in the leadership development process. They are crucial in addressing the challenges of leadership development for high performance (Zakaria et al., 2017). In summary, Blue Ocean Leadership stands out for its emphasis on actionable leadership practices, alignment with market realities, distribution of leadership across all levels, and focus on high-impact, low-cost activities. This approach marks a significant shift from traditional leadership models, which often center on personal traits and behaviors.

Academic Staff Capabilities

Academic staff in universities, including faculty and administrators, play a crucial role in the progression and success of higher education institutions. Their roles, responsibilities, competencies, and developmental needs have been the subject of various studies (Dinh et al., 2021; Kohtamäki, 2019; Pham, 2021). A study conducted at a South African university explored the career competencies essential for academic staff to progress successfully in their careers. This study was underpinned by an integrated competency framework that included reflective, communicative, and behavioral competencies. Reflective competencies encompassed gap analysis, self-evaluation, social comparison, and goal orientation. Communicative competencies involved information seeking and negotiation, while behavioral competencies included strategy alignment, control and agency, university awareness, continuous learning, and collaboration. Notably, strategy alignment emerged as the most commonly found competency, especially among more senior academics (Barnes et al., 2022). This study highlights the importance of holistic development for academic staff, emphasizing the need for continuous learning and adaptability in an ever-evolving academic environment.

The enhancement of academic staff capabilities is a multifaceted endeavor that can be addressed through several effective strategies. A pivotal step involves the careful assessment and selection of leaders during the managerial appointment process (ElAlim Etway & Mohamed, 2019). This approach ensures the promotion of individuals possessing essential skills and qualities necessary for effective leadership roles. Emphasizing this aspect is crucial as it forms the foundation for competent and visionary management.

Furthermore, it is imperative for these selected leaders to devise tailored strategies aimed at engaging faculty members who might feel disengaged or underutilized. Such strategies could include offering support and resources designed to reignite their passion and enhance their involvement in academic activities (Dinh et al., 2021; Meyer & Evans, 2005; Pham, 2021). This approach not only benefits the individual faculty members but also contributes positively to the overall academic environment.

Additionally, investment in robust and modern organizational capabilities is essential. These capabilities encompass areas such as leadership acumen, effective communication skills, and a nurturing institutional culture (Odengo et al., 2022). Developing these areas is fundamental in fostering a healthy and productive relationship between university management and the academic staff. This relationship is a cornerstone for achieving sustainable performance within the educational institution (Vorster & Quinn, 2017).

Moreover, the role of educational development programs cannot be overstated in the current educational landscape. These programs are instrumental in providing support to academic staff, aiding them in honing their research skills and achieving excellence in teaching (Bingwa & Ngibe, 2021; Meyer & Evans, 2005; Pham, 2021). Through these programs, staff members can develop a stronger research profile, which is increasingly important in a globally competitive academic environment. Additionally, these programs often offer innovative teaching methodologies, thereby enriching the educational experience for students and educators alike.

These studies collectively underscore the multifaceted nature of academic staff roles and highlight the importance of developing specific competencies for career progression and effective academic administration. They also point to the need for tailored development programs that address these competencies and support academic staff in meeting the challenges of a dynamic higher education environment.

Demographic Factors and Leadership

The connections between leadership orientations/capabilities and demographic factors such as gender, age, academic rank, and years of experience have been examined in various studies across different contexts.

A study conducted by Mohnot (2019) explored the impact of demographic variables on academic leadership preparedness within Indian higher education institutions. The study, which included 372 academic leaders, found that age, leadership experience, and academic disciplinary background had a significant relationship with leadership preparedness. Interestingly, the type of institution—whether private or government—did not seem to affect leadership preparedness. The study revealed that leaders with a background in the humanities and social sciences were generally more prepared compared to their counterparts in natural and physical sciences. These findings suggest that certain demographic characteristics may influence the development and readiness for leadership roles within academic settings,

highlighting the need for targeted leadership development programs that consider these factors.

While research offers insights into academic leadership, a broader literature review could encompass additional demographic variables such as gender and academic rank (Mohnot, 2019; Pani, 2017). Gender, for instance, is often explored in leadership research, with studies examining how gendered perceptions and biases can impact leadership styles and effectiveness (Ravichandran & Ahuja Dua, 2022; Žydžiūnaitė, 2016). Age and academic rank can also play a role in leadership development, as they often correlate with differing levels of experience and institutional knowledge. Years of experience, whether within academia or leadership positions specifically, can contribute to a leader's orientation and capabilities, offering practical skills that complement theoretical knowledge (Mohnot, 2019).

The synthesis of literature on this topic would likely reveal complex interplays between these demographic factors and leadership qualities, providing a nuanced understanding of how various elements contribute to the effectiveness of leaders in higher education. It is essential for institutions to consider these demographic factors when designing leadership development programs and when assessing leadership potential and performance within their academic staff.

In summary, the literature reveals extensive research on leadership styles and their impacts in higher education, highlighting approaches that prioritize inclusivity, empathy, and responsiveness to stakeholder needs. Studies have also examined specific competencies and development strategies for enhancing academic staff capabilities. Additionally, connections have been established between certain demographic variables and leadership preparedness. However, there remains a need to explore these factors specifically in relation to blue ocean leadership orientations among academic staff. This study aims to address this gap by evaluating blue ocean leadership levels across academic staff subgroups based on key demographic and professional characteristics including gender, age, academic rank, and years of service. The analysis will shed light on the research question: "How do demographic and professional characteristics influence Blue Ocean Leadership (BOL) scores among academic staff?" Findings will provide insights to help tailor leadership development initiatives and human capital strategies based on the distinct needs of different demographic segments of the academic workforce.

Methodology

This cross-sectional study utilized a quantitative approach and correlational design to examine the factors associated with Blue Ocean Leadership (BOL) among academic staff across universities in Gaziantep, Turkey. As noted by Setia (2016), a cross-sectional quantitative methodology enables the statistical assessment of potential correlations and relationships between variables of interest within a sample measured at a specific point in time. Furthermore, survey-based methodologies allow

for the relatively quick and economical gathering of data from a large population (Dillman, 2014). Hence, a structured survey technique was determined as an optimal approach for efficiently collecting leadership data from the target sample.

Sample

The sample comprised 452 academic personnel selected via multi-stage random sampling from the target population. Academic staff members were randomly chosen from within each of the selected universities while also ensuring proportionate representation across departments (Table 1).

Table 1. Demographic distribution of participants

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Female	204	45.133
	Male	248	54.867
Age	23-27	65	14.381
	28-32	95	21.018
	33-37	98	21.681
	38-42	59	13.053
	43-47	16	3.54
	48-52	65	14.381
	53 and older	54	11.947
Education Level	BS	23	5.088
	MA	135	29.867
	Ph. D.	294	65.044
Administrative Role	No administrative role	272	60.177
	Head department/program	46	10.177
	Head department	75	16.593
	Institute/Vocational School Director	34	7.522
	Dean	25	5.531
Academic Role	Research Assistant	111	24.558
	Lecturer	46	10.177
	Doctoral Research Assistant	15	3.319
	Doctoral Lecturer	21	4.646
	Assistant Professor Dr.	105	23.23
	Associate Professor Dr.	64	14.159
	Professor Dr.	90	19.912
University Status	State University	291	64.381
	Private University	161	35.619
Seniority In University	Less than 1 year	50	11.062
	1-5 year	207	45.796
	5-10 year	108	23.894
	11-15 year	35	7.743
	16-20 year	28	6.195
	21 and over years	24	5.31

The data from universities in Gaziantep, Turkey, presents a detailed picture of the academic staff's demographic and professional characteristics. The gender distribution among the 452 academic staff members is relatively balanced, with males comprising 54.867% and females 45.133%. This indicates a fairly equal gender representation. The age profile of the staff is concentrated in the middle age brackets, particularly between 28 to 37 years, highlighting a workforce predominantly in its mid-career phase. A striking 65.044% of the staff hold a Ph.D., underscoring a high level of educational attainment, while those with Master's and Bachelor's degrees follow at 29.867% and 5.088%, respectively.

In terms of roles, a majority (60.177%) do not have any administrative role, aligning with the typical focus on teaching and research in academia. The remainder are spread across various administrative positions, with 'Head of Department' being notably prevalent. Academically, the staff covers a wide spectrum, with 'Research Assistant' and 'Assistant Professor Dr.' being the most common positions, followed by 'Prof. Dr.' and 'Assoc. Prof. Dr.', reflecting a healthy mix of both junior and senior academic roles.

Regarding the type of institution, state universities employ the majority (64.381%) of the staff, indicating their dominant role in Gaziantep's educational sector, compared to private universities (35.619%). Finally, the seniority distribution shows a significant number of staff (45.796%) with 1-5 years of service, suggesting a relatively new or recently hired workforce, with a gradual decrease in numbers among those with longer tenure.

In summary, this data portrays a diverse, well-educated, and professionally varied academic workforce in Gaziantep, marked by a good balance of gender, a strong emphasis on higher education, a blend of different academic and administrative roles, and a predominant employment in state universities.

Data collection tool

In this research, the Blue Ocean Leadership (BOL) scale was utilized for data collection. This scale was originally formulated within the context of vocational colleges in Penang, Malaysia. The methodological approach of the study incorporated the use of Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), culminating in the development of an instrument that comprises 13 items, categorized under three distinct dimensions: focus (encompassing 7 items), visionary (3 items), and idealized influences (3 items). The scale underwent a re-adaptation process for the context of Turkey. This adaptation involved an initial phase of ensuring linguistic validity. A team first translated the scale from English to Turkish, followed by another language expert who retranslated the Turkish version back into English. Subsequent comparisons were made between these translations. The revised scale was then administered to a sample of 500 academic staff members. Ethical clearance for the study was obtained from the Ethics Committee of Gaziantep University. Furthermore, consent forms were

acquired from participants, confirming their voluntary participation before administering the survey. The data collected were thoroughly reviewed, with irrelevant or incomplete responses being excluded. The remaining 452 responses were divided into two groups for exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis.

A principal component analysis was conducted. The Bartlett's Test of Sphericity yielded a result of χ^2=987, df=105, p < .001, and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure was .889. Items 7, 11, 12, 13, and 20 were removed from the scale due to low factor loading values. The Varimax rotation was deemed appropriate. Ultimately, the scale was determined to have a unidimensional structure.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was subsequently applied. The results were as follows: χ^2/df = 1.15, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .973, Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) = .968, Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) = .0424, and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .0246. Given that χ^2 / df < 3, CFI and TLI > .90, and SRMR and RMSEA < 0.8, as per the criteria established by Brown (2015) and Hu and Bentler (1999), the three-factor structure of the scale was validated through CFA. The study also established the scale's reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of .801 and McDonald's omega of .80, confirming the scale as both valid and reliable for assessing blue ocean leadership.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics including mean, median, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, minimum and maximum were calculated for the overall Blue Ocean Leadership (BOL) scores to characterize the distribution and variability of the leadership measure in the sample. Bayesian independent samples t-tests were conducted to evaluate group differences in BOL scores by gender, university status (state vs private), and administrative role (with vs without). Bayes factors (BF10) were computed to quantify evidence for the alternative hypothesis of a group difference against the null hypothesis of no difference. Bayes factors greater than 1 indicate greater support for the alternative, while values less than 1 indicate more support for the null. A Bayesian ANOVA was used to assess the impact of age, education level, academic status, and seniority in university on BOL scores. These enabled comparisons of multiple groups simultaneously. Bayes factors were calculated between models that included the grouping variables against null models. Post-hoc comparisons between pairs of groups were conducted when warranted, with Bayes factors again used to quantify evidence for differences. For all Bayesian tests, a default prior of Cauchy (0, r = $\sqrt{2}$) was employed. Posterior probabilities and Bayes Factors were estimated numerically using Markov Chain Monte Carlo sampling procedures implemented in R statistical software. Credible intervals around parameter estimates were constructed from the posterior distributions. Error percentages were calculated to ensure sampling accuracy in the Bayesian computations. The various Bayesian procedures enabled probabilistic comparisons of the evidence for and against hypothesized differences or effects in a coherent framework. Focusing on relative evidence through Bayes factors

provided information beyond traditional null hypothesis significance testing. The multivariate modeling and post-hoc analysis facilitated nuanced explorations of group and covariate influences on leadership qualities measured by the BOL instrument in this academic sample.

Findings

Table 2. Descriptive of BOL

	N	Median	Mean	S.d	Skewness	Kurtosis	Min	Max
BOL	452	47.0	49.12	10.47	0.30	0.32	15	75

The table outlines the statistical analysis of Blue Ocean Leadership (BOL) scores for a sample of 452 academic individuals. The median BOL score is 47.0, indicating that the distribution of scores is balanced in a way that half of the individuals score below and half above this value. The mean score is slightly higher at 49.12, suggesting a distribution that leans toward higher scores; this is also reflected in the positive skewness value of 0.30, which points to a right-skewed distribution with more individuals scoring below the mean and fewer with very high scores. The standard deviation is 10.47, signifying a substantial spread around the mean, implying a significant variation in BOL scores among the individuals assessed. The kurtosis of 0.32 hints at a distribution with a slightly sharper peak and heavier tails than a normal distribution, which could suggest that there are more individuals with scores around the mean compared to what would be expected in a normal distribution. The scores range from a minimum of 15 to a maximum of 75, highlighting a broad range in the leadership qualities or characteristics measured by BOL within the academic cohort. This wide range indicates a diverse set of BOL scores, which may reflect varied leadership styles or effectiveness among the individuals in the sample.

Gender

Table 3. Bayesian t-test results based on gender

Group	N	Mean	SD	BF_{10}	error %
Female	204	48.912	10.306	0.113	0.147
Male	248	49.298	10.615		

Tables 3 present a Bayesian t-test analysis of the Blue Ocean Leadership (BOL) scores by gender among academic individuals, along with descriptive statistics for each group. In the descriptive statistics section, we see that BOL scores have been recorded for 204 females and 248 males. The mean BOL score for females is 48.912 with a standard deviation (SD) of 10.306, and for males, the mean score is slightly higher at 49.298 with a SD of 10.615. The Bayesian Independent Samples T-Test results show a Bayes Factor (BF_{10}) of 0.113 for BOL, which indicates that the data are approximately 8.85 times more likely under the null hypothesis (no difference

between genders) than the alternative hypothesis (a difference between genders). This is considered substantial evidence for the null hypothesis. The error percentage of 0.147% is quite low, suggesting high confidence in these results. In conclusion, the Bayesian t-test analysis suggests that there is no significant difference in BOL scores between female and male academic individuals in this sample, as the evidence is leaning heavily towards the null hypothesis of no difference.

Age

Table 4. Descriptive statistics based on age

age	N	Mean	SD
23-27	65	46.077	8.793
28-32	95	47.305	9.082
33-37	98	48.806	9.897
38-42	59	52.966	10.601
43-47	16	59.375	10.21
48-52	65	47.569	9.079
53 and older	54	51.204	13.721

The descriptive for BOL scores across age groups show that the mean scores tend to increase with age, particularly noticeable in the 43-47 age group, which has a mean BOL score of 59.375, higher than the other age groups. The standard deviations (SD) are relatively consistent, though there is a noticeable increase in variability (for the oldest age group (53 and older).

Table 5. Bayesian ANOVA results based on age

Models	P(M)	P(M|data)	BF_M	BF_{10}	error %
Age	0.5	0.999	1608.621	1	
Null model	0.5	6.213×10^{-4}	6.217×10^{-4}	6.217×10^{-4}	0.006

The Bayesian ANOVA model comparison indicates a strong preference for the model that includes age as a factor affecting BOL scores. The prior probability for each model was set at 0.500 (50%), reflecting no initial preference for either model. After observing the data, the probability of the age model being the correct one (P(M|data)) is virtually 1 (99.9%), with the Bayes Factor in favor of the age model over the null model (which assumes no effect of age) being extremely high at 1608.621. This suggests overwhelming evidence that age has a significant effect on BOL scores.

Table 6. Bayesian post-hoc test results based on age

Age	Age group	Prior Odds	Posterior Odds	$BF_{10, U}$	error %
23-27	28-32	0.219	0.053	0.242	0.04
	33-37	0.219	0.167	0.763	0.019
	38-42	0.219	37.505	171.244	1.135×10^{-8}
	43-47	0.219	2206.029	10072.562	8.112×10^{-7}
	48-52	0.219	0.062	0.283	0.031
	53 and older	0.219	0.639	2.919	0.008
28-32	33-37	0.219	0.06	0.274	0.044
	38-42	0.219	10.069	45.973	5.942×10^{-8}
	43-47	0.219	702.143	3205.931	1.313×10^{-9}
	48-52	0.219	0.039	0.176	0.049
	53 and older	0.219	0.285	1.303	0.013
33-37	38-42	0.219	0.637	2.907	0.007
	43-47	0.219	34.229	156.289	2.943×10^{-8}
	48-52	0.219	0.051	0.233	0.042
	53 and older	0.219	0.08	0.367	0.028
38-42	43-47	0.219	0.41	1.873	0.007
	48-52	0.219	2.598	11.862	2.698×10^{-7}
	53 and older	0.219	0.057	0.26	0.027
43-47	48-52	0.219	193.213	882.195	8.812×10^{-9}
	53 and older	0.219	0.442	2.017	0.007
48-52	53 and older	0.219	0.164	0.748	0.017

Note. The posterior odds have been corrected for multiple testing by fixing to 0.5 the prior probability that the null hypothesis holds across all comparisons (Westfall, Johnson, & Utts, 1997). Individual comparisons are based on the default t-test with a Cauchy (0, r = 1/sqrt(2)) prior. The "U" in the Bayes factor denotes that it is uncorrected.

The Post Hoc Comparisons for age show the results of pairwise comparisons between different age groups. The Bayes Factor (BF10, U) indicates the strength of evidence for a difference between groups. For example, Academicians in the 43-47 age group have higher BOL levels than many other age groups. Hypothesis H1 is highly

supported in extraordinary evidence. For example, in the studies 43-47 and 23-27, 28-32, 33-37, 48-42, the B10,U value was calculated as 10072.562, 3205.931, 156.289 and 882.195, respectively. The error percentages are extremely low, indicating high confidence in these results.

The analysis strongly suggests that there is a significant age effect on BOL scores among academic staff, with a tendency for scores to increase with age. The evidence is particularly strong for the differences between the 43-47 age group and the younger age groups. This could reflect that leadership qualities measured by the BOL may develop or become more pronounced with age and experience. The 95% credible intervals for each age group do not overlap significantly with the younger groups, reinforcing this interpretation. The corrected posterior odds account for multiple testing and still show strong evidence for age-related differences. The data here reflect that, at least in this academic sample, age is more than a mere number; it appears to correlate with leadership attributes as measured by BOL.

Educational Level

Table 7. Descriptive statistics based on educational level

Education level	N	Mean	SD
BS	23	46.391	13.142
MA	135	46.681	8.924
Ph.D	294	50.459	10.683

The descriptive statistics provide mean BOL scores for the different educational levels: BS, MA, and Ph.D. While the mean scores for BS (46.391) and MA (46.681) are quite similar, there is a notable increase for Ph.D. holders, who have a mean score of 50.459. The standard deviation (SD) is highest for the BS group and lowest for the MA group, with the Ph.D. group in between. It indicates especially between the MA and Ph.D. levels, suggesting a real difference in scores between these groups.

Table 8. Bayesian ANOVA results based on educational level

Models	P(M)	P(M|data)	BF_M	BF_{10}	error %
Education level	0.5	0.968	30.512	1	
Null model	0.5	0.032	0.033	0.033	0.031

The Bayesian ANOVA model comparison provides evidence that educational level is a significant factor in BOL scores. With a prior probability (P(M)) of 0.500 for both the model that includes educational level and the null model, the data shifts the posterior probability (P(M|data)) to 0.968 in favor of the model that includes educational level. This results in a Bayes Factor (BFM) of 30.512, suggesting that the model with

educational level is over 30 times more likely than the null model. The error percentage of 0.031% indicates high confidence in the model.

Table 9. Bayesian post-hoc test results based on age

	Educational Level	Prior Odds	Posterior Odds	$BF_{10, U}$	error %
BS	MA	0.587	0.139	0.236	0.017
	Ph.D	0.587	0.489	0.832	0.011
MA	Ph.D	0.587	29.647	50.471	4.965×10^{-4}

Note. The posterior odds have been corrected for multiple testing by fixing to 0.5 the prior probability that the null hypothesis holds across all comparisons (Westfall, Johnson, & Utts, 1997). Individual comparisons are based on the default t-test with a Cauchy (0, r = 1/sqrt(2)) prior. The "U" in the Bayes factor denotes that it is uncorrected.

The Post Hoc Comparisons show the results of pairwise comparisons between different educational levels. The comparison with the highest evidence is between the MA and Ph.D. levels, with a Bayes Factor (BF10, U) of 50.471, suggesting strong evidence that there is a significant difference in BOL scores between these two educational levels. The error percentage for this comparison is exceptionally low, further reinforcing the confidence in this result.

The analysis suggests that there is a significant difference in BOL scores related to the educational level of academic staff, particularly between those with a Master's degree and those with a Ph.D. The evidence does not strongly differentiate between BS and MA levels, as reflected in the lower posterior odds and Bayes Factors. The coefficient of variation is highest for the BS level, indicating a higher relative variability in BOL scores among those with a Bachelor's degree compared to the other groups. In summary, the educational level appears to be a meaningful factor in the BOL scores of academic staff, with the most substantial difference observed between the Master's and Ph.D. levels.

Academic status

Table 10. Descriptive statistics based on academic status

Academic role	N	Mean	SD
Prof Dr.	90	50.111	11.172
Assoc. Prof Dr.	64	51.219	10.746
Ass. Prof. Dr.	105	50.552	10.981
Dr. Lecturer	21	48.857	9.27
Dr. Research Assistant	15	50.667	8.165
Lecturer	46	46.87	9.692
Research Assistant	111	46.541	9.541

The descriptive statistics show the mean BOL scores for each academic role, with 'Associate Professor Dr.' having the highest mean score of 51.219 and 'Research Assistant' the lowest at 46.541. The standard deviations are relatively similar across roles, indicating a similar level of variability in BOL scores within each role.

Table 11. **Bayesian ANOVA results based on academic status**

Models	P(M)	P(M|data)	BF_M	BF_{10}	error %
Null model	0.5	0.515	1.061	1	
Academic status	0.5	0.485	0.943	0.943	0.002

The model comparison in the Bayesian ANOVA suggests that there is no strong evidence for differences in BOL scores across different academic roles. The prior probabilities (P(M)) were set at 0.500, reflecting no initial preference for either the null model or the model that includes academic role as a factor. The posterior probability (P(M|data)) after considering the data is almost evenly split between the null model (0.515) and the model including academic role (0.485). The Bayes Factor for the academic role model (BF10) is 0.943, and the error percentage is extremely low at 0.002%, suggesting that the evidence for any differences in BOL scores by academic status is not strong.

University Status

Table 12. Bayesian t-test results based on university status

Group	N	Mean	SD	BF_{10}	error %
State University	291	48.997	10.807	0.115	0.139
Private University	161	49.354	9.852		

The analysis conducted using a Bayesian t-test on the Blue Ocean Leadership (BOL) scores of academic staff from state and private universities reveals that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups. The sample comprised 291 individuals from state universities with an average BOL score of approximately 48.997 and a standard deviation indicating variability of scores at 10.807. In comparison, 161 individuals from private universities had a slightly higher average BOL score of 49.354, with a marginally lower standard deviation of 9.852, implying slightly less variability in scores. The Bayes Factor, which quantifies the support for the null hypothesis over the alternative hypothesis, is 0.115. This value suggests that the data are much more likely to occur under the null hypothesis, indicating no significant difference between the groups. Moreover, the error percentage is exceptionally low at 0.139%, further reinforcing the confidence in the finding that the type of university—state or private—does not significantly influence the BOL scores of the academic staff in this sample.

Seniority in their University

Table 13. Descriptive statistics based on seniority

Seniority in university	N	Mean	SD
1-5 year	207	47.92	10.376
11-15 year	35	56.80	12.475
16-20 year	28	45.79	5.294
21 and over years	24	51.67	11.258
5-10 year	108	50.60	10.659
Less than 1 year	50	46.20	7.309

The descriptive statistics table shows the number of individuals (N), mean BOL scores, standard deviations (SD), standard errors (SE), coefficients of variation, and 95% credible intervals for each seniority group. The group with "11-15 years" of seniority stands out with the highest mean BOL score of 56.800 and a relatively high SD of 12.475. The group with "Less than 1 year" has the lowest mean score of 46.200 and one of the lowest SDs, indicating less variability in their BOL scores.

Table 14. Bayesian ANOVA results based on seniority

Models	P(M)	P(M|data)	BF_M	BF_{10}	error %
Seniority in university	0.5	1	2323.85	1	
Null model	0.5	4.301×10^{-4}	4.303×10^{-4}	4.303×10^{-4}	0.002

The model comparison reveals a stark contrast between the null model (which assumes no effect of seniority on BOL scores) and the model that includes seniority as a factor. The prior model probabilities (P(M)) were both set at 0.500, indicating no initial preference. However, after analyzing the data, the model including seniority has a posterior probability (P(M|data)) of 1.000, and the null model's posterior probability drops to an almost negligible 4.301×10^{-4}. The Bayes Factor for the model including seniority (BFM) is exceedingly high at 2323.850, providing overwhelming evidence that seniority in the university has a significant effect on BOL scores.

Table 15. Bayesian post-hoc test results based on seniority

		Prior Odds	Posterior Odds	$BF_{10, U}$	error %
Less than 1 year	1-5 year	0.26	0.078	0.299	0.036
	5-10 year	0.26	1.114	4.284	0.006
	11-15 year	0.26	971.984	3739.537	4.956×10^{-10}

	16-20 year	0.26	0.065	0.251	0.014
	21 and over years	0.26	0.907	3.489	0.008
1-5 year	5-10 year	0.26	0.309	1.189	0.016
	11-15 year	0.26	483.434	1859.927	9.475×10^{-10}
	16-20 year	0.26	0.091	0.351	0.019
	21 and over years	0.26	0.195	0.75	0.012
5-10 year	11-15 year	0.26	1.985	7.639	0.004
	16-20 year	0.26	0.594	2.286	0.008
	21 and over years	0.26	0.066	0.254	0.016
11-15 year	16-20 year	0.26	104.916	403.646	1.008×10^{-8}
	21 and over years	0.26	0.205	0.787	0.009
16-20 year	21 and over years	0.26	0.825	3.176	0.009

Note. The posterior odds have been corrected for multiple testing by fixing to 0.5 the prior probability that the null hypothesis holds across all comparisons (Westfall, Johnson, & Utts, 1997). Individual comparisons are based on the default t-test with a Cauchy (0, r = 1/sqrt(2)) prior. The "U" in the Bayes factor denotes that it is uncorrected.

The Post Hoc Comparisons provide specific insights into the differences between various levels of seniority. The comparison between the groups "Less than 1 year" and "11-15 years" yields an extraordinarily high Bayes Factor (BF10, U) of 3739.537, suggesting extremely strong evidence for a difference in BOL scores between these two seniority levels. Notably, the "11-15 year" group has a significantly higher mean BOL score than other groups, as reflected in other comparisons with high Bayes Factors.

Overall, the results from the Bayesian ANOVA and subsequent analyses clearly indicate that seniority is a significant factor affecting BOL scores among academic staff. There is particularly strong evidence that individuals with "11-15 years" of seniority have higher BOL scores compared to those with less seniority or more than 15 years. The consistent patterns across the Bayesian model comparison, analysis of effects, and post hoc tests underscore the importance of considering seniority when evaluating leadership qualities in an academic setting.

Administrative role

Table 16. Bayesian t-test results based on university administrative role

Group	N	Mean	SD	BF_{10}	error %
No	272	49.456	10.502	0.149	0.113
Yes	180	48.622	10.424		

The Bayesian t-test results presented in the table examine the differences in Blue Ocean Leadership (BOL) scores between academic personnel with and without administrative roles. The analysis includes data from 272 individuals without administrative roles, who have an average BOL score of 49.456 and a standard deviation of 10.502, indicating the variability of BOL scores within this group. In comparison, the group with administrative roles comprises 180 individuals with a slightly lower average BOL score of 48.622 and a similar standard deviation of 10.424, suggesting comparable variability in scores.

The Bayes Factor (BF_{10}) associated with the comparison is 0.149, indicating that the evidence for a difference in BOL scores due to administrative role is not substantial. Specifically, this Bayes Factor suggests that the data are only 1.49 times more likely under the alternative hypothesis (that there is a difference between groups) than the null hypothesis (that there is no difference). Moreover, the error percentage of 0.113% shows high confidence in the test result. Consequently, the Bayesian analysis suggests that holding an administrative role does not significantly affect the BOL scores of academic staff, as the difference between the two groups is not statistically significant.

Discussion

This study examined the blue ocean leadership orientations among academic staff across universities in Gaziantep, Turkey using the Blue Ocean Leadership (BOL) scale developed by Noordiana et al. (2016). The analysis aimed to assess BOL levels according to key demographic variables including gender, age, education level, academic rank, university status, seniority, and administrative role. The cross-sectional quantitative analysis provided novel insights into the connections between these professional and personal characteristics and the innovative, motivational leadership qualities measured through the BOL instrument within an academic context.

The findings revealed no statistically significant difference in BOL scores between male and female academic staff. This aligns with research by Ekman et al. (2018), who also found no clear gender differences in transformational leadership behaviors in universities. However, it contrasts with some studies that have reported gender variations in leadership styles and effectiveness in academia (Ravichandran & Ahuja Dua, 2022; Žydžiūnaitė, 2016). The lack of gender differences suggests that the

specific qualities emphasized in the blue ocean leadership framework, including empathy, trust-building and innovative vision-setting, are manifested comparably across both genders among the academic workforce examined here.

Notably, age emerged as having a pronounced effect on BOL scores, with a tendency for scores to increase with age. This reinforces connections found in earlier research between age, experience and leadership capabilities (Mohnot, 2019). In the current study, the strongest differences emerged between academic staff aged 43-47 years and their younger counterparts. As posited by Mohnot (2019), this age-related pattern may reflect that the composite of visionary, motivational and trust-building qualities prioritized in the BOL approach develop over time with greater experience in academia. However, beyond the 43-47 age bracket, this upward trajectory attenuated, hinting that the leadership attributes measured become less pronounced again closer to retirement age.

Additionally, educational level impacted BOL orientations, with PhD holders exhibiting significantly higher scores than those with a Master's degree. This edge for doctorate holders mirrors findings on the links between academic leadership preparedness and educational level (Mohnot, 2019). The advanced expertise and qualification signified by a PhD appears to translate to stronger manifestation of capabilities like innovative thinking, empathy and communicative vision central to the blue ocean leadership concept.

On the other hand, academic rank within the university did not reveal definitive differences in BOL scores in this academic cohort. Although some variations were observed between levels, with associate professors showing the highest mean scores, the Bayesian analysis did not provide substantial evidence to differentiate the groups. This contrasts with indications that leadership effectiveness and orientation can depend partly on faculty rank (Mohnot, 2019). It suggests that the qualities gauged through the BOL instrument are not necessarily tiered across academic hierarchy.

Similarly, employment at either state-run or private universities did not markedly impact BOL orientations within the sample. This parallels findings by Mohnot (2019) that institutional type had little connection to leadership preparedness in Indian universities. It implies that blue ocean leadership attributes among faculty and administrators may be fostered through systemic practices in Turkish higher education rather than differing markedly by university ownership or funding status.

In contrast, seniority within the university showed a pronounced relationship with BOL levels, with staff having 11-15 years of experience exhibiting significantly higher scores than less experienced peers. As posited in management research (Hassan et al., 2013), this mid-career stage which balances seasoning and vitality may be optimal for manifesting the visionary, empathy, trust and innovation elements measured in the BOL instrument. On the other hand, holding administrative duties did not appear to affect BOL scores substantively. This suggests that the motivational leadership

qualities captured are not necessarily higher for those in formal management roles compared to faculty and researchers.

Overall, these findings provide empirical insights on how blue ocean leadership orientations assessed through the BOL scale are manifested among different academic subgroups based on age, education, experience and other characteristics. The study addresses a gap in understanding how demographic factors relate to innovative, inspirational leadership specifically within an academic context (Bingwa & Ngibe, 2021; Dumulescu & Muţiu, 2021). The patterns revealed around age, education and experience can help inform policy and training interventions aimed at maximizing leadership potential across higher education institutions. Tailored professional development initiatives accounting for life stage, qualifications, and career tenure may be most effective for fostering motivational qualities among diverse faculty (Hassan et al., 2013). Beyond Turkish academia, these findings contribute to broader research on blue ocean leadership and its connections to demographic variables across organizational settings (Noordiana et al., 2016).

Conclusion

This study aimed to examine blue ocean leadership orientations among academic staff at universities in Gaziantep, Turkey using the Blue Ocean Leadership scale. It analyzed the motivational leadership qualities across faculty subgroups based on demographic factors including gender, age, education level, academic rank, university status, seniority, and administrative roles. The Bayesian quantitative analysis provided new evidence on how these characteristics relate to strengths in visionary thinking, trust-building, innovative mindset and inspirational communication assessed through the blue ocean leadership concept.

The key findings showed minimal differences based on gender or university status, some variations across age and academic rank, but more pronounced effects related to seniority, education level and administrative roles. There was no definitive evidence that being male or female impacted blue ocean leadership scores, suggesting comparable capabilities across genders related to empathy, insight and vision-setting. Similarly, academic staff at private and state universities exhibited equivalent scores, indicating that motivational leadership qualities centered on innovation and inspiration are manifested irrespective of institution type.

However, age and experience showed important connections to leadership orientations, with higher blue ocean scores evident among faculty in their mid-40s and those with 11-15 years of seniority. This points to an intersection of career stage and seasoning being optimal for visionary, trust-building capabilities. Additionally, doctorate qualifications strongly predicted higher leadership scores compared to master's level education, highlighting the potential benefits of advanced expertise. But lack of stark differences across academic ranks implies motivational qualities are

not necessarily tiered by hierarchy. Lastly, formal administrative duties did not necessarily translate to higher inspirational leadership orientations.

These insights address a need for focused analysis on how personal and professional attributes relate to multidimensional, nontraditional leadership capacities specifically among faculty and administrators in higher education. The findings can inform policies on recruitment, role assignment, qualifications requirements, and leadership development initiatives tailored to support different demographic subgroups. Fostering blue ocean leadership across varied academic staff profiles can catalyze cultures of innovation, inspiration and exponential value within universities to better serve stakeholders.

The study has limitations in its localized scope and cross-sectional design. Follow-up research can build on these findings by tracking blue ocean leadership longitudinally across career stages. Additionally, comparative studies across different cultural and academic contexts could reveal further insights on relationships between demographics and inspirational, visionary leadership. Overall, by illuminating connections between key characteristics of academic staff and strengths in empathy, trust, insight and vision, this analysis contributes to advancing leadership research and practice for motivation and high performance in higher education.

References

[1] Abu Hasan, F., Komoo, I., Nazli, M., Nor, M., & Abdullah, Z. (2017). Transformation of universities and the national blue ocean strategy: a case study of Universiti Malaysia Terengganu. Journal of Sustainability Science and Management, 12, 70–78.

[2] Alam, S., & Islam, M. T. (2017). Impact of Blue Ocean Strategy on Organizational Performance: A literature review toward implementation logic. IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 19(01), 01–19. https://doi.org/10.9790/487x-1901030119

[3] Barnes, N., du Plessis, M., & Frantz, J. (2022). Career Competencies for Academic Career Progression: Experiences of Academics at a South African University. Frontiers in Education, 7. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.814842

[4] Bingwa, L., & Ngibe, M. (2021). The impact of academic training programmes in improving teaching and learning: A case of academic staff at a selected university of technology. South African Journal of Higher Education, 35(2). https://doi.org/10.20853/35-2-4620

[5] Brown, T. A. (2015). Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Applied Research. The Guilford Press.

[6] Dillman, D. A. (2014). Moving Survey Methodology Forward in our Rapidly Changing Moving Survey Methodology Forward in our Rapidly Changing World:

A Commentary World: A Commentary. Journal of Rural Social Sciences, 31, 12–31. https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jrss

[7] Dinh, N. B. K., Caliskan, A., & Zhu, C. (2021). Academic leadership: Perceptions of academic leaders and staff in diverse contexts. Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 49(6), 996–1016. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143220921192

[8] Dumulescu, D., & Muțiu, A. I. (2021). Academic Leadership in the Time of COVID-19—Experiences and Perspectives. Frontiers in Psychology, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.648344

[9] Ekman, M., Lindgren, M., & Packendorff, J. (2018). Universities need leadership, academics need management: discursive tensions and voids in the deregulation of Swedish higher education legislation. Higher Education, 75(2), 299–321. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0140-2

[10] ElAlim Etway, E. A., & Mohamed, N. T. (2019). Relationship between academic leaders' capabilities and faculty staff work engagement. Malaysian Journal of Nursing, 10(4), 107–119. https://doi.org/10.31674/mjn.2019.v10i04.014

[11] Hanafi, W. N. W., Daud, S., & Baharin, N. L. (2018). Blue Ocean Leadership and Emotional Intelligence in Government Link Companies (GLCs): Preparing for Industry 4.0. SHS Web of Conferences, 56, 04008. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185604008

[12] Hassan, S., Mahsud, R., Yukl, G., & Prussia, G. E. (2013). Ethical and empowering leadership and leader effectiveness. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 28(2), 133–146. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941311300252

[13] Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Structural Equation Modeling, 6(1), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

[14] Kasalak, G., Güneri, B., Ehtiyar, V. R., Apaydin, Ç., & Türker, G. Ö. (2022). The relation between leadership styles in higher education institutions and academic staff's job satisfaction: A meta-analysis study. Frontiers in Psychology, 13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1038824

[15] Kim, W. C., & Mauborgne, R. A. (2014a). Blue ocean leadership. Harvard Business Review.

[16] Kim, W. C., & Mauborgne, R. A. (2014b, September 23). The four pillars of blue ocean leadership. Harvard Business Review. https://knowledge.insead.edu/leadership-organisations/four-pillars-blue-ocean-leadership

[17] Kohtamäki, V. (2019). Academic leadership and university reform-guided management changes in Finland. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 41(1), 70–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2018.1553499

[18] Lawton-Misra, N., & Pretorius, T. (2021). Leading with heart: academic leadership during the COVID-19 crisis. South African Journal of Psychology, 51(2), 205–214. https://doi.org/10.1177/0081246321992979

[19] Loh, K. L., Mohd Yusof, S., & Lau, D. H. C. (2019). Blue ocean leadership in lean sustainability. In International Journal of Lean Six Sigma (Vol. 10, Issue 1, pp. 275–294). Emerald Group Holdings Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLSS-06-2016-0029

[20] Meyer, L. H., & Evans, I. M. (2005). Supporting academic staff: Meeting new expectations in higher education without compromising traditional faculty values. Higher Education Policy, 18(3), 243–255. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300086

[21] Mızrak, F., & Baykal, E. (2019). Leading Factors Contributing International Organizations To Be Agile and Blue Ocean Strategy; an Evidence From Turkish Civil Aviation Sector. Stratejik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 3(3), 465–490. https://doi.org/10.30692/sisad.562477

[22] Mohnot, H. (2019). The impact of some demographic variables on academic leadership preparedness in Indian higher education. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 43(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2017.1349891

[23] Noordiana, W., Hanafi, W., Daud, S., & Lyana Baharin, N. (2016). BLUE OCEAN LEADERSHIP DETERMINANTS. In International Journal of Management and Applied Science (Issue 2).

[24] Odengo, R. A., Bula, H., & Kiiru, D. (2022). Mediating Effect of Organisational Capabilities on Relational Contract and Performance of Academic Staff at Selected Public Universities in Kenya. Universal Journal of Management, 10(4), 69–79. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujm.2022.100402

[25] Pandita, A., & Kiran, R. (2023). Tapping the Potential of Academic Leadership, Experiential Learning, and Employability of Students to Enhance Higher Educational Institute Performance. SAGE Open, 13(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231183932

[26] Pani, A. (2017). Academic Leadership: Concept, Attributes and Practices. University News, 55(49), 17–25.

[27] Pham, D. H. (2021). The Professional Development of Academic Staff in Higher Education Institution. Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability, 23(1), 115–131. https://doi.org/10.2478/jtes-2021-0009

[28] Ravichandran, A., & Ahuja Dua, S. (2022). Influence of demographic attributes on the performance of academic staff: a study of higher educational institutions in a province of India. International Journal of Advanced Research, 10(07), 592–605. https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/15076

[29] Setia, M. (2016). Methodology series module 3: Cross-sectional studies. Indian Journal of Dermatology, 61(3), 261. https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5154.182410

[30] Smith, Z. A., & Wolverton, M. (2010). Higher education leadership competencies: Quantitatively refining a qualitative model. Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 17(1), 61–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051809348018

[31] Steele, G., & White, E. R. (2019). Leadership in Higher Education: Insights from Academic Advisers. The Mentor: Innovative Scholarship on Academic Advising, 21, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.18113/P8MJ2161110

[32] Vorster, J.-A., & Quinn, L. (2017). Re-Framing Academic Staff Development. In Pedagogic Frailty and Resilience in the University (pp. 109–121). SensePublishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-983-6_8

[33] Wan Hanafi, W. N., Daud, S., & Baharin, N. L. (2016). Is MLQ Instrument Applicable to Verify the Blue Ocean Leadership Traits? IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 32(1). https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/32/1/012054

[34] Zakaria, Z., Khairudin Idris, M., & Bakhari Ismail, M. (2017). Blue Ocean Leadership (BOL) Practices towards Promoting Employee Engagement in Public Service. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 7(3). https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i3/2696

[35] Žydžiūnaitė, V. (2016). Intellectual Leadership of Researchers in Higher Education: Relationship Between the Demographic Factors and Roles (Lithuanian Context). Acta Technologica Dubnicae, 6(3), 11–31. https://doi.org/10.1515/atd-2016-0017