



Value creation through behaviour based competencies in higher education– A modern education perspective

Rupa Mahajan

Lecturer, University of Jammu, Gujrabasti, Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir, India

Abstract

Purpose– The purpose of paper is to examine empirically theoretical concepts of service dominant logic (SDL) in value creation applied by faculty members of two universities

Design/Methodology/Approach– An empirical analysis is conducted to understand the extent to which service dominant logic (SDL) is predicted by various organisational traits. 400 respondents of University of Jammu and Guru Nanak Dev University were contacted.

Findings– The SEM results indicate significant relationship of SDL with all the three antecedents namely, organisational justice, organisational commitment and employee participation as well as with value creation.

Originality- The study contributes to existing literature by providing empirical evidence of SDL and its antecedents in context to value creation by faculty members.

Research limitations– Future studies should examine the role of individual traits like personality traits, motivation in predicting SDL. Consequential variables of SDL like organisational performance, customer satisfaction etc. should also be examined.

Keywords: higher education, SDL, SEM

Introduction

In SDL value creation is concerned with integration of resources and sharing of competencies between different stakeholders for their mutual benefit (Vargo and Lusch 2017) ^[67]. Recent development in research considers value creation as a central concept applicable to service sector, which has been receiving substantial attention in the marketing literature (Kuzgun & Asugman, 2015) ^[30]. In all kinds of exchange, the worth of what is obtained is evaluated in terms of value gained (Gummesson, 2008; Vargo & Lusch, 2008; Kuzgun & Asugman, 2015) ^[30, 64, 65, 36]. Lin and Lin (2006) ^[32] remark that value creation is based on service provision rather than on goods production. It is considered as the key determinant of collaborative provider-customer relationship and results when all members direct their efforts and capabilities collectively to enhance the organisational performance (Chahal & Mahajan, 2015; Chou, Lin & Huang, 2016) ^[12, 13]. In this context, Gummesson (2008) and Vargo and Lusch (2008) ^[64, 65, 36] state that level of value creation is augmented when all stakeholders participates in a SDL-based (network) organisation through networking and interaction among various stakeholders.

The concept of Service Dominant Logic (SDL) and its relationship with value creation has received significant attention in the marketing literature but the concept has not been empirically validated much. Till today very limited studies have examined the SDL concept and its related propositions. For instance, researchers such as Lusch, *et al.*, (2007) ^[35], Maglio and Spohrer (2008) ^[37], Vargo (2008) ^[64, 65, 36] and Cabiddu, Lui and Piccoli (2013) ^[8] have investigated the framework of SDL and its impact in the creation of value and have emphasized on the need to investigate it empirically. They all emphasize on the role of SDL in value creation in an organisation by the collaboration and interaction of its core stakeholders. Likewise, researchers such as Littleton and Whitelock (2004), Lusch and Webster Jr (2011) ^[34] and McColl-Kennedy (2012) ^[40] recommend to focus on SDL from the stakeholders perspective where all the members work collaboratively in networked based organisations. Similarly, Chou, Lin and Huang (2016) ^[13] also remark that SDL enables employees to collaborate and adjust with co-workers, to work in a networking based system that helps in maximising the organisational efficiency and productivity to contribute in the creation of value. However this relationship is yet to be explored and established.

SDL is conceptualised in terms of two competencies that are, knowledge and skills that enables the stakeholders to collaborate and adjust within an organisation (Lusch, Vargo & Brien, 2007; Edvardson, Tronvoll & Gruber, 2011; Chou, Lin & Huang, 2016) ^[35, 16, 13]. These two competencies based on interaction and network of relationships are categorised as collaborative competencies and absorptive competencies. Researchers such as Lusch and Vargo (2008) ^[64, 65, 36], Maglio and Spohrer (2008) ^[37] and Chahal and Mahajan (2015) ^[12] also state that these two competencies should be encouraged to improve organisational performance. Further, the study argues that SDL is predicted through various other factors. For instance, Chou, Lin and Huang (2016) ^[13] comment that SDL based on collaboration of provider and customer relationship results in creation of value only

if such collaborations are fair, that is based on organisational justice. The same is expressed by Yi, Natarajan and Gong 2011^[68]. Further scholars such as Yilmaz and Bokeoglu (2008)^[69] and Oyewobi, Sulieman and Jamil (2012)^[49] have also remarked that SDL environment prevails when organisational environment focuses on justice for enhancing commitment level. Thus committed individuals play an important role through regular participation in enhancing the organisational performance (Hazre & Srivastava, 2009)^[26]. Recent studies such as, Chahal and Mahajan (2014b)^[11] remark that SDL based on competencies, is fit management philosophy to be applied in services sector including higher education sector. SDL requires interaction based on knowledge and skill exchange, which is very important to be supervised and supported by service competencies of various stakeholders (Karpen, Bove & Lukas, 2009; Golooba & Ahlan, 2013; Ronald & Amelia, 2014)^[21, 56]. Since education sector is based on knowledge sharing and skill development among various stakeholders, SDL can be implemented for attaining sustainability and competitive advantage of educational institutions (Karpen, Bove & Lukas, 2009; Golooba & Ahlan, 2013; Ronald & Amelia, 2014)^[21, 56]. Thus, it is argued that to enhance the growth and performance of the higher education organisations, the objective of higher institutions should not be only to just impart education, but to focus on network of relationships through SDL based interactions. Further, the study put forth that sustainability in higher education institutions can be achieved by satisfying their core stakeholders through imparting knowledge, values, and developing skills. However being an emerging concept, empirical literature on SDL framework encompassing factors contributing to the development of SDL and consequences is very thin and hence needs to be underpinned for its theoretical development. Thus the present study endeavours to examine the role of three antecedents in predicting SDL and also in creating value by faculty members of two universities operating in northern India namely University of Jammu (UOJ) and Guru Nanak Dev University (GNDU). Thus the study provides a stimulus for investigating concept of value creation based on current demanding behavioural trends of interaction and networking of SDL. Based on the above discussion it is evident that there is a need to explore ways of increasing the value of SDL in higher education organisations. The study provides a platform for motivating the researchers to investigate the concept of SDL and value co-creation, since the current trend demands for more “connectivity” and “interactivity” between the providers and customers in a modern education system (Golooba & Ahlan, 2013; Vargo & Lusch, 2017)^[67].

Theoretical Development and Hypotheses

Service Dominant Logic Based Competences

Service-dominant Logic (SDL) concept, given by Vargo and Lusch in 2004, has a primary focus on operant resources – resources that are intangible and dynamic and are capable of creating value. The fundamental canon of SDL is that service is exchanged for service, where service is the process of exchange that applies competencies for benefit of all stakeholders and is the basis for value creation (Vargo & Lusch, 2008; McColl-Kennedy, 2012; Lai & Tan, 2015; Chou, Lin & Huang, 2016; Wilden *et al* 2017)^[64, 65, 36, 40, 31, 13, 63]. In this context, Lusch, Vargo and Brien (2007)^[35] initially remark that SDL can be seen from the perspective of competencies and identified collaborative, absorptive and adaptive competencies. However later, Lusch and Vargo (2008)^[64, 65, 36] opine that application of organisational competencies namely collaborative and absorptive competencies are pivotal for the benefit of all stakeholders and the organisation. Researchers such as Ballantyne and Varey (2008)^[4], Gummenson (2008)^[24] and Maglio and Spohrer (2008)^[37] also support the same. Further Randall, Pohlen and Hanna (2010)^[55] added four more competencies namely collaboration dynamics, information systems, organisational leadership and environment. Ordanini and Parasuraman (2010)^[48] also suggest that competencies such as collaborative, dynamic and knowledge interfaces play vital role in enhancing the performance of the organisation. Later Edvardson, Tronvoll and Gruber (2011)^[16] propose that collaborative and adaptive competencies are important for any organisation to succeed. However, we argue that all the competencies can be classified under two broad categories namely collaborative and absorptive competencies. Lusch and Vargo (2008)^[64, 65, 36] opine that application of organisational competencies namely collaborative and absorptive competencies are pivotal for benefit of all stakeholders and organisation. Collaborative competencies entails all individuals to collaborate with each other to be able to adjust with dynamic environment (Lusch & Vargo, 2008)^[64, 65, 36]. Absorptive competencies requires employers / employees to provide correct and accurate information to their colleagues and not to mislead their co-workers or any other stakeholder involved in organisation (Lusch & Vargo, 2008)^[64, 65, 36]. This interacting and competencies-based environment paves a long way in augmenting the organisational performance (Lusch *et al.*, 2007)^[35]. Chahal and Mahajan's (2014b)^[11] study on higher education reveal that the two competencies were evolved as four-dimensional structure comprising three sub-competencies of absorptive and one of collaborative competencies. However absorptive competencies were found to contribute more in contrast to collaborative competencies. Based on the significance of these two competencies we argue that;

H1 Absorptive and collaborative competencies contribute significantly to SDL.

Organisational Justice

Organisational Justice as given by Greenberg (1987)^[19] refers to individual perception about the extent to which they are treated fairly in organisations to influence organisational outcomes (Greenberg, 1996)^[20]. Scholars such as, Tatum *et al.*, (2003)^[62], Ebogie and Otukoya (2005)^[15], Nga *et al.*, (2010)^[45], Shah (2010) and Najafi *et al.*, (2011)^[43] express that if individuals perceive their organisations as fair, they reciprocate by performing in such

ways that benefit the organisation. Organisational justice is considered and established as three dimensional construct comprising, *distributive*, *procedural* and *interactional justice* and this is also supported in the literature by various scholars like Niehoff and Moorman (1993), Camilleri (2006)^[9], Nga *et al.*, (2010)^[45] and Shah (2010). It enables individuals to work collectively in a SDL based system which may ultimately lead to organisational effectiveness and value creation (Chou, Lin & Huang, 2016)^[13]. Researchers such as, Hannam and Jimmieson (2002), Jahangir, Akbar and Haq (2004)^[12], Camilleri (2006)^[9], Radzi *et al.*, (2009)^[53], Mohammad, Habib and Alias (2010)^[42], Malik and Naem (2011)^[39] and Najafi *et al.*, (2011)^[43] remark that interaction and collaboration of organisational members results in improving organisational performance and innovations, only if such collaborations are fair, that is based on organisation justice. Therefore we hypothesise that;

H2: There is a positive relationship between Organisational Justice (OJ) and SDL.

Organisational Commitment

Porter *et al.*, (1974) and Angle and Perry (1983) describe organisational commitment as the relative power of an individual participation in an organisation. They remark that commitment consists of strong belief and will to attain objective with considerable effort of individuals to remain as an organisational member. In other words it refers to the level of attachment of an individual with the organisation (Ackfeldt & Coote, 2000; Newman, Thanacoody & Hui, 2011)^[44] and is also considered as level of involvement of an individual in the organisation (Gautam *et al.*, 2004; Chugtai & Zafar, 2006; Mogosti, Boon & Fietcher, 2011)^[18]. Organisational commitment as a three component model as identified by Allen and Meyer (1990)^[2] comprising affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment is considered in the present study. Mogosti, Boon and Fletcher (2011)^[41] remark that knowledge sharing behaviour (SDL) leads to improved organisational performance and the increased level of satisfaction, consequently leading to higher commitment level. SDL based on exchange of knowledge and skills, while commitment which is primarily based on provider- customer relationship is equally important for SDL based organisations (Hazra & Srivastava, 2009; Sramek *et al.*, 2009; Newman, Thanacoody & Hui, 2011)^[26, 61, 44]. As such we hypothesise that,

H3: Organisational Commitment (OC) positively influences SDL.

Employee Participation

Employee Participation is a process in which interaction takes place among individuals who are working in a network of organisations (Cappelli & Rogovsky, 1998; Binyaseen, 2009)^[10, 7]. It refers to psychological feeling of employees to maintain balance in their involvement in information processing, decision making and problem solving that enables them to get involved and engrossed in a role to be performed in the organisation (Saks, 2006; Bhatti & Quereshi, 2007)^[57, 5]. High performing, effective organisations have a culture that encourage employee participation (Saks, 2006)^[57], which impact individual as well as organisational outcomes (Bhatti & Quereshi, 2007)^[5]. Saradha and Patrick (2011)^[58] remark effective employee participation induces individuals to be more willing to get involved in decision-making, goal setting or problem solving activities, which subsequently result in higher employee performance. According to Saks (2006)^[57] and Bhatti and Quereshi (2007)^[5] employee participation is a two dimensional approach namely, *job engagement* and *organisational engagement*. Kuzgun and Asugman (2015)^[30] and Pires, Dean and Rehman (2015) remark that employee participation leads to value creation in the process of exchange of service in a SDL based organisation. As such encouraging employees to participate in organisation should be encouraged to increase job satisfaction, commitment and performance of employees (Saks, 2006; Saradha & Patrick, 2011)^[57, 58] and also reduces employees stress, leading to reduced turnover (Cappelli & Rogovsky, 1998; Saradha & Patrick, 2011)^[10, 58].

H4: There is a positive relationship between Employee Participation (EPT) and SDL.

Value Creation

Scholars like Chahal and Mahajan, (2015)^[12] have also focused on the role SDL in co-creation of value and stressed to further examine the impact of various antecedents on SDL in creating value. SDL benefits the organisation by enabling the employees to collaborate and adjust with co-workers and to work in a networking system to promote effective interaction among various stakeholders. As such these interactions create dynamic environment where all the stakeholders collaborate and participate in decision-making to get regular feedback from various members of the organisation. Such efforts consequently enhance relation among different stakeholders and lead to value creation for the organisation. Further employees with such competencies are able to adjust with the changes in the environment both internally and externally (Chahal & Mahajan, 2014b; Basharat & Ahmad 2017)^[11, 6]. In this context, Ford and Bowen (2008)^[17], Vargo and Lusch (2004)^[66], Gummenson (2008), Cabiddu, Lui and Piccoli (2013)^[8], Lai and Tan (2015)^[31] and Kuzgun and Asugman (2015)^[30] argue that there is a need for SDL to be researched to gain more empirical validation and to have more insights on the value creation process through interaction among various organisational members. The SDL based relationship leads to effective interaction between different stakeholders and provide an opportunity for knowledge sharing which consequently paves way for optimal utilisation of the skills and competencies of each member (Vargo & Lusch, 2017; Wilden *et al* 2017)^[67, 63]. Value creation has been examined from various perspectives such as “value-in-experience” (Pralhad & Ramaswamy, 2004) and “value-in-use” (Vargo & Lusch, 2004)^[66]. However value-creation is examined mainly through three perspectives namely, value created

for employees, value created for customers and value created for both providers and customers (Lin & Lin, 2006) [32]. Most recently, Mahajan (2017) studied value creation in higher education sector as four dimensional comprising, teaching value creation, research value creation, coordinated services value creation and administrative services value creation in higher education sector. Thus, H5: SDL significantly contributes to value creation (VC).

Methodology

Sample and survey instrument

An empirical analysis is conducted to understand the extent to which SDL is predicted by three organisational traits namely; organisational justice, organisational commitment and employee participation. University of Jammu (UOJ) and Guru Nanak Dev University (GNDU) were contacted for collecting data from faculty members. These two universities were contacted as they both are state level universities operating since 1969 and offering almost similar courses. Four hundred eighty one faculty members from both the universities were contacted for gathering data related to the study using census method. The questionnaires were personally distributed to faculty members. All the Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors were contacted from the two universities.

Measures

SDL scale is formed by reviewing studies namely Lusch and Vargo (2008) [64, 65, 36], Maglio and Spohrer (2008) [37], Vargo (2008) [64, 65, 36], Edvardson, Tronvoll and Gruber (2011) [16] and Chahal and Mahajan (2014b) [11]. Items for organisational justice are generated from studies such as Greenberg (1987) [19], Niehoff and Moorman (1993), Hannam and Jimmieson (2002), Mohammad, Habib and Alias (2010) [42], Nga *et al.* (2010) [45] and Shah (2010) which are spread across three dimensions namely distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Further Allen and Meyer (1990) [2] scale of organisational commitment along with other studies namely, Somech and Bogler (2002) [60], Yilmaz and Bokeoglu (2008) [69] and Oyewobi, Sulieman and Jamil (2012) [49] are used to extract items to measure organisational commitment. Furthermore employee participation scale items were engendered from studies namely, Cappelli and Rogovsky (1998) [10], Saks (2006) [57], Joennsson (2008), Binyaseen (2009) [7] and Saradha and Patrick (2011) [58]. Lastly, a self-structured scale for value creation is generated from studies such as Lusch and Vargo (2004) [66], Gronroos (2008), Vargo (2008) [64, 65, 36], Ngugi, Johnson and Erdely (2010), Gronroos (2011) [23] and Randall, Gravierb and Prybutok (2011) [55]. All the five constructs namely, SDL, organisational justice, organisational commitment, employee participation and value creation are anchored on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 stands for strongly disagree and 5 stands for strongly agree.

Measurement Models and Study Results

Descriptive Statistics followed by EFA, item analysis and CFA were performed on the five constructs namely, SDL, organisational justice, organisational commitment, employee participation and value creation. However before analysing the data t-test is used to measure perceptual gap between faculty members of UOJ and GNDU. T-test result indicates insignificant difference in the opinion of faculty members of UOJ and GNDU for SDL and three antecedents. Hence data of UOJ and GNDU is combined for further analysis and interpretation. Out of four hundred eighty one respondents the combined effective valid respondents after outliers deletion came out to be 400 (UOJ=213, GNDU=187) while the response rate came out to be 90.85% for faculty members. The item selection criteria followed for EFA included factor loading (FL) and communality value (CV) greater than or equal to.5 while selection criteria for item analysis included cronbach alpha (greater than 0.7), inter- item correlation (within 0.3 to 0.9), item mean, item variance and item-to-total correlation coefficient (CITC) (greater than 0.3). Model goodness fit indices greater or equal to.9 and RMSEA less than.08 with significant SRW values are considered for item selection under CFA. The measurement model results of the selected five constructs are given as under:

SDL

SDL is evolved as three factor structure comprising *absorptive competencies I*, *absorptive competencies II* and *collaborative competencies* after the application of CFA. The model fit indices ($\chi^2/df= 2.800$, SRMR=.063, RMSEA=.067), GFI=.945, AGFI=.916, NFI =.924, RFI=.902, IFI=.950, TLI=.935, CFI=.950) were as per the prescribed criteria. Further the result reveals that all the three competencies significantly predict SDL with moderate to high SRW (.576 to.801) and critical ratio ranged from 9.147 to 13.910.

Organisational Justice

CFA application confirmed organisational justice construct to be three factor structure comprising *distributive justice*, *procedural justice* and *interactional justice*. The SRW value of the items ranged between.704 and.921 and the critical ratios are also satisfactorily attained ranging between 8.514 and 18.756. All the fit indices ($\chi^2/df =2.943$, SRMR=.031, RMSEA (.070), GFI =.993, AGFI =.907, NFI=.991, RFI=.972, IFI=.994, TLI=.982, CFI=.994) are also as per the criteria

Organisational Commitment

Three factor solution of organisational commitment identified after EFA and item analysis is used for confirmatory factor analysis. All the fit indices ($\chi^2/df=4.819$, SRMR=.030, RMSEA=.068, GFI =.952, AGFI =.904, NFI=.982, RFI=.916, IFI=.904, TLI=.948, CFI=.902) are as per the criteria reflecting robust model fitness. The SRW values ranged between .889 to .572 for three factors namely, affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment

Employee Participation

CFA applied on bi-dimensional construct of employee participation namely, job engagement and organisation engagement indicated significant critical ratios, ranged between 5.246 and 24.854 with SRW values between .596 and .851. The model fitness is magnificently attained ($\chi^2/df=4.722$, SRMR=.032, RMSEA=.053, GFI=.985, AGFI=.923, NFI=.977, RFI=.924, IFI=.981, TLI=.937, CFI=.981).

Value Creation

The CFA applied on the value creation resulted in good model fitness ($\chi^2/df=2.739$, SRMR=.034, RMSEA=.060, NFI=.909, RFI=.964, IFI=.913, TLI=.968, CFI=.912). The four dimensions recorded significant SRW values that is, SRW=.853 (*teaching*), SRW=.823 (*research*), SRW=.755 (*coordinated services*) and SRW=.820 (*administrative services*).

Reliability and Validity

The psychometric results also indicate that all scales are reliable, that is, the values of cronbach alpha and composite reliability for all the five scales namely, SDL, organisational justice, organisational commitment, employee participation and value creation are above .70 (Table 1). Validity of the scale is also examined through convergent validity and discriminant validity for all the five scales. The AVE values (greater than .5) given in table 1 reflect the existence of convergent validity while square root of AVE greater than correlation estimates reflect the discriminant validity

Table 1: Composite Reliability, Average Variance Extracted and Correlation Matrix

Constructs	Alpha value	CR	AVE	Correlation				
				SDL	OJ	OC	EPT	VC
SDL	.863	.922	.561	.707	-	-	-	-
OJ	.743	.799	.577	.131	.759			
OC	.774	.765	.696	.087	.022	.704		
EPT	.721	.725	.535	.019	.127	.560	.731	
VC	.749	.755	.515	.059	.391	.528	.372	.717

* Values in the diagonal of correlation matrix are the square root of AVE

Note: SDL (Service Dominant Logic); OJ (Organisational Justice); OC (Organisational Commitment) EPT (Employee Participation); VC (Value Creation), CR (Composite Reliability) & AVE (Average Variance Extracted).

Hypotheses Testing Results

SDL

SDL is found to be multi-dimensional construct with *absorptive competencies* segregated into two dimensions *absorptive competencies – I* and *absorptive competencies – II*. However among the accepted competencies *collaborative competencies* magnificently predicts SDL followed by *absorptive competencies- I* and *absorptive competencies- II*. Hence, hypothesis H1 is accepted.

Relationship of SDL with organisational justice, organisational commitment, employee participation and value creation

To test the SDL relationship with organisational justice, organisational commitment, employee participation and value creation, SEM (AMOS software) is used (Figure 1.2). The overall results reveal significant relationships of the three antecedents with SDL (SRW=.535, $p=.034$) and value creation (SRW=.647, $p=.015$). The model fitness is also satisfactorily attained ($\chi^2/df=4.515$, RMSEA=.077). Among the three antecedents organisational justice is contributing highly (SRW=.782; CR=4.981) to the SDL, followed by organisational commitment (SRW=.684, CR=5.645) and employee participation (SRW=.673, CR=4.393). As such all hypotheses H2, H3, H4 and H5 are accepted (Table 2).

Table 2: Relationship of SDL with Organisational Justice, Organistaional Commitment, Employee Participation and Value Creation

Variable	Hypothesis	P-value	CR Range	SRW	Model-fitness	Accept/Reject
SDL	H1	.000	9.147-13.910	.576-.801	$\chi^2/df=2.800$, RMSEA=.067 GFI=.945, AGFI=.916, NFI=.924, CFI=.950,	Accepted
Organisational Justice – SDL	H2	.000	4.981	.782	$\chi^2/df=4.515$, RMSEA=.077, GFI=.933, AGFI=.982, NFI=.947, CFI=.932	Accepted
Organistaional Commitment - SDL	H3	.040	5.645	.684		
Employee Participation - SDL	H4	.000	4.393	.673		
Value creation –SDL	H5	.015	5.673	.647		

Note: SDL (Service Dominant Logic), CR (Critical ratio) & SRW (Standardised Regression Weight).

Discussion and Suggestion

The study result reveals that SDL is a three-dimensional scale comprising collaborative competencies, absorptive competencies – I and absorptive competencies – II. Among the three competencies collaborative competencies magnificently predicts SDL, while absorptive competencies- I and absorptive competencies- II moderately predicts SDL. Collaborative competencies are developed through collaborative work and regular participations in various seminars, workshops, conferences etc. These collaborative activities in a SDL based environment help in enhancing faculty members' knowledge and equip them with latest skills to attain excellency in their teaching skills. Similarly, SDL also helps in developing absorptive competencies –I and II. The SDL based networking (absorptive competencies -I) acquaints an organisation with effective decision-making skills by recognising faculty members' suggestions and viewpoints while taking decisions relating to them in different formal committees and regulatory bodies. Such an environment also helps faculty in optimally utilising their interactive skills with peers to ensure knowledge exchange. Further, absorptive competencies II are developed by ensuring high level of objective and balanced interaction among various faculty members in the department. Additionally, regular routine interactions with students, on varied topics of academic relevance and contemporary issues also contributes in the effective knowledge sharing, dissemination and generation and paves way in the development of absorptive competencies.

Further, study results reveal that all the three predictors of SDL that are, organisational justice, organisational commitment and employee participation, contribute moderately but significantly towards SDL. The results suggest that value creation among faculty members in the university system is enhance when higher authorities create effective and fair organisational culture that promotes faculty participation and commitment. Specifically, the study findings reveal importance of distributive, procedural and interactional justice for creating fair working environment to motivate faculty members to participate in regular interactions at varied formal and informal levels. Similarly, level of organisational commitment- continuance commitment, affective commitment and normative commitment, also paves way to enhanced absorptive and collaborative competencies. To strengthen the impact of commitment on SDL based behaviour, the finding point out that faculty members should be encouraged to perform their duties and follow academic and non- academic norms and policies, ethically and sincerely. In brief, participation at the organisation and the departmental levels in various academic and non-academic activities and regular interaction with peer groups enable faculty members to develop absorptive and collaborative competencies. Lastly, the SDL framework reflects significant impact on value creation of faculty members in teaching, research, coordinated services and administrative services. The findings show that enhanced value creation results when faculty members accept changes in the organisation, positively and sportingly and ready to take initiatives to enhance the quality of academic and research performance.

The SDL concept thus suggests that value is determined through integration and use of operant resources. However, the suggestions given in this paper if implemented and adapted by each of the faculty member of both the universities in specific and by all faculty members in general will help in strengthening the potential of faculty and leading to value creation in the higher education institutions. Thus the higher education institutions should be provided a common platform to share resources and competences in a service-oriented and mission driven environment.

Limitations and Future Research

The research is conducted from faculty perspective to understand the relationship between SDL and value creation in the higher education sector. Since SDL is a network concept, future studies need to explore the relationship from other stakeholder perspective like higher officers, students, research scholars and supporting members for underpinning the SDL framework. Further, besides the selected three antecedents, other constructs like personality traits, motivation customer participation, etc. can be explored in the future in predicting SDL. Similarly, other consequential variables like organisational performance, employee productivity, customer satisfaction etc. can also be examined to theorize the SDL framework. Further, the present study results are confined to two higher educational institutions UOJ and GNDU with respect to SDL culture framework. These

results can further be validated across other private and public educational institutions and in other service sectors like hotel management, tourism, banking, tele-communication, insurance companies, corporations etc.

Conclusion

Besides from the concept of value creation, that is, rooted in the Service Dominant Logic, the study has also dealt with the relationship of SDL with three organisational traits to propose a service-oriented and innovative system in higher education institutions. The study demonstrates how SDL competencies can be configured and managed to support value co-creation between researchers, faculty members, and other stakeholders to provide a direction for modern business education in the higher educational institutions.

References

1. Ackfeldt A, Coote LV. A study of organisational citizenship behaviour in a retail Setting. *Journal of Business Research*,2000:58:151-159.
2. Allen NJ, Meyer JP. The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organisation. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*,1990:63:1-18.
3. Angle HL, Perry JL. An empirical assessment of organisational commitment and organisational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*,1981:26(1):1-14.
4. Ballantyne D, Varey RJ. The service- dominant logic and the future of marketing. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*,2008:36:11-14.
5. Bhatti KK, Qureshi TM. Impact of employee participation on job satisfaction, employee commitment and employee productivity. *International Review of Business Research Papers*,2007:3(2):54-68.
6. Basharat T, Ahmad H. Applying Service Dominant Logic Perspective: Studying Patient Care System of Shaukat Khanum Memorial Cancer Hospital (Lahore) and Shouldice Hospital (Canada). *Journal of Service Science Research*,2017:9(1):31-46.
7. Binyaseen A, Mohammad A. Office layouts and employee participation. *Facilities*,2009:28(7/8):348-357.
8. Cabiddu F, Lui TW, Piccoli G. Managing value co-creation in the tourism industry. *Annals of Tourism Research*,2013:42:86-107.
9. Camilleri E. Towards developing an organisational commitment-public service motivation model for the Maltese public service employees. *Public Policy and Administration*,2006:21(1):63-83.
10. Cappelli P, Rogovsky N. Employee involvement and organisational citizenship behaviour: implication for labour law reform and lean production. *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*,1998:51(4):633-652.
11. Chahal H, Mahajan R. Exploring role of service competence orientation (SCO) in creating value in higher education sector. *Amity Business School*,2014b:15(2):67-83.
12. Chahal H, Mahajan R. The mediating role of organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) and service dominant logic (SDL) in creating value in higher education”, *Apeejay Journal of Management and Technology*,2015:10(1):49-61.
13. Chou EY, Lin CY, Huang HC. Fairness and devotion go far: Integrating online justice and value co-creation in virtual communities. *International Journal of Information Management*,2016:36(1):60-72.
14. Chughtai AA, Zafar S. Antecedents and consequences of organisational commitment among Pakistani university teachers. *Applied HRM Research*,2006:11(1):39-64.
15. Ebigie BO, Otukoya OW. Antecedents of organisational citizenship behaviour in a government- owned enterprise in Nigeria. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*,2005:14(4):389-399.
16. Edvardson B, Tronvoll B, Gruber T. Expanding understanding of service exchange and value co-creation: a social construction approach. *Journal of Academic Marketing Science*,2011:39:327-339.
17. Ford RC, Bowen DE. A service -dominant logic for management education: it's time. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*,2008:7(2):224-243.
18. Gautam T, Dick RV, Wagner U, Upadhyay N, Davis AJ. Organisational citizenship behaviour and organisational commitment in Nepal. *Aston academy for research in management, Research paper, Aston University, UK, 2004, 1-25. www.segi.edu.my/onlinereview/... 23.php*, accessed on 3 April 2009.
19. Greenberg J. A taxonomy of organisational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*,1987:12(1):9-22.
20. Greenberg J. *The quest for justice on the job*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, 1996.
21. Golooba M, Ahlan AR. Service value co-creation in research and innovation practices in higher education institutions in Malaysia. *Procedia Technology*,2013:11:342-347.
22. Gronroos C. Service logic revisited: who creates value? And who co-creates. *European Business Review*,2008:20(4):298-314.
23. Gronroos C. Value co-creation in service logic: A critical analysis. *Marketing Theory*,2011:11(3):279-301.
24. Gummenson E. Extending the service-dominant logic from customer centricity to balanced centricity. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*,2008:36:15-17.
25. Hannam R, Jimmieson N. The relationship between extra-role behaviour and job burnout for primary school teachers: a preliminary model and development of an organisational citizenship behaviour scale. *School of Psychology, University of Queensland, 2006. www.aare.edu.au/02pap/han02173. htm...*, accessed on 22 Oct 2010.

26. Hazra SG, Srivastava KBL. Impact of service quality on customer loyalty, commitment and trust in the Indian banking sector. *The IUP Journal of Marketing Management*,2009:53(3&4):74-95, accessed on 4 June 2011.
27. Jahangir N, Akbar MM, Haq M. Organisational citizenship behaviour: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of BRAC*,2004:1(2):75-85.
28. Joenson T. A multi- dimensional approach to employees participation and the association with social identification in organisations. *Emerald*,2008:30(6):594-607.
29. Karpen IO, Bove LL, Lukas BA. Linking service-dominant logic and strategic business practice: A conceptual model of a service-dominant orientation. *Journal of Service Research*,2012:15(1):21-38.
30. Kuzgun E, Asugman G. Value in services – a service dominant logic perspective. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*,2015:207:242-251.
31. Lai KP, Tan CH. Neighbours first, bankers second”: Mobilising financial citizenship in Singapore. *Geoforum*,2015:64:65-77.
32. Lin GR, Lin J. Ethical customer value creation: Drivers and barriers. *Journal of Business Ethics*,2006:67:93-105.
33. Littleton K, Whitelock D. Guiding the creation of knowledge and understanding in a virtual learning environment. *Cyber Psychology and Behaviour*,2004:7(2):173-181.
34. Lusch RF, Webster JFE. A stakeholder-unifying co-creation philosophy for marketing. *Journal of Macro-marketing*,2011:31(2):129-134.
35. Lusch RF, Vargo SL, Brien MO. Competing through service: Insights from service-dominant logic. *Journal of Retailing*,2007:83(1):5-18.
36. Lusch RF, Vargo SL. The service- dominant mindset, in bill hepley and windy murphy (Ed). *Service Science Management and Engineering, Education for the 21st Century*, Springer, 2008, 89-96.
37. Maglio PP, Spohrer J. Fundamentals of service science. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*,2008:36:18-20.
38. Mahajan R. OCB and SDL in higher education – A comparative study of University of Jammu and Guru Nanak Dev University, University of Jammu, Ph. D Thesis, 2017.
39. Malik ME, Naeem B. Impact of perceived organisational justice on organisational commitment of faculty: Empirical evidence from Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research in Business*,2011:1(9):92-98.
40. Mc-Kennedy C, Janet R, Vargo SL, Dagger TS, Sweeney JC, Kasteren YV. Health care customer value co-creation practice styles. *Journal of Service Research*, 2012, 1-20, mkt.shidler.hawaii.edu/CVs/CV_Vargo6.doc, accessed on 14 March 2011.
41. Mogotsi IC, Boon JA, Fletcher L. Modelling the relationships between knowledge sharing, organisational citizenship, job satisfaction and organisational commitment among School Teachers in Botswana. *African Journal of Library*,2011:21(1):41-58.
42. Mohammad J, Habib FQB, Alias MAB. Organisational justice and organisational citizenship behaviour in higher education institution. *International Journal of Global Business and Management Research*,2010:2(1):13-32.
43. Najafi S, Noruzy A, Azar HK, Shirkouhi NS, Dalv MR. Investigating the relationship between organisational justice, psychological empowerment, job satisfaction, organisational commitment and organisational citizenship behavior: An empirical model. *African Journal of Business Management*,2011:5(13):5241-5248.
44. Newman A, Thanacoody R, Hui W. The impact of employee perceptions of training on organisational commitment and turnover intentions: A study of multinationals in the Chinese service sector. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*,2011:22(8):1765-1787.
45. Nga GB, Hackermeier I, Jiao X, Wagdarikar P. Organisational citizenship behaviour and perception of organisational justice in student jobs, 2010. GRIN Verlag.<http://www.grin.com/de/e-book/152678/organisational-citizen-ship-behaviour-and-perception-of-organisational-justice>.
46. Ngugi IK, Johnsen RE, Erdely P. Relational capabilities for value co-creation and innovation in SMEs. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*,2010:17(2):260-278.
47. Niehoff BP, Moorman RH. Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Academy of Management Journal*,1993:36(3):527-536.
48. Ordanini A, Parasuraman A. Service innovation viewed through a service - dominant logic lens: A conceptual framework and empirical analysis. *Journal of Service Research*, 2010, 1-21.
49. Oyewobi LO, Suleiman B, Jamil AM. Job satisfaction and job commitment: A study of quantity surveyors in Nigerian public service. *International Journal of Business and Management*,2012:7(5):179-192.
50. Pires GD, Dean A, Rehman M. Using service logic to redefine exchange in terms of customer and supplier participation. *Journal of Business Research*68, 2015, 925-932.
51. Porter LW, Richard M, Richard S, Mowday T, Boulian PV. Organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,1974:59:603-609.
52. Prahalad CK, Ramaswamy V. Co-creation experiences: The next practice in value creation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*,2004:18(3):6-14.

53. Radzi SM, Ramley SZA, Salehuddin M, Othman Z, Jalis MH. An empirical assessment of hotel departmental managers turnover intentions: The impact of organisational Justice. *International Journal of Business and Management*,2009:4(8):173-183.
54. Randall WS, Gravierb MJ, Prybutokc VR. Connection, trust, and commitment: dimensions of co-creation. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*,2011:19(1):3-24.
55. Randall WS, Pohlen TL, Hanna J. Evolving a theory of performance –based logistics using insights from service dominant logic. *Journal of Business Logistics*,2010:31(2):35-61.
56. Ronald, Amelia. Measuring service quality on higher education base on service dominant logic. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*,2014:6(5):95-106.
57. Saks AM. Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*,2006:21(7):600-619.
58. Saradha H, Patrick HA. Employee engagement in relation to organisational citizenship behavior in information technology organisations. *Journal of Marketing and Management*,2011:2(2):74-90.
59. Shah N. A study of the relationship between organisational justice and employee readiness for change. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*,2010:24(3):224-236.
60. Somech A, Bogler R. Antecedents and consequences of teacher organisational and professional commitment. *Educational Administration Quarterly*,2002:38(4):555-577.
61. Sramek BD, Droge C, Mentzer JT, Myers MB. Creating commitment and loyalty behaviour among retailers: what are the roles of service quality and satisfaction?. *Journal of the Academic of Marketing Science*,2009:37:440-454.
62. Tatum BC, Eberlin R, Kottraba C, Bradberry T. Leadership, decision making and organisational justice. *Journal of Management*,2003:41(10):427-439.
63. Wilden R, Akaka MA, Karpen IO, Hohberger J. The Evolution and Prospects of Service-Dominant Logic, An Investigation of Past, Present, and Future Research. *Journal of Service Research*,2017:20(4):345-361.
64. Vargo SL. Paradigmatic traps and perspectives. *Journal of Service Research*,2008:11(2):211-215.
65. Vargo SL, Lusch RF. Why Service?. *Journal of Academic of Marketing Science*,2008:36:25-38.
66. Vargo SL, Lusch RF. Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*,2004:68(1):1-17.
67. Vargo SL, Lusch RF. Service-dominant logic 2025. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*,2017:34(1):41-67.
68. Yi Y, Nataraajan R, Gong T. Customer participation and citizenship behavioral influences on employee performance, satisfaction, commitment, and turnover intention. *Journal of Business Research*,2011:64:87-95.
69. Yilmaz K, Bokeoglu OC. Organisational citizenship behaviour and organisational commitment in Turkish primary schools. *Work Applied Sciences Journal*,2008:3(5):775-780.