

---

## GOING THE EXTRA MILE: STUDENT PERSPECTIVE WITHIN PAKISTANI HIGHER EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT

**Dr Muhammad Nawaz.**  
(corresponding author)

M.Com (UOS) PAK, PhD (ARU) UK Lecturer  
(Commerce) Sindh University Laar Campus, Badin,  
Sindh. Pakistan

**Noor Baloch.**

PhD Scholar, Institute of Commerce, University of  
Sindh, Jamshoro, Sindh, Pakistan.

---

**Dr Mushtaque Ali Jariko, PhD**

(Aalborg University, Copenhagen), Assistant Professor,  
Institute of Business Administration, University of  
Sindh, Jamshoro, Pakistan

**Tania Mushtaque.**

PhD scholar, Roskilde University, Denmark, Lecturer at  
Institute of Information and Communication  
Technology (IICT)

### ABSTRACT

*This article explores student citizenship behaviour (SCB) within Pakistani higher educational context. SCB has been investigated by the researchers in different contexts primarily through quantitative approaches. However, there is scant evidence about the phenomena in an Asian context in general and in Pakistani context in particular. This research is intended to fill that gap by utilizing qualitative approach. Data was collected through focus groups and semi-structured in-depth interviews and were analysed through hermeneutic phenomenological analysis process.*

**Keywords;** Student citizenship behaviour, qualitative, higher education, Pakistan.

## 1.0 Introduction

One of the primary goals of an academic institution is to produce people equipped with the right knowledge, skills and behaviour for academic success, the job market and society. For example, Allison et al., (2001) have explained that;

“Recent research in management and marketing has identified key skills and behaviours linked to academic success. These skills are known collectively as organisational citizenship behaviours” (Allison *et al.*, 2001, p. 282).

Furthermore, SCB has been recognised as a vital element needed to foster academic success, career development, socialisation and retention in students during the early stages of their degrees (Ehtiyar et al, 2010; Poropat, 2011; Wilcox *et al.*, 200; Mackie, 1998).

OCB refers to how members of an organisation support their colleagues when performing their duties. Furthermore, it adds value to the overall performance of the organisation. However, such behaviour is neither an official part of their duty nor can it be paid for or rewarded formally. Thus, OCBs can be defined as:

“...an individual’s behaviours that in the aggregate aids organizational effectiveness, but that is neither a requirement of the individual’s job nor directly rewarded by the formal system” (Organ, 1988, p. 101).

In 2002, the Government of Pakistan established the Higher Education Commission of Pakistan (HEC). The purpose of the HEC was to enhance quality standards, strengthen technological and physical infrastructures, develop industrial and academic linkages and increase research output within the Pakistani higher education sector. Since then, the number of university campuses has increased from 168 to 258 and 41 new universities have been established (HEC, 2013). In addition, more than 10,000 scholars were awarded either national or international scholarships to undertake their doctorates, with some 5,000 of these completing their PhDs by 2013 (*ibid.*).

As a direct result of these initiatives, six Pakistani universities were ranked among the top 300 universities within Asia. Furthermore, two other universities in Pakistan were ranked among the top 300 world universities for science and technology. Student enrolments have increased from 330,000 to over 1,000,000. It would also appear that after the inception of the HEC, the overall quality of the higher educational institutions also increased.

However, the HEC’s policies have primarily focused on faculty development, research output and infrastructure building. It has not developed a mechanism to include students in the quality enhancement process. This could be judged by the fact that since its inception, the HEC has not conducted a single student satisfaction survey to ascertain or understand their concerns. It should be noted that student participation is widely recognised as a significant contributor to the educational process:

“...in the higher education sector, students have always been expected to play an active role in the educational process. Primarily, this has traditionally been through actively engaging with the teaching and learning process and through their contributions to departmental and institutional quality assurance mechanisms” (Little & Williams, 2010, p. 115).

McCulloch (2009) believes that students are co-producers in the educational service delivery process and that they actively engage with the learning process. Moreover, students and faculty members each bring their elements to the learning process, which thus makes learning a comprehensive process. However, with diminishing student participation and a reduced understanding of how their behaviour might impact upon the educational process, the objective of quality education might only rarely be achieved.

## 2.0 Literature review

Student Citizenship Behaviour (SCB) has only been studied within the academic setting by a very few researchers (see Allison *et al.*, 2001; Chen & Carey, 2009). However, students contribute to their academic setting in order to achieve better development, the more efficient delivery of educational services and the more efficient functioning of the educational institution. Chen and Carey (2009) state that plenty of research has been carried out in the organisational context to investigate citizenship behaviour. However, only a handful of studies are available on citizenship behaviour in the academic context. Chen and Carey (2009) further maintain that we do not know how citizenship behaviour impacts on the social and academic life of the student, nor are we aware of the types of SCB.

Students play a pivotal role in academic institutions and it is desirable to understand SCB as being a key stakeholder. SCB can be defined as the voluntary and positive acts of students who contribute to and enhance the performance of both individuals and the institution. Meuter and Bitner (1998) state that there are three types of service production:

1. The service could be produced by the organisation and its staff (for example, the airline industry and the Internet).
2. The service could be produced with the help of the organisation, staff and customer (for example, universities and hospitals).
3. The service could be produced entirely by the customer (for example, service customisation).

In addition, Claycom *et al.* (2001) maintain that customers may participate in service production at three different levels:

1. The customer just attends the service event and all the work has been done by staff (low level).
2. The customer participates in the service by providing feedback and pinpointing weak areas of the service (middle level).
3. The customer participates in the production and development of the service and is considered as a co-producer and partial employee (high level).

Kotze and du Plessis (2003) maintain that students participate jointly with the staff of educational institutions in the production and development of the educational service (high level participation), so that it is considered that students act as co-producers and partial employees.

## 2.1 Dimensions of Student Citizenship Behaviour

Whilst there is a lack of research specific to SCB in the higher educational context, researchers have attempted to overcome this obstacle by borrowing constructs from the business context to explore SCB. Allison *et al.*, (2001) explain, with examples, how building blocks of citizenship behaviour could be adapted into the academic setting

Allison *et al.*, (2001) studied 211 undergraduate business students to examine the impact of these five building blocks of OCB on their productivity and GPA (grade point average). They state that these building blocks have a positive and significant impact on student productivity and GPA, although not all students showed an equal level of OCB. However, the study fails to consider any new constructs for the study of OCB in an academic context. In addition, the study demonstrates that students showed an uneven OCB, but no reason is presented for this effect. It is possible that this study might have been more original if the researchers had considered utilising a qualitative approach.

With regard to the significance of SCB, Khaola (2008) notes that Allison *et al.* (2001) proved that OCB contributes to both student academic achievement and productivity. However, Allison *et al.* (2001) employed a self-reported measure for GPA. In addition, they did not specify any differences between the antecedents of OCB in the business and academic contexts. Khaola (2008) conducted a study using an objective academic measure to assess the role of self-esteem and commitment to OCB as well as student academic achievement. He generated data from 196 third year undergraduate students from the National University of Lesotho, concluding that students with high self-esteem and commitment showed a higher level of citizenship behaviour. Furthermore, the only altruistic dimension of OCB played a significant role in student academic achievement. This result does not fully match with the findings of Allison *et al.* (2001), who claim that all constructs of OCB positively contribute to OCB.

However, this scale, as employed by both Allison *et al.* (2001) and Khaola (2008), is aligned with business contexts and ignores the heterogeneity between the academic and business contexts.

In addition, Gehring (2006) attempted to explore the dimensions of SCB in Germany under the concept of university citizenship behaviour. He developed and validated a university citizenship behaviour scale for use in the German context. However, it is not wise to employ the term 'university citizenship behaviour' for SCB because the word 'university' encompasses all major stakeholders, such as the staff, faculty members and the public. In addition, Gehring's study overlooked the new constructs and predominantly relied on standard OCB constructs which had emerged through organisational research in the field of business.

Okunrotifa (1979) states that key dimensions of SCB are that students engage in teamwork with other students, do not complain, keep their working area neat and tidy, finish work on deadline, make effective and efficient use of the materials provided by the institution, feel obliged to work with honesty without monitoring and protect the institution's property. However, Chen and Carey (2009) explain that the descriptions provided by Okunrotifa (1979) do not provide the complete picture of SCB. However, considerable time has been passed since 1979. The working context has radically changed in today's educational system.

While earlier studies (for example, Allison *et al.*, 2001; Khaola, 2008) were based on standard OCB constructs, Chen and Carey (2009) note the scarcity of research in the field of citizenship behaviour, particularly with reference to student perspectives. Consequently, they undertook a study to develop a scale

of OCBs, to measure educational citizenship behaviour, and explore the antecedents and consequences of educational citizenship behaviour in Chinese culture. In the first phase, they asked six research participants to identify potential elements of educational citizenship behaviour, generating 25 items. They divided this measure into two factors, after exploratory factor analyses based on conscientious and altruistic behaviour (i.e. self-regulation and other oriented citizenship behaviour

Chen and Carey (2009) found that intrinsic motivation played a vital role in self-regulated citizenship behaviour, while other forms of oriented-based citizenship behaviour did not require any motivation. They concluded that culture has a significant impact on various types of educational citizenship behaviour and their antecedents. Despite the quantitative nature of the study, Chen and Carey (2009) took the right move to identify constructs from participants, eventually developing a comparatively rich description of citizenship behaviour compared to other studies (such as Allison *et al.*, 2001; Gehring, 2006; Khaola, 2008).

Similarly, in a recent study, Myers *et al.* (2015) examined classroom citizenship behaviour (CCB) in the American context. They developed a CCB scale through three stage processes. In the first stage, a survey was distributed among students to generate examples of CCB from students. In the next stage, a revised survey was collected from 155 students, which generated 414 examples of CCB. After filtering out redundant items, 90 items were identified. Then, utilising exploratory factor analysis, the final 23 items were developed. Myers *et al.* (2015a) divided these 23 items into three main categories.

In the first category, nine items relate to 'involvements' reflecting the student's active engagement with classmates and faculty members. The second category concerns those activities taken to develop interpersonal relationships ('affiliation'), while the third category ('courtesy') includes elements of etiquette. Although Myers *et al.* (2015) have developed detailed categories of CCB, further research is needed to check the reliability and validity of their scale within various contexts. Their study primarily encompasses the citizenship that a student may exhibit in the classroom setting to co-students and faculty members. Furthermore, it fails to identify out of class citizenship behaviour. Comparing the CCB scale developed in the American context with the scale developed by Chen and Carey (2009) in the Chinese context, it can be seen that each scale identifies different elements. This indicates that the study context does matter while examining SCB.

If we consider all of the above evidence, it would appear from a comparison of the constructs of the scales employed by Gehring (2006), Khaola (2008), Allison *et al.* (2001) and Chen and Carey (2009), that each scale generates different categories of SCB according to the various geographical contexts of the participants observed (i.e., America, China, Africa and Germany). All studies employed quantitative methodologies. Therefore, this study sets out to answer the research questions: How do students display citizenship behaviour within the Pakistani public higher education context?

### 3.0 Research Methodology

Interpretative phenomenological approach has been used to examine SCB in Pakistani higher educational context. In first phase, we conducted five small size focus groups. Bryman (2012) suggests that in focus group meetings the researcher should attempt to collect information related to a particular topic from a range of participants who have personal experience or knowledge of the particular issue under investigation. The focus group setting allows participants to express their experiences in a safe environment. The reason to conduct focus groups in the first phase was to be acquainted with the multiple perspectives of the participants about citizenship behaviours. In addition, another intention was to acquire guidance to include in the interview guide for the semi-structured in-depth interviews which were to follow the focus groups.

In second phase, we conducted twenty semi-structured interviews were conducted from students of Pakistani Public Sector University. Bryman (2012) notes that interviews are the most frequently used method in qualitative research. Furthermore, the nature of the interview, being less structured in qualitative studies, enabled me to explore the phenomena of SCB holistically. Gill and Johnson (2002) maintain that, through in-depth interviews, a researcher can understand the interviewee in his/her context, explore the hidden conscious and obtain multiple perspectives of the phenomena. The participant were selected through purposive random sampling and snowball random sampling techniques. The data analysis process was guided by the hermeneutical phenomenological approach.

### 4.0 Findings and interpretations

The data analysis reveals that SCB in Pakistani context can be divided into five major categories.

#### 4.1 In-work SCB

The first super-theme is in-work SCB, which refers to those actions of students which help other students, staff, faculty members and/or the institution to perform their official duties or commitments. These results match those observed from earlier published studies. Smith *et al.* (1983, p. 654) articulate that “OCB (organisational citizenship behaviours) lubricate the social machinery of the organisation” and help people at work to perform well. Furthermore, there is reasonable evidence to suggest that OCB enhances the performance of both the staff and the organisation as a whole (Bolino *et al.*, 2002).

The first sub-theme of in-work SCB involves students helping other students in assignments and presentations. The study participants claim that, as the majority of students at UOSJP come from a rural background, they are not used to the rigours of academia. Unfortunately, there are no systems in place for teaching assignment preparation and oral presentation at the university. This is why students face many difficulties in their first year of university education. The data analysis reports that senior students have always supported junior students to improve their assignments and presentation skills.

This finding is in agreement with the publication of Groth (2005), who found from a study of 222 participants in the business context, that customers support other customers during their service delivery encounters. Rosenbaum and Massiah (2007) describe that their older customers, keeping in mind the difficulties they have faced in the past, develop sympathetic feelings for new customers, and they were seen to show helping behaviour to new customers. In the academic context, this finding matches with the findings of Allison *et al.* (2001), Chen and Carey (2009) and Khaola (2008), who all report that students help co-students in their academic related works.

The second sub-theme of in-work SCB is group study. Group study is a phenomenon in which students with different skills combine their efforts to achieve a shared goal, such as understanding a particular topic or doing a group activity. Podsakoff *et al.* (2000) and Schnake and Dumler (2003) suggest that citizenship behavior in groups is an under-theorised area and call for research in this field. In the business setting, groups and teams are formed on the basis of the task through formal business procedures. However, in the academic setting there could be various ways in which groups can be formed and operate.

The current study found three main factors to be responsible for group formation in the academic context: geography, ethnicity and gender. The study participants claimed that students form a group for different reasons. Each member in a group plays the role of moderator or even as a leader who may have commentary skills, then the other group members' work together to achieve the common goal(s). This result may be explained by the fact that, in the academic setting, classrooms, shared facilities and campus-based accommodation provide a conducive environment for socialisation and the formation of groups.

If we look again at the literature review of this study, we can now better understand that researchers have not yet explained the group study dimension of citizen behaviour in an academic context. Chen and Carey (2009) classify group study as citizenship behaviour, but they fail to explain the basis of group formation and other dynamics. Myers (2012) examines the impact of group composition on citizenship behaviour, finding that students who either self-select their group members or are assigned to random groups show the same levels of citizenship behaviour. However, members of self-selected groups were seen to display a higher level of commitment, trust and satisfaction. My data analysis shows that students used geographic origins and ethnicity to form similarly oriented groups. Connerley and Mael (2001) report that 30% of students prefer to form groups with students from their own native town or area.

The third sub-theme of in-work SCB is that of maintaining discipline and following instructions. The study participants claim that they always maintain a good discipline in the classroom, as well as outside of the classroom, which makes the work of other people easier. In their view, it is reasonable to support students, staff and faculty members. For example, students claim that they do not make noise in the class nor in the library, and that they follow the instructions and guidance of the staff, faculty members and institution. Bowen (1986) notes that in a service delivery process, the presence and co-operation of service users is necessary for efficient service production and consumption.

In the academic context, Chen and Carey (2009) found that by following instructions and maintaining discipline in the class, students are supporting their co-students and faculty members. However, in addition to this, my study found that, in the context of UOSJP, students exhibit this behaviour not only in the classroom but also outside of the class. It seems that where rules are not properly communicated and executed, student cooperation becomes vital for the success of the service delivery process.

The fourth sub-theme of in-work SCB is to give suggestions and feedback. The students studied claim that they provided feedback and suggestions to faculty members when needed. This finding is consistent with those of Myers *et al.* (2015). They recognised feedback by students as one type of citizenship behaviour. However, being a qualitative study, my study has also shed light upon how this mechanism works in the classroom setting.

The fifth sub-theme concerns providing attention and output. This is a distinctive type of behaviour which students display to their teachers. Lengnick-Hall (1996) found that the customer's role could enhance service quality. Furthermore, in the academic context Chen and Carey (2009) recognise that displaying dedication towards studies in the classroom is one type of SCB.

My findings confirm that students' positive contact with faculty members, through gesture and posture, will incline teachers to make an extra effort to share their knowledge. The participants revealed that they always pay more attention to the teacher during lectures through positive body language and that they try to complete the tasks as assigned by the teachers. Furthermore, the students claim that their positive gestures and postures develop satisfaction among teachers.

The sixth sub-theme of in-work SCB is doing the job of the staff. The study participants stated that when they found staff busy or absent, then they support them and undertake some part of the staff member's job. For example, a few participants mentioned that although dusting and organising class chairs are the duties of cleaner, when a cleaner was late or busy with other work then the students do that job for them. Likewise, it is not an easy task to hand out the 1,000 or so student identity cards personally by one clerk. In such cases, the clerk is usually helped by students to distribute the cards.

These results match the study of van Doorn *et al.* (2010), who suggest that customers usually assist frontline employees in their work. Organ (1988) terms this as 'altruism' when one employee helps another employee. It seems that, in the context of UOSJP, students frequently help staff and faculty members by doing some part of their official work. However, to the best of my knowledge, no published study has yet highlighted this aspect of SCB in the academic context.

The seventh and final sub-theme of in-work SCB is teaching computer and library skills. The study participants claim that the majority of students initially lack basic computer and library skills when commencing their university education. Senior students thus teach their co-students these skills. In the context of UOSJP, neither the Institute of Library Science nor the Institute of Computer Science provide any basic skills training to students, which is why this role of co-students becomes vital for student learning. Researchers (for example, Allison *et al.*, 2001; Chen and Carey, 2009; Myers *et al.*, 2015a) report that students may help co-students outside of the classroom. However, they do not mention this type of SCB.

## 4.2 Pro-work SCB

The second super-theme of this study is pro-work SCB. This consists of those actions that may not directly help other students, staff, faculty members and the institution in performing their official role or commitments, but which can indirectly enhance their performance.

The first sub-theme of this category is to help in the search for accommodation. In the context of UOSJP, accommodation issues remain the focus for many of the participants interviewed. The majority of students come to the university from far-flung areas of the Sindh province and Pakistan. Consequently, there is always a high demand for campus and private accommodation. However, the majority of students prefer the university accommodation as it is cheap, convenience and very near to the campus. Students always help and guide other students in their search for suitable accommodation.

Wilcox *et al.* (2005) investigated the retention of university students, reporting that if students find compatible friends, then the student retention rate can be increased. However, they also state that living arrangements are vital to this process.

The second sub-theme of pro-work SCB is related to financial support. The study participants shared that, at various times, they have financially supported their fellow students, poor staff members and even the institution through the organisation of events. Fyrand *et al.* (2002) maintain that in social establishment, people receive three types of support from others (companionship, emotional and instrumental). In instrumental support, people provide financial aid to co-workers. The study conducted by Rosenbaum and Massiah (2007) involving 207 gym members indicated that, due to the nature of the gymnasium business, customers become known to each other, develop relationships and display various types of citizenship behaviour. Moreover, those who receive support from co-members also help other members.

The third theme of pro-work SCB is tipping. Tipping is particularly related towards the staff (non-academic) members. In the context of UOSJP, both male and female students organise various events during the year, with members of staff helping them. In many cases, students will provide these staff members with a tip for their services, as an incentive. Chi *et al.* (2011) suggest that staff who serve their customers well will gain a greater tip than otherwise. In my study, the participants maintain that whenever they are supported by staff members for any activity, they will give a tip to encourage them.

This observation has not previously been described in studies relating to SCB. However, this finding must be interpreted with caution, because students may use a tip to encourage their future support, from being satisfied from their service or, as suggested by Chi *et al.* (2011), it can be the result of deep-acting staff support. Azar (2005) supports the findings, stating that customers can support frontline service staff through a tip, based on sympathy and thanks.

The fourth sub-theme of pro-work SCB involves acknowledgement of services. The study participants narrated that every year students distribute appreciation and merit certificates to staff members to acknowledge their services. The purpose of this activity is to recognise the efforts of the staff members and motivate them to provide good service to future students. Several published studies reveal various modes of support to staff, such as tipping and displaying courteous behaviour. However, this type of citizenship behaviour has not been widely studied in the academic context. In a business setting, it has been established that recognising the efforts of an employee by a manager is an external reward that motivates the employee.

The fifth sub-theme of pro-work SCB regards the charitable acts of students toward the staff and institution. The data analysis reveals that students undertook various charitable acts such as blood donation, planting trees and bushes, and painting the university walls. This finding is consistent with those of Johnson and Rapp (2010), who term this as supportive behaviour. However, in their study, the questionnaire used to collect information only included items for fund raising and money donation. A possible explanation for this might be that the context of their research is different and business customers are usually not well connected, like university students. The academic setting allows service users to support co-students, staff and the institution in a more cooperative way.

MacNeela and Gannon (2013) note that, in an academic context, students often become involved in structured charity acts through volunteering. However, my finding from this current study suggests that, due to the lack of any formal structure such as a student union, any such activities are usually initiated by the students on an individual basis or through a group of friends.

The sixth sub-theme of pro-work SCB is ignoring the mistakes of others. The study participants highlighted this theme, discussing various events where they ignored the mistakes of staff and faculty members. Claycomb *et al.* (2001) note that during service encounters, if employees do not provide an adequate service or if they make mistakes, customers will tolerate such behaviour without any complaints. Keaveney (1995) maintains that by ignoring such mistakes, customers are helping the organisation, because dissatisfaction is a key factor which contributes to customer dysfunctional behaviour.

Yi and Gong (2013), using a consumer value co-creation scale, confirmed tolerance towards various types of customer citizenship behaviour. However, the nature of tolerant behaviour is different in the academic context. Students ignored the actions of staff and faculty members when they did not check transcripts correctly, when a faculty member wrongly declared a student absent, when a teacher did not take the class on time, when a teacher asked students to attend unscheduled classes, when staff did not follow the university rules, and when staff did not share important information with them on time. These findings support the studies of Allison *et al.* (2001), Chen and Carey (2009) and Khaola (2008), who all declare that ignoring mistakes is one type of SCB.

The seventh sub-theme of pro-work SCB involves participating in private events. One unanticipated finding was that participation in the private events of other students has been identified as one type of citizenship behaviour. The study participants shared that when their co-students participate in their private events (such as birthdays), this increases socialisation amongst them and students become more inclined to show citizenship behaviours to each other.

This finding is in agreement with the study conducted by Dekas *et al.* (2013), which suggests that due to advancement in technology and management practices, the nature of citizenship behaviour has changed. They consider a birthday celebration of a co-member of staff to be a good act and part of citizenship behaviour. Gehring (2006) mentions that students help each other in solving private problems. However, my own findings reveal that, in the context of UOSJP, alongside helping co-students with their private problems, students also participate in private events to socialise and enhance the morale of their co-students.

The eighth sub-theme of pro-work SCB is that of displaying courteous behaviour. The study participants claim that they show polite behaviour to other students, staff and faculty members. The participants also point out that such polite behaviour is vital to motivating staff, as a staff member feels good when he/she is dealt with politely. These findings are in agreement with Claycomb *et al.* (2001), who report that the customer is not a mere receiver of a service, but a contributor in the service, and that the customer's action is vital for the success of the service delivery process.

The ninth sub-theme of pro-work SCB is arbitration and extended support. The study participants discussed their positive role in student conflicts, stating that whenever any problem arises among students, they will play the role of arbitrator between them to develop harmony within the class. Farh *et al.* (2004) identify

employees' efforts to develop interpersonal harmony among workers as one dimension of citizenship behaviour in the Chinese context. Khaola (2008) similarly reports that students will take measures to prevent problems among themselves. However, Khaola (2008) did not fully explain this phenomenon, due to the quantitative nature of the study. My findings suggest that, in the context of UOSJP, as students belong to different religious, ethnic and economic backgrounds there are more possibilities of conflicts arising among them. It seems that arbitration is a way to maintain a healthy environment at the university and a good relationship among the students.

Those students who had received such extended support revealed that when a co-student could not attend an examination due to a personal issue, they met up with the instructor and obtained relief for that student. It seems that students are using nagging to get support for co-students from teachers. Nagging refers to harmless but constant techniques to pursue a teacher for a favourable outcome (Dunleavy and Myers, 2008). Flattering instructor nagging is identified by Dunleavy and Myers (*ibid.*), whereby students are deliberately involved in actions that they perceive are good for building a rapport with teachers. Afterwards, students use that rapport to obtain support from these teachers.

The tenth sub-theme of pro-work SCB is organising and participating in institutional events. Gruen (1995) maintains that, in the business setting, customers participate in company events. Allison *et al.* (2001) also identify student participation and help in organising various events as a SCB in the academic context.

However, if we look at the academic setting of UOSJP, the students (with little or no help from the university) organise quite a large number of events. During this process, students collect funds from other students. They decide what activities will be included in the events and allow other students to help and participate. We can say (in the context of UOSJP) that the students are not just mere participators, but the managers of these university events.

### **4.3 Communication-related SCB**

Communication-related SCB is the third super-theme of SCB. The first sub-theme is offline information sharing. The data indicates that students share information between themselves, through personal communication, to support other students, the staff and faculty members. In the specific context of UOSJP, there is a near-total lack of any modern Internet-based interactive system provided by and for use within the university. Furthermore, due to the high ratio of student population to staff, faculty members and staff need help from students to communicate and share important information with students. For example, as has arisen in practice, if due to some reason a faculty member knows he/she will not be able to take the class, he/she can then inform just one of the student for that class, who then quickly shares that information with the other students using their own mobile network system.

Yi and Gong (2011) describe how, in the service setting, customers are not like a sleeping partner, but play their part in service production and consumption. Liu and Tsaur (2014), investigating the citizenship behaviour of a group of tourists, found that tour members help each other and the tour leader, through the communication and sharing of information. If we look at the academic setting, students spend a relatively long time at one particular location (the university), so they also support other students, teachers and staff by sharing information.

The second sub-theme of communication-related SCB is online information sharing. The study participants state that they mainly shared information through social networking sites. This information ranged from assignment topics, submission dates, study notes, important dates and deadlines, to any other information that is useful for their community. According to the Pakistan Telecommunication Authority (PTA, 2015), as a result of the recent development of the telecom sector within Pakistan, there are now 122.59 million mobile users and 23.221 million Internet users in the country.

Chhachhar *et al.* (2013) claim that 42.2% of all students at UOSJP were regular users of 'Facebook' in 2013. It seems that information technology has provided students with a virtual platform of their own by which to share useful information. The study participants emphasise that online sharing is more beneficial for those students who, due to some reason, cannot attend the institution or who live at a distance from the campus. This finding is consistent with the study of Selwyn (2009) who explored the use of 'Facebook' for educational purposes, collecting data from 909 university graduates. He found that students shared education-related information and university experiences with other students.

The third sub-theme of communication-related SCB is promotion of the institution. The study participants mention that they had recommended their institution to friends and family. Moreover, they always passed on positive comments about their institution in person or via online communication. The role of the online community is vital in this promotion. An 'online community' can be defined as:

“[a] social group or organisation where people voluntarily become a member and participate in interactive activities with other members to exchange desired benefits they seek through the chosen community” (Kang *et al.*, 2007, p. 114).

Tsai and Pai (2013) found that online communities play a vital role in information sharing and recommendation for an organisation. Recommendation by service users has a more significant impact than a company-sponsored advertisement, because it has been provided by satisfied customers (Feick & Price, 1987). This finding is consistent with previous studies which show that satisfied customers always recommend that product or service to others. By doing this in an academic setting, students are supporting their institution, making a positive image in front of the public through personal and online communication. Teo and Soutar (2012) found, in the Singaporean context, that students who have a satisfied and emotional attachment with their institution spread positive remarks about it.

The fourth sub-theme of communication-related SCB relates to displaying affiliation. The data analysis shows that students display affiliation with their institution by pasting the institute's logo onto their bags or notebook, a non-verbal communication. The students have also used slogans for that same purpose, displayed on books and bags, such as 'Proud to be Commercian'. Furthermore, students use products (such as cups and pens) that contain the logo of their institute or university, to show their attachment or commitment to it. Bove *et al.* (2009) state that customers use various ways to show their relationship with an organisation.

Aspara *et al.* (2014) spell out that, in this era of competition, each university wants to establish their brand to compete in the higher education industry. It seems that students, through displaying affiliation, not only show their commitment to their organisation, but also promote that organisation through non-verbal communication. Researchers (for example, McAlexander *et al.*, 2006; McAlexander & Koenig, 2010) have introduced the concept of brand community into higher education. They state that university branded logo goods could help in building a brand community, which can benefit higher educational institutions in the long run. However, it seems that there are no conscious efforts by UOSJP officials to develop a brand community.

#### 4.4 Policing-related SCB

The fourth super-theme is policing-related SCB. Policing is an active act of the customer, in which the customer observes, corrects and discourages the negative actions of other customers (Bettencourt, 1997; Gruen *et al.*, 2000). The majority of students claim that they are not only undertaking good actions for their co-students, staff and faculty members, but also taking various actions to stop or prevent any negative actions of other students which could be harmful to individuals and/or the institution. The data reflects that students keep a vigilant eye on the actions of co-students via the online virtual world, as well as offline both in and outside of the class. Whenever they find any activity that is not good for the student community and/or institution, the students play an active role to stop or discourage it.

The first sub-theme of policing-related SCB is 'offline in the class' policing. The study participants explain that, in the class and during lectures, a few students may try to disturb the service delivery by using various methods that are neither good for the class nor the teacher. In this situation, the students request these disruptive students to avoid actions that may disturb the class. Researchers (for example, Allison *et al.*, 2001; Khaola, 2008; Chen & Carey, 2009) acknowledge that students will attempt to follow rules and regulations. However, none of these studies shed any light on the policing behaviours of students. It seems that academia is the type of service which cannot be produced without the active involvement of students. Influencing co-students in the class to stop them from negative acts is supportive to other students, faculty members and the institution.

The second sub-theme of policing-related SCB is offline 'out of class' policing. This type of SCB refers to those policing actions of students in which they stop other students displaying negative behaviour outside the class and classroom (e.g., at hostels, on university-owned buses, or in the library). As discussed earlier, policing is an important dimension of SCB. These findings show that the scope of that behaviour is not limited to the classroom. Students show policing behaviour at libraries, computer laboratories, dormitories and while using university-owned transport. These findings suggest that, in the context of UOSJP, policing behaviour is more extended and vibrant.

The third sub-theme of policing-related SCB is online policing. This refers to those steps taken by the administrator of a social networking site to reduce negative usage.

“Social networking sites are a group of Internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0, and that allow the creation and exchange of user generated content” (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010, p. 61).

Social networking sites have replaced the old traditional ways and even some newer ways of communication, and consumers are frequently sharing their shopping experiences with other consumers. It is thus somewhat surprising that previous studies have focused on offline citizenship behaviour rather than virtual citizenship behaviour. However, my own data analysis shows that nearly every class has its own 'Facebook' page, where students share their ideas and other posts. Those study participants who were the administrators of 'Facebook' pages claim that they did not allow any post that they consider to be inappropriate. In addition, other participants who were members of a 'Facebook' group claim that they also discourage the negative attitudes of other students.

Chhachhar *et al.* (2013) investigated the internet usage of students at UOSJP, stating that 42.2% of the students used 'Facebook' for communication and spent 1 to 3 hours per day on it. In addition, 26% of their respondents claimed that they spent 4 to 7 hours on 'Facebook'. Their findings reveal the potential importance of student policing behaviour via social networking sites. My study examined the use of information technology via social networking sites for promoting good citizenship behaviour, and explored its nature and the amount of usage over the academic calendar. Students' usage of social networking sites increases during the mid and end of each semester, due to assignment submissions and examination preparation. These findings suggest that virtual or online policing is supporting the good behaviour by students in the context of UOSJP.

#### 4.5 Voice-related SCB

Voice-related SCB is the fifth super-theme identified. The 'voice' refers to those positive behaviours by which students offer suggestions for improvement in a product or service. These types of behaviour are the result of positive experiences with the service, product or organisation (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Ng and Feldman (2012) have found that voice can be the result of stress, and stress is indirectly proportionate with voice. In addition, people can use voice behaviour to reduce stress.

My data analysis shows that the students surveyed use soft methods (such as magazine articles, poetry or stage drama) to communicate their views and suggestions on how to improve the situation. In the context of UOSJP, there is no any standard mechanism through which students can share their views. It seems that students choose harmless and indirect ways to share their grievances with the administration.

The first sub-theme of voice-related SCB is using the voice through magazines. In the context of UOSJP, students publish magazines with or without the help of the institution. These magazines provide students with a platform whereby they can show their creativity and raise their concerns. In these magazines, students make their case relating to a particular issue through 'soft tones' in the shape of stories. It seems that in the university setting, due to power differences, students do not have an appropriate platform to express their grievances. So, these magazines provide them with the opportunity to achieve this. Olausen (2007) presents three major roles of students from the analysis of their campus newspaper: the campus/education role, the political role and the social role. My findings are consistent with those of Olausen (*ibid.*), who states that students use magazines as a medium to raise voices for different causes.

The second sub-theme of voice-related SCB is the use of voice through poetry. The data shows that students at the university use poetry to express their experiences and ideas. Poetry is used as a voice by the students to communicate how to improve their situation.

“The art of poetry involves a sifting and analysing of personal data, close observation of the external and internal worlds and the creation therefrom of a condensed, holistic narrative. The validity of the poem lies in its ability to resonate in the reader, to communicate emotional truths in language that is fresh and engaging” (Sherry & Schouten, 2002, p. 231).

Gallardo *et al.* (2009) found that poems are a valuable way of understanding personal experience through voice. Mohammadian *et al.* (2011) explored the impact of poetry on stress reduction in undergraduate students, finding that writing poetry reduces stress. It seems that when students feel stress due to some issue they want to raise (to improve a situation, for example), they adopt poetry as a mode for expression.

The third sub-theme of voice-related SCB is the use of voice through stage performance. The study participants mention that students participate in stage drama. These stage performances are mostly based on student experiences within the university, with students using their voice to reflect various issues (for example, the rude behaviour of faculty members or the lack of certain facilities). Goffman (1959) developed a framework to understand human behaviour in its natural setting by adopting the theatre metaphor (that life is like a theatre and everyone is playing multiple roles in multiple settings at multiple locations).

“The theatrical impulse among human beings emerged with their very capacity for meaning, and dramaturgy is the efficient, efficacious, and parsimonious method of articulating and experiencing it” (Perinbanayagam, 1985, p. 63).

Performance is a method of communication that can be achieved through gesture, posture or speech.

“If one individual attempts to direct the activity of others by mean of example, enlightenment, persuasion, exchange, manipulation, authority, threat, punishment, it will be necessary regardless of his powerful position, to convey effectively what he wants to be done, what he is prepared to do to get it done and what he will do if it is not done. Thus the most objective form of naked power, physical coercion, is often neither objective nor naked but often means of communication, not merely a mean of function” (Goffman, 1959, p. 234).

McNaughton (2004) believes that, in drama, participants play an active role and communicate what they observe. It seems that students use drama as a way to educate stakeholders about a particular issue or situation. Some researchers (for example, Özdemir & Çakmak, 2008; Ormanlı & Ören, 2010) state that drama has been used to educate, to make aware and to train people. My own findings are consistent with this, as through stage performances the students aim to create awareness about some issues in order to make positive changes specific to them.

The fourth sub-theme of voice-related SCB is through a silent voice. The study participants claim that whenever they find that the behaviour of a faculty member is not good towards students, they do not complain about this behaviour but just stop active participation in that class. The participants believe that ‘actions speak louder than words’. It is better to keep silent than display negative behaviour. If the teacher can judge and accept these cues, then he can improve his attitude. This finding corroborates the ideas of Van Dyne *et al.*, who term such behaviour ‘pro-social silence’, stating that:

“pro-social silence is based on awareness and consideration of alternatives and the conscious decision to withhold ideas, information, and opinions” (2003, p. 1368).

## 5.0 Conclusion

The literature review highlighted that the majority of the research on SCB (for example, Allison *et al.*, 2001; Gehring, 2006; Khaola, 2008; Annuar Khalid *et al.*, 2013) employed scales based on a standard OCB scale to measure SCB. However, this measurement consists of five basic constructs developed by researchers in the business context (i.e., altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy and sportsmanship). However, some researchers (notably Chen & Carey, 2009; Myers *et al.*, 2015) developed their own scales to measure SCB (for these authors, in the Chinese and American contexts).

The findings of this study suggest that, in the context of Pakistani public higher education, some constructs of SCB are hybrid in nature. Some of the dimensions of SCB identified in this study match with the OCB scales adopted from the business context. Furthermore, some dimensions harmonised with the scales developed by Chen and Carey (2009) and Myers *et al.* (2015) in order to understand SCB. However, the majority of the dimensions of SCB did not match with them. It seems that, in general, elements of SCB within the context of public higher education in Pakistan are different from those of previous studies because of its contextual nature.

This study further reports that students display citizenship behaviour not only just with their co-students; the scope of SCB was wide enough to include staff, faculty members and the institution as a whole. A recent study by Batool (2014) reports that within the context of Pakistani higher education, teachers' exhibit citizenship behaviour towards students, colleagues, staff and the institution. It seems that students are also frequently supporting their co-students, staff, faculty members and their institution. In this way, their actions significantly impact upon the overall performance of the academic institutions involved. The key limitation of this study that it investigates SCB with lens of student experience only. Future research can be done to understand experience of faculty members and non-academic staff related to SCB.

## 6.0 REFERENCES

1. Allison, B.J., Voss, R.S. & Dryer, S. (2001). "Student classroom and career success: the role of organizational citizenship behaviour", *Journal of Education for Business*, 76(5), 282-288.
2. Aspara, J., Aula, H., Tienari, J. & Tikkanen, H. (2014). "Struggles in organizational attempts to adopt new branding logics: the case of a marketizing university", *Consumption Markets and Culture*, 17(6), 522-552.
3. Azar, O.H. (2005). "Who do we tip and why? An empirical investigation", *Applied Economics*, 37(16), 1871-1879.
4. Batool, N. (2014). "Going the extra mile: what does it mean for the male and female university teachers of Pakistan?". PhD thesis, Middlesex University.
5. Bettencourt, L.A. (1997). "Customer voluntary performance: customers as partners in service delivery", *Journal of Retailing*, 73(3), 383-406.
6. Bolino, M.C., Turnley, W.H. & Bloodgood, J.M. (2002). "Citizenship behaviour and the creation of social capital in organizations", *Academy of Management Review*, 27(4), 505-522.
7. Bove, L.L., Pervan, S.J., Beatty, S.E. & Shiu, E. (2009). "Service worker role in encouraging customer organizational citizenship behaviors", *Journal of Business Research*, 62(7), 698-705.
8. Bowen, D.E. (1986). "Managing customers as human resources in service organizations", *Human Resource Management*, 25(3), 371-383.
9. Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Chen, S.X. & Carey, T.P. (2009). "Assessing citizenship behaviour in educational contexts: the role of personality, motivation, and culture", *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 27(2), 125-137.
11. Chi, N., Grandey, A.A., Diamond, J.A. & Krimmel, K.R. (2011). "Want a tip? Service performance as a function of emotion regulation and extraversion", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(6), 1337-1346.
12. Claycomb, C., Lengnick-Hall, C.A. & Inks, L.W. (2001). "The customer as a productive resource: a pilot study and strategic implications", *Journal of Business Strategies*, 18(1), 47-69.
13. Connerley, M.L. & Mael, F.A. (2001). "The importance and invasiveness of student team selection criteria", *Journal of Management Education*, 25(5), 471-494.
14. Dekas, K.H., Bauer, T.N., Welle, B., Kurkoski, J. & Sullivan, S. (2013). "Organizational citizenship behaviour, version 2.0: a review and qualitative investigation of OCBs for knowledge workers at Google and beyond", *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27(3), 219-237.
15. Dunleavy, K.N. & Myers, S.A. (2008). "Exploring the concept of student nagging behaviour", *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, 9(1), 13-19.
16. Ehtiyar, V.R., Aktas, A.A. & Ömüriş, E. (2010). "The role of organizational citizenship behaviour on university student's academic success", *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 16(1), 47-61.
17. Farh, J., Zhong, C. & Organ, D.W. (2004). "Organizational citizenship behaviour in the People's Republic of China", *Organization Science*, 15(2), 241-253.
18. Feick, L.F. & Price, L.L. (1987). "The market maven: a diffuser of marketplace information", *The Journal of Marketing*, 51(1), 83-97.
19. Fyrand, L., Moum, T., Finset, A. & Glennås, A. (2002). "The impact of disability and disease duration on social support of women with rheumatoid arthritis", *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 25(3), 251-268.

20. Gallardo, H.L., Furman, R. & Kulkarni, S. (2009). "Explorations of depression poetry and narrative in autoethnographic qualitative research", *Qualitative Social Work*, 8(3), 287-304.
21. Gehring, F. (2006). "University citizenship behaviour. Development and validation of an inventory on contextual performance at universities [University citizenship behavior. Entwicklung und validierung eines fragebogens zu umfeldbezogener leistung an hochschulen]". Diploma thesis, Aachen, Germany: RWTH Aachen University.
22. Gill, J. & Johnson, P. (2002). *Research Methods for Managers*, London: Sage.
23. Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, republished 2002, New York: Garden City.
24. Groth, M. (2005). "Customers as good soldiers: examining citizenship behaviors in internet service deliveries", *Journal of Management*, 31(1), 7-27.
25. Gruen, T.W., Summers, J.O. & Acito, F. (2000). "Relationship marketing activities, commitment, and membership behaviors in professional associations", *Journal of Marketing*, 64(3), 34-49.
26. HEC (2013). *Higher Education Commission of Pakistan, 2012-2013. Annual Report*, Islamabad, Pakistan: Higher Education Commission of Pakistan.
27. Johnson, J.W. & Rapp, A. (2010). "A more comprehensive understanding and measure of customer helping behaviour", *Journal of Business Research*, 63(8), 787-792.
28. Kang, I., Lee, K.C., Lee, S. & Choi, J. (2007). "Investigation of online community voluntary behaviour using cognitive map", *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 23(1), 111-126.
29. Kaplan, A.M. & Haenlein, M. (2010). "Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media", *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59-68.
30. Keaveney, S.M. (1995). "Customer switching behaviour in service industries: an exploratory study", *The Journal of Marketing*, 59(2), 71-82.
31. Khaola, P. (2008). "Organisational citizenship behaviour within learning environments", *International Journal of Management Education*, 7(1), 73-80.
32. Kotze, T.G. & du Plessis, P. (2003). "Students as 'co-producers' of education: a proposed model of student socialisation and participation at tertiary institutions", *Quality Assurance in Education*, 11(4), 186-201.
33. Lengnick-Hall, C.A. (1996). "Customer contributions to quality: a different view of the customer-oriented firm", *Academy of Management Review*, 21(3), 791-824.
34. Liu, J.S. & Tsaor, S. (2014). "We are in the same boat: tourist citizenship behaviors", *Tourism Management*, 42, 88-100.
35. Mackie, S. (ed.) (1998). "Jumping the hurdles". Paper presented at the Higher Education Close Up Conference, 6-8 July, University of Central Lancashire.
36. MacNeela, P. & Gannon, N. (2013). "Process and positive development: an interpretative phenomenological analysis of university student volunteering", *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 29(3), 407-436.
37. Mallick, A., 2014. *Class Politics in the Era of Neoliberalism: The Case of Karachi*,
38. McAlexander, J.H. & Koenig, H.F. (2010). "Contextual influences: building brand community in large and small colleges", *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 20(1), 69-84.
39. McAlexander, J.H., Koenig, H.F. & Schouten, J.W. (2006). "Building relationships of brand community in higher education: a strategic framework for university advancement", *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 6(2), 107-118.

40. McCulloch, A. (2009). "The student as co-producer: learning from public administration about the student–university relationship", *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(2), 171-183.
41. McNaughton, M.J. (2004). "Educational drama in the teaching of education for sustainability", *Environmental Education Research*, 10(2), 139-155.
42. Meuter, M.L. & Bitner, M.J. (1998). "Self-service technologies: extending service frameworks and identifying issues for research", *Marketing Theory and Applications*, 9, 12-19.
43. Mohammadian, Y., Shahidi, S., Mahaki, B., Mohammadi, A.Z., Baghban, A.A. & Zayeri, F. (2011). "Evaluating the use of poetry to reduce signs of depression, anxiety and stress in Iranian female students", *The Arts in Psychotherapy*, 38(1), 59-63.
44. Myers, S.A. (2012). "Students' perceptions of classroom group work as a function of group member selection", *Communication Teacher*, 26(1), 50-64.
45. Myers, S.A., Goldman, Z.W., Atkinson, J., Ball, H., Carton, S.T., Tindage, M.F. & Anderson, A.O. (2015). "Student civility in the college classroom: exploring student use and effects of classroom citizenship behavior", *Communication Education*, 65(1), 1-19.
46. Ng, T.W. & Feldman, D.C. (2012). "Employee voice behavior: a meta-analytic test of the conservation of resources framework", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33(2), 216-234.
47. Olausen, K. (2007). "Protests without teargas: portrayals of campus activism in the print media 1996-2004". PhD thesis, North Carolina State University, USA.
48. Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. [e-book] Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com. .
49. Ormancı, Ü. & Ören, F.Ş. (2010). "Classroom teacher candidates' opinions related to using drama in primary school: an example of Demirci faculty of education", *Ankara University, Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 43(1), 165-191.
50. Özdemyr, S.M. & Çakmak, A. (2008). "The effect of drama education on prospective teachers' creativity", *International Journal of Instruction*, 1(1), 13-30.
51. Perinbanayagam, R.S. (1985). *Signifying Acts: Structure and Meaning in Everyday Life*, Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.
52. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B. & Bachrach, D.G. (2000). "Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research", *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
53. Poropat, A.E. (2011). "The role of citizenship performance in academic achievement and graduate employability", *Education Training*, 53(6), 499-514.
54. PTA (2015). *Telecom Indicators, October 2015*. Pakistan Telecommunication Authority. Available online at: [http://www.pta.gov.pk/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=269&Itemid=658](http://www.pta.gov.pk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=269&Itemid=658) (accessed December 2015).
55. Rosenbaum, M.S. & Massiah, C.A. (2007). "When customers receive support from other customers: exploring the influence of intercustomer social support on customer voluntary performance", *Journal of Service Research*, 9(3), 257-270.
56. Schnake, M.E. & Dumler, M.P. (2003). "Levels of measurement and analysis issues in organizational citizenship behaviour research", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76(3), 283-301.
57. Selwyn, N. (2009). "Faceworking: exploring students' education-related use of Facebook", *Learning, Media and Technology*, 34(2), 157-174.

58. Sherry, J.F. & Schouten, J.W. (2002). "A role for poetry in consumer research", *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(2), 218-234.
59. Smith, C., Organ, D.W. & Near, J.P. (1983). "Organizational citizenship behavior: its nature and antecedents", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 653-663.
60. Teo, R. & Soutar, G.N. (2012). "Word of mouth antecedents in an educational context: a Singaporean study", *International Journal of Educational Management*, 26(7), 678-695.
61. Tsai, H. & Pai, P. (2013). "Explaining members' proactive participation in virtual communities", *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 71(4), 475-491.
62. Van Doorn, J., Lemon, K.N., Mittal, V., Nass, S., Pick, D., Pirner, P. & Verhoef, P.C. (2010). "Customer engagement behavior: theoretical foundations and research directions", *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), 253-266.
63. Van Dyne, L. & LePine, J.A. (1998). "Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: evidence of construct and predictive validity", *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108-119.
64. Van Dyne, L., Ang, S. & Botero, I.C. (2003). "Conceptualizing employee silence and employee voice as multidimensional constructs", *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1359-1392.
65. Wilcox, P., Winn, S. & Fyvie-Gauld, M. (2005). "'It was nothing to do with the university, it was just the people': the role of social support in the first-year experience of higher education", *Studies in Higher Education*, 30(6), 707-722.
66. Yi, Y. & Gong, T. (2013). "Customer value co-creation behavior: scale development and validation", *Journal of Business Research*, 66(9), 1279-1284.