

Exploratory Research on the Role of Trust as a Relationship Dimension that exists between the Students and the University of Mumbai

Mayur Sarfare,

Assistant Professor
SVKM's Usha Pravin Gandhi college of Arts, Science and Commerce,
Vile Parle, Mumbai -400056
Contact: mayur.sarfare@upgcm.ac.in

Abstract

The future course of a society can ultimately be determined by the relationship that exists between public organizations and its publics. Fruitful relationships produce results that typically advance the objectives of an organization. Therefore, it becomes imperative to study the various components also known as the relationship dimensions that will enable us to evaluate the existing state of relationship between a key public organization, which in this study is the Mumbai University, and its strategic publics, which being its students itself. One of the most crucial relationship variables that is thought to be useful in determining the nature of the relationship between students and their university is "trust". The exploratory research aimed to measure the degree of trust that the students share with the university of Mumbai. Since measuring something as intangible as trust would be challenging, a qualitatively quantitative methodology was adopted that quantified 'trust' by breaking it down into three measurable sub-dimensions – 'Integrity', 'Dependability' and 'Competence' based on well-established Public Relations measurement scale developed by Dr James Grunig. The research aimed to understand the relation of the level of trust shared by the students and its effect on the image of the university in the student's mind. It was found that the three sub-dimensions of trust were of a reasonably high degree in the students' mind in relation to the University of Mumbai.

Keywords: Organization-public relationships, Organizational Trust, Strategic Publics, Relationship Dimensions.

Introduction

Organization –public relationship has always remained as an important aspect of public relations research. Positive organization-public relations are valued, according to a new paradigm in relationship management. Public relations is able to transcend the media relations and publicity model thanks to the relationship management paradigm. The value of a high-quality relationship between organizations and their audiences is what is known as public relations. The measurement of organization-public relationship is a way by which one can actually determine the state of the relationship that exists, and the various components that affects the stability of that relationship. An organization is an organized structure consisting of administrative officials like a government department. Going by that definition, one can also consider University as an organization and the students of this university would automatically become its strategic publics. There are various relationship dimensions such as "control mutuality", "satisfaction", "commitment", "exchange relationship", "communal relationship" and "trust" which help determine the nature and quality of the relationship (Grunig & Childers, 1999).

This research will however be focussing on "trust" as a relationship dimension. The research will attempt to measure the trust element amongst the students that they share for the University and its influence on the image that University has in the student's mind. The existing perception of the university in the student's mind can be studied by measuring the degree of trust that students share for the university. The element of trust can be a crucial metric to assess the impact of any organization's PR value, therefore the impact of the effort put by the University to promote itself can in a way be determined by measuring the extent to which the reliance and confidence that students have in the University.

The element of trust is such that it is almost vital to the existence of an organization. For a University to function efficiently, it's imperative that its strategic publics that are its students should have high level of confidence placed in the way of its operation. By measuring one of the relationship dimensions, one could understand the perception of the organization in the minds of its publics. As far the University is concerned, it doesn't take any special effort to improve its ties with the students and as a result is oblivious to the existing perception that the students have in their mind. Also currently there exists no kind of mechanism that can study about the image that the students have created in their mind.

The researcher is intensely curious to study about the existing level of trust that exists between the students, to find out if there resides the belief in the minds of its publics; whether the University is fair and just, whether it does what it says and finally, if it is capable of doing what it says.

Literature Review

Organization-public relationship

Ledingham and Bruning (1998) described organization public relationships as “*the state that exists between an organization and its key publics that provides economic, social, political, and/or cultural benefits to all parties involved, and is characterized by mutual positive regard* (Ledingham & Bruning, 1998).” Various scholars have researched on the aspect of the organization-public relationships and have established various parameters to measure the quality of relationship of the organization with its publics. Organization-public relationship comes broadly under the relationship management theory. The concept of relationship management and measurement can be traced back to the year 1984; Miss Ferguson proposed a model that focussed on relationship as a unit of analysis as opposed to studying the organization and its publics. She stated that relationship should be the major focus of research efforts. She maintained that this focus was more suitable than the media communication and public relations theory development that had been dominated by the communication processes and effects. Ferguson (1984) had established six parameters or what is also known as ‘relationship dimensions’ based on which the organization-public relationship could be studied. **Dynamic vs. static, open vs. closed, mutual satisfaction, distribution of power, mutual understanding & mutual agreement** were the 6 components that she had put into consideration (Jo, 2003).

Relationship Dimensions

Dr James Grunig in 1999 developed a reliable “*PR Relationship Measurement Scale*” that helped in finding the outcomes of the long-term relationships of an organization. Grunig had identified 6 components or precise elements on the basis of which one could measure the nature and quality of the organization-public relationship; they were “**control mutuality**”, “**trust**”, “**satisfaction**”, “**commitment**”, “**exchange relationship**” and “**communal relationship**” (Grunig & Childers, 1999). In 1997, Mr Huang provided relationship indicators “**relational commitment**” and “**relational satisfaction**” along with *trust and control mutuality* as components used by James Grunig to study Organisation-public relationship (Opr). (Jo, 2003) In 1998 Ledingham and Bruning put forwarded *openness, trust, involvement, investment and commitment* as important parameters to study Opr. Kim in 2001 included **local and community involvement, reputation** along with *trust and commitment* as the relationship dimensions to measure relationships (Kim, 2003).

This study now intends to look at ‘**trust**’ specifically as a relationship dimension, its relevance and significance in the growth of relations between the organization and its constituents.

Before studying trust as a relationship dimension, it is imperative that the researcher conducts an in-depth study on the idea of trust, on the various models of trust and its typologies.

Defining trust and its typologies

Trust has been regarded as being integral and fundamental to the functioning of complex and interdependent society (Moran & Hoy, 2000). Dr James Grunig in his *PR Relationship Measurement Scale* defined *trust* as, “one party’s level of confidence in and willingness to open oneself to the other party.” He proposed that trust had three sub-dimensions: “**Integrity**”, “**Dependability**” and “**Competence**”. “*Integrity*: the belief that an organization is fair and just .*Dependability*: the belief that an organization will do what it says it will do and, *competence*: the belief that an organization has the ability to do what it says it will do (Grunig & Childers, 1999).

The concept of trust is so vital to the existence of an organization; therefore, it has been studied widely by many scholars till date, and very low level of unanimity has been achieved in terms of what trust means .As a result there have been diverse definitions of trust emerging out of various studies spanning from personality trait to structural phenomenon. (1995)Mayer, Schoorman and Davis argue that confidence and dependability can’t be synonyms to trust, for they feel that it is too ‘simplistic’ and ‘has obfuscated the nature of trust’. Trust has been pointed out to be as the ‘central strategic asset’ during the organizational restructuring crisis of the 1990’s (Mishra, Webb, & Weick & Roberts, 1996 & 1993).

In 1978, Gabbaro had proposed a four-stage model of the development of trust between the publics and their organization. Mutual impression making and orientation made the first stage. It is followed by learning and exploration that becomes the second stage. Limits of trust are influenced by the individuals and there arises a mutual set of

expectations in the minds of the two parties. In the final stage, realistic expectations have been made and there is reciprocal trust necessary for a stable relationship to exist (Rawlins, 2007).

Various studies had classified trust into various categories. D. Harrison and Norman L. Chervany did a study on trust titled *'Meanings of Trust'*; they have tried tackling the issue of the divergent definitions of trust. They have attempted to create two conceptual typologies of trust. Typology (a) was classification for the types of trust, and typology (b) a set of six related types of trust constructs, by which the mean that type of trust constructs that can be conceptually distinguished from each other. They had formed three major categories of trust; those were **Impersonal/Structural**, **Dispositional**, and **Personal/Interpersonal**. They had defined "Impersonal/Structural as the kind of trust that founded and built upon the social and institutional structures in the situation," which is not on the person or personal attributes of the trusted parties. Here trust is looked upon as an 'institutional property'. 'Dispositional' trust is what is based on the 'personality attributes of the trusting party.' Here a person has general faith in the 'human nature' and has the proclivity to trust other people. **Personal trust** is where "one person trusts another specific person, persons, or thing(s) in the specific situation" and **inter-personal trust** is where "two or more people (or groups) trust each other in the specific situation," (Mcknight & Chervany, 1996).

In a study by Devon Johnson and Kent Grayson titled *'Cognitive and Affective Trust in Service Relationships'*, they have tried to study the role of **emotional trust (affective)** in forging connections with customers. They have stated that emotional trust has lot of significance in consumer-service firm relationships, as the relationship here is characterized by the "credence qualities" that cut shorts the customer's capacity of making objective assessments. Here the 'affective signal' of the service provider has direct impact on the minds of the customer and may be an indicator the service quality. They have divided trust here into three types: "**cognitive trust**", "**affective trust**" and "**behavioural trust**". **Cognitive trust** has been explained as "*customer's confidence or willingness to rely on a service provider's competence and reliability*". **Affective trust** is defined as "*confidence one places in a partner on the basis of feelings generated by the level of care and concern the partner demonstrates.*" The primary characteristics of this type of trust are a sense of security and the relationship's observed strength. Reputation effects also have a bearing on the formation of affective trust. This is mainly an emotion-driven trust, where a partner is ready to venture beyond what is available to him from the knowledge, distantly related to what is known as a 'leap of faith'. **Behavioural trust** has been put forward here as the third component of trust that "constitutes for the actions that flow from a state of cognitive and affective trust." The investigation's outcome was Affective trust considerably increased the likelihood of anticipating future encounters, whereas cognitive trust greatly increased sales effectiveness and anticipation of future contacts. The study may yield some evidence that, in financial service transactions, trust is conceptualized as having both cognitive and emotive elements (Johnson & Graysn, 2005).

Organizational Trust

A paper by IABC Research foundation defines Organizational Trust as "*The organization's willingness, based upon its culture and communication behaviours in relationships and transactions, to be appropriately vulnerable based on the belief that another individual, group, or organization is competent, open and honest, concerned, reliable, and identified with common goals, norms, and values.*" The trust model developed by this paper has five dimensions: "**Competence**", "**Openness and honesty**", "**Concern for employees**", "**Reliability and Identification**"; they have been studied to be as the five factors that create organizational trust (-Zalabak & Morreale, 2011).

A paper titled "*Integrated model of Organizational Trust*" by David Schoorman contended ability, benevolence and integrity as three most important factors that contributes to the formation of trust in a group or organization. Willingness to take risk in a relationship reflects the degree of trust existent in the relationship and this willingness to take risk is directly proportional to the rise in the above three factors, however a very strong system of control tends to restrict the growth of trust in an organization. (Schoorman, Mayer, Roger, & Davis, 2007). Kirsimarja Blomqvist in his paper "*Building Organizational trust*" has attempted to explain how institutional and interpersonal trust relate to one another. They put out a methodology for fostering organizational trust that integrates personal and organizational trust. The paper puts forward various bases for the formation of organizational trust which are: "self-reference", "Organizational structure", "Organizational goals and vision", "Managerial philosophy", "Organizational culture", "Organizational values and Competence" (Blomqvist, Sundqvis, & Seppanen, 2005).

Relation between Organizational culture and Organizational Trust

Edgar Schein (1992) defined organizational culture as "*a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by the group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well*

enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.”The behavioural norms and the treatment of the people within the organization affect the characteristics of an organizational culture. It also arises from how things operate every day in an organization and what is taken to be as granted by the employees. The employee’s perception of what is expected of them and their idea of what kind of behaviour is reinforced and rewarded will define the organizational culture (Schein, 1992).

An organization's ability to compete and be productive is directly correlated with the level of trust its strategic publics have in it. It is said that one key component of a company's culture is trust. Bibb and Kourdi (2004) list a number of observable traits that characterize a culture of trust. An environment is created by these characteristics that interact with each other in which people trust each other or are trusted by each other. They were: “Shared values”, “a shared mission or goal”, “open and authentic leadership”, “a culture of consensus not force”, “a feeling of enjoying work”, “an atmosphere of fun and enjoyment”, “a desire to learn and not blame”, and “honesty and authentic conversations” (Bib & Kourdi, 2004). Culture in the organization is said to be created by the particular culture of that organization; the culture remains highly dynamic (Schein, 1992).

Genetzky and Hogan theorized that there was a direct correlation between workplace culture and trust within an organization, that is, that company culture determined organizational trust, in a study that sought to ascertain the relationship between the two. The study came to the conclusion that trust was influenced by company culture. There were some behavioural rules that affected trust. The implication was that organizational trust might be predicted by the culture of an organization (Genetzky, 2010).

Measuring trust

Trust is something as intangible as confidence or reliance placed in a person; therefore, measuring trust would require comparison to some standard or baseline and would have to be quantifiable (Paine K. , 2007). A key descriptive study measured organizational trust by identifying five distinct dimensions of trust. The dimensions were borrowed for the Mishra’s Model of Organizational trust (1996). *Competence; honesty, concern, openness and reliability* were the dimensions that were included in this study. The fifth component proposed by this study was “*identification*”. *Identification* quantifies the degree to which a person adheres to the norms, values, and beliefs that are part of the company's culture. The organisational trust survey prepared by them had 30 statements in it which were marked on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being *very little* and 5 being *very great*. These statements helped measure all the five dimensions of trust by assigning values that were from 1 to 5(very little to very great) (Zalabak, Ellis, & Cessaria, 2000).

Trust was one of the dimensions amongst the other five relationship dimensions that Dr Grunig had identified and tried to measure to find out about the quality of relationship existing between an organization and its publics in his paper titled “*Guidelines for Measuring Relationships in Public Relations.*”He had broken down “trust” into three components; *integrity, dependability and competence*. A series of statements were prepared which were specifically designed to measure these three components of trust which would indicate the overall trust that the publics share for their organization (Grunig & Childers, 1999).

Situational theory of publics

The situational theory of publics by Dr Grunig and Hunt states that publics can be bifurcated on the basis of the degree to which they are cognizant of the problem and their level to which they are going to do something about it. Theory affirms “*that publics can be identified and classified according to the extent to which they are aware of the problem and to the extent to which they do something about the problem. Specifically, the theory examines how publics are formed and how this can help an organisation segment the publics accordingly in order to communicate with them.*”

The theory categorizes publics into 4 categories.

- “Nonpublic: Public has not recognized the problem or the problem doesn’t exist.”
- “Latent public: Problem here exists, but the public has not recognized it.”
- “Aware public: Group identifies and recognizes the existence of a problem.”
- “Active public: Group is cognizant of the problem and organizes itself to respond to it.”

The theory explains that it is the type of public that would determine the content of communication. It also emphasizes that in order to settle disagreements or issues before they worsen and the public decides to take action, an organization must engage with both its *latent* and *aware publics* (Grunig J. E., 1966).

Defining University

The Collins English dictionary defines “University” as “*an institution of higher education having the authority to award bachelors and higher degrees, usually having research facilities.*” The Oxford dictionary defines University as “*an educational institution designed for instruction, examination, or both, of students in many branches of advanced learning, conferring degrees in various faculties, and often embodying colleges and similar institutions:*” The concept of campus has always been very important part of idea or image of a “university” in many countries. It is indicative of the location that represents the University. Physical location and the physical connectivity of the University with its campus has always been a general idea of the mass that has been changing with the advent of the large single institutions. There are various huge Universities that have separate campuses. There is an important line of distinction between University systems that may regulate the affairs over multiple University campuses and individual institutions having branch campuses (Haddawy, 2011).

Research design and methodology

Statement of problem

The researcher intends to understand the existing level of trust between the students and the University of Mumbai.

Objectives

1. To find out the general level of trust that exists between the students and the University of Mumbai.
2. To investigate upon the three dimensions of trust: integrity, competence and dependability amongst students

Research questions

1. What is the general level of trust that the students have placed in the University of Mumbai?
2. What is the general attitude that the students have towards the ability of the University of Mumbai to be reliable, competent and just?

Methodology

Considering that the researcher is trying to measure something as intangible as the concept of trust, the approach required couldn't be limited to either one of the methodologies. It had to be a blend of both. The methodology of this research was quantitatively qualitative, which is to quantify a construct like trust by operationalizing and measuring its sub-dimensions. Particular values were assigned to numbers, based on which the conclusion were drawn (Use of Likert scale). The questionnaire was administered to respondents that measured the three key sub-dimensions of **Dependence, Integrity and Competence**, which was based on Dr Gruning's scale of measuring trust.

Operational Definitions of the study:

“Integrity: the belief that an organization is fair and just (Grunig & Childers, 1999)”.

“Dependability: the belief that an organization will do what it says it will do (Grunig & Childers, 1999)”.

“Competence: the belief that an organization has the ability to do what it says it will do (Grunig & Childers, 1999)”.

Since Likert scale was used as the scaling technique, the type of data received was ordinal.

Method

The method used to collect data would be cross-sectional surveys, involving a series of agree/disagree statements.

Tools of data collection

The data collection was done using surveys that involved a series of agree/disagree statements pertaining to the trust component *based on the guidelines proposed and questionnaire prepared by Dr Grunig in his paper – “Guidelines for Measuring Relationships in Public Relations”* that was administered to the sample extracted from the whole population of all the students who have enrolled for the Master’s degree course in the 32 departments present in the Mumbai University Kalina campus, all of the questions were close-ended (Grunig & Childers, 1999). Since the researcher intended to measure the degree of trust that the students have placed in the University, the questionnaires were made to be close ended so that the results will be quantifiable and can be used to reach a qualitative inference. This was possible by assigning values to numbers on the scale used for measuring their trust (the use of Likert scale). If, presumably, all the three components of trust i.e. *Integrity, Competence and Dependability* are measured to be high based on the responses of the student from the questionnaire, it would mean that the level/degree of trust shared by the students is high and vice-versa.

Sampling

The population of the research is the entire number of students who are currently a part of a full-time Masters Degree course that is offered by all the departments that exists within the entire campus of the Mumbai University, which is close to 34 departments. The study is restricted only to the departments existing within the Mumbai University Kalina Campus. The sampling technique adopted was voluntary sampling under the non-probability sampling. The questionnaire was administered to five students from each department, which resulted in the sample size of 170 students.

Limitations of the study

There are close to five and a half lakh students who are directly and indirectly associated with Mumbai University, and therefore the sample size studied was very limited considering the time constraints. Due to non-probability sampling, the sampling error cannot be exactly calculated. Trust as variable is something that will keep varying with time; therefore, the results found cannot be used as a reference for the distant future, but for the immediate future.

Delimitations of the study

The study is limited to only the first year and final year students who are pursuing their Masters degree in the institutions within the compound of the university. There are 100 odd colleges within the city that is under the Mumbai University which haven’t been covered in this study.

Data and Analysis

A pre-test was conducted amongst the students of the researcher’s department to find out if the respondent didn’t face any kind of confusion or ambiguity while answering the questionnaire, after which few changes were made in the questionnaire before it was eventually administered to the actual sample.

According to this study, the relationship dimension - trust had been broken down into three important components that constituted trust, which were: *Integrity, Competence and Dependability*. By measuring each of those components individually it would allow the researcher to understand the level of trust existent.

The operational definition of Integrity in this research is the belief that an organization is fair and just, it would involve various aspects such as ethical behaviour, moral soundness, honesty and impartiality. The questionnaire was designed to find out the belief of the students encompassing these aspects that define integrity. Any result falling (decimals) between 2 and 3 is considered to be as “agree” as it was the value assigned in the beginning of the study, where value of 1 being assigned for strongly agree, 2 as agree, 3 as cant decide, 4 as disagree and 5 being strongly disagree based on the “Likert scale”. “Fairness”, “Valid & Justifiable principles”, “Ethical behaviour”, “Honesty”, “Impartiality”, “Moral soundness”, “Justness” and the original dimension of “faith in the Integrity” were the components on which the dimension of integrity were tested, and the individual mean values calculated of each component based on the responses of the 32 students were 2.25, 2.42, 2.72, 3.03, 2.52, 2.31, 2.23 and 2.68 respectively. The **mean of the total value** of the 8 sub-components of **integrity** when calculated was **2.52**. Therefore what one deduces from the calculated value is that the dominant belief amongst the students is that they **agree University is fair and just**.

The operational definition of *dependability* in this research is *the belief that an organization does what it says*. The various sub-components of this dimension that were tested through the statements designed were “confidence”, “free

from uncertainty”, “*freedom from doubt*” and “*level of assurance*”. The mean of the value calculated based on the responses, following were the results 2.75 was the mean calculated amongst all the responses for variable confidence. 2.16 for the variable “free from uncertainty”, the mean values 3.03, 3.06, 2.16 for “freedom from doubt”, “level of assurance” and the “original dimension of faith in the dependability” respectively. The **mean of the total value** of the 5 sub-components of **dependability** when calculated was **2.63**. What can be deduced from this value is that the dominant belief amongst the students is that **they agree that University does what it says**.

The operational definition of **competence** in this research is *the belief that an organization can do what it says*. The various sub-components of this dimension that were tested through the statements designed were *faith in ability, reputation of efficiency, faith in capacity and operational capability*. The mean of the value calculated based on the responses, following were the results: 2.94 was the mean calculated amongst all the responses for variable *faith in ability*. 2.34 for the variable “*reputation of efficiency*”. The mean values 3.00, 2.50 for variables “*faith in capacity*”, “*operational capability*”. The **mean of the total value** of the 4 sub-components of **dependability** when calculated was found to be **2.69**. The inference drawn from this value is that the dominant belief amongst the students is that **they agree that University capable of doing what it says**.

Conclusion

The University of Mumbai enjoys a high degree of trust from its students. On the basis of all the findings observed in chapter 4, the researcher has arrived to the conclusion that there is indeed an overwhelming degree of trust that resides with in the mind of the students with respect to the Mumbai University. The responses of the students in favour of the University has preponderated the ones that were not, these responses elicited from the questionnaire were conceived and designed to understand exclusively the underlying beliefs that the students held when it came to these sub-dimensions. All the three sub-dimensions of trust: Integrity, Dependability and Competence, were critical to the definition of trust as far as quantifying it was concerned. The three sub-dimension of trust when tested through these set of statements have been found to be of a reasonably high degree in the students’ mind. The relationship dimension “trust” between the organization (University) and its strategic publics (students) has been found to be very much existent. The majority of students believe that the University is quite efficient and capable in its functioning, that it is reliable; fair and impartial in its decision making and treatment. These responses make the researcher understand that the majority of students still hold an unshakeable belief about the Mumbai University being just; dependable and competent.

Future Scope of Research

On the contrary to the popular belief that the level of trust must have deteriorated in the light of the recent controversies that swaddled the University, the degree of trust remains to be very much intact. What could constitute as a part of the scope for future research is the investigation about this unfathomably contradicting belief amongst the students as opposed to the popular notion amongst the masses that they associate with the University and its failure to acquire the trust of the students. For such an entrenched belief to exist, one will have to go to the roots of these beliefs to find out the provenance from where it originally emerges. It is more likely to have emanated from the earlier generations. More than a belief, it is a kind of faith that cohabits with the cultural beliefs of the people in this country; this is again something that will require further investigation and research. For over several decades there has been this unquestioning belief that people placed in the University, in its functioning; for it has a glorious history and an untarnished reputation that succeeded in creating several layers of this feeling of reliability and confidence in the minds of the layman, that has gone on to take up residence in their minds for all these years. There is a need to understand and study in depth, if it is the case, and understand the causes that could have given rise to this unquestioning and deep-seated belief of University being ever so trust worthy and reliable. One can hypothesize that the untainted reputation of the University which was maintained and created by the predecessors of the current governing members could have managed to have that layer of confidence in the students mind to continue to exist. One needs to explore and understand if Government owned organizations have this *ready-made* veneer of respect and reverence attached to it, which almost makes it inevitably immune to acts that can potentially vitiate its trust-worthiness.

Another aspect that can be studied in future is perhaps a connection between the belief of the students and its deep relation to the culture in Indian society, this culture, for instance, stresses on state institutions as deliverers and its relation to the development of trust.

Trust is just one of the relationship dimensions that determine the nature of organization-public relationship, there are various other relationship dimensions, such commitment, satisfaction, control mutuality, communal

relationship, exchange relationship, honesty, openness and etc, which needs to be explored upon to provide a greater understanding of the quality of relationship that exists between the students and the Mumbai University.

Appendix

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE USED TO MEASURE TRUST

1. This University treats students like me fairly and justly. (Integrity)
2. I am aware that the university will consider pupils like me when making significant decisions. (Integrity; original dimension: faith).
3. This University can be relied on to keep its promises. (Dependability)
4. I believe that this university considers what students like me have to say before arriving at decisions. (Dependability)
5. This university is capable of carrying out its stated objectives. (Competence)
6. Principles that are valid, justifiable and logical seem to guide this University's behaviour. (Integrity)
7. This university doesn't deceive by offering individuals like me conflicting information. (Integrity)
8. I am very willing to let the University make decisions for students like me. (Dependability)
9. This University is known to be successful at the things it tries to do. (Competence)
10. My professors / department administrators do not reveal all the decisions taken by the University. (Integrity)
11. The administration section does not discriminate when it comes to redressal of the student's grievances. (Integrity)
12. I am highly satisfied with the capacity of the University to achieve its objectives. (Competence)
13. I believe that the head of my department is successful and sincere in communicating with the students. (Dependability)
14. I am quite confident about my department's ability to operate efficiently. (Competence)
15. I am confident that the University is going to be on schedule when it comes to displaying the results of the last examination. (Dependability)
16. I believe that the degree awarded to me by the University will be recognized by all the organizations to help me get a well-paid job. (Original dimension faith; Dependability)
17. I know I will receive adequate information regarding the decisions made by the University that may affect my academics. (Integrity)
18. The top management has always kept their commitment to students. (Dependability)
19. I believe that the University sets question papers that give a fair chance for all the students to perform well in the examinations; if studied and answered in a reasonably well manner. (Integrity)

Bibliography

- [1] Bib, S., & Kourdi, J. (2004). Trust Matters: For Organisational and Personal Success. (2004, October 1). *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 53(7).
- [2] Seppänen, R., Blomqvist, K., & Sundqvist, S. (2007, February). Measuring inter-organizational trust—a critical review of the empirical research in 1990–2003. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36(2), 249–265
- [3] Genetzky. (2010). Determining the Relationship and Influence. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska - Lincoln].
- [4] Grunig, J. & Childers, L. (1999). Guidelines for Measuring Relationships in Public Relations. 43. Institute for Public Relations.
- [5] Grunig, J. & Childers, L. (1999). Guidelines for Measuring Relationships in Public Relations. 40. Institute for Public Relations.
- [6] Grunig, J. (1966). The role of information in economic decision making. *Journalism Monographs*, 1-51.
- [7] Haddawy, P. (2011). Defining the Concept of University for Research Benchmarking.
- [8] Jo, S. (2003). Measurement of Organization–Public Relationships: Validation of Measurement Using a Manufacturer–Retailer Relationship. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 18(3), 225–248.

- [9] Johnson, D., & Graysn, K. (2005). Cognitive and affective trust in service relationships. *Journal of Business Research* , 8.
- [10] Atul Kathole , Dinesh Chaudhari “Securing the Adhoc Network Data Using Hybrid Malicious Node Detection Approach”, *Proceedings of the International Conference on Intelligent Vision and Computing (ICIVC 2021)* pp 447–457 © 2022 The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.
- [11] Kim, J. (2003). *Effects of organization-public relationships*.
- [12] Ledingham, & Bruning. (1998). *A longitudinal study of organization-public relationship dimensions. Public Relations As Relationship Management*. Routledge Publishing.
- [13] Mcknight, H., & Chervany, N. (1996). *The Meanings of Trust*.
- [14] Mishra, Webb, & Weick & Roberts. (1996 & 1993).
- [15] Atul B Kathole, Dr.Dinesh N.Chaudhari, "Pros & Cons of Machine learning and Security Methods, "2019.<http://gujaratresearchsociety.in/index.php/JGRS>, ISSN: 0374-8588, Volume 21 Issue 4
- [16] Moran, T., & Hoy. (2000). page 549.
- [17] K. N. Vhatkar and G. P. Bhole, “Optimal container resource allocation in cloud architecture: A new hybrid model,” *Journal of King Saud University - Computer and Information Sciences*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 1906–1918, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.jksuci.2019.10.009.
- [18] Paine, K. (n.d.). *Measuring public relationships*.
- [19] Rawlins, B. (2007, October 29). *Trust and pr practise*.
- [20] Atul B Kathole, Dr.Prasad S Halgaonkar, Ashvini Nikhade, " Machine Learning & its Classification Techniques, " *International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering (IJITEE)* ISSN: 2278-3075, Volume-8 Issue-9S3, July 2019.
- [21] Sonali D. Patil, Roshani Raut, Rutvij H. Jhaveri, Tariq Ahamed Ahanger, Pallavi V. Dhade, Atul B. Kathole, Kapil N. Vhatkar, "Robust Authentication System with Privacy Preservation of Biometrics", *Security and Communication Networks*, vol. 2022, Article ID 7857975, 14 pages, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/7857975>
- [22] Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*.
- [23] Schoorman, D., Mayer.Roger, & Davis, J. (2007). *An Integrative model of trust*.
- [24] K. N. Vhatkar and G. P. Bhole, “Particle swarm optimisation with grey wolf optimisation for optimal container resource allocation in cloud,” *IET Networks*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 189–199, 2020, doi: 10.1049/iet-net.2019.0157.
- [25] Zalabak, P. (2011). *Building high-trust organizations. Leader to Leader*.
- [26] Zalabak, P., Ellis, K., & Cessaria, R.; Tamara L. Gillis. *The IABC Handbook of Organizational Communication*. Jossey-Bass Wiley Imprint, 2006.