Trust Repair

by

James Raven

Trust Repair

by James Raven

2026

Ethics International Press, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Contents

Preface

Trust is a foundational condition of social, organisational, and institutional life. It enables cooperation under uncertainty, allows individuals and communities to accept vulnerability, and sustains the legitimacy of organisations and public systems. Yet trust is fragile. When it is violated, the consequences extend far beyond reputational damage or operational disruption. Trust breakdown can undermine safety, erode moral authority, and destabilise relationships that are difficult—or sometimes impossible—to restore.

This book emerged from sustained engagement with organisations, leaders, regulators, and stakeholders grappling with trust failure. Across sectors, a recurring pattern was evident: despite increasing attention to trust repair, many responses remained superficial, instrumental, or misaligned with the lived experience of those harmed. Apologies were offered where protection was required. Communication strategies were deployed where accountability was demanded. In some cases, efforts to "restore trust" intensified distrust.

The motivation for this book is not to provide another prescriptive toolkit for reputation management, but to offer a rigorous, ethically grounded examination of what trust repair entails—and what it does not. It challenges the assumption that trust can always be repaired, or that it should be. Instead, it asks a more difficult question: *under what conditions is renewed trust morally justified?*

The book is written for scholars, practitioners, policymakers, and leaders who recognise that trust repair is not merely a technical or strategic exercise, but a moral and institutional challenge. It draws on interdisciplinary scholarship in organisational studies, ethics, sociology, psychology, governance, and risk, while remaining grounded in practical realities.

Importantly, this book does not promise certainty. Trust repair is inherently contingent, uneven, and ethically constrained. The frameworks developed here are designed not to guarantee trust, but to discipline organisational behaviour, foreground vulnerability, and clarify responsibility. Where trust cannot be restored, the book argues for ethical restraint rather than symbolic closure.

If this book succeeds, it will not offer comfort, but clarity.

Introduction

1. Trust, vulnerability, and the problem of repair

Trust is commonly described as confidence, belief, or expectation. In organisational and institutional contexts, it is often treated as an asset to be built, managed, or restored. Such characterisations, however, obscure a more fundamental reality: trust is a willingness to accept vulnerability in situations of uncertainty. To trust is to place oneself at risk based on expectations about another's competence, integrity, or benevolence.

When trust is violated, what is lost is not merely confidence but safety, predictability, and moral assurance. Individuals and communities may experience betrayal, moral injury, and heightened exposure to harm. These consequences explain why trust repair is so difficult—and why many attempts fail.

Despite a growing body of literature on trust and trust repair, organisational responses to trust breakdown remain dominated by instrumental logics. Trust is treated as a perception to be corrected, a narrative to be managed, or a metric to be recovered. This book argues that such approaches misunderstand the nature of trust itself.

Trust repair is not about restoring favourable perceptions. It is about whether renewed vulnerability can be ethically justified.

2. Why trust repair fails

Across sectors, trust repair efforts often fail for predictable reasons. Organisations may rush to apology without acknowledging harm, prioritise communication over protection, or seek closure before stakeholders are ready. In other cases, trust repair is pursued even where the magnitude of harm, power asymmetry, or moral misalignment makes restoration ethically inappropriate.

These failures are not merely practical mistakes; they reflect deeper conceptual errors. Much of the existing trust repair literature assumes:

- That trust is always repairable
- That repair follows a linear trajectory
- That organisations can manage trust outcomes
- That success is measured by restored confidence

This book challenges these assumptions. It argues that trust repair is contingent, interpretive, and morally constrained. In some cases, the ethical response to trust breakdown is not repair, but restraint.

3. Purpose and contribution of the book

The purpose of this book is threefold.

First, it offers a **normative re-framing** of trust repair, grounding it in vulnerability, responsibility, and ethical justification rather than reputation or performance.

Second, it develops **diagnostic frameworks** that help organisations and stakeholders assess whether trust repair is plausible, appropriate, or ethically limited. These include:

- The **APIE Trust Repair Model** (Acknowledgement, Protection, Integrity, Evidence)
- The **ATMUM Framework** (Attribution, Time, Magnitude, Understanding, Moral alignment)

Third, it bridges theory and practice by examining how trust repair unfolds across sectors and contexts, and how it can be embedded as an organisational capability rather than a crisis response.

Rather than prescribing universal solutions, the book equips readers with conceptual tools to navigate complexity, uncertainty, and moral tension.

4. Structure of the book

The book is structured into twelve chapters, progressing from conceptual foundations to applied organisational practice and final reflection.

- **Chapters 1–2** establish the conceptual foundations of trust, vulnerability, and moral responsibility.
- **Chapters 3–6** examine trust violations, their causes, consequences, and the limits of prevailing trust repair approaches.
- **Chapter 7** introduces the **APIE Trust Repair Model**, providing a sequenced and ethically grounded framework.

- **Chapter 8** explores foundational trust and trust evaluation mechanisms.
- **Chapter 9** presents the **ATMUM Framework**, analysing factors that shape trust repair outcomes.
- **Chapter 10** examines trust repair across sectors and contexts.
- **Chapter 11** focuses on applied trust repair and organisational practice.
- **Chapter 12** offers final conclusions and reflections, addressing ethical limits, leadership implications, and future directions.

Importantly, conclusions and reflections are intentionally reserved for the final chapter. Earlier chapters remain analytical and diagnostic.

5. Intended audience

This book is written for:

- Scholars of trust, ethics, and organisations
- Leaders and executives facing trust breakdown
- Regulators and policymakers concerned with legitimacy
- Practitioners responsible for governance, risk, and ethics

While academically rigorous, the book is designed to remain accessible to those engaged in real-world trust repair challenges.

6. A final word before beginning

Trust repair is often framed as an organisational necessity. This book takes a different position: trust repair is an ethical

responsibility—but only when it respects vulnerability, acknowledges limits, and resists coercion.

Where trust cannot be repaired, honesty is preferable to illusion.

The chapters that follow do not offer easy answers. They offer a disciplined way of thinking about trust, harm, responsibility, and restraint.

Chapter 1
Understanding Trust in Organisational Life

Part 1

1.1 Introduction

Trust occupies a central position in organisational life, yet it remains one of the most conceptually ambiguous and inconsistently applied ideas in management, governance, and organisational practice. Trust is frequently invoked as a prerequisite for effective leadership, collaboration, innovation, and legitimacy, but it is often treated as self-evident rather than analytically defined. This lack of conceptual clarity becomes especially problematic when trust breaks down, as organisations struggle to articulate what has been lost, why it matters, and how it might be responsibly repaired.

In contemporary organisational contexts characterised by complexity, uncertainty, and interdependence, trust enables coordinated action where direct control is limited or impossible [1]. Individuals routinely depend on others whose actions they cannot fully observe, predict, or constrain. Organisations rely on trust to function across hierarchical, professional, and institutional boundaries, while stakeholders extend trust to organisations whose decisions may significantly affect their wellbeing.

This chapter establishes the conceptual foundation for the book by examining trust as a relational, ethical, and vulnerability-based phenomenon embedded in organisational life. It argues that trust cannot be reduced to confidence, compliance, or reputation, and that misunderstanding trust leads directly to ineffective and often damaging responses when trust is violated. By clarifying what trust is and how it operates, this chapter prepares the ground for subsequent analysis of trust violations and trust repair.

1.2 The central role of trust in organisations

Trust performs a crucial enabling function in organisations by reducing complexity and facilitating cooperation under conditions of uncertainty [2]. Without trust, organisational life would require exhaustive monitoring, rigid contractual specification, and constant enforcement, making coordinated action inefficient and unsustainable.

At the interpersonal level, trust supports collaboration, knowledge sharing, and psychological safety. Employees who trust their colleagues and leaders are more willing to speak openly, take initiative, and engage constructively with uncertainty [33]. Trust in leadership also shapes commitment and willingness to accept decisions that may involve personal risk or sacrifice [19].

At the organisational level, trust underpins legitimacy and authority. Organisations depend on trust from employees, clients, regulators, and the public to operate effectively. When trust is present, stakeholders are more likely to grant discretion, tolerate mistakes, and engage in cooperative problem-solving [35]. When trust erodes, organisations often face increased scrutiny, resistance, and disengagement.

Beyond organisational boundaries, trust facilitates inter-organisational collaboration, including partnerships, supply chains, and regulatory relationships. In such contexts, trust reduces transaction costs and supports adaptive coordination where formal contracts cannot anticipate every contingency [7].

Despite its importance, trust is frequently treated instrumentally—as a means to achieve performance outcomes rather than as a relational condition with ethical significance. This instrumental framing contributes to shallow approaches to trust building and repair, where trust is managed as an asset rather than respected as a moral relationship [65].

1.3 Trust, uncertainty, and vulnerability

A defining characteristic of trust is that it involves **vulnerability**. To trust is to accept exposure to the actions of others in situations where outcomes are uncertain and potentially consequential [4]. Trust is therefore only meaningful where risk exists; in situations of complete control or certainty, trust is unnecessary.

In organisational contexts, vulnerability takes multiple forms. Employees may be vulnerable to decisions affecting their job security, safety, or dignity. Clients and service users may be vulnerable to professional judgement or organisational competence. Communities may be vulnerable to organisational activities that generate social or environmental risk.

Trust enables individuals and groups to accept such vulnerability on the assumption that others will act competently, ethically, and with appropriate regard for their interests. When these

assumptions are violated, trust breakdown is often experienced not merely as disappointment but as betrayal [44].

Understanding trust as vulnerability helps explain why trust violations can provoke strong emotional and moral reactions disproportionate to the triggering event. A single failure may be interpreted as evidence of deeper unreliability or moral indifference, reshaping expectations about future behaviour [38].

1.4 Trust as a relational phenomenon

Trust is not a static attribute or individual disposition; it exists within relationships and is shaped through interaction over time. Trust judgements are influenced by shared experiences, communication patterns, and the consistency between words and actions [5].

In organisational settings, trust relationships are embedded within formal roles, hierarchies, and institutional norms. Trust between a manager and an employee, for example, is influenced not only by personal behaviour but also by organisational policies, incentive structures, and cultural signals [16].

Because trust is relational, it is also context-dependent. Behaviour that sustains trust in one organisational context may undermine it in another. Discretion may signal professionalism in expert contexts but appear opaque or arbitrary in public governance settings [30].

This relational character complicates attempts to manage or repair trust through standardised interventions. Trust repair requires

sensitivity to how relationships are structured and experienced, rather than reliance on generic solutions [47].

1.5 Distinguishing trust from related concepts

A common source of confusion in organisational practice is the conflation of trust with related but distinct concepts such as confidence, reliance, compliance, and reputation.

- **Confidence** refers to expectations about outcomes, often based on performance history or probability, and does not necessarily involve vulnerability.
- **Reliance** may occur without trust where behaviour is constrained by incentives or sanctions [3].
- **Compliance** reflects adherence to rules or authority and may be motivated by fear or obligation rather than trust.
- **Reputation** is a collective judgement about past behaviour that may influence trust but is not equivalent to it [36].

Organisations often assume that restored performance, reduced complaints, or improved reputation indicate trust recovery. In reality, stakeholders may remain distrustful but constrained, disengaged, or resigned [23].

Distinguishing trust from these related concepts is essential for diagnosing trust breakdown accurately and for avoiding illusory trust repair.

1.6 Trust and power asymmetry

Trust relationships in organisations are rarely symmetrical. Power differentials shape who bears risk, who has voice, and whose

interests are prioritised. Employees, service users, and communities are often more vulnerable than those who design policies or make strategic decisions [42].

Power asymmetry complicates trust in two ways. First, it increases the moral responsibility of those with greater power. Second, it limits the ability of less powerful actors to withdraw trust without incurring significant costs.

Trust may therefore coexist with dependency, fear, or resignation. Failure to recognise this reality leads to overestimation of trust and underestimation of harm when trust is violated [48].

1.7 Why trust is fragile

Trust is often slow to build but quick to erode. Several factors contribute to this fragility:

- Trust judgements are forward-looking and risk-sensitive
- Negative events are weighted more heavily than positive ones
- Violations prompt reinterpretation of past behaviour
- Moral breaches generalise beyond specific incidents [38]

Once trust is damaged, subsequent actions are interpreted through a lens of suspicion, making repair more difficult. This fragility underscores the importance of prevention, ethical leadership, and learning.

1.8 Transition to Part 2

This first part of the chapter has established trust as a relational, vulnerability-based, and ethically significant phenomenon central

to organisational life. It has clarified why trust matters, why it is fragile, and why its breakdown carries profound consequences.

Part 2 will examine **levels of trust in organisational life**, exploring how trust operates simultaneously at interpersonal, organisational, inter-organisational, and institutional levels.

Part 2

1.9 Levels of trust in organisational life

Trust in organisational life does not operate at a single level. Rather, it exists simultaneously across multiple, analytically distinct but practically interconnected levels. Failure to recognise these levels has contributed to significant confusion in both academic research and organisational practice, particularly when organisations attempt to diagnose or repair trust breakdown.

The most commonly identified levels of trust include **interpersonal trust**, **organisational trust**, **inter-organisational trust**, and **institutional or societal trust** [17]. Each level involves different trust referents, different sources of vulnerability, and different mechanisms of formation and erosion.

Interpersonal trust refers to trust between identifiable individuals, such as between colleagues, managers and employees, or professionals and clients. It is shaped by direct interaction, perceived intentions, consistency, and competence. Interpersonal trust often develops through repeated experience and carries strong emotional content [18].

Organisational trust, by contrast, refers to trust in an organisation as a collective entity. This form of trust is less dependent on personal relationships and more closely associated with systems, structures, values, and governance arrangements. Individuals may trust an organisation while distrusting particular leaders, or trust a manager while distrusting the organisation that employs them [16].

Inter-organisational trust arises in ongoing relationships between organisations, such as partnerships, alliances, supply chains, or regulatory arrangements. Here, trust is shaped by reputation, contractual safeguards, shared norms, and prior collaboration. Power asymmetries and information asymmetries play a particularly prominent role at this level [7].

Finally, institutional or societal trust refers to confidence in broader systems such as professions, markets, governments, or regulatory regimes. This level of trust shapes expectations before direct interaction occurs and strongly influences how organisational behaviour is interpreted [30].

1.10 Misalignment between trust levels

A critical implication of multi-level trust is that trust repair at one level does not automatically restore trust at others. Organisations frequently overlook this, assuming that addressing interpersonal failures will restore organisational or institutional trust, or that systemic reforms will automatically rebuild relational trust.

For example, replacing a senior leader may improve interpersonal trust perceptions but leave organisational trust damaged if underlying governance failures remain unaddressed. Conversely,

introducing new policies or controls may strengthen organisational trust while leaving interpersonal relationships strained or resentful.

Misalignment between trust levels can produce misleading signals. Stakeholders may comply with new systems while remaining distrustful, or may express trust in individuals while continuing to doubt organisational intentions. Without recognising these distinctions, organisations risk misinterpreting stability as trust [23].

Effective trust repair therefore requires **multi-level diagnosis**, identifying where trust has been damaged and ensuring that responses are aligned accordingly.

1.11 Trust over time: accumulation, erosion, and thresholds

Trust is inherently temporal. It develops gradually through repeated interaction and consistent behaviour, yet it can erode rapidly when expectations are violated. This asymmetry reflects the fact that trust judgements are forward-looking and risk-sensitive [38].

In organisational contexts, trust erosion is often incremental rather than sudden. Minor deviations from expected behaviour may initially be tolerated or rationalised, particularly where prior trust is high. Over time, however, these deviations may accumulate, eventually reaching a threshold beyond which trust collapses.

This threshold effect helps explain why organisations are often surprised by the intensity of stakeholder reactions following trust violations. What appears to be a single incident may represent the

culmination of long-standing concerns that were previously unacknowledged or suppressed [31].

Trust repair efforts that focus narrowly on the triggering event may therefore fail to address deeper patterns of erosion.

1.12 Expectations and trust judgements

Trust is shaped fundamentally by expectations. Stakeholders form expectations about competence, integrity, and benevolence based on past experience, social norms, professional standards, and organisational commitments [1].

Trust violations frequently arise from **expectation mismatch** rather than absolute failure. Organisations may believe they have acted reasonably or lawfully, while stakeholders experience actions as negligent, deceptive, or dismissive. Such mismatches are particularly likely where communication is poor or where power asymmetries limit dialogue [48].

Expectations also vary across stakeholder groups. Employees, regulators, service users, and communities may hold different expectations of the same organisation. Trust repair efforts that fail to recognise this plurality risk satisfying some audiences while alienating others.

Recalibrating expectations through explanation, engagement, and learning is therefore a central component of trust repair.

1.13 Trust, identity, and organisational values

Trust is closely linked to identity and values. Stakeholders often trust organisations not only because of what they do, but because

of what they claim to stand for. Mission statements, ethical codes, and public commitments shape expectations and provide interpretive frames for organisational behaviour [35].

When trust violations contradict stated values, they tend to provoke stronger reactions than failures perceived as purely technical. Integrity breaches in organisations that emphasise ethical leadership may be experienced as hypocrisy rather than incompetence [52].

This identity dimension intensifies the moral character of trust breakdown and complicates repair. Technical fixes may address operational shortcomings while leaving perceived value inconsistencies unresolved.

Trust repair therefore requires attention to symbolic and moral dimensions alongside substantive reform.

1.14 Trust and decision-making under uncertainty

Trust plays a critical role in decision-making under uncertainty. Individuals and organisations rely on trust when information is incomplete, outcomes are unpredictable, or expertise is specialised [2].

In organisational contexts, trust influences willingness to delegate, accept advice, and tolerate risk. High-trust environments may encourage innovation and flexibility, while low-trust environments often default to rigid control and defensive decision-making [60].

However, trust can also create blind spots. Excessive trust may reduce vigilance, discourage dissent, or normalise risky behaviour. Several major organisational failures have been linked to cultures of unquestioned trust in authority or expertise [26].

This dual role of trust—as both enabling and potentially distorting—highlights the importance of balancing trust with appropriate safeguards.

1.15 Trust in complex and distributed organisations

Contemporary organisations are increasingly complex, distributed, and networked. Authority and responsibility are often dispersed across teams, units, and external partners. In such environments, trust becomes both more necessary and more fragile.

Individuals may need to trust systems and processes rather than identifiable persons. Digitalisation, outsourcing, and algorithmic decision-making further complicate trust relationships by reducing visibility and diffusing accountability [114].

Formal mechanisms such as standards, audits, and regulation can support trust in complex systems, but overreliance on formalisation may crowd out relational responsiveness and learning [57].

Understanding trust in complex organisational systems is therefore essential for diagnosing modern trust breakdowns and designing credible repair strategies.

1.16 Implications for understanding trust breakdown

The analysis in this part of the chapter reinforces several key implications:

- Trust breakdown often occurs across multiple levels simultaneously
- Apparent stability may mask deep distrust
- Expectation mismatch is a common trigger of trust erosion
- Identity and values intensify moral reactions to violations
- Complexity and dispersion increase vulnerability to trust failure

These insights help explain why trust breakdowns are frequently more severe and persistent than organisations anticipate.

1.17 Transition to Part 3

Parts 1 and 2 of this chapter have examined trust as a relational, multi-level, and temporally dynamic phenomenon embedded in organisational life. They have highlighted the roles of vulnerability, expectations, identity, and complexity in shaping trust judgements.

Part 3 will deepen this analysis by examining **the ethical and emotional dimensions of trust**, including responsibility, fairness, culture, leadership, and voice.

Part 3

1.18 The ethical foundations of trust

Trust is not only a functional mechanism for reducing uncertainty; it is also an ethical relationship grounded in moral judgement. To trust another party is to make an implicit ethical assessment about their intentions, competence, and regard for one's interests [65]. This moral dimension distinguishes trust from strategic reliance or calculated cooperation, which may occur without any expectation of ethical conduct.

In organisational contexts, ethical expectations are shaped by professional standards, organisational values, and societal norms. Stakeholders do not merely evaluate whether organisations achieve outcomes, but whether they do so in ways that are fair, honest, and respectful. When organisations violate trust, they are therefore often perceived to have failed morally rather than simply operationally [44].

This ethical character helps explain why trust violations generate strong emotional responses such as anger, betrayal, and indignation. These reactions reflect perceived breaches of moral obligation rather than technical error. Any serious account of trust repair must therefore engage with ethics and moral responsibility rather than relying solely on procedural correction.

1.19 Moral responsibility and organisational agency

A central challenge in organisational trust is determining who bears moral responsibility when trust is violated. Organisations are complex collectives, and harmful outcomes often result from

distributed decisions rather than individual wrongdoing. This diffusion of responsibility can obscure accountability and frustrate stakeholders seeking moral recognition of harm [41].

Despite this complexity, stakeholders routinely attribute moral agency to organisations as entities. Organisations are expected to uphold values, honour commitments, and accept responsibility for outcomes arising from their actions. When organisations refuse to accept responsibility—by deflecting blame onto individuals, procedures, or external circumstances—they are often perceived as evasive or morally indifferent [35].

Trust repair therefore requires organisations to engage seriously with questions of moral agency. This does not necessitate simplistic blame, but it does require acknowledgment of organisational responsibility for systemic failures that expose others to harm.

1.20 Trust, fairness, and justice

Perceptions of fairness and justice are central to trust judgements. Stakeholders evaluate not only outcomes but also the processes through which decisions are made and the manner in which they are treated. Procedural justice, distributive justice, and interactional justice all contribute to perceptions of trustworthiness [69].

In organisational life, decisions regarding promotion, discipline, resource allocation, and service delivery are frequently interpreted through a justice lens. Even when outcomes are unfavourable, fair and transparent processes can sustain trust. Conversely, opaque or

inconsistent procedures may erode trust even where outcomes are objectively reasonable [70].

Trust repair efforts that focus exclusively on correcting outcomes may therefore fail to address deeper concerns about fairness and voice. Restoring trust often requires visible commitment to just processes, meaningful participation, and respectful treatment.

1.21 The emotional dimension of trust

Trust is both cognitive and emotional. While trust judgements involve assessment of evidence and experience, they are also shaped by feelings of security, confidence, and belonging. Emotional responses to trust violations are influenced by perceived intent, severity of harm, and the quality of prior relationships [44].

Organisations often underestimate the emotional impact of trust breakdown. Responses that emphasise rational explanation or legal defensibility may appear cold or dismissive, further damaging trust. Stakeholders may interpret such responses as failure to recognise the human consequences of organisational actions [38].

Effective trust repair therefore requires emotional intelligence and empathy alongside substantive change. Acknowledging emotional harm is often a prerequisite for restoring moral credibility.

1.22 Organisational culture and trust

Organisational culture plays a decisive role in shaping trust dynamics. Cultural norms influence whether individuals feel safe to speak up, how mistakes are handled, and whether ethical concerns are taken seriously. Cultures characterised by openness, learning, and psychological safety are better positioned to sustain trust than those marked by defensiveness or blame [33].

Culture also shapes how trust repair efforts are interpreted. Organisations with histories of denial or reputational defensiveness may struggle to regain trust even after implementing reforms. Conversely, organisations known for honesty and learning may be granted greater benefit of the doubt [46].

Trust repair that ignores cultural context risks being superficial. Without cultural alignment, formal reforms may be perceived as symbolic rather than substantive.

1.23 Leadership and trust

Leadership plays a central role in shaping trust relationships. Leaders act as symbolic representatives of organisational values, and their behaviour often carries disproportionate weight in trust judgements. Consistency between words and actions, willingness to accept responsibility, and attentiveness to stakeholder concerns are critical leadership behaviours for sustaining trust [19].

Leadership failures—particularly those involving integrity or benevolence—can rapidly undermine trust across an organisation. Attempts to delegate trust repair entirely to communications teams or compliance units may therefore lack credibility.

Trustworthy leadership is not solely a matter of personal character; it is also reflected in the systems leaders create and the behaviours they reward or tolerate [52]. Leaders who enable learning and accountability strengthen trust foundations even in the face of failure.

1.24 Trust, voice, and silence

Trust influences whether individuals feel able to raise concerns, challenge decisions, or report wrongdoing. In high-trust environments, voice is encouraged and valued. In low-trust environments, silence may prevail even where problems are evident [23].

Silence can be both a cause and a consequence of trust breakdown. Fear of retaliation, futility, or marginalisation may discourage reporting, allowing issues to persist. When failures eventually surface, the absence of prior voice may be misinterpreted as complicity.

Trust repair therefore requires credible mechanisms for voice and protection for those who speak up. Without such mechanisms, trust repair efforts may lack authenticity.

1.25 Professional trust and expertise

Many organisational trust relationships involve reliance on professional or expert judgement. In such contexts, trust is closely tied to perceptions of competence, integrity, and adherence to professional norms [118].