

The Psychology of Trust: Mechanisms, Modulators, and Impact on Interpersonal Relationships – A Comprehensive Review

Marzieh Zanjanian¹, Farshid Khalili Dehdezi²

¹Master of Science in Personality Psychology, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

²PhD in Communication Sciences and Technology, Islamic Azad University, Dolatabad Branch, Isfahan, Iran.

Abstract

Article history:

Received: 29 Sep 2025
Accepted: 8 Dec 2025
Available online: 16 Dec 2025

Keywords:

Trust
Interpersonal Trust
Attachment
Relationship Quality
Trust Repair

Objective: This review synthesizes contemporary empirical research and theoretical models on the psychological construct of trust. It seeks to elucidate its cognitive, affective, and neurobiological foundations, trace its development and dynamics within interpersonal relationships, and evaluate its impact on relational outcomes across contexts. Furthermore, it examines the processes of trust violation and repair, identifying gaps for future research.

Methods: A narrative review methodology was employed. Electronic databases (PsycINFO, PubMed, Scopus) were searched for English-language articles published between 1990-2024, using keywords including "trust," "interpersonal trust," "trustworthiness," "betrayal," "attachment," and "relationship quality." Theoretical papers, empirical studies (experimental, longitudinal, neuroimaging), and meta-analyses were included. Key theoretical frameworks (Attachment, Social Exchange) provided the structure for synthesis.

Results: Trust is a multifaceted construct predicated on perceived ability, benevolence, and integrity. Its development is heavily influenced by early attachment patterns and subsequent interpersonal experiences. Neurobiological research implicates oxytocinergic systems and prefrontal-limbic circuitry in trust decisions. High trust is consistently associated with superior relationship outcomes, including increased satisfaction, commitment, intimacy, and effective conflict resolution. Trust violations trigger profound distress and relational reevaluation, yet repair is possible through structured processes involving acknowledgment, restitution, and consistent behavioral change.

Discussion: Trust functions as the foundational currency of social life, enabling vulnerability and cooperation. Its psychology is best understood through an integrative lens that combines dispositional, experiential, and situational factors. While cultural and individual differences modulate trust dynamics, its core role in relationship health is universal. Future research must further explore digital trust formation, neurodiversity, and the efficacy of trust-building interventions across the lifespan.

Cite this article as: Zanjanian M, Khalili Dehdezi F. The Psychology of Trust: Mechanisms, Modulators, and Impact on Interpersonal Relationships – A Comprehensive Review. *Humanist Stud Soc Res.* 2026;2(1):5. <https://doi.org/10.22034/hssr.2025.236499>

Introduction

In the intricate tapestry of human social existence, trust operates as the indispensable thread that weaves individuals into functional dyads, families, and communities. Conceptually, trust represents a psychological state characterized by the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of

another's intentions or behavior [1]. Far more than a passive belief in reliability, it is an active, dynamic, and multifaceted construct that integrates cognitive appraisals, emotional bonds, and behavioral commitments. It enables individuals to navigate the inherent uncertainty of social interactions, transforming

Correspondence:

Marzieh Zanjanian

E-mail: mazanjanian@gmail.com



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) which allows users to read, copy, distribute and make derivative works for non-commercial purposes from the material, as long as the author of the original work is cited properly.

potential risk into opportunity for connection, cooperation, and mutual growth [2].

The profound significance of trust becomes most starkly visible in its absence. Relationships marred by distrust are characterized by vigilance, constraint, and emotional distance; they incur high "transaction costs" in the form of monitoring, suspicion, and conflict [3]. At a societal level, declines in social trust are correlated with poorer public health outcomes, reduced economic efficiency, and political fragmentation [4]. Conversely, high-trust environments foster innovation, resilience, and collective well-being. Within the interpersonal realm, trust is the single strongest predictor of relationship satisfaction and longevity, underpinning everything from the sharing of mundane daily concerns to the profound vulnerability of emotional and physical intimacy [5].

Despite—or perhaps because of—its fundamental importance, trust remains a complex and sometimes paradoxical phenomenon. It can be built gradually over years yet shattered in an instant. It is influenced by deep-seated, biologically-informed dispositions and yet is exquisitely sensitive to immediate social cues. It is universal in its importance yet culturally variable in its expression and development [6]. Recent decades have witnessed an explosion of interdisciplinary research aimed at unpacking this complexity. Advances in social neuroscience have begun to map the brain's "trust pathways," while longitudinal studies in relationship science have traced the life cycle of trust within partnerships over time [7,8]. Simultaneously, the digital revolution has created entirely new contexts for trust formation and violation, from online dating to remote teamwork, presenting novel challenges to our evolved psychological mechanisms [9].

This comprehensive review article, therefore, seeks to provide an integrative and up-to-date synthesis of the psychology of trust and its paramount impact on interpersonal relationships. We move beyond earlier summaries to incorporate the last decade of groundbreaking research, placing classic theoretical models in dialogue with contemporary empirical findings. The review is structured to first deconstruct the very architecture of trust—exploring its foundational theories, developmental origins from infancy through adulthood, and the neuropsychological systems that make the "leap of faith" possible. It then investigates its operational impact across key relational domains, from romantic partnerships and friendships to professional collaborations. Crucially, we dedicate significant focus to the dissolution and restoration of trust, examining the anatomy of betrayal and the evidence-based pathways to repair. Finally, we identify pressing future directions in a rapidly evolving social landscape. By weaving together insights from

psychology, neuroscience, sociology, and clinical practice, this review aims to offer a holistic and nuanced resource for scholars, clinicians, and anyone invested in understanding and nurturing the foundational force that binds human connections.

2. Methods

This narrative review was conducted to synthesize a broad and interdisciplinary body of literature. A systematic search strategy was implemented across three major electronic databases: PsycINFO, PubMed, and Scopus. Search terms included combinations of: "psychology of trust," "interpersonal trust," "trustworthiness," "trust development," "trust violation," "betrayal," "attachment AND trust," "social exchange," "oxytocin AND trust," "relationship satisfaction," and "trust repair." The search was limited to articles published in English between 1990 and 2024, with a particular emphasis on high-impact studies from the past 15 years.

Inclusion criteria encompassed: (1) peer-reviewed empirical studies (experimental, correlational, longitudinal, neuroimaging); (2) theoretical and conceptual papers from leading scholars in social psychology, relationship science, and organizational behavior; and (3) systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Exclusion criteria included non-English publications and articles focused solely on institutional or political trust without clear interpersonal implications.

The initial search yielded over 800 articles. Titles and abstracts were screened for relevance, after which approximately 200 core papers were selected for full-text review. Key theoretical frameworks, including Attachment Theory [10] and the Integrative Model of Organizational Trust [11], provided an organizing scaffold. Data extraction focused on theoretical perspectives, methodological approaches, key findings, and implications for understanding interpersonal dynamics. The synthesis is presented thematically rather than chronologically.

3. Results

3.1. Theoretical and Psychological Foundations

Contemporary models view trust as multidimensional. Mayer et al.'s integrative model posits that trust in a trustee is determined by perceptions of their ability, benevolence, and integrity, moderated by the trustor's own propensity to trust [11]. This calculus-based trust can evolve into identity-based trust, where parties internalize each other's values [12].

Attachment theory remains a preeminent framework [10]. Secure attachment, fostered by

responsive caregiving, creates internal working models that expect others to be trustworthy and supportive [13]. In contrast, insecure attachments (anxious or avoidant) predispose individuals to hypervigilance for betrayal or reluctance to rely on others, respectively [14]. These patterns demonstrate remarkable stability into adult romantic relationships [15].

From a social exchange perspective, trust develops through repeated interactions that confirm expectations of reciprocity and fairness [16]. Investments and risks taken in a partner, when reciprocated, build relational capital and deepen mutual trust [17].

3.2. Neurobiological and Physiological Correlates

Trust is not merely a psychological abstraction but is rooted in biological systems. Neuroimaging studies reveal that trust decisions engage a network involving the ventral striatum (reward processing), the amygdala (threat and risk assessment), and the medial prefrontal cortex (social cognition and mentalizing) [18,19]. The neuropeptide oxytocin has been extensively studied for its role in promoting trust, affiliative behaviors, and the attenuation of amygdala activity in response to social threats [20,21]. However, its effects are context-dependent and may reinforce existing social biases rather than promote generalized trust [22]. Cortisol and autonomic nervous system responses also modulate and are modulated by trust interactions, particularly in stress-buffering within close relationships [23].

3.3. Impact on Interpersonal Relationship Outcomes

The empirical evidence for trust as a relationship cornerstone is robust.

- **Romantic Relationships:** High trust is one of the strongest predictors of relationship satisfaction and commitment [24,25]. It facilitates greater intimacy through increased self-disclosure [26], promotes more constructive conflict resolution by reducing hostility [27], and enhances the perception of a partner's supportiveness during stress [28]. It also serves as a protective factor against destructive behaviors like excessive jealousy and partner monitoring [29].
- **Friendships and Social Networks:** Trust enables the depth and resilience of friendships, allowing for emotional support, confidentiality, and reliable reciprocity [30]. It reduces the cognitive "transaction costs" of maintaining social networks, fostering broader and more supportive social capital [31].
- **Cooperation and Performance:** In group settings, interpersonal trust among members (psychological safety) catalyzes knowledge sharing, creativity, and collective efficacy [32]. It reduces the need for formal monitoring and enables effective collaboration toward shared goals [33].

3.4. Trust Violation and Repair Processes

Trust violations—breaches of benevolence or integrity such as deceit, infidelity, or unreliability—constitute significant relational stressors. They trigger intense negative affect (anger, hurt), precipitate a fundamental reevaluation of the relationship and the transgressor's character, and often lead to withdrawal or retaliation [34,35].

The repair process is arduous but possible. Effective repair typically requires a multi-phase approach:

1. **Acknowledgment:** The transgressor must fully acknowledge the violation, take responsibility, and express sincere remorse and empathy for the hurt caused [36].
2. **Explanation:** Providing a substantive, non-defensive explanation (especially one that mitigates perceived malicious intent) can aid cognitive processing for the victim [37].
3. **Restitution & Penance:** Tangible efforts to make amends and voluntary acts of penance by the transgressor demonstrate commitment to change [38].
4. **Behavioral Consistency:** The gradual restoration of trust depends overwhelmingly on the transgressor displaying consistent, trustworthy behavior over time, allowing for the accumulation of new, positive evidence [39]. The victim's capacity for forgiveness, while beneficial for personal well-being, is distinct from restored trust [40].

4. Discussion

This review consolidates a central, evidence-based thesis: trust is the vital, yet fragile, infrastructure of human social life. It is not a static trait but a dynamic state, continuously negotiated through an interplay of one's historical blueprint for relationships (attachment), ongoing cognitive-affective assessments of a partner (ability, benevolence, integrity), and deeply embedded neurobiological processes [10,11,18]. The evidence clearly demonstrates that high-trust relationships are not merely more satisfying but are functionally superior across metrics that matter: they are more adaptable to stress, more supportive in times of need, and more efficient and cooperative in pursuing shared goals [24,28,32]. This functional superiority underscores that investing in trust is not a romantic ideal but a pragmatic strategy for relational resilience.

The integration of neurobiological findings represents a paradigm shift, moving trust from a purely psychosocial construct to a biopsychosocial one. The fact that decisions to trust engage reward circuitry (ventral striatum) while violations trigger threat responses (amygdala) reveals that our social bonds are regulated by the same fundamental systems that govern primary survival needs [18,19]. This deep biological embedding explains why trust feels so consequential

and why betrayals cause physical pain. The role of oxytocin further bridges the cognitive-affective divide, highlighting how neurochemistry can facilitate the lowering of defensive barriers to permit vulnerability [20]. However, the context-dependent nature of these effects serves as a crucial caveat; biology enables, but does not determine, trust. Social learning and situational cues ultimately gate and guide these neurochemical responses [22].

The literature on trust repair offers a sobering yet hopeful corrective to simplistic notions of conflict resolution. It reveals that an apology, while often a necessary starting point, is woefully insufficient on its own [36]. True repair is a protracted, behavior-heavy process that resembles the initial building of trust—but on difficult terrain scarred by negative evidence. The transgressor must move from words to sustained, verifiable action, rebuilding their trustworthiness one reliable behavior at a time [39]. This has profound implications for couples therapy, organizational management, and even international diplomacy, emphasizing that reconciliation requires structured processes, transparent accountability, and, above all, patience.

Important moderators further complicate the trust landscape. Individual differences in personality (e.g., high agreeableness, low neuroticism) and, most notably, attachment style create powerful filters through which trust signals are interpreted [41,14]. A securely attached individual may perceive a partner's late arrival as an unfortunate circumstance, while an anxiously attached individual may immediately frame it as evidence of neglect or unfaithfulness. Cultural contexts add another layer, shaping fundamental norms about whether trust should be granted initially (as in high-trust, universalist societies) or must be earned cautiously over time (as in particularist societies) [42,43]. These differences can lead to significant cross-cultural misunderstandings in both personal and professional relationships.

Future Research Directions must address the novel challenges and persistent gaps in our understanding:

1. The Digital Frontier: How is trust built when interactions are mediated by screens, algorithms, and curated identities? Research must explore how cues like responsiveness, transparency, and authenticity are signaled online, and how the ease of exit in digital spaces affects trust investment and repair [44].

2. Neurodiversity and Inclusion: The field must move beyond neurotypical models to understand trust

dynamics in conditions like Autism Spectrum Disorder, where social-cognitive processing differs. This research is critical for developing supports that foster secure relationships for neurodiverse individuals [45].

3. Intervention Science: There is a pressing need for the development and rigorous testing of targeted interventions. These could range from psychoeducational programs for couples and families to organizational training focused on building psychological safety and repairing team trust after failures [46].

4. Macro-Social Influences: Longitudinal and multi-level research is needed to investigate how large-scale forces—economic inequality, political polarization, public health crises, and climate anxiety—erode the foundational social fabric of trust and, consequently, strain interpersonal relationships [47].

Conclusion

The psychology of trust reveals a construct that is both elegantly simple in its function and remarkably complex in its execution. It is the essential willingness to make a leap of faith, a leap that is simultaneously grounded in the lessons of our past, the perceptions of our present, and the biology of our being. In a world often characterized by uncertainty and division, the conscious cultivation of trust—through self-awareness, empathetic communication, and unwavering integrity—remains one of the most powerful acts available to individuals and communities. It is the cornerstone not only of personal happiness but of collective flourishing. As relationships continue to evolve, the principles delineated here will remain central to fostering the connection, cooperation, and resilience upon which our shared future depends.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to express their appreciation to all those who helped us conduct this research.

Funding

None

Authors Contributions

The authors contributed to the data analysis. Drafting, revising and approving the article, responsible for all aspects of this work.

Conflict of Interest

None

References

1. Rousseau DM, Sitkin SB, Burt RS, Camerer C. Not so different after all: a cross-discipline view of trust. *Acad Manage Rev* 1998;23(3):393-404.
2. Luhmann N. *Trust and power*. Chichester: Wiley; 1979.
3. Williamson OE. *The economic institutions of capitalism*. New York: Free Press; 1985.
4. Wilkinson R, Pickett K. *The inner level: how more equal societies reduce stress, restore sanity and improve everyone's well-being*. London: Penguin Books; 2019.
5. Gottman JM, Silver N. *The seven principles for making marriage work*. New York: Harmony Books; 1999.
6. Fiske AP. *Structures of social life: the four elementary forms of human relations*. New York: Free Press; 1991.
7. Coan JA, Sbarra DA. Social baseline theory: the social regulation of risk and effort. *Curr Opin Psychol* 2015;1:87-91.
8. Murray SL, Holmes JG, Collins NL. Optimizing assurance: the risk regulation system in relationships. *Psychol Bull* 2006;132(5):641-66.
9. Henderson S, Gilding M. 'I've never clicked this much with anyone in my life': trust and hyperpersonal communication in online friendships. *New Media Soc* 2004;6(4):487-506.
10. Bowlby J. *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. 2nd ed. New York: Basic Books; 1969.
11. Mayer RC, Davis JH, Schoorman FD. An integrative model of organizational trust. *Acad Manage Rev* 1995;20(3):709-34.
12. Lewicki RJ, Wiethoff C. Trust, trust development, and trust repair. In: Deutsch M, Coleman PT, Marcus EC, editors. *The handbook of conflict resolution: theory and practice*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2006. p. 92-119.
13. Simpson JA. Foundations of interpersonal trust. In: Kruglanski AW, Higgins ET, editors. *Social psychology: handbook of basic principles*. 2nd ed. New York: Guilford Press; 2007. p. 587-607.
14. Mikulincer M, Shaver PR. Attachment orientations and emotion regulation. *Curr Opin Psychol* 2019;25:6-10.
15. Fraley RC, Roisman GI. The development of adult attachment styles: four lessons. *Curr Opin Psychol* 2019;25:26-30.
16. Thibaut JW, Kelley HH. *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley; 1959.
17. Rusbult CE, Van Lange PA. Why we need interdependence theory. *Soc Personal Psychol Compass* 2008;2(5):2049-70.
18. Krueger F, McCabe K, Moll J, Kriegeskorte N, Zahn R, Strenziok M, et al. Neural correlates of trust. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2007;104(50):20084-9.
19. Delgado MR, Frank RH, Phelps EA. Perceptions of moral character modulate the neural systems of reward during the trust game. *Nat Neurosci* 2005;8(11):1611-8.
20. Kosfeld M, Heinrichs M, Zak PJ, Fischbacher U, Fehr E. Oxytocin increases trust in humans. *Nature* 2005;435(7042):673-6.
21. Ditzen B, Schaer M, Gabriel B, Bodenmann G, Ehlert U, Heinrichs M. Intranasal oxytocin increases positive communication and reduces cortisol levels during couple conflict. *Biol Psychiatry* 2009;65(9):728-31.
22. De Dreu CK, Greer LL, Handgraaf MJ, Shalvi S, Van Kleef GA, Baas M, et al. The neuropeptide oxytocin regulates parochial altruism in intergroup conflict among humans. *Science* 2010;328(5984):1408-11.
23. Beckes L, Coan JA. Social baseline theory: the role of social proximity in emotion and economy of action. *Soc Personal Psychol Compass* 2011;5(12):976-88.
24. Fletcher GJ, Simpson JA. Ideal standards in close relationships. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 2001;10(3):102-5.
25. Campbell L, Stanton SC. The role of trust in romantic relationships. In: Simpson JA, Campbell L, editors. *The Oxford handbook of close relationships*. New York: Oxford University Press; 2013. p. 478-501.
26. Collins NL, Miller LC. Self-disclosure and liking: a meta-analytic review. *Psychol Bull* 1994;116(3):457-75.
27. Simpson JA. Psychological foundations of trust. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 2007;16(5):264-8.
28. Collins NL, Feeney BC. A safe haven: an attachment theory perspective on support seeking and caregiving in intimate relationships. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2000;78(6):1053-73.
29. Rempel JK, Ross M, Holmes JG. Trust and communicated attributions in close relationships. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2001;81(1):57-64.
30. Fehr B. Friendship formation. In: Sprecher S, Wenzel A, Harvey J, editors. *Handbook of relationship initiation*. New York: Psychology Press; 2008. p. 29-54.
31. Putnam RD. *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster; 2000.
32. Edmondson AC. Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Adm Sci Q* 1999;44(2):350-83.
33. Dirks KT, Ferrin DL. The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organ Sci* 2001;12(4):450-67.
34. Fitness J. Betrayal, rejection, revenge, and forgiveness: an interpersonal script approach. In: Leary MR, editor.

- Interpersonal rejection. New York: Oxford University Press; 2001. p. 73-103.
35. Elangovan AR, Shapiro DL. Betrayal of trust in organizations. *Acad Manage Rev* 1998;23(3):547-66.
 36. Schumann K. The psychology of offering an apology: understanding the barriers to apologizing and how to overcome them. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 2018;27(2):74-8.
 37. Tomlinson EC, Mryer RC. The role of causal attribution dimensions in trust repair. *Acad Manage Rev* 2009;34(1):85-104.
 38. Bottom WP, Gibson K, Daniels SE, Murnighan JK. When talk is not cheap: substantive penance and expressions of intent in rebuilding cooperation. *Organ Sci* 2002;13(5):497-513.
 39. Schweitzer ME, Hershey JC, Bradlow ET. Promises and lies: restoring violated trust. *Organ Behav Hum Decis Process* 2006;101(1):1-19.
 40. McCullough ME, Root LM, Cohen AD. Writing about the benefits of an interpersonal transgression facilitates forgiveness. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2006;74(5):887-97.
 41. Evans AM, Revelle W. Survey and behavioral measurements of interpersonal trust. *J Res Pers* 2008;42(6):1585-93.
 42. Yamagishi T, Yamagishi M. Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motiv Emot* 1994;18(2):129-66.
 43. Fetchenhauer D, Dunning D. Do people trust too much or too little? *J Econ Psychol* 2009;30(3):263-76.
 44. Hancock JT, Toma CL. Putting your best face forward: the accuracy of online dating photographs. *J Commun* 2009;59(2):367-86.
 45. Brewer N, Young RL, Barnett E. Measuring theory of mind in adults with autism spectrum disorder. *J Autism Dev Disord* 2017;47(7):1927-41.
 46. Coyle-Shapiro A, Conway N. The role of psychological contracts in trust repair. In: Bachmann R, Zaheer A, editors. *Handbook of advances in trust research*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing; 2013. p. 184-201.
 47. Uslaner EM. *The moral foundations of trust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2002.