HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

PHILOSOPHICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF TRUST COMMUNICATION: COMMITMENT, VIOLATION AND REPAIR

Gulbahor Abdullayeva
Senior Teacher, Department of English Linguistics,
Navoi State University, Navoi, Uzbekistan
ORCID: 0009-0001-1640-5657
e-mail: abdullaevagulbahorphd@gmail.com
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24321914

Abstract. This article analyzes the philosophical and psychological interpretations of the concept of trust and substantiates the possibility of applying them as a theoretical basis for the linguistic study of trust communication. In philosophical approaches, trust is viewed as reliance on the commitments of others, whereas psychological research reveals the components of trust and the mechanisms of its violation and repair. As a result of the analysis, a three-stage model of the trust process (commitment – violation – repair) is developed, and the need to study the verbal expression of each stage is demonstrated. The article constitutes the theoretical foundation of a comparative study being conducted on English and Uzbek language material.

Keywords: trust, trust communication, commitment, trust violation, trust repair, speech act, comparative research.

Trust is regarded as a necessary condition for cooperation in all spheres of social life, from family relationships to political and economic institutions. For this reason, it has been studied in a number of disciplines, such as philosophy, sociology, psychology, management and linguistics. However, each discipline has illuminated a particular facet of trust: philosophy has focused on its essence and moral nature, and psychology on the mechanisms of its formation and violation, while in linguistics trust has been considered mainly within the scope of individual words and speech acts. A holistic study of trust as a process that is established, violated and repaired through speech activity has not yet been sufficiently developed.

To address this problem, the notion of trust itself must first be clarified from an interdisciplinary perspective. The aim of the article is to analyze the philosophical and psychological interpretations of trust and, on their basis, to develop the theoretical foundations of the commitment – violation – repair model for the study of trust communication. To achieve this aim, the following objectives were set: (1) to determine the place of the concept of commitment in philosophical interpretations of trust; (2) to summarize the psychological components of trust and the factors of its formation; (3) to analyze research on trust violation and repair; (4) to integrate these findings into a three-stage model.

The study is theoretical and analytical in nature and relies on the comparative-historical method, analysis and synthesis, and systematization.

In the philosophical literature, the starting point for understanding trust is to distinguish it from mere reliance. We rely on a clock to keep correct time, yet if it runs incorrectly, we are not offended by it; we simply consider it broken. When another person deceives us, the situation is entirely different: we are offended, we feel indignation, and we hold a grievance against that person. A. Baier interprets trust as reliance on another person's goodwill, that is, entrusting something of value to them and

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

thereby making ourselves vulnerable (Baier, 1986). In this sense, trust always involves the acceptance of vulnerability, that is, relying on another while knowing that risk exists.

R. Holton clarifies this through the concept of the "participant stance": in trusting, we regard the other not merely as an object whose behavior can be predicted, but as a responsible person; therefore, when trust is violated, we feel not disappointment but betrayal (Holton, 1994). This idea goes back to P. Strawson's notion of "reactive attitudes" (resentment, gratitude, forgiveness) (Strawson, 1962) . Thus, it becomes evident that trust and its violation constitute a social relationship with moral and ethical significance.

The connection between trust and commitment has been substantiated most consistently by K. Hawley: according to her interpretation, to trust someone to do something means to believe that they have a commitment to do it and to rely on that commitment being fulfilled (Hawley, 2014) . This approach distinguishes trust from prediction: the trusting person not only thinks "they will do so", but also believes "they ought to do so". Commitment, in turn, is by nature a socio-communicative phenomenon: it frequently arises through speech actions such as promises, guarantees and oaths. In the theory of J. Austin and J. Searle, such speech acts are termed commissives: by uttering them, the speaker commits himself or herself to a future course of action (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). Here, a direct bridge between philosophical and linguistic analysis becomes visible: commitment, as the philosophical basis of trust, is constructed in language by specific verbal means.

From a sociological perspective, the function of trust is also related to this. According to N. Luhmann, trust reduces social complexity: we cannot control all the actions of others, and therefore we act by relying on their commitments (Luhmann, 1979). Trust is thus seen as one of the foundations of cooperation in society.

Thus, philosophical approaches characterize trust by three features: (1) the acceptance of vulnerability; (2) reliance on another's commitment; (3) the emergence of moral responsibility and reactive attitudes when trust is violated. These features explain why trust is regulated precisely through communication, since a commitment is established, a violated commitment is acknowledged and its fulfillment demanded, and a damaged relationship is restored through apology and compensation. M. U. Walker describes moral repair as the process of restoring trust and hope in shared norms within damaged relationships (Walker, 2006).

In psychological research, the model of R. Mayer, J. Davis and F. Schoorman is the most widely applied; in it, trust is defined as the willingness to accept vulnerability, while trustworthiness is divided into three factors: ability, benevolence and integrity (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). D. Rousseau and co-authors define trust as "a state of willingness to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of the intentions and behavior of another" (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998).

These studies complement the philosophical conclusion from a psychological standpoint: reliance on the fulfillment of a commitment is based on assessments of ability (whether the person is able to fulfill it), benevolence (whether they wish to fulfill it) and integrity (whether they keep their word). What is important for linguistics is that each of these three factors is manifested through speech and is evaluated through speech.

It has also been emphasized that the formation of trust depends on cultural context. Drawing on the cases of the USA and Japan, T. Yamagishi and M. Yamagishi showed that the relationship between general trust and commitment-based relations differs across cultures (Yamagishi &

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Yamagishi, 1994). At the same time, most such works rely on Western and East Asian material. In Turkic-Uzbek culture, the role of such factors as the mahalla (neighborhood community), the family, elders, shame and respect has not been sufficiently studied from this perspective.

In psychological research, trust violations are differentiated according to their type. P. Kim and co-authors demonstrated the difference between competence-based violations (error, incompetence) and integrity-based violations (deception, breaking a promise) and established that they require different responses (Kim, Ferrin, Cooper, & Dirks, 2004). E. Tomlinson and R. Mayer showed that repair following a violation depends on how the cause of the violation is attributed (internal or external, stable or temporary, controllable or uncontrollable) (Tomlinson & Mayer, 2009).

From a philosophical perspective, a violation is an unfulfilled commitment, whereas from a psychological perspective it is the non-fulfillment of a positive expectation. Communicatively, it manifests itself in three forms: (1) the violation itself (failure to keep a promise, lying, disclosure of a secret); (2) acknowledgment of the violation or assignment of blame (accusation, complaint, objection); (3) the response of the violating party (denial, justification, admission). How these speech phenomena are expressed in the two cultures will be examined at subsequent stages of the dissertation research.

The literature on trust repair has developed in two directions. The first concerns repair strategies, that is, means such as apology, denial, explanation, promises and compensation. In the experiments of P. Kim and co-authors, apology proved more effective in repairing trust after a competence-based violation, whereas denial proved more effective after an integrity-based violation (Kim, Ferrin, Cooper, & Dirks, 2004). The second concerns the relational nature of the repair process: K. Dirks, R. Lewicki and A. Zaheer interpret repair not merely as an action of the violating party, but as a reciprocal process between the two parties (Dirks, Lewicki, & Zaheer, 2009).

Of particular importance for linguistic analysis is the fact that R. Lewicki, B. Polin and R. Lount divided the effective structure of an apology into six components: expression of regret, explanation of what went wrong, acknowledgment of responsibility, declaration of repentance, offer of repair and request for forgiveness (Lewicki, Polin, & Lount, 2016). This classification can be analyzed from the perspective of speech act theory and serves as a reference framework for comparative research.

It should also be noted that in psychological research, repair has mostly been studied in laboratory or organizational settings and predominantly in English; language itself (word choice, grammatical form, degree of politeness) has not been a unit of analysis. This defines the research gap.

By integrating the philosophical and psychological approaches, trust communication can be represented as a three-stage process.

Stage	Philosophical essence	Psychological essence	Verbal expression (to be investigated)
Commitment	Reliance on another's commitment (Hawley, 2014; Baier, 1986)	Willingness to accept vulnerability; assessments of ability, benevolence and integrity (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995)	Promise, guarantee, oath, request and consent to it (commissives)
Violation	Non-fulfillment of a commitment, betrayal,	Violation of expectations, competence and integrity	Accusation, complaint, objection; denial,

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

	reactive attitudes (Holton, 1994; Strawson, 1962)	violations, attribution (Kim, Ferrin, Cooper, & Dirks, 2004; Tomlinson & Mayer, 2009)	justification, admission
Repair	Moral repair, forgiveness (Walker, 2006)	Apology, acknowledgment of responsibility, compensation, relational repair (Dirks, Lewicki, & Zaheer, 2009; Lewicki, Polin, & Lount, 2016)	Apologizing, giving an explanation, promising correction, asking for and granting forgiveness

On this basis, trust communication is understood as speech activity aimed at establishing trust (undertaking a commitment), maintaining it, expressing and evaluating its violation, and repairing it. This concept makes it possible to study trust not as a static state, but as a dynamic process that emerges in speech. The model can also operate as a cycle: successful repair leads to a new, more robust commitment, whereas unsuccessful repair turns into distrust.

Conclusion

The analysis leads to the following conclusions. First, in philosophical research, trust is interpreted as reliance on another's commitment, which links it directly to speech acts. Second, psychological research has identified the components of trust (ability, benevolence, integrity), as well as the types of violation and the strategies of repair, but has largely left linguistic means out of account. Third, the synthesis of the philosophical and psychological approaches makes it possible to develop the commitment – violation – repair model and to clarify the concept of trust communication. Fourth, existing theories have been constructed mainly on Western material, and their applicability to Uzbek culture and language requires special investigation. In the next article, each stage of the model will be analyzed from the perspective of the semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural features of English and Uzbek.

References

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
2. Baier, A. (1986). Trust and Antitrust. Ethics, 96(2).
3. Dirks, K. T., Lewicki, R. J., Zaheer, A. (2009). Repairing Relationships within and between Organizations. Academy of Management Review, 34(1).
4. Hawley, K. (2014). Trust, Distrust and Commitment. Noûs, 48(1).
5. Holton, R. (1994). Deciding to Trust, Coming to Believe. Australasian Journal of Philosophy, 72(1).
6. Kim, P. H., Ferrin, D. L., Cooper, C. D., Dirks, K. T. (2004). Removing the Shadow of Suspicion. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89(1).
7. Lewicki, R. J., Polin, B., Lount, R. B. (2016). An Exploration of the Structure of Effective Apologies. Negotiation and Conflict Management Research, 9(2).
8. Luhmann, N. (1979). Trust and Power. Chichester: Wiley.
9. Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust. Academy of Management Review, 20(3).
10. Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., Camerer, C. (1998). Not So Different After All. Academy of Management Review, 23(3).

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

11. Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Strawson, P. F. (1962). Freedom and Resentment. Proceedings of the British Academy, 48.
13. Tomlinson, E. C., Mayer, R. C. (2009). The Role of Causal Attribution Dimensions in Trust Repair. Academy of Management Review, 34(1).
14. Walker, M. U. (2006). Moral Repair. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Yamagishi, T., Yamagishi, M. (1994). Trust and Commitment in the United States and Japan. Motivation and Emotion, 18(2).