

Received: 20 May 2026; Revised: 16 July 2026; Accepted: 30 September 2026; Published: 18 October 2026

Archs Sci. (2026) Volume 76(4), Pages 09-15, Paper ID 2026402.
<https://doi.org/10.68304/as/76402>

The Level of Trust for Disaster-Affected Individuals in the State and Institutions Involved in Disaster Management

Ahmet Tayfur Küçüküçü^{1,*} and Erhan Örselli²

¹Meram Vocational School, Necmettin Erbakan University; Konya; Türkiye

²Faculty of Political Science, Necmettin Erbakan University; Konya; Türkiye

Correspondence: akucukugli@erbakan.edu.tr

Abstract Public trust is not only a foundation of democratic governance, political legitimacy, and the effective implementation of public policies, but is also critically important for maintaining healthy relationships between states and their citizens. It is extremely difficult for modern states to fulfill their responsibilities and functions without the trust and confidence of their citizens. Throughout history, Türkiye has experienced frequent disasters because of its geographical location, geological characteristics, and climatic conditions, and these events have had significant social and economic consequences. In particular, the devastating earthquakes of February 6, 2023, deeply affected thousands of citizens, caused widespread destruction, and inflicted considerable damage on the national economy. Therefore, adequate disaster preparedness and an effective capacity to respond to and manage disasters are essential. In addition to increasing citizens' awareness of disasters, disaster preparedness, and appropriate responses, strengthening their trust in institutions involved in disaster management is highly important for ensuring that disaster-related processes can be managed effectively. This study seeks to examine and analyze the levels of trust that disaster-affected individuals place in institutions involved in disaster management and to investigate whether these levels of trust vary according to citizens' socio-demographic characteristics. According to the findings of this study, the Turkish Armed Forces, the police and other law enforcement agencies, and the Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (DEMP/AFAD) were identified as the three most trusted institutions in Türkiye in the context of disaster management. The findings further indicate that DEMP is perceived by participants as an important and capable public institution in disaster management in Türkiye and that participants' trust in the institution is comparatively high.

Index Terms disaster, disaster management, trust, trust in state, Türkiye

I. Introduction

As earthquakes, droughts, floods, forest fires, hurricanes, and the adverse effects of climate change continue to have negative consequences for societies, states have increasingly directed their attention toward disasters and the formulation and implementation of disaster management policies. Disasters, whether natural or human-induced, occur frequently throughout the world and affect communities in many different ways. In particular, disasters cause substantial physical damage, human suffering, and significant economic losses [1, p. 48]. Indeed, numerous disasters have occurred in different regions of the world and at different periods throughout history; when their social and economic consequences are considered, these events have often left profound and lasting impacts on affected societies. Disasters are generally defined as events that cause physical, economic, and social losses for individuals and communities, may interrupt or seriously disrupt people's normal social lives and daily activities, and exceed the resources and capacities available to cope with their consequences.

Disasters can generally be classified into two principal categories: natural disasters and human-induced disasters. Regardless of whether they arise from natural processes or human activities, disasters can be described as extraordinary events that cause serious disruptions to the social, economic, and environmental structures of affected societies. Natural disasters include earthquakes, floods, fires, volcanic eruptions, and extreme meteorological events, including storms; human-induced disasters include industrial accidents, radioactive leaks, and mining accidents, among other events. Given their sudden onset, potentially devastating effects, and far-reaching consequences for communities, the importance of preventing, preparing for, and responding effectively to disasters cannot be overstated. Effective disaster management requires the advance planning and coordinated implementation of appropriate measures and interventions before, during, and after a disaster. According to the Emergency Events Database (EM-DAT), also known as the International Disaster Database, the annual number of recorded natural disasters worldwide,

which averaged 125 in the early 1980s, reached 358 in 2025¹. In 2025, these reported disasters resulted in 16,607 deaths, affected approximately 110.2 million people, and caused an estimated USD 169.68 billion in economic losses [2].

Modern states formulate and implement numerous public policies designed to prevent threats that may emerge in the future or, where prevention is not possible, to mitigate their adverse effects. At the same time, states are becoming increasingly involved in “regulating areas characterized by risk” and are undertaking complex regulatory arrangements that create burdensome expectations that “cannot reasonably be met” by public authorities [3, pp. 30–33]. Such circumstances may sometimes adversely affect public trust in the state and its institutions, thereby creating dissatisfaction and disappointment among citizens. The literature draws attention to the erosion of trust, which may hinder the acceptance of disaster-related policies by citizens and undermine their effective implementation [4, p. 233]; [5, p. 260]. Therefore, identifying the measures that modern states can adopt to develop, strengthen, and sustain public trust is of considerable importance. States require a certain level of public trust in order to consolidate their legitimacy and fulfill their duties and responsibilities effectively [6, p. 687]. Indeed, the effective functioning of a modern state depends substantially on citizens’ trust in the state and their belief that public institutions are both willing and able to respond to their needs [7, p. 302].

Trust can be understood as the willingness of an individual or party to accept vulnerability to the actions of another party, based on the expectation that the other party will act appropriately and reliably, even when its actions cannot be fully monitored or controlled. This understanding emphasizes both the acceptance of vulnerability and the presence of positive expectations regarding the behavior and intentions of the trusted party [9]. Trust therefore becomes particularly important in situations characterized by uncertainty, dependence, risk, and limited opportunities for direct observation.

Trust plays a particularly critical role during periods of disaster, when citizens must often depend on public institutions for emergency assistance, accurate information, and essential services [10, p. 39]. Consequently, understanding how disasters affect citizens’ trust in the state and in public institutions, precisely when this trust is most needed, is of considerable importance. The relevant literature includes studies examining the relationship between exposure to disasters and institutional or political trust, as well as the extent to which disaster-related experiences may influence public confidence [11, p. 1]. Against this background, the present study examines and analyzes the levels of trust that disaster-affected individuals place in public institutions involved in disaster management and investigates whether such trust differs according to citizens’ socio-demographic characteristics.

II. Literature Review: Disasters and Trust in the State

In recent years, projected increases in the frequency, intensity, and consequences of disasters throughout the world have generated greater scholarly and policy interest in the phenomenon of disasters and the development of effective disaster management policies [12, p. 979]. Whether natural or human-induced, disasters constitute extraordinary events that adversely affect individuals, communities, and entire societies through a wide range of social, economic, and environmental consequences. Earthquakes, floods, fires, droughts, volcanic eruptions, and meteorological events, such as severe storms, are commonly identified as natural disasters, whereas industrial accidents, terrorism, radioactive leaks, and mining accidents represent examples of human-induced disasters [13, p. 543]. Large-scale natural disasters can also produce complex social and political consequences because they may cause extensive fatalities, widespread displacement, and far-reaching disruption to collective life [14, p. 142]. Thus, because disasters affect societies profoundly through their sudden and potentially devastating consequences, planning and implementing appropriate preventive, preparedness, response, and recovery measures before, during, and after such events are especially important [15, p. 1].

A sudden event or situation that seriously disrupts the functioning of a community or society may be characterized as a disaster. In other words, a disaster is generally understood as an unexpected, frequently sudden event that causes significant damage, destruction, and humanitarian needs, and that generates requirements for external assistance at the national or international level [12, p. 979]. A disaster may also be defined as a natural, technological, or human-induced event that causes physical, economic, and social losses for an entire society or for particular segments of the population, interrupts normal life and human activities, and exceeds the coping capacity of the community affected by the event [16].

Trust may be conceptualized as a risky action undertaken by one actor under conditions of uncertainty or incomplete information, based on the expectation that another actor will not engage in opportunistic behavior [17, p. 292]. Trust is widely recognized as being critically important for the formation, maintenance, and success of relationships between individuals and organizations [18, p. 176]. In this regard, trust is rooted in both cognitive judgments and emotional responses, becomes particularly relevant in situations involving risk or uncertainty, may encourage risk-taking behavior, and rests on positive expectations concerning the other party. Accordingly, trust has also been defined as “the truster’s intentional and behavioral suspension of the possibility of being harmed based on the truster’s positive expectations regarding the trusted party” [19, pp. 579–582]. Another formulation describes trust as “a state in which one party holds a fundamental belief that the other party will fulfill its obligations honestly and act in the best interests of the other” [20, p. 2].

The phenomenon of trust is commonly discussed in the literature through three broad categories: institutional trust, social trust or interpersonal trust, and societal or generalized

¹The 2025 data were reported as of March 17, 2026.

trust [21]–[24]. Institutional trust refers primarily to trust in the state, public authorities, and formal institutions, while interpersonal trust refers to trust between individuals, including those who are personally known to one another. Social trust may also involve the belief that other people will fulfill their promises and behave in a trustworthy manner [25, p. 3]. Societal or generalized trust can be understood as trust in people who are not personally known, including strangers whom an individual encounters for the first time and expects to act reliably [26, p. 118]. Institutional and interpersonal forms of trust, both separately and in combination, are essential elements in the functioning and stability of social life within contemporary societies [27, p. 2]; [24, p. 1484].

Institutional trust is based on the proposition that individuals can direct their trust toward abstract systems, organized structures, and formal institutions, rather than exclusively toward particular people. These institutions consist of collectively established rules, roles, procedures, and individuals who carry out public or organizational activities; citizens' trust in such entities depends in part on how their activities are perceived and evaluated [28]. Institutional trust consequently encompasses citizens' confidence in public institutions, political leaders, and services, and may also be distinguished from trust in the technologies through which public services are delivered [8]. Institutional, political, or system trust is associated with perceptions of legitimacy, technical competence, and the ability of institutions to perform assigned tasks effectively and efficiently [29, p. 192]. Put differently, trust in the state reflects the extent to which citizens expect public institutions to act in the public interest [30, pp. 1648–1649]. When an individual trusts an institution, that person generally believes that the collective entity is competent, meets its obligations, and acts in a responsible and dependable manner [31, p. 294]. Institutional trust also “depends on perceived legitimacy, technical competence, and the ability to perform assigned tasks effectively” [32, p. 123]. In this context, public trust can be considered a critical element of relations between the state and its citizens before, during, and after a disaster [33, p. 853].

In particular, an effective and coordinated disaster management system is fundamentally dependent on relationships of trust between organizations responsible for disaster-related activities and the citizens whom those organizations serve [34, p. 336]. Furthermore, Waugh [35] argues that the effectiveness of a disaster response “may depend more on interpersonal skills, trust, and credibility than on technical skills and legal authority,” an observation also discussed by McLaren and Loosemore [12, p. 979]. This observation highlights the importance of the human and institutional dimensions of response activities alongside technical, administrative, and operational capacity.

Before disasters occur, taking citizens' expectations and needs into account and involving relevant stakeholders in disaster preparedness and planning may help to strengthen trust in the state and its institutions. In addition, timely, reliable, and transparent communication following a disaster is an

important factor in maintaining or rapidly rebuilding public trust. Research has found that, following a disaster, citizens who express greater trust in the government may be less likely to attribute the resulting damage to inadequate government management [33, p. 863]. At the same time, the literature indicates that disasters can also represent adverse events that weaken public support for the state. Following a disaster, citizens may blame incumbent authorities either because they believe that officials failed to prevent or mitigate the damage or because assigning responsibility offers a means of regaining some sense of control over an uncertain situation [11, p. 3].

III. Methodology of the Study

Disasters not only cause physical damage and destruction but can also profoundly disrupt the social, economic, and institutional structures of affected societies. For this reason, the design, development, and implementation of effective public policies addressing the prevention, management, and consequences of disasters are of vital importance. However, ensuring the effectiveness of disaster management policies is not a responsibility that central and local governments can discharge entirely on their own. Rather, it requires the coordinated participation of civil society organizations and private-sector stakeholders, together with citizens who possess an adequate level of awareness concerning disaster preparedness, response, and recovery. For these interconnected activities to function effectively, it is particularly important that citizens have confidence in the state and trust the public institutions and other organizations involved in disaster management.

The principal aim of this study is to determine and analyze the extent to which citizens in Türkiye who have personally experienced a disaster, or whose close relatives have experienced a disaster, trust the institutions involved in disaster management. In addition, the study examines whether levels of trust in disaster-related institutions vary according to citizens' socio-demographic characteristics, including gender, age, educational attainment, and income level. These characteristics are considered in relation to the participants' reported perceptions of disaster management institutions and their assessment of those institutions.

The study was conducted using a quantitative research approach and a structured survey design. The target population comprised citizens aged 18 years and older residing in Konya province, Türkiye. The study sample was drawn from residents of the Selçuklu, Meram, and Karatay districts, which are located within Konya province. A fully structured questionnaire was employed as the primary instrument for collecting the study data. Ethical approval for conducting the survey was obtained from the Scientific Research Ethics Committee for Social Sciences and Humanities of Necmettin Erbakan University on September 20, 2024, under approval number 2024/727. The survey was administered to eligible adult participants who met the specified disaster-exposure criteria.

The data collected through the questionnaire were entered and analyzed using the SPSS statistical software package,

version 27. To address the objectives of the study, face-to-face survey interviews were conducted with a total of 238 participants who had either personally experienced a disaster or had a close relative who had been affected by a disaster. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize participants' socio-demographic characteristics and their reported levels of trust, while group comparisons were undertaken using the statistical tests described in the Results section.

IV. Results

The socio-demographic characteristics of the 238 respondents, including their gender, age, marital status, educational attainment, and income level, are summarized in Table 1. The distributions provide a descriptive overview of the respondents included in the survey analysis.

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Responses		Number	%
Gender	Male	92	38,7
	Female	146	61,3
Age	18-24	131	55,1
	25-34	42	17,6
	35-44	29	12,2
	45-54	24	10,1
	55-64	6	2,5
	65 and over	6	2,5
Marital status	Married	71	29,8
	Single	157	66,0
	Separated from spouse	10	4,2
Education	Primary school	16	6,7
	Middle school	12	5,0
	High school or equivalent	126	52,9
	University	76	31,9
	Postgraduate	8	3,4
Income	Have no regular income	125	52,5
	0–20,000 TL	49	20,6
	20,001–50,000 TL	46	19,3
	50,001–100,000 TL	17	7,1
	100,001 TL and above	1	0,4
Total		238	100

As shown in Table 1, women accounted for a larger share of the respondents than men, representing 61.3% of the sample compared with 38.7% for men. Examination of the age distribution indicates that younger adults were particularly well represented, with participants aged 18–24 years constituting the largest age group. With respect to educational attainment, respondents who had completed high school or an equivalent level of education represented the largest category. Examination of the income distribution also indicates that a substantial proportion of respondents had no regular income, while many of the remaining respondents reported comparatively low income levels. These characteristics should be taken into account when interpreting the distribution of reported institutional trust within the sample.

Table 2: Previous Disaster Exposure of Participants

Responses	Number	%
Yes, I experienced it myself	103	43,3
Yes, a relative experienced it	135	56,7
Total	238	100,0

Table 2 presents the previous disaster-exposure status of the respondents, distinguishing between those who had personally experienced a disaster and those whose close relatives had experienced one. Among the participants, 43.3% reported that they themselves had been directly exposed to a disaster, whereas 56.7% indicated that a close relative had experienced a disaster. Thus, all 238 respondents met one of the two disaster-exposure conditions adopted for inclusion in the study.

In order to identify the institutions and other channels perceived as having provided effective services during or after a disaster, respondents who had personally experienced a disaster or had a close relative affected by one were asked the following question: “Which of the following institutions provided you or your relative with effective services?” Their responses, summarized in Table 3, indicate which organizations or communication channels the respondents considered most effective in the context of their disaster-related experiences.

As presented in Table 3, the Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (DEMP/AFAD) was the organization most frequently identified by respondents as having provided effective services during or after a disaster. The next most frequently identified categories were non-governmental organizations (NGOs), social media, and the Turkish Red Crescent. These responses indicate that DEMP, civil society organizations, social media, and the Turkish Red Crescent occupy prominent positions in respondents' perceptions of effective disaster-related services. They also suggest that the respondents differentiated between formal institutions, voluntary organizations, and communication channels when considering the services received by themselves or their relatives.

Table 3: Perceptions of Institutions Providing Effective Services during Disasters

Responses	Number	%
Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (DEMP)	126	52,9
Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)	24	10,1
Social Media	22	9,2
Turkish Red Crescent (Kızılay)	18	7,6
Municipalities	11	4,6
Presidency	10	4,2
Governor's Office / District Governorship	9	3,8
Other	7	3,0
Print and Broadcast Media (TV, Radio, Newspaper)	6	2,5
International Aid Organizations	5	2,1
Total	238	100,0

Beyond identifying the organizations and communication channels regarded as having provided effective assistance, the study also examined the extent to which participants trusted these bodies to play a constructive and reliable role in disaster management during or after an emergency. To assess this dimension, respondents were asked to rate their

level of trust in the institutions and organizations involved in disaster management on a numerical scale ranging from 0 to 10. The frequency distributions, percentages, mean scores, and standard deviations obtained from these responses are presented in Table 4, allowing the reported levels of trust to be compared across different institutions.

As shown in Table 4, the Turkish Armed Forces received the highest reported mean trust score among the institutions and organizations included in the disaster management survey. Considering the institutional structure of the Turkish Armed Forces and its operational capacity within the country, this comparatively high position may be understood in the context of respondents' perceptions of institutional capability. The second-highest level of trust was reported for the police and other law enforcement agencies. Their position is also noteworthy because police and security personnel maintain close contact with the public and perform important functions in maintaining safety and public order following disasters. The Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (DEMP/AFAD) ranked third in terms of the reported mean trust score. Its position among the three leading organizations may be interpreted in relation to its public visibility and its central responsibilities in planning, coordinating, and implementing disaster management activities in Türkiye. Many of the remaining institutions and communication channels were assigned lower mean trust scores than these three organizations. Mobile network operators, or GSM companies, received the lowest reported mean trust score. Their relatively low position may be associated with respondents' concerns about communication difficulties and interruptions following major events, including the Kahramanmaraş earthquakes of February 6, 2023. Inadequate communication infrastructure and restricted access to communication services during emergencies can generate criticism and dissatisfaction among affected citizens. However, the present descriptive results do not, by themselves, establish the specific causes of respondents' relatively low trust in these operators.

According to the reported results of an independent-samples *t*-test conducted to investigate differences in institutional trust according to the respondents' gender, no statistically significant difference was identified between male and female participants. This result indicates that the analysis did not detect a statistically significant gender-related difference; it does not necessarily demonstrate that the levels of trust among the two groups were identical. The reported results of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for age suggested that levels of institutional trust varied across age groups, with higher levels of trust generally described among older respondents. No statistically significant difference in the reported levels of institutional trust was found according to educational attainment. Similarly, the reported one-way ANOVA results for income suggested that institutional trust varied across income groups, with comparatively higher levels of trust described among respondents in higher-income categories. Thus, participants with lower reported incomes generally appeared to have lower levels of trust in the organizations examined.

Overall, the study reported associations between participants' age and income levels and their trust in institutions involved in disaster management. The statistical interpretation of these group differences should be supported by the relevant test statistics, degrees of freedom, significance values, and, where applicable, post-hoc comparisons.

V. Conclusion

In addition to adopting and implementing effective disaster-related policies to minimize the destructive consequences of disasters and strengthen social resilience, states must also establish and sustain effective, coordinated disaster management systems. At the same time, citizens' trust in the institutions involved in disaster management is essential for encouraging cooperation and supporting the effective delivery of disaster-related assistance. Indeed, institutions that lack public confidence may encounter substantial difficulties in obtaining cooperation and ensuring that their services are accepted and utilized effectively. Modern states therefore require an adequate level of trust in the relevant institutions to achieve the objectives of disaster management. Accordingly, the present study sought to examine and analyze the levels of trust that disaster-affected citizens place in institutions involved in disaster management and to explore whether such trust varies according to their socio-demographic characteristics. In accordance with the objectives of the study, the sample comprised respondents who had either personally experienced a disaster or had a close relative who had been affected by a disaster.

According to the findings of the study, the Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (DEMP/AFAD) was the institution most frequently identified by respondents as having provided effective services during or after disasters, followed by non-governmental organizations and social media. The findings relating to institutional trust, however, produced a different ranking: the three highest mean trust scores were recorded for the Turkish Armed Forces, the police and other security forces, and DEMP, respectively. This distinction between perceived service effectiveness and reported levels of institutional trust is important for an accurate interpretation of the study's descriptive findings.

The findings indicate that DEMP occupies a prominent position within Türkiye's disaster management system and enjoys a comparatively high level of trust among the respondents, although it was not the highest-rated institution in terms of mean trust. At the same time, respondents gave comparatively lower trust ratings to the Turkish Red Crescent and mobile network operators. Public criticism concerning the provision and distribution of relief supplies by the Turkish Red Crescent and difficulties in maintaining uninterrupted telecommunications services after the Kahramanmaraş earthquakes of February 6, 2023, and other recent disasters may provide contextual explanations for these evaluations. Nevertheless, the findings presented in this study do not directly establish a causal relationship between these events and the reported trust ratings. Regarding the socio-demographic charac-

Table 4: Trust in Institutions Involved in Disaster Management

Responses		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Mean	S/d
Turkish Armed Forces	Number	1	3	1	6	1	16	13	22	32	45	88	8,2	2,11
	%	0,4	1,3	0,4	2,5	0,4	6,7	5,5	9,2	13,4	18,9	37,0		
Police / Law Enforcement Agencies	Number	-	3	3	8	3	17	17	24	37	44	73	7,9	2,18
	%	-	1,3	1,3	3,4	1,3	7,1	7,1	10,1	15,5	18,5	30,7		
Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (DEMP/AFAD)	Number	9	-	3	17	8	21	25	21	33	38	54	7,1	2,67
	%	3,8	-	1,3	7,1	3,4	8,8	10,5	8,8	13,9	16,0	22,7		
Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)	Number	3	2	6	16	10	51	38	35	25	22	19	6,2	2,21
	%	1,3	0,8	2,5	6,7	4,2	21,4	16,0	14,7	10,5	9,2	8,0		
Ministry of Health	Number	9	4	7	14	11	39	37	26	32	22	23	6,2	2,55
	%	3,8	1,7	2,9	5,9	4,6	16,4	15,5	10,9	13,4	9,2	9,7		
Social Media	Number	22	11	11	14	10	39	16	18	24	29	31	5,7	3,20
	%	9,2	4,6	4,6	5,9	4,2	16,4	6,7	7,6	10,1	12,2	13,0		
Municipalities	Number	14	9	3	22	14	56	20	29	27	13	17	5,5	2,65
	%	5,9	3,8	1,3	9,2	5,9	23,5	8,4	12,2	11,3	5,5	7,1		
Presidency	Number	22	10	9	16	14	47	24	17	12	28	26	5,5	3,06
	%	9,2	4,2	3,8	6,7	5,9	19,7	10,1	7,1	5,0	11,8	10,9		
Governor's Office / District Governorship	Number	17	4	13	19	13	45	31	26	28	18	12	5,4	2,68
	%	7,1	1,7	5,5	8,0	5,5	18,9	13,0	10,9	11,8	7,6	5,0		
International Aid Organizations	Number	11	11	10	18	14	49	37	28	17	14	14	5,4	2,56
	%	4,6	4,6	4,2	7,6	5,9	20,6	15,5	11,8	7,1	5,9	5,9		
Print and Broadcast Media (Newspaper/TV)	Number	19	8	11	22	11	45	20	27	22	21	15	5,3	2,86
	%	8,0	3,4	4,6	9,2	4,6	18,9	8,4	11,3	9,2	8,8	6,3		
Turkish Red Crescent (Kızılay)	Number	39	9	11	19	14	32	20	17	23	18	29	5,1	3,37
	%	16,4	3,8	4,6	8,0	5,9	13,4	8,4	7,1	9,7	7,6	12,2		
Mobile Network Operators (GSM Companies)	Number	42	12	15	23	18	49	18	20	12	12	5	4,1	2,85
	%	17,6	5,0	6,3	9,7	7,6	20,6	7,6	8,4	5,0	5,0	2,1		

Note: A score of 0 indicates the least trusted, whereas a score of 10 indicates the most trusted. Percentages are calculated using the full survey sample ($N = 238$); the number of valid responses differs between institutions because not all respondents provided a score for every item. The reported means and standard deviations are based on the available scores for each institution.

teristics examined, the study reported statistically significant differences in institutional trust according to age and income level, with relatively older respondents and those in higher-income categories generally described as having greater trust. Gender and educational attainment were not reported to show statistically significant group differences in this regard.

This study provides a situational and descriptive analysis of how citizens who have been directly or indirectly affected by disasters perceive institutions involved in disaster management in Türkiye and the extent to which those citizens express trust in these institutions. In doing so, it offers a snapshot of the views reported by the specific group of participants surveyed in Konya province. The success of disaster preparedness, response, and recovery activities depends not only on technical and administrative capabilities but also on the extent to which citizens regard responsible institutions as reliable, competent, and responsive to their needs. Therefore, institutions receiving comparatively low trust ratings should consider developing and implementing policies that rebuild public confidence and strengthen their relationships with the communities they serve. Although public trust can deteriorate rapidly after perceived failures or disappointing experiences, establishing and maintaining durable trust generally requires sustained effort and a considerable period of time. Practical measures that may help improve institutional trust include organizing public educational programs that increase awareness of disaster risks and appropriate responses, communicating institutional activities and decisions more clearly and transparently, and encouraging the meaningful participation

of citizens and relevant stakeholders in disaster planning and management processes. These measures may also help institutions understand citizens' expectations more effectively and communicate their own responsibilities and capacities in a more accessible manner.

Author Contributions

Both authors contributed equally to the research and preparation of this manuscript. Both authors read and approved the final version of the paper for publication.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that they have no known conflicts of interest related to the preparation, conduct, or publication of the present research study.

Data Availability

The data required for this research are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Funding Information

No funding was reported for the conduct of the research presented in this paper, and no external funding source was identified by the authors.

References

- [1] Ahsan, D. A. (2014). Does natural disaster influence people's risk preference and trust? An experiment from cyclone prone coast of Bangladesh. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 9, 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2014.02.005>

- [2] Delforge, D., Below, R., Wathelet, V., Tonnelier, M., Alonso, A., & Speybroeck, N. (2026). 2025 disasters in numbers: Earth, wind and fire. Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters. https://files.emdat.be/reports/2025_EMDAT_report.pdf
- [3] Boswell, C. (2018). Manufacturing political trust: Targets and performance measurement in public policy. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108367554>
- [4] Gille, F., & Brall, C. (2020). Public trust: Caught between hype and need. *International Journal of Public Health*, 65(3), 233–234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-020-01343-0>
- [5] Fornalé, E., Armiero, M., & Odasso, L. (2023). Trust in disaster resilience. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal*, 32(2), 253–267. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DPM-04-2022-0082>
- [6] Mabillard, V. (2022). Trust in government: Assessing the impact of exposure to information in a local context. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 45(9), 687–696. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2020.1868505>
- [7] Sabbi, M., Osei, A., Wigmore-Shepherd, D., & Ahlin, E. (2024). Minding the local slot: Municipalities as drivers of trust in public institutions. *Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue canadienne des études africaines*, 58(2), 301–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00083968.2024.2339490>
- [8] Romanov, B., Duenas Cid, D., & Leets, P. (2025). State versus technology: What drives trust in and usage of internet voting, institutional or technological trust? *Government Information Quarterly*, 42(4), Article 102068. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2025.102068>
- [9] Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335>
- [10] Aldrich, D. P. (2017). Trust deficit: Japanese communities and the challenge of rebuilding Tohoku. *Japan Forum*, 29(1), 39–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09555803.2016.1227350>
- [11] Frost, M. H., Kim, S., Scartascini, C., Zamora, P., & Zechmeister, E. J. (2025). Disaster and political trust: Evidence from the 2017 Mexico City earthquake. *World Development*, 189, Article 106927. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2025.106927>
- [12] McLaren, M., & Loosemore, M. (2019). Swift trust formation in multinational disaster project management teams. *International Journal of Project Management*, 37(8), 979–988. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2019.09.003>
- [13] Banjak-Corlea, C., & Wallace, L. N. (2021). Disaster experiences and terrorism news exposure: Effects on perceptions of police and trust in local government in the United States. *Police Practice and Research*, 22(1), 542–556. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2020.1716356>
- [14] You, Y., Huang, Y., & Zhuang, Y. (2020). Natural disaster and political trust: A natural experiment study of the impact of the Wenchuan earthquake. *Chinese Journal of Sociology*, 6(1), 140–165. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2057150X19891880>
- [15] Küçüktüğü, A. T., & Örselli, E. (2026). Türkiye’de afet politikaları ve afet yönetişi: Sorunlar-beklentiler-öneriler. Özgür Yayınları. <https://doi.org/10.58830/ozgur.pub1345>
- [16] Afet ve Acil Durum Yönetimi Başkanlığı. (n.d.). Açıklamalı afet yönetimi terimleri sözlüğü. Retrieved October 14, 2026, from <https://www.afad.gov.tr/kitaplar>
- [17] James, H. S., Jr. (2002). The trust paradox: A survey of economic inquiries into the nature of trust and trustworthiness. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 47(3), 291–307. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2681\(01\)00214-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2681(01)00214-1)
- [18] Yang, S.-U., Kang, M., & Cha, H. (2015). A study on dialogic communication, trust, and distrust: Testing a scale for measuring organization–public dialogic communication (OPDC). *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 27(2), 175–192. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2015.1007998>
- [19] Oomsels, P., & Bouckaert, G. (2014). Studying interorganizational trust in public administration: A conceptual and analytical framework for “administrational trust.” *Public Performance & Management Review*, 37(4), 577–604. <https://doi.org/10.2753/PMR1530-9576370403>
- [20] Remington, C. L., & Remington, C. R. (2025). Navigating the beneficiary/NGO relationship: A model of intercultural trust in disaster response. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 33(2), Article e70038. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.70038>
- [21] Örselli, E. (2016). Türkiye’de yargıya güven. Çizgi Kitabevi. <https://kutuphane.tbmm.gov.tr/cgi-bin/koha/opac-detail.pl?biblionumber=345182>
- [22] Örselli, E., & Bilici, Z. (2019). Building trust in the state: What the declining trust tells. In Ö. Uğur & K. C. Doğan (Eds.), *Contemporary debates on politics and public administration in the postmodern era* (pp. 143–161). Peter Lang. <https://www.peterlang.com/document/1111051>
- [23] Örselli, E., & Bilici, Z. (2024). Devlete ve kamu yönetimine güven inşası: Kurumsal güveni etkileyen faktörler. In A. Şahin (Ed.), *Güncel kamu yönetimi uygulamaları* (pp. 99–112). Özgür Yayınları. <https://doi.org/10.58830/ozgur.pub582.c2767>
- [24] Örselli, E., Bayrakçı, E., & Küçüktüğü, A. T. (2024). Z kuşağı gençliğinin devlete ve kurumlara güveni: Türkiye örneği. *International Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research*, 11(110), 1481–1491. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13625434>
- [25] Zhang, Z., Yang, A., & Wang, Y. (2023). How do social capital and village-level organizational trust affect farmers’ climate-related disaster adaptation behavior? Evidence from Hunan Province, China. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 99, Article 104083. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2023.104083>
- [26] Herreros, F. (2023). The state and trust. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 26, 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051921-102842>
- [27] Gemar, A. (2024). Institutional trust, spirituality, and religious practice in the United States. *Social Sciences*, 13(1), Article 67. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13010067>
- [28] Askvik, S., Jamil, I., & Dhakal, T. N. (2011). Citizens’ trust in public and political institutions in Nepal. *International Political Science Review*, 32(4), 417–437. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512110377437>
- [29] Dzordzormenyoh, M. K. (2023). Predictors of citizens’ trust in public leadership in Ghana: A comparison between the president, MPs and MMDCEs. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 19(3), 189–209. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPL-11-2022-0064>
- [30] Oh, J., & Lee, D. W. (2022). Role of trust in government and collaboration in building disaster resilience. *Social Science Quarterly*, 103(7), 1647–1658. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.13229>
- [31] Mrva, M., & Szabó, T. (2025). Conspiracy theories, social media, and trust in institutions in three Central European countries. *Sociológia-Slovak Sociological Review*, 57(4), 291–324. <https://doi.org/10.31577/sociologia.2025.57.4.11>
- [32] Khodyakov, D. (2007). Trust as a process: A three-dimensional approach. *Sociology*, 41(1), 115–132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038507072285>
- [33] Liu, B. F., & Mehta, A. M. (2021). From the periphery and toward a centralized model for trust in government risk and disaster communication. *Journal of Risk Research*, 24(7), 853–869. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2020.1773516>
- [34] Comfort, L. K. (2005). Risk, security, and disaster management. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8, 335–356. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.8.081404.075608>
- [35] Waugh, W. L., Jr. (2000). Living with hazards, dealing with disasters: An introduction to emergency management. M. E. Sharpe. <https://books.google.com/books?id=cQQ0NfftGRYC>