The Crisis of Expertise

Institutional trust, scientific authority, and the public information system, 2000-2026

Sources.org.uk Review Brief | May 2026

The collapse in trust is best understood as a systems failure. Institutions communicated through old authority structures while the public moved into a networked environment where evidence, performance, scandal, identity, and algorithmic visibility are judged together.

This report reviews the trust problem across science, journalism, public institutions, and expertise. It does not assume that public scepticism is irrational. It treats trust as a social technology: a way of deciding who can be relied on when direct verification is impossible. That technology is under pressure from fragmented media, visible institutional failure, politicised expertise, research incentives, misinformation, and economic insecurity. The answer is not a return to blind deference. The answer is a more legible form of authority.

At a glance

What is the central problem?	People are asked to trust institutions whose internal methods are often invisible, while online systems constantly surface counter-claims and scandals.
Is trust in science gone?	No. Large surveys still show substantial trust in scientists, but trust is lower than the early pandemic high and is politically uneven.
Why does journalism matter?	News organisations mediate public knowledge, but trust in news has weakened in many markets and engagement has shifted to platforms.
What rebuilds trust?	Competence, transparency, correction, humility, independence, local presence, and clear separation between evidence and advocacy.

The trust problem

Most people cannot personally verify the safety of a vaccine, the reliability of a climate model, the accuracy of a war report, or the validity of a statistical claim. Modern society depends on delegated knowledge. We trust pilots, engineers, doctors, accountants, scientists, editors, judges, and inspectors because life is too complex for every citizen to reproduce every check themselves.

That arrangement becomes fragile when three things happen at once. First, institutions make mistakes in public. Second, media systems reward the most emotionally charged interpretation of those mistakes. Third, audiences divide into communities with different trusted messengers. The result is a crisis of expertise that is partly about performance, partly about communication, and partly about the architecture of attention.

The evidence is not one-dimensional. Pew data in 2026 reported that 77 percent of US adults had at least a fair amount of confidence in scientists to act in the public interest, roughly stable from 2024 and 2025 but below the 87 percent recorded near the start of the Covid-19 pandemic. Gallup recorded US trust in mass media at 28 percent in 2025, a new low in its series. Reuters Institute's 2025 Digital News Report found global news trust stable at around 40 percent, but paired that with declining engagement and platform disruption. These figures point to a fractured landscape, not universal collapse.

Why expertise became harder to defend

The old public model of expertise relied on controlled gates. Journals reviewed scientific claims. Newspapers selected stories. Broadcasters structured public attention. Professional bodies enforced standards. Those gates were imperfect and often exclusionary, but they gave institutions a recognisable form. The internet did not abolish gates; it multiplied them and made many of them commercial, opaque, and personalised.

The modern user encounters experts next to non-experts, institutions next to anonymous accounts, peer-reviewed work next to screenshots, and careful uncertainty next to confident simplification. The expert is no longer automatically framed as an authority. They are one voice in a feed. In that feed, the moral tone of a claim can matter more than its method, and the speed of reaction can matter more than correction.

Expert institutions also damaged themselves. Scientific publishing has incentives for novelty, positive results, and citation. Journalism has incentives for speed, conflict, and audience retention. Universities have incentives for prestige metrics. Public agencies have incentives to protect institutional reputation. None of these incentives prove dishonesty, but they create visible points of suspicion. Once suspicion becomes the default, expertise has to earn attention before it can earn belief.

Science, uncertainty, and public expectation

Science often moves by revision. This is a strength inside science and a weakness in public communication. A new study changes a probability, not reality itself. A recommendation changes when evidence, context, or risk changes. To a public trained to expect certainty from authority, revision can look like incompetence or manipulation. During crises, this gap becomes severe.

The reproducibility debate widened public awareness of scientific fallibility. The National Academies report on reproducibility and replicability carefully distinguishes reproducibility, meaning consistent computational results with the same data and analysis, from replicability, meaning consistent results across studies addressing the same question with new data. This distinction helps, because a failed replication is not always fraud. It can reveal boundary conditions, statistical noise, measurement differences, or genuine error.

Trustworthy science therefore cannot be sold as infallibility. It has to be presented as a disciplined process with known weaknesses and corrective mechanisms. The public can handle uncertainty when it is explained plainly. What corrodes trust is certainty followed by reversal, advocacy presented as neutral evidence, and institutions that correct quietly after announcing loudly.

Journalism and the loss of a shared floor

Journalism once supplied a rough shared floor of public facts. It never served everyone equally, and it always had bias, but a limited number of major outlets gave publics overlapping reference points. The platform era has weakened that floor. Many people still get news from established sources, but distribution and interpretation increasingly happen through social platforms, video personalities, newsletters, podcasts, search snippets, and group chats.

Reuters Institute's 2025 work describes traditional news media struggling with connection, engagement, trust, and subscriptions. Pew has also reported falling trust in information from national and local news organisations in the US. The public is not merely rejecting information. It is selecting different trust brokers. Some are journalists. Some are creators. Some are friends. Some are political figures. Some are search engines or AI systems.

This creates a strange situation: people may distrust "the media" while trusting a media figure; distrust institutions while trusting a doctor on YouTube; distrust journalists while relying on stories found through journalists. The unit of trust has shifted downward from institution to person, format, and perceived authenticity.

What a repair strategy looks like

A serious repair strategy begins with legibility. Institutions should show how they know what they claim to know. That means visible methods, accessible sources, uncertainty ranges, correction logs, conflicts-of-interest disclosures, and clear distinctions between evidence, interpretation, and recommendation. It also means avoiding theatrical certainty. Calm precision ages better than rhetorical dominance.

The second repair principle is proximity. People trust what they can encounter repeatedly in concrete settings. Local doctors, local reporters, local teachers, and local researchers can often carry more credibility than national spokespeople. Institutions that have no human surface become easier to caricature.

The third principle is separation of roles. Science informs policy but does not mechanically decide policy. Journalism investigates and explains but should not hide activism inside reportage. Public institutions must act, but they should not pretend that every action follows automatically from neutral evidence. The public is more likely to forgive difficult judgement than concealed judgement.

The sharp point: expertise will not recover by demanding deference. It will recover by becoming more inspectable, more humble, and more difficult to confuse with public relations.

Why distrust often looks reasonable

Distrust grows when the public sees contradiction without context. One scientific study says one thing, another seems to say the opposite, and a headline turns provisional evidence into a conclusion. For researchers, disagreement may be normal. For the public, it can look like chaos. Institutions need to explain why early evidence changes and why a single study rarely settles a question.

Distrust also grows when institutions use moral pressure where evidence is thin. Public communication sometimes tries to produce compliance by overstating certainty. That can work briefly, but it creates a long-term debt. When nuance later appears, audiences may feel managed rather than informed. A trust strategy built on pressure can win a week and lose a decade.

Distrust grows when criticism is treated as hostility. Some criticism is bad-faith or politically motivated. Some is not. Institutions that cannot distinguish between the two teach the public that defensiveness matters more than truth. A credible expert culture needs visible correction, not only visible defence.

Finally, distrust grows when expertise is merged with status. People may resent experts less for knowing things than for appearing to rule without accountability. The cultural problem is not knowledge itself. It is the impression that credentials are being used as a substitute for explanation.

A better public contract for expertise

The public contract should be: here is what we know, here is how we know it, here is what we do not know, here is what would change our mind, here is who paid for the work, and here is where judgement enters. This contract is slower than confident messaging, but it is more durable.

Scientific institutions should normalise uncertainty without sounding evasive. A confidence interval, a prior assumption, a replication attempt, or a limitation section can be explained in ordinary language. The public does not need every technical detail. It needs enough structure to see that uncertainty is being managed rather than hidden.

Journalism has a parallel task. It should make sourcing visible, avoid treating every disagreement as equal, and distinguish evidence from controversy. A fringe claim may be newsworthy because it is influential, but that does not make it evidentially equal. Good journalism can explain influence without laundering credibility.

Public agencies should separate risk assessment from political choice. Evidence can say that a policy reduces one risk while increasing another cost. Deciding whether that trade-off is acceptable is a public judgement. Trust improves when institutions admit the boundary between technical advice and democratic decision.

Indicators of seriousness

A serious institution corrects errors in the same place and with comparable visibility to the original claim. It does not bury corrections in technical pages while allowing simplified claims to circulate. A correction is not a humiliation. It is proof that the institution still has contact with reality.

A serious institution publishes conflicts of interest and funding. It does not assume that the public will ignore money, prestige, or political incentives. Disclosure does not eliminate bias, but it allows readers to interpret claims more intelligently.

A serious institution can name the strongest objection to its own position. This is rare and powerful. It shows that the institution is reasoning rather than broadcasting. It also prevents critics from becoming the only people who appear to understand the weaknesses.

A serious institution invests in boring public goods: methods pages, data access, explainers, local relationships, accessible archives, and staff who can answer questions without contempt. Trust is built by repeated reliability more than by campaigns about trust.

Sources and further reading

[1] Pew Research Center, Americans confidence in scientists, 2026. https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2026/01/15/americans-confidence-in-scientists/

[2] Pew Research Center, Public Trust in Scientists and Views on Their Role in Policymaking, 2024. https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2024/11/14/public-trust-in-scientists-and-views-on-their-role-in-policymaking/

[3] Gallup, Trust in Media at New Low of 28% in U.S., 2025. https://news.gallup.com/poll/695762/trust-media-new-low.aspx

[4] Gallup, Confidence in Institutions historical trends. https://news.gallup.com/poll/1597/confidence-institutions.aspx

[5] Reuters Institute, Digital News Report 2025. https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/digital-news-report/2025

[6] Reuters Institute, Digital News Report 2025 executive summary. https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/digital-news-report/2025/dnr-executive-summary

[7] National Academies, Reproducibility and Replicability in Science, 2019. https://www.nationalacademies.org/our-work/reproducibility-and-replicability-in-science

[8] National Academies, definitions of reproducibility and replicability, 2019. https://www.nationalacademies.org/news/new-report-examines-reproducibility-and-replicability-in-science-recommends-ways-to-improve-transparency-and-rigor-in-research

[9] Cologna et al., Trust in scientists and their role in society across 68 countries, Nature Human Behaviour, 2025. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-024-02090-5

[10] Edelman Trust Barometer 2026. https://www.edelman.com/trust/2026/trust-barometer