Reputation Advisors
International

REPUTATION REPAIR IN THE DIGITAL AGE

Limits, Realities, and the
Path to Recovery

Authors

Eric W. Rose, EKA, Los Angeles, California, USA

Michael MacMillan, PRA Communications, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Rune Mørck Wergeland, Wergeland Apenes, Oslo, Norway

Rainer Westermann, Westermann Advisors, Munich, Germany

Table of Contents

I. Introduction: The Semantics and Substance of Repair

In reputation management, language is not decoration; it sets the foundation for responsibility, expectations, and measurable results. Words like *repair*, *fix*, and *correct* may seem similar in casual use, but in the fields of crisis communications and reputational management, they are different. Understanding these distinctions matters not only for professionals doing the work but also for clients who have suffered reputational harm, courts, and attorneys who rely on expert testimony to assess the damage and the effectiveness of reputational repair programs.

A car can be fixed, and a fact can be corrected. But a reputation is different; it can be repaired. Fixing means returning something to its original state. Correcting means changing an error.

"

Repairing a reputation means recognizing that some damage lasts, and rebuilding trust takes ongoing, thoughtful effort.

The *Webster's Dictionary* definition of reputation is "overall quality or character as seen or judged by people in general; recognition by other people of some characteristic or ability, a place in public esteem or regard: good name."

Reputation is neither mechanical nor transactional. It is organic, cumulative, and rooted in trust. Crisis and reputation management professionals recognize that once fractured, a person or company's reputation cannot simply be reset. This is why reputational harm cases in courts and public

arenas focus on mitigation, not erasure; repair, not reversal.

II. Why "Fixed" Is a Misleading Concept

When something is "fixed," the expectation is that it will operate as if no damage ever occurred. This standard is possible for objects, machines, contracts, and even digital systems, but impossible for human perception. The notion that a reputation can be "fixed" assumes a level of control and predictability that does not exist in the real world of public opinion, media dynamics, and digital permanence.

To claim that a reputation has been "fixed" is to imply a total restoration: that the pre-crisis perception of integrity, trustworthiness, or character can be wholly reinstated. This is a fallacy. The human mind does not process reputational information as binary data; it integrates memory, emotion, and bias. Once a negative impression has been made, it cannot be completely unmade.

"You can't unring the bell" is a common expression in reputation management that captures a fundamental truth about communication and perception. Once something has been said, published, or shared, especially in today's digital environment, it cannot truly be undone. The metaphor comes from the simple fact that once a bell has been rung, the sound waves cannot be pulled back; the reverberation has already occurred.

In the same way, once damaging words, actions, or information are released into the public sphere, they can't simply be "taken back." Even if a statement is retracted, deleted, or corrected, the initial impression often endures. It's far easier to prevent the bell from being rung than to try to silence its echo after the fact. In reputation management, this saying serves as a cautionary reminder: Every word, post, and decision can shape how an individual or organization is perceived, sometimes permanently.

In addition, actions speak louder than words. Whether in North America, in Europe, or in other locations across the globe, trying to explain away the issue is not enough. Your stakeholders want to know you have identified the problem, learned from the incident, and taken action to ensure it will not happen again. Without meaningful action, it is all just words, and that is not enough these days. The famed cyanide-in-the-Tylenol is a famous example of doing the right things at great cost, with invaluable gains in customer confidence.

Even after comprehensive campaigns, content suppression, media engagement, paid advertising campaigns, owned media,[1] thought leadership, social validation, and years of demonstrated performance, the "scar" remains. People may forgive, but they rarely forget. The search engines certainly do not. The original content often persists online indefinitely, is indexed and cached, and occasionally resurfaces when least expected.

Courts in the United States recognize this reality by awarding damages; the law implicitly acknowledges that reputation is not a renewable or replaceable asset. The role of the reputation expert is not to offer guarantees of total restoration, but to design and evaluate programs that reasonably *repair*, reduce harm, rebuild trust, and redirect narrative momentum toward recovery. By contrast, the concept of receiving compensation for the loss of reputation does not exist in the European Union. Damages are awarded for defamation and for financial losses resulting from such acts, but the hurdles are high, and the reward is small. This is not surprising when one considers that damages awarded for the loss of a limb amount to tens of thousands in Europe, but often many millions in the U.S.

There are insurers in Germany and several other European countries that offer policies called "Vertrauensschadensversicherungen"[2] (trust damage insurance), which include coverage for reputational losses. They pay for the efforts required to repair your reputation, not for potential damages, and typically require that the insured have a crisis preparedness program in place.

Reputation must also be viewed in a cultural context. There is a big difference between a formal court of law and broader implications in the public arena. There is also a big difference, from country to country and culture to culture, in whether something belongs in a court of law.

The same applies to dealing with the truth. While truth is valued across cultures, how honesty and accountability are expressed can differ significantly. In some cultures, once trust is broken by an attempt to hide or distort

---

[1] In public relations, owned media refers to all communication channels and platforms that a company or individual controls directly, like a website, blog, newsletter, or social media account, unlike earned media, which is publicity that a company or individual receives, either organically or through its own promotional efforts, such as a news story, mention in an online blog or social media post, or a review by a customer.

[2] "Vertrauensschadenversicherung" (VSV) is available in several countries in the EU, and cross-border selling is possible. At its core, VSV protects companies against financial losses resulting from intentional criminal acts by trusted individuals. Many policies also insure reputational damages. However, VSV does not ensure reputation damage as a monetary value. What it can insure, under strict conditions, are approved crisis communication and PR mitigation costs following a proven insured fraud event, usually subject to a small sublimit, insurer consent, and immediate notification. Actual reputational value losses (goodwill, market share, share price) are systematically excluded. Reputation-related protection and repair usually pays for service providers like PR agencies, reputation management firms, and legal/media response coordination. However, there are caps on expenses, and the insurer must approve the provider before work starts. Insurance never includes goodwill compensation. Some policies also cover the costs of responding to regulators, communicating with public authorities, preparing executives for interviews, and operating customer- and investor-focused crisis hotlines. Typical exclusions that void a claim are reputational harm without a financial crime, known misconduct before the policy start, failure to implement internal controls, gross negligence, fines and penalties levied, market loss due solely to public opinion, and "expected" reputational consequences.

reality, it becomes challenging to restore, especially when individuals fail to acknowledge mistakes or offer sincere apologies. Cultural context also matters in how mistakes are handled. For example, in the U.S. and the U.K., people are often cautious about admitting fault because acknowledging an error can carry legal consequences. In many European countries, however, openly admitting a mistake may actually help resolve the issue more constructively, as the legal risks are generally lower.

In the U.S. and the U.K., leaders who acknowledge mistakes and take clear action to correct them often stand out as more credible and trustworthy, despite the lingering, sometimes irrational fear that admitting fault might increase exposure to liability. Demonstrating accountability not only reinforces integrity but also positions these leaders and their organizations as more desirable and resilient in the long run.

III. The Limits of Correction: Why Accuracy Is Not Enough

Correction is an important, but narrow, concept. It concerns only factual accuracy. When an error is discovered, in most (but not all) cases it is corrected. A newspaper prints a correction, a company issues a clarification, or a defamer posts a retraction. On paper, the record may appear "corrected." Yet the harm can often endure.

The problem lies in imbalance: the correction rarely matches the initial falsehood's reach or emotional impact. The first exposure to a false narrative carries disproportionate influence. Audiences form judgments instantly; retractions arrive later and quietly and are often unheeded.

Studies in cognitive psychology and media effects confirm that first impressions are "stickier" than later clarifications. Once a damaging idea embeds in public consciousness, subsequent corrections only

partially dislodge it. In an Alabama Law article, "The Credibility Effect: Defamation Law and Audiences,"[3] Yonathan A. Arbel argues that defamation law not only affects speakers and targets but also shapes how third parties perceive information. Through lab experiments, Arbel finds that defamation law increases public trust in media reports, a "credibility effect." While this trust is beneficial when reports are accurate, it can worsen the impact of falsehoods and stigmatize innocent individuals who choose not to sue. The study suggests courts should reconsider current legal balances and the assumption that defamation suits effectively combat misinformation.

Moreover, retractions are frequently viewed through a skeptical lens. They are self-serving, defensive, and often perceived as damage control rather than the objective truth. A corporate "mea culpa" or court-ordered statement lacks the independent authority of the original coverage, especially when that coverage came from a trusted news source. Thus, while correction may satisfy journalistic or legal obligations and is an important and necessary first step on the road to reputation recovery, it does not fulfill the moral, perceptual, or practical requirement of repair.

Finally, a proper correction must necessarily restate the original falsehood to amend it. Without repeating the error, there is nothing to anchor the clarification against, and the audience cannot understand what is being corrected. This creates a paradox: to fix misinformation, one must give it voice again. The correction, therefore, risks reinforcing the very claim it seeks to erase, illustrating the narrow and imperfect nature of factual repair.

"

Corrections fix the *record*; they do not fix *reputation*. The two are not equivalent.

---

[3] Yonathan A. Arbel, The Credibility Effect: Defamation Law and Audiences, 52 J. LEGAL Stud. 417 (2023)

IV. Repair: A Process, Not a Point in Time

Repair, in the professional sense, is an ongoing and multifaceted process designed to mitigate the effects of reputational harm, rebuild stakeholder confidence, and realign public perception over time. It is not about making the damage disappear; it is about managing the consequences of perception in a world where information is permanent, networked, and uncontrollable. A reputation repair program typically includes some of the following elements:

Data Assessment: A critical first step in any reputational repair effort is *acknowledging the situation as it stands, including the issue itself* and any failures, missteps, or shortcomings that contributed to or accelerated the reputational damage. This honest recognition establishes credibility and prevents further erosion of trust.

Once the situation is clearly admitted and defined, the next step is an assessment to identify the sources, scale, and substance of the reputational harm. This involves analyzing where the harm originated, how widely it has spread, and how it is being perceived. Tools may include content analysis, sentiment tracking, search-engine mapping, and comprehensive media monitoring to understand the factual record of the damage, not just the perception. The objective is to quantify the harm, identify patterns, and create a clear baseline from which recovery efforts can be measured.

People Assessment: A formal People Assessment[4] is generally not required in a

professional reputation repair program because practical repair efforts focus on objective, measurable harm rather than individual perceptions. Court-recognized and widely accepted professional methodologies emphasize factual indicators, including media coverage, search engine results, sentiment trends, and the reach and persistence of the false or damaging content, because these indicators provide a far more accurate and defensible picture of reputational impact.

While stakeholder interviews, surveys, or panel sessions may be incorporated in certain corporate or internal communications contexts, they can also be inefficient, intrusive, and in some cases counterproductive. These activities can unintentionally reignite negative attention or alert individuals who were previously unaware of the issue. Moreover, individual opinions do not change the public-facing digital narrative, which is typically the primary driver of reputational harm and the focus of remediation strategies. . For these reasons, the prevailing approach in professional settings is to rely primarily on data-driven analysis and strategic corrective actions rather than broad perception-gathering exercises, which are considered optional and sometimes unnecessary in establishing or repairing a reputation in a meaningful way.

Strategic Positioning and Messaging: It is important to develop a narrative framework that demonstrates integrity while introducing new, positive proof points. The message must be authentic, consistent, and aligned with stakeholder expectations. It does not need to address the issue at hand directly, as doing so could risk repeating or amplifying negative coverage. Instead, the strategy should aim to shift the debate, reframing the conversation toward constructive themes that reinforce credibility, purpose, and long-term value.

---

[4] A People Assessment is a process used in some communication or organizational contexts to gather direct feedback from individuals or stakeholder groups who may have been affected by an event, issue, or reputation-related incident. It typically involves one-on-one conversations, interviews, surveys, or panel discussions designed to understand how a situation has influenced people's perceptions, attitudes, emotions, and intentions. The goal of a People Assessment is to collect qualitative insights into what individuals think, how they feel, and how their views may have changed, so that this information can inform decision-making or communication strategies.

Digital Perception Management: An SEO strategy powered by evolving AI technologies can speed and strengthen content creation and digital engagement efforts. This can include analyzing search visibility, identifying negative narratives, and rapidly generating optimized content that outperforms harmful material. Making key spokespeople more visible across different forums—podcasts, social media, speaking engagements, and industry associations—can also significantly increase the supply of credible, verified, on-message content.

Earned Media Rehabilitation Rebuilding relationships with journalists, influencers, and professional peers to facilitate accurate, balanced coverage over time. This includes thought leadership, op-eds, and public visibility tied to credible third-party validation.

Paid Programmatic and Targeted Media Buy Program: Executing a paid media campaign might be advised, one that leverages programmatic advertising, audience segmentation, and retargeting to deliver positive messaging directly to key stakeholder groups. These efforts are designed for sustained impact (typically lasting a year or more) and are not a short-term fix. This long-term visibility ensures favorable narratives remain consistently present across digital platforms and search ecosystems, reinforcing and complementing ongoing earned and owned media efforts.

Behavioral and Organizational Proof: The most effective repair strategy is demonstrated behavior. No amount of messaging can overcome inconsistent or untrustworthy conduct, or perceived lack of transparency. A commitment to taking action and an openness to two-way dialogue are imperative. Day-to-day actions, leadership changes, philanthropy, community involvement, and consistent performance form the foundation of enduring repair.

Measurement and Reporting: Quantifying the progress of repair can be achieved through reputation tracking metrics, media sentiment analysis, search result improvements, and stakeholder surveys. Some programs use this information to adjust media buys and digital advertising strategies; however, this is purely an option and not always necessary. Repair is both an art and a science. The *art* lies in the experience and intuition of professionals who have managed and executed repair programs before, those who understand how tone, timing, and message alignment can restore credibility without relying solely on data. These practitioners can often sense reputational momentum and make course corrections through judgment, relationships, and context that numbers alone cannot capture. The *science* lies in measurement, the disciplined use of analytics to track sentiment, visibility, and impact over time. It is not necessary to use both to run an effective reputation recovery strategy.

Repair recognizes imperfection. It aims for better, not before. It accepts that, while total restoration may be impossible, meaningful improvement and mitigation are achievable over time, with investment and credibility.

V. The Psychology of Irreversibility: Memory and the "Scar Effect"

To understand why reputations cannot be fully "fixed," one must examine how humans process information. Once exposed to a claim, especially one emotionally charged, such as an allegation of dishonesty or misconduct, the brain encodes those details within a moral context. Even when later disproven, the emotional association lingers. Psychologists call this the [continued influence effect](#).[5]

This means that even after a correction or exoneration, audiences often continue to rely, consciously or subconsciously, on the initial misinformation.

---

[5] Kan et al. Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications (2021) 6:76
https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-021-00335-9

"

The "scar" persists in memory, influencing behavior, trust, and professional opportunity.

—

From a repair standpoint, this effect underscores why narrative reframing, not simple rebuttal, is required. The goal is to replace emotional associations with new, positive ones through repeated exposure to credibility-building content. This takes time, strategy, and consistency—factors incompatible with the notion of a quick "fix."

VI. The Digital Echo Effect: When Reach Is Unknowable

In traditional media, audience reach could be reasonably quantified: circulation, ratings, or subscriber lists. In the digital age, that certainty no longer exists. Online content spreads laterally and exponentially through popular AI chatbots, social networks, aggregators, syndicators, and algorithmic amplification. Even with sophisticated analytics, we can measure only *confirmed* reach—clicks, impressions, or shares within known datasets. The actual reach is unknowable.

Journalist, blogger, and certified Mental Health First Aid Counselor Tres Savage[6] has commented "the American public's tolerance for injurious journalistic mistakes in a digital age where a lie can travel halfway around the world while the truth is still working through two-factor authentication." He made his observations while detailing the Oklahoma Court of Civil Appeals' affirmation of a libel

verdict against the Gannett newspaper *The Oklahoman,* in a case where the newspaper falsely identified a former local football coach as the broadcast announcer who uttered a racial slur in a live broadcast.

This uncertainty profoundly shapes the strategy of reputational repair. Because one cannot know precisely how far the false or negative information traveled, campaigns must assume the widest plausible exposure. Targeting only those audiences confirmed to have seen the falsehood would leave countless others unaddressed—those who heard it indirectly, recall it vaguely, or encountered it through secondary commentary.

Therefore, reputation repair programs often seek to reach *more* people than the verified audience. This is not excess; it is a necessity. Repair must overcompensate for unknown propagation. It must reintroduce the repaired narrative across multiple touchpoints—search, social, professional, and media ecosystems—ensuring that new, positive content achieves saturation over time.

The most successful reputation repair campaigns often last well beyond a year. This is why true experts emphasize both the cost and the duration of genuine repair; it is not about simply matching numbers, but about outpacing memory. In today's digital environment, information does not fade; it accumulates. Harmful content remains searchable, shareable, and easily rediscovered long after the initial crisis has passed. Some actors may see real or perceived benefits in promoting or extending the lifespan of harmful content and seek to propagate that narrative to advance their own agendas. As a result, meaningful reputation repair demands persistence, creativity, and scale.

Sustained campaigns work not because they erase the past, but because they steadily build a stronger, more credible narrative that overshadows it. Over time, consistent positive visibility can change how people perceive a person or brand, rebalancing search results and public sentiment. The process is resource-intensive and requires ongoing monitoring, message discipline, and adaptive

---

[6] Tres Savage, "Affirming The Oklahoman Libeled Teacher, Appellate Court Would Cut $25 Million Damages to $7.5 Million," *NonDoc,* Oct. 2, 2025. https://nondoc.com/2025/10/02/affirming-the-oklahoman-libel-verdict-appellate-court-proposes-cutting-punitive-damages.

storytelling. Proper repair is a marathon, not a sprint, measured not in weeks or months, but in the gradual re-establishment of trust and credibility across audiences.

VII. The Fallacy of "Equal Correction"

In the case of defamatory content, some suggest that reputational harm can be undone if the correction appears on the same platform as the original defamation. This is a fundamental misunderstanding of how information spreads and endures. The original statement may have been amplified by dozens of secondary sources, syndicated newswires, blogs, and social media reports, each introducing its own audience. The retraction, however, rarely benefits from such viral diffusion.

Even when published in the same outlet, the correction is seldom seen by the same audience. Timing, placement, and interest fatigue all limit visibility. Moreover, as discussed earlier, readers interpret the two pieces differently: The initial story evokes curiosity and emotion; the correction feels procedural or perfunctory. One imprints, the other fades.

Thus, from a repair standpoint, "equal correction" is not achievable because there is no equivalence between harm and rectification in human perception. The objective is not to match the falsehood's reach, but to change the context in which the subject is perceived—over time, across diverse platforms, and through credible third-party reinforcement.

VIII. The Economics of Repair: Cost, Time, and Realistic Outcomes

Reputation repair is resource-intensive. It demands sustained effort across communication, operational, and often legal domains. The duration of a credible repair program can range from months to years, depending on the nature and scale of the harm. Each phase—diagnosis, messaging, visibility rebuilding, and

measurement—requires professional expertise and a significant financial investment.

Clients and courts often ask: "How long will it take?" or "Can a reputation ever be fully restored?" The honest answer is: *It depends, but it can never be made fully whole if it has spread on news sites and social media*. The harm may be mitigated, the narrative reframed, and the harmful content suppressed, but traces will remain. The client may one day find themselves in a better place overall, but the online record, once created, cannot be entirely erased. Indeed, with the right strategy and sustained effort, clients can regain lost ground but also emerge with a stronger narrative, enhanced credibility, and a future no longer overshadowed by the past.

This enduring residue is precisely why, particularly in the United States, damages are awarded in defamation cases. They recognize the economic and professional costs of reputational injury and the expense of undertaking partial repair. The process is not cosmetic; it is restorative in scope and grounded in both communications science and human psychology.

IX. Repair as Strategic Communication

Reputation repair operates as a communications strategy. The most sophisticated campaigns align narrative repair with demonstrable action. Messaging without behavior is dismissed as spin; behavior without narrative leaves progress invisible.

The reputationally harmed individual or organization must become the primary proof point of their own redemption. Transparency, accountability, and measurable contribution are the cornerstones of this approach. Over time, these behaviors generate third-party validation and, if the person or company is well-known, often earn media coverage, endorsements, and testimonials that reinforce the repaired narrative more credibly than any self-directed statement could.

Repair, therefore, is both *performative* and *substantive*. It requires consistent alignment between words and deeds. The absence of criticism does not measure success; instead, it is measured by the return of credibility among key stakeholders.

X. The Role of Time: Why Patience Is Integral to Repair

Time is an indispensable component of reputation repair. Unlike a correction in a traditional media outlet, which is instantaneous, repair unfolds gradually as new experiences, content, and behaviors overwrite older perceptions. The half-life of reputational damage is long; it cannot be shortened by decree or desire.

The passage of time allows for narrative maturation, in which public focus shifts, positive evidence accumulates, and the emotional weight of the original negative or defamatory material diminishes. In some cases, the best repair strategy includes deliberate pauses, strategic silence followed by controlled re-emergence, to allow the noise of controversy to subside before reintroduction of new messaging.

This temporal reality differentiates professional repair from reactive public relations. It acknowledges that rebuilding trust is not merely about exposure, but about endurance.

XI. Measuring the Immeasurable: Metrics in an Unknowable Environment

While the full extent of reputational harm may be unknowable, progress toward repair can be meaningfully assessed through relative indicators. Not all of these measures are required, but reputation professionals typically rely on a combination of the following tools:

- **Search Engine Results:** Improvements in search rankings and the ratio of positive to negative results.

- **Media Sentiment:** The balance of favorable versus unfavorable coverage and its trajectory over time.

- **Social Media Analytics:** Shifts in engagement tone, follower growth, and the amplification of positive narratives.

- **AI Summary Results:** Ensuring accuracy and timeliness of information being provided to user prompts and queries.

- **Stakeholder Perception Surveys:** Targeted assessments of sentiment among investors, clients, employees, or constituents.

- **Business Performance Metrics:** Evidence of restored opportunities, client retention, revenue recovery, or partnership renewals.

- **Narrative Analysis:** Tracking how recurring themes, key messages, or descriptive language evolve across articles, interviews, and commentary.

- **Influencer and Expert Commentary:** Monitoring tone shifts among analysts, journalists, or thought leaders with high credibility in relevant fields.

- **Crisis "Half-Life":** Measuring how long negative stories persist in public discourse before dissipating.

- **Benchmarking:** Comparing results against independent reputation indices (e.g., Edelman Trust Barometer) for external validation.

- **Share of positive vs. negative coverage** in the competitive or peer landscape

- **Wikipedia page stability and neutrality** (edit frequency, correction of vandalism)

These metrics do not measure "wholeness"; they measure trajectory. The question of whether a correction should restate the original error reflects a long-standing debate within journalism itself. Some editors, including those at major national publications, have historically advised avoiding repetition of the mistake to prevent reinforcing misinformation. Yet, as the *Columbia*

Journalism Review noted in a 2009 analysis, [The New York Times](#)[7] explicitly embraces restating the original error to clarify and account for it. This policy underscores the paradox of correction: Clarity requires context, even when that context risks briefly reviving the falsehood. A review of a [New York Times' corrections](#)[8] demonstrates this standard: One correction concerning Saudi Arabia's artificial intelligence initiatives clarified that DeepSeek was not using Aramco data[9] centers, while another corrected the century in which Paso Robles became a hot springs destination.[3] Each demonstrates that, even in the most responsible newsrooms, the act of correction necessitates revisiting the error, an unavoidable reminder that factual rectification alone cannot erase the memory or impact of misinformation.

XII. The Legal Nexus: Why "Repair" Is the Correct Standard

In US defamation and related areas of litigation,[10] experts are frequently asked whether a reputation can be "fixed." The correct professional answer is *no,* only repaired. As discussed, the term *repaired* aligns with the standard of mitigation: taking reasonable, proportionate steps to reduce harm. It is measurable, realistic, and consistent with best practices for communication professionals.

Courts and juries must understand that reputational harm, once inflicted, cannot be erased even with a retraction or correction. This is the foundation for a claim for compensatory damages. A repaired reputation may regain functionality, but never perfect harmony with its pre-harm state.

The use of the term *repaired* is therefore essential not only for professional accuracy but also for evidentiary integrity. It conveys the permanence of the damage while affirming the possibility and value of meaningful restoration through expert intervention.

XIII. The Reality of Enduring Impact

Even after sustained repair efforts, the individual or organization may continue to experience diminished opportunities. Employers, investors, and partners operate with a risk-averse mindset; the mere mention of controversy can disqualify an otherwise qualified candidate. Search results, archived content, and algorithmic resurfacing ensure that the digital echo persists indefinitely. As well, those same stakeholders will now hold the individual or organization on a "short leash" with little to no latitude for future missteps. With trust in short supply, it's imperative that a reputation repair program also put careful controls in place to avoid any further unforced errors. Even a minor issue can have an outsized impact in a low-trust, high-skepticism stakeholder landscape.

This is especially pronounced in high-trust sectors—finance, healthcare, education, and public service, where perceptions of integrity are inseparable from operational legitimacy. A

---

[7] Craig Silverman, "To Repeat or Not to Repeat," *Columbia Journalism Review*, July 27, 2009. https://www.cjr.org/behind_the_news/to_repeat_or_not_to_repeat_1.php

[8] Eric A. Taub, "5 Great Road Trips to Take in the Western U.S. This Fall," *The New York Times*, October 21, 2025. https://www.nytimes.com/2025/10/21/travel/fall-road-trips-foliage-western-us.html

[9] Adam Satariano and Paul Mozur, "Saudi Arabia's New Power Play Is Exporting A.I. to the World," *The New York Times*, October 27, 2025. https://www.nytimes.com/2025/10/27/technology/saudi-arabia-ai-exporter.html

[10] This discussion reflects a primarily U.S.-centric legal framework in which reputational harm, compensatory damages, and mitigation standards are well-developed components of civil litigation. The authors of this white paper are public relations practitioners and reputation experts from multiple jurisdictions around the world, and note that the concepts described in this section—particularly the litigation posture surrounding harm, repair, and evidentiary standards—may have limited or no direct analogue in many Nordic or Germanic legal systems, where defamation law, remedies, and procedural approaches differ significantly. The terminology and analysis presented here should therefore be understood within the context of U.S. legal norms,

even as the underlying communications principles remain globally applicable.

single false allegation, even corrected, can permanently alter professional trajectories.

Repair acknowledges this reality and adapts. It focuses not on erasure but on creating a new image in which the positive outweighs the negative and credibility, once lost, is progressively re-earned.

For those involved in reputation repair, we recognize that it is the process of restoring an individual's or organization's credibility, image, and trustworthiness after it has been damaged by negative publicity, defamation, misconduct, or other events that harm public perception.

It involves both strategic communication and tangible corrective actions to change the narrative and rebuild confidence among key audiences, such as customers, employees, investors, and the public.

XIV. Conclusion: Repair as a Philosophy of Realism

Reputation repair begins with a clear-eyed assessment of the situation. This stage involves identifying the source, scale, and nature of the damage, and analyzing media coverage, social media sentiment, and stakeholder reactions to fully understand how the issue took shape and where it has spread. Only by grasping the scope and drivers of the problem can an organization begin to formulate an effective path forward.

The next step is accountability and response. When appropriate, this means acknowledging mistakes honestly and transparently. In other cases, it may require correcting misinformation or refuting false claims through credible, fact-based communication. The goal is to demonstrate responsibility and control—showing that the organization neither avoids scrutiny nor allows inaccuracies to stand unchallenged.

Corrective action follows naturally, focusing on tangible steps to prevent recurrence and rebuild confidence. This could include policy reforms, leadership or structural changes, third-party audits, or other visible measures

that prove the organization has learned from the event and is committed to improvement.

A comprehensive communication strategy is essential throughout the process. Coordinated, transparent messaging across media, legal, and stakeholder channels ensures that the organization speaks with one voice. Consistency and credibility are key to reestablishing integrity and reshaping public perception over time.

Reputation management is not about perfection; it is about progress. To "repair" a reputation is to engage in a disciplined, evidence-based process of recovery that acknowledges both the limits of correction and the impossibility of total restoration.

"Fixed" implies wholeness; "corrected" means accuracy. Only "repaired" captures the nuanced, iterative, and enduring nature of reputational recovery in the internet age. It accepts that scars remain visible but insists that function and credibility can be restored.

In an era where misinformation travels farther and faster than truth, reputation repair demands humility, patience, and rigor. It is not an act of "routine" public relations—it is an act of reconstruction. The unknowable reach of harm dictates an expansive, proactive approach; the permanence of digital memory requires resilience; and the pursuit of trust demands authenticity.

"

Ultimately, reputation repair is not about rewriting history; it is about writing the next chapter with integrity, consistency, and proof.

A good start toward building lasting trust is to be honest, admit one's failures, and repair.

About the Authors

Eric W. Rose is a veteran executive in public relations, marketing, and communications with over 35 years of experience. He is a partner at EKA in Los Angeles, specializing in guiding clients through complex corporate reputation challenges and has assisted clients in navigating crises stemming from natural and human-made disasters, labor disputes, product recalls, layoffs, and plant closures.

Eric has distinguished himself in litigation, crisis communications, reputation management, image repair, and counseling. Eric has created public relations and marketing/communications programs for the legal profession and has provided litigation support throughout the United States. Eric has served as an expert information source and analyst for the mass media on crisis communications, image repair, and reputation management issues.

He is a respected court-qualified expert witness and has testified on matters relating to crisis communications, defamation, damaged image, reputation prevention, and the costs of implementing repair programs. He has provided expert testimony nationally on the costs and measures required to restore reputations. Eric has also been a rebuttal expert witness and excels in reputational repair and identifying and mitigating social media vulnerabilities.

Eric excels at distilling intricate legal matters into digestible, clear, and impactful narratives tailored to specific audiences. He also specializes in crafting communication strategies designed to navigate the litigation processes. His track record includes shaping narratives in high-profile cases, anticipating potential case outcomes, and effectively influencing key stakeholders to cultivate an environment conducive to the client's objectives.

Michael MacMillan is a seasoned communications strategist with 25 years of experience helping organizations navigate complexity, build trust, and lead with purpose. As Managing Director at PRA Communications, he focuses on the mining, metals, and minerals industry—advising clients at the intersection of innovation, reputation, and stakeholder engagement.

Throughout his career, Michael has shaped campaigns for Fortune 500 companies, startups, and government agencies. A former journalist, he brings a sharp eye for narrative and a steady hand to sensitive communications, from internal change initiatives to high-stakes media moments. His counsel spans strategic messaging, executive visibility, crisis and risk communications, and integrated content that moves people—and business—forward.

Before PRA, Michael held senior roles at two global communications agencies, where he led large, multidisciplinary teams—bringing together creative, government, crisis, and digital leads—and delivered award-winning work across media relations, thought leadership, and corporate reputation.

Rune Mørck Wergeland is an operational strategist with special emphasis on business consulting, crisis consulting and strategic analysis.

He has more than 20 years of experience as a consultant for Norwegian and international public and private companies. He has worked with transport, energy, technology, research and the public sector. Wergeland has previously held various positions in NRK, including as desk manager and crisis manager.

Rune is educated in communication and journalism, organizational psychology and decision management. He is widely used as a lecturer, and as a mentor for both top managers and those in the middle of their career. Wergeland also holds a number of board positions in and outside Norway.

Rainer Westermann specializes in Reputation Management, Leadership Communication, Crisis Communication and Litigation PR. He advised and represented many national as well as international clients through legal disputes, reputation risks and acute crisis situations. He is the principal of Westermann Advisors, a consultancy for management and communication.

Rainer has many years of experience as a consultant, entrepreneur, and corporate officer. He founded and managed Fleishman-Hillard Germany. Later, he moved to Canada with his family, where he built a successful corporate communications and investor relations practice for Fleishman-Hillard Canada. After that, he became a Member of the Management Board of LHS Group, a software company based in Atlanta, USA (NASDAQ: LHSG, Neuer Markt: LHI). Returning from the USA after LHS was sold, he took on the role of CEO of Burson-Marsteller in Germany. In 2004, he was named head of global communications for Infineon Technologies, a German DAX 30 corporation.

Rainer serves on the Executive Education Board of the Executive Education Center at the TUM School of Management and is also active as a lecturer in the EMBA program.

<u>About Reputation Advisors International</u>

Reputation Advisors International is a worldwide association of senior communications professionals with expertise in high-stakes issues related to reputation management, brand positioning, legal and regulatory communications, crisis planning and response, and related areas.

With members in 16 cities across the globe, Reputation Advisors International offers a community of high-level counselors who view effective reputation management as more than just crisis communications planning and response. Our members bring a range of experience and a depth of knowledge that benefits both members and their clients.

As leaders in small and mid-sized firms around the globe, member professionals have prior experience working in some of the largest public relations agencies worldwide, as well as in large corporations, major media outlets, and government.