Policy Uncertainty and Corporate Governance: How Firms Restructure Their Governance Strategies Under Policy Uncertainty

Yusuf Ahmed Al Binali
College of Business & Finance, Ahlia University, Bahrain.

ABSTRACT

Policy uncertainty has become a defining feature of the contemporary corporate environment. Elections, trade disputes, geopolitical realignments, and rapidly shifting regulatory regimes force firms across industries and geographies to reconsider how they govern themselves and how they manage relationships with employees, stakeholders, and the broader institutional environment. This paper examines how corporations restructure their governance strategies in response to policy uncertainty, with particular attention to the trust deficits that emerge within organizations during periods of regulatory volatility. Drawing on resource dependence theory, institutional theory, and agency theory, the paper traces how uncertainty affects corporate decision-making, board composition, risk governance, and internal communication structures. Real-world examples from firms operating under Brexit-related disruption, geopolitical trade tensions, and pandemic-era regulatory flux illustrate the mechanisms through which governance changes occur. The paper concludes with a set of practical advisories for workplace managers who must maintain functional, trust-based work environments even when the external policy landscape is unstable.

Keywords: Policy uncertainty, corporate governance, regulatory volatility, trust deficit, institutional theory, workplace management, governance reconfiguration

INTRODUCTION

Firms have always operated within a regulatory environment, but the nature of that environment has changed considerably over the past two decades. What was once a relatively stable backdrop of rules, expectations, and enforcement norms has given way to something much harder to predict. Trade agreements collapse and are renegotiated. Elections bring in governments that reverse the regulatory commitments of their predecessors. Geopolitical rivalries disrupt supply chains and force firms to reconsider long-standing international arrangements. Central banks and fiscal authorities shift their stances in ways that ripple through investment decisions across entire industries.

Baker, Bloom, and Davis (2016) constructed one of the most widely used empirical measures of policy uncertainty, the Economic Policy Uncertainty (EPU) Index, and their data showed that policy uncertainty had been rising over the long term and spiked dramatically during moments of political transition or crisis. Bloom (2009) had earlier documented the real economic costs of uncertainty shocks, showing that firms reduce hiring and capital expenditure when uncertainty is high and resume activity only once uncertainty resolves.

Against this backdrop, corporate governance, which is the system by which firms are directed and controlled, becomes both more important and more difficult. Governance structures are designed to manage relationships, allocate authority, and handle risk. When the external environment becomes

unpredictable, those structures come under pressure. Boards must make decisions with less information. Managers must communicate with employees who are anxious about what regulatory changes mean for their jobs, their benefits, and the future of the organization. Trust, which is foundational to organizational functioning, often suffers.

This paper takes up these issues in three movements. The first part examines the theoretical basis for understanding how firms respond to policy uncertainty at the governance level. The second part looks at specific real-world cases in which trust deficits emerged within organizations as a direct or indirect consequence of regulatory volatility. The third part offers a set of practical advisories for managers who are charged with maintaining healthy, productive work environments when external uncertainty threatens to erode the organizational trust on which those environments depend.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Three established theoretical perspectives help explain how and why firms restructure their governance when policy uncertainty rises. None of them alone captures the full picture, but together they give a reasonably full account of what happens inside organizations when the external regulatory environment becomes difficult to read.

Resource Dependence Theory

Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) argued that organizations are not autonomous entities; they depend on their external environments for the resources they need to survive. This dependency creates vulnerability, and firms attempt to manage that vulnerability by shaping their relationships with resource providers and, where possible, by influencing the regulatory conditions under which they operate. When policy uncertainty rises, the resource flows on which firms depend become harder to predict. Capital markets become jittery, suppliers reassess their terms, and customers defer spending decisions. Firms respond by adjusting their boundary-spanning mechanisms, including board composition, political lobbying activities, and strategic alliances, to better manage these dependencies under uncertain conditions.

From a resource dependence perspective, governance reconfiguration during periods of policy uncertainty is not simply a defensive reaction. It is an active strategy aimed at reducing vulnerability and maintaining access to critical resources. Bringing new board members with regulatory expertise or political connections, for example, is a direct response to the resource scarcity that regulatory uncertainty can create.

Institutional Theory

DiMaggio and Powell (1983) showed that organizations facing environmental uncertainty often look to each other for guidance on how to respond. Their concept of institutional isomorphism, the tendency of organizations to come to resemble one another within the same field, has particular relevance here. When new regulatory demands or policy uncertainties emerge, firms in the same industry often adopt similar governance responses, not necessarily because those responses are optimal, but because they are legitimate and reduce the risk of standing out.

North (1990) extended this thinking to the broader question of institutions and their role in economic life. North argued that institutions, understood as the formal rules and informal norms that structure human interaction, determine the constraints within which organizations operate. When institutions change rapidly or become contested, the constraints on firm behavior shift as well, and governance structures must adapt accordingly.

Agency Theory

Jensen and Meckling (1976) established the foundational framework of agency theory, which centers on the conflict of interest that arises when one party (the principal) delegates authority to another (the agent) who may act in self-interested ways that diverge from the principal's interests. In the context of corporate governance, shareholders are principals and managers are agents. Policy uncertainty complicates this relationship in several ways.

When the external environment is volatile, managers may have incentives to hoard information, avoid risky but value-creating investments, or delay decisions until uncertainty resolves. Shareholders, anticipating these tendencies, may demand stronger monitoring mechanisms, more frequent reporting, or changes in executive compensation structures. These dynamics play out at the governance level through changes in board oversight, audit practices, and risk management protocols.

Williamson (1985) added a transaction cost dimension to this analysis, arguing that uncertainty increases the cost of contracting and creates incentives for firms to internalize activities they might otherwise outsource. This internalization logic has implications for governance, as bringing more functions inside the firm requires more elaborate internal governance mechanisms to manage them.

POLICY UNCERTAINTY AND CORPORATE GOVERNANCE RECONFIGURATION

How do firms actually change their governance in response to policy uncertainty? The research literature and practical observation point to several interconnected mechanisms.

Board Composition and Advisory Structures

One of the most visible governance responses to policy uncertainty is the reshaping of boards and advisory councils. Faccio (2006) documented the prevalence of politically connected firms across a broad sample of countries, finding that firms with board members who had political ties enjoyed certain advantages when working through shifting regulatory environments. When policy uncertainty rises, the demand for that kind of expertise intensifies.

Firms facing volatile regulatory environments frequently add independent directors with backgrounds in government, law, or public policy. They establish government relations committees at the board level and create dedicated advisory groups charged with monitoring and interpreting regulatory developments. This is not window-dressing. It reflects a genuine recognition that governance structures built for stable regulatory conditions may be inadequate when those conditions change.

Risk Governance and Scenario Planning

Policy uncertainty forces firms to take risk governance more seriously. Gulen and Ion (2016) showed empirically that policy uncertainty is associated with significant declines in corporate investment, and that this relationship is strongest for firms whose investment opportunities are most sensitive to government policy. The governance implication is that risk identification and assessment must expand to incorporate regulatory scenarios that might previously have been treated as implausible.

In practical terms, this means that firms under policy uncertainty tend to develop more elaborate scenario planning processes, stress-test their business models against alternative regulatory outcomes, and revise their risk appetite statements to reflect the possibility of disruptive policy change. The risk committee of the board often takes on a more prominent role, and the Chief Risk Officer, where such a position exists, gains organizational standing.

Internal Communication and Organizational Transparency

Governance is not only about the relationship between firms and their external stakeholders. It is also about how authority and information flow inside organizations. When policy uncertainty is high, the internal governance challenge is considerable. Employees notice when senior leaders seem uncertain about the future. They observe hesitation in investment decisions, shifts in headcount, and changes in the way management talks about strategic priorities. These signals, even when unintentional, affect how employees perceive the organization's stability and their own place within it.

Julio and Yook (2012) found that corporate investment drops in the years of national elections, when policy uncertainty is particularly salient, suggesting that firms hold back not only from capital expenditure but also from strategic commitments more broadly. The internal governance challenge during these periods is to maintain organizational cohesion and employee engagement in the face of signals that might otherwise be read as signs of distress.

TRUST DEFICITS IN THE WORKPLACE UNDER POLICY UNCERTAINTY

The relationship between policy uncertainty and trust within organizations is one of the less examined but practically significant dimensions of this problem. Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) offered an integrative model of organizational trust that identified ability, benevolence, and integrity as the three core dimensions on which trust in organizational actors depends. Each of these dimensions comes under pressure when policy uncertainty is high.

How Trust Erodes

When organizations operate in volatile regulatory environments, leadership ability is tested in ways it ordinarily is not. A CEO who ran the business competently during a stable period may struggle to project the same competence when the rules are changing and outcomes are genuinely hard to predict. Employees read these signals carefully.

The benevolence dimension of trust also suffers. Employees tend to trust leaders who they believe have their interests at heart. Regulatory uncertainty often forces firms to make decisions, freezing hiring, delaying promotions, restructuring teams, that appear to signal a prioritization of survival over employee welfare. Even when these decisions are defensible on business grounds, they can be experienced as a betrayal of an implicit organizational compact.

Integrity, the third dimension in Mayer et al.'s framework, is perhaps most acutely affected. Integrity is tied to consistency between what leaders say and what they do. When policy uncertainty forces frequent pivots in strategy, communication, and resource allocation, leaders who made commitments in one regulatory environment may find those commitments hard to keep in a changed one. The gap between words and actions, even when it reflects genuine external pressure rather than bad faith, damages perceptions of integrity.

Dirks and Ferrin (2002), in their meta-analytic review of trust in leadership, found strong and consistent relationships between trust in leadership and key organizational outcomes including job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and intention to stay. The erosion of trust during periods of policy uncertainty is therefore not only a social problem within the firm; it is a performance problem with measurable consequences.

Specific Triggers of Workplace Trust Deficits

Several specific workplace dynamics tend to generate trust deficits during periods of policy uncertainty. These include:

- Inconsistent or delayed communication about how external regulatory changes will affect the firm and its employees. When management knows more than it shares, employees fill the information vacuum with speculation, which is usually more alarming than the actual situation.

- Sudden changes in governance structures or reporting lines that are presented as routine reorganizations but are clearly connected to external pressures. Employees are generally perceptive about when structural changes reflect genuine strategic logic and when they reflect crisis management.

- Changes in how risk and compliance functions are staffed or positioned. When firms rapidly expand risk and legal functions or bring in outside consultants to assess regulatory exposure, employees observe these changes and draw conclusions about the organization's vulnerability.

- Executive departures or significant changes in board composition that are not adequately explained. In environments of high policy uncertainty, these changes are often interpreted as signs of internal disagreement about how to respond to external threats.

- Differential treatment of employees across departments or regions that reflects the firm's attempt to insulate higher-priority operations from regulatory risk. Those in de-prioritized units notice their relative treatment.

REAL-WORLD CASES: TRUST DEFICITS AND GOVERNANCE RECONFIGURATION IN PRACTICE

Brexit and UK-Based Multinational Firms

The prolonged uncertainty surrounding the United Kingdom's exit from the European Union provided a sustained and well-documented case of regulatory volatility affecting corporate governance. Between the 2016 referendum and the eventual passage of the Withdrawal Agreement in early 2020, firms operating across the UK and EU faced years of genuine ambiguity about trade rules, staffing rights, data transfer protocols, and regulatory equivalence in financial services.

Several large UK-based financial institutions responded by relocating portions of their operations and workforce to EU jurisdictions, particularly Dublin, Amsterdam, Frankfurt, and Paris. These decisions, often announced incrementally, created significant trust problems within the affected organizations. Employees in London offices who were asked to transfer faced disruption to their personal lives, and those who were not offered the opportunity to move experienced the legitimate fear of redundancy. Management communication during this period was frequently criticized as evasive, partly because leaders genuinely did not know what the final regulatory outcome would be.

At the governance level, many UK firms added regulatory affairs positions to their boards or executive committees, established Brexit-specific scenario planning groups, and revised their risk disclosures substantially. These were rational responses to genuine uncertainty, but they also signaled to employees and markets alike that the organization was operating in genuinely uncertain territory.

US-China Trade Tensions and Multinational Supply Chains

The escalation of trade tensions between the United States and China from 2018 onward created a different kind of policy uncertainty for multinational firms with supply chains spanning both economies. Tariff changes, technology export controls, and entity list designations created an environment in which sourcing

decisions, investment commitments, and partnership arrangements could be rendered uneconomic or unlawful with limited warning.

Firms in sectors such as semiconductors, consumer electronics, and industrial machinery found their governance frameworks tested in new ways. Technology firms that had built close collaborative relationships with Chinese partners faced pressure from US regulatory authorities to restructure or terminate those relationships, while simultaneously facing commercial pressure to maintain them. Employees working in international partnership roles found their job functions challenged from multiple directions.

The trust deficit in this context often appeared between headquarters and regional operations. Employees in Asia-Pacific offices, particularly those with personal and professional networks in China, sometimes experienced a genuine misalignment between the strategic logic being communicated by headquarters and the commercial realities they were managing on the ground. This disconnect, which was ultimately a governance problem about how authority and information were being distributed, eroded trust in both directions.

Pandemic-Era Regulatory Flux

The COVID-19 pandemic generated an extraordinary volume of regulatory change over a compressed timeframe. Firms across every sector had to respond to workplace safety mandates, furlough schemes, emergency credit facilities, reporting requirements, and, later, vaccination and testing protocols, all of which shifted rapidly and sometimes inconsistently across jurisdictions.

The governance challenge was acute because the usual deliberative processes through which firms digest regulatory change were overwhelmed. Decisions that would ordinarily go through multiple committee reviews and legal assessments had to be made within days or hours. This speed was necessary but it created governance gaps. Employees in many organizations experienced the pandemic period as one in which the normal predictability of organizational life had been replaced by a flow of sudden announcements from senior management.

Trust deficits during this period were often most severe in organizations where management had not invested in strong communication infrastructure before the crisis. Firms with established practices of transparent, regular communication with employees fared better at maintaining trust than those where information had traditionally flowed on a need-to-know basis. The governance lesson from this episode is that communication practices are a governance issue, not merely an HR concern.

DISCUSSION

The cases reviewed above point to a set of patterns that recur across different kinds of policy uncertainty and different organizational contexts. It is worth drawing these together before moving to practical recommendations.

Governance reconfiguration in response to policy uncertainty is not a sign of organizational weakness. It is a normal and, in many cases, prudent response to a changed environment. The theoretical frameworks examined in Section 2 all predict that organizations will adjust their structures and strategies when environmental conditions shift. The question is not whether reconfiguration should happen but whether it happens in a thoughtful and coordinated way or as a series of reactive lurches.

What often gets underweighted in these governance discussions is the trust dimension. Corporate governance scholarship has historically focused on the relationship between firms and their external stakeholders, particularly shareholders and regulators. The internal dimension, how governance changes

affect the trust that employees place in their organizations and leaders, has received less systematic attention despite its clear operational significance.

The cases here also show that firms which communicate proactively, even when they cannot provide definitive answers, tend to manage trust better than those that go quiet or provide reassurances that subsequent events make look misleading. Transparency about uncertainty is itself a trust-building act, even if it is counterintuitive. Telling employees honestly that the organization is working through a difficult period and that certain things are not yet known is more trust-preserving than projecting a false confidence that events later contradict.

There is also a governance design point worth making. Firms that had invested in risk governance, scenario planning, and robust internal communication before the onset of policy uncertainty were better positioned to respond to it when it arrived. Governance is partly about managing current conditions and partly about building organizational capacities that will matter most precisely when conditions become difficult.

ADVISORIES FOR WORKPLACE MANAGERS

Workplace managers occupy a particularly demanding position during periods of policy uncertainty. They are not setting the governance agenda at the board level, but they are the primary interface between organizational strategy and employee experience. The following advisories are directed at managers who are trying to maintain trust, engagement, and performance in teams that are operating in an uncertain regulatory context.

Advisory 1: Be the Translator, Not the Amplifier

Managers receive information about policy changes and organizational responses from above. Their first and most important function is to translate that information into something meaningful and actionable for the people on their teams. This requires knowing the difference between translating and amplifying. Translating means taking a complex or ambiguous communication from senior leadership and rendering it in terms that employees can understand and work with. Amplifying means adding layers of anxiety or speculation that make the uncertainty worse.

In practical terms, this means that managers should prepare for team conversations by identifying the two or three things they can say with confidence, even if much remains uncertain. It also means being willing to say, clearly and without apology, that some things are not yet known but that the team will be told as soon as they are. This kind of honest framing is more trust-preserving than attempting to appear more certain than the situation warrants.

Advisory 2: Create Structured Channels for Employee Concerns

One of the most damaging dynamics during periods of policy uncertainty is the accumulation of unaddressed employee anxiety. When employees have concerns about how regulatory changes will affect their roles, their colleagues, or the organization's future, and they have no structured way to express or discuss those concerns, those concerns do not disappear. They circulate in informal networks, often in distorted form.

Managers can address this by creating regular, structured opportunities for employees to ask questions and express concerns. This does not require elaborate formal processes. It can be as simple as dedicating the last fifteen minutes of a weekly team meeting to an open Q and A about organizational developments. The key features are regularity, which prevents anxiety from building up between sessions, and genuine openness, which means managers must be willing to hear concerns they may find uncomfortable and respond to them honestly.

Advisory 3: Protect Team Routines and Rituals

When external uncertainty is high, the predictability and stability that exists within the team becomes unusually valuable. Research on organizational resilience consistently finds that teams with strong internal routines and relational cohesion are better able to maintain performance under pressure than those that are loosely organized. Managers can deliberately protect and reinforce the routines, both work-related and social, that give their teams a sense of normalcy.

This is a counterintuitive advisory in environments where the pressure to respond to external changes can make routine feel like a luxury. But maintaining the team meeting schedule, honoring the feedback cycles employees expect, and continuing the informal social interactions that build connection all serve the practical purpose of signaling that the team's foundations are intact even if the environment around them is not.

Advisory 4: Be Alert to Differential Impact

Policy uncertainty rarely affects all employees equally. Regulatory changes related to trade, immigration, taxation, or sector-specific compliance often have very different implications for different employees depending on their function, their nationality, their tenure, or their role in the organization's current strategic priorities. Managers who are aware of these differentials can address them directly rather than allowing employees who feel most exposed to feel invisible.

This means that managers should, where possible, have individual conversations with team members who are likely to be disproportionately affected by regulatory uncertainty, rather than relying solely on group communications. A team member who faces visa uncertainty because of a changed immigration policy, for example, needs a different kind of conversation than one who is unaffected. Treating all employees as if they experience uncertainty in the same way can itself become a source of trust deficit.

Advisory 5: Model Epistemic Honesty

Dirks and Ferrin (2002) identified integrity, the alignment between what leaders say and what they do, as a central pillar of trust in leadership. In conditions of genuine uncertainty, one of the most powerful things a manager can do to protect their integrity is to be openly honest about the limits of what they know. This sounds simple, but it runs against the grain of managerial cultures that reward confidence and decisiveness.

Epistemic honesty means distinguishing clearly between what is known, what is uncertain but probable, and what is genuinely unknown. It means not foreclosing questions by projecting a certainty that the situation does not support. And it means being willing to come back to employees and revise earlier assessments when new information arrives, without treating that revision as an embarrassment. Managers who model this kind of honesty build the kind of trust that survives difficult periods because it is built on something real.

Advisory 6: Align Upward to Improve Information Flow

Managers are positioned between senior leadership and their teams, and one of the most valuable things they can do during periods of policy uncertainty is to actively work to improve the flow of information in both directions. Upward, this means surfacing the specific concerns, questions, and morale indicators from their teams to senior management with enough specificity to be actionable. Downward, it means advocating within the organization for the communication clarity and frequency that their teams need.

In organizations where senior leaders are focused on the external regulatory challenge, the internal communication dimension can easily be neglected. Middle managers who see this happening and who

have the organizational standing and judgment to raise it constructively provide a genuinely important governance function, even if that function is not formally labeled as such.

PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ADVISORIES

Advisories are only as useful as the implementation practices that bring them to life. The following section translates each of the advisories above into concrete, step-by-step practices that managers can adopt within their organizations.

Implementing the Translator Role

Before any all-hands communication or team meeting that will involve discussion of regulatory or policy-related uncertainty, managers should write out a simple three-column summary for their own reference: what is confirmed, what is uncertain but likely, and what is genuinely unknown. This preparation discipline prevents the tendency to either over-reassure (by treating uncertain things as confirmed) or over-alarm (by treating uncertain things as inevitably negative). Sharing this framework explicitly with employees, by using the same three categories in spoken communication, helps employees develop a more calibrated understanding of the organization's situation.

Structuring Employee Concern Channels

Managers should establish a standing agenda item in weekly or biweekly team meetings titled something like 'Questions about where we are' or 'What are you hearing?' The item should have a fixed time allocation (fifteen to twenty minutes is generally sufficient), be run without defensiveness, and generate a written log of questions and the manager's responses, which is then circulated to the team. Questions that cannot be answered immediately should be tracked and followed up on within a defined timeframe, typically three to five business days.

Protecting Team Routines

Managers should audit their current team routines, including regular meetings, feedback cycles, recognition practices, and social interactions, and make a deliberate decision about which of these to protect as non-negotiable during periods of organizational turbulence. The audit should result in a short list of three to five practices that will be maintained regardless of external pressure. This list should be communicated to the team, not as a grand gesture but as a matter-of-fact signal that the manager is paying attention to team cohesion.

Addressing Differential Impact

Managers should map their teams against the specific regulatory or policy changes that are creating uncertainty, identifying which team members are likely to be most affected. For each highly affected individual, the manager should schedule a one-on-one conversation that acknowledges the specific nature of their situation, explains what the organization knows and is doing, and invites the employee to share their concerns. These conversations should be documented in a brief note to ensure follow-through, and should be revisited as new information becomes available. The mapping exercise itself, the deliberate act of thinking through differential impact, will often surface considerations that managers would otherwise miss.

Modeling Epistemic Honesty in Practice

Managers should develop a personal vocabulary for acknowledging uncertainty that feels natural and authoritative rather than hesitant. Phrases like 'What I know for certain is X, and what I cannot tell you yet is Y' or 'My best current read is X, but I want to be clear that this could change if Z happens' normalize uncertainty without making it seem overwhelming. Managers should also practice recovering from

situations where they communicated something that later proved to be incorrect, not with excessive self-criticism, but with a straightforward acknowledgment of what changed and why the earlier assessment was wrong.

Aligning Upward

Managers should compile a monthly summary of the trust-related concerns they are hearing from their teams and share this with their own managers as a routine report rather than an alarm signal. The framing matters: this is not a complaint register but an organizational intelligence input. Managers who develop this habit create a feedback loop that benefits senior leadership and demonstrates their own commitment to organizational health. Over time, this practice can shift organizational culture around communication, from one where bad news is managed silently to one where it is surfaced and addressed.

CONCLUSION

Policy uncertainty is not a temporary or exceptional condition. It is, for firms operating in global markets with complex regulatory exposures, an ongoing feature of the business environment. The question for corporate governance is not how to wait it out but how to build structures and practices that remain functional under conditions of sustained ambiguity.

This paper has argued, drawing on resource dependence theory, institutional theory, and agency theory, that firms characteristically respond to policy uncertainty by reconfiguring their governance structures: adjusting board composition, strengthening risk governance, and revising internal communication practices. These responses are rational and, in many cases, necessary. But they carry costs at the organizational trust level that are often inadequately managed.

The real-world cases examined here, from Brexit-driven relocations to pandemic-era regulatory flux, illustrate the mechanisms through which trust deficits emerge when policy uncertainty forces governance changes that employees experience as unsettling. Trust, as Mayer et al. (1995) showed, depends on perceived ability, benevolence, and integrity, and all three dimensions are vulnerable under conditions of genuine uncertainty.

The advisories offered for workplace managers are grounded in this analysis. They ask managers to be honest translators rather than reassurance machines, to create structured channels for employee concerns, to protect the team routines that provide stability within turbulence, to attend to differential impact with individual sensitivity, to model epistemic honesty as an organizational value, and to align upward to improve the quality of information flowing through the organization.

None of these advisories require organizational authority beyond what most managers already possess. They require attention, discipline, and a willingness to treat communication and trust as operational priorities rather than soft skills. In conditions where the external regulatory environment is unpredictable, the ability of managers to maintain the internal environment of trust and functioning becomes one of the most consequential governance capabilities an organization can have.

REFERENCES

Baker, S. R., Bloom, N., & Davis, S. J. (2016). Measuring economic policy uncertainty. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(4), 1593–1636. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjw024

Bloom, N. (2009). The impact of uncertainty shocks. *Econometrica*, 77(3), 623–685. https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA6248

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611–628. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611

Faccio, M. (2006). Politically connected firms. *American Economic Review*, 96(1), 369–386. https://doi.org/10.1257/000282806776157704

Gulen, H., & Ion, M. (2016). Policy uncertainty and corporate investment. *Review of Financial Studies*, 29(3), 523–564. https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhv050

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305–360. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(76)90026-X

Julio, B., & Yook, Y. (2012). Political uncertainty and corporate investment cycles. *Journal of Finance*, 67(1), 45–71. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.2011.01707.x

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

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Harper & Row.

Williamson, O. E. (1985). *The economic institutions of capitalism*. Free Press.