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HOW DO LEADERS REPAIR TRUST? AN EXAMINATION OF TRUST REPAIR DURING THE UK EXPENSES SCANDAL

“The scams are bad enough. Worse is the total absence of any repentance. [The MPs] have had weeks to consider how they would answer public revulsion when they were caught with their hands in the voters’ pockets. What was required was a display of contrition. Yet the collective response has been to try to brazen it out”. Andrew Rawnsley, political commentator, The Observer, May 10 2009.

For decades the importance of trust in leadership has been emphasised (Bowler & Karp, 2004; Burke, Sims, Lazzara, & Salas, 2007; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Liu, Siu, & Shi, 2010). Trust is central to effective leadership and understanding how to build and repair trust is considered a “critical management competency” (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Yet little empirical research has examined how leaders repair trust once it is broken (Dirks, Lewicki & Zaheer, 2009). The few trust repair studies conducted to date have been experimental in nature using undergraduate students and have de-contextualised the trust breach and repair process (Gillespie & Dietz, 2009).

This paper examines trust repair strategies of leaders in the context of the 2009 UK Parliamentary expenses scandal. On the 8th May 2009, the Daily Telegraph newspaper in Britain began publishing accounts of how hundreds of the 646 British members of parliament (hereafter ‘MPs’) in the lower chamber of the British legislature (the ‘House of Commons’) had abused the privileges of their expenses system. Some had done so in ways that were criminal (e.g. deliberate fraud; tax evasion); many had willfully violated the spirit of the system’s regulations to engage in deliberate profiteering; while others had been guilty of crass or unfortunate administrative errors. About a third of MPs, in the words of the Daily Telegraph investigation, were ‘saintly’. This major political scandal resulted in a loss of public trust in politicians (Ross, 2010) with MPs now the professional group that the British people most mistrust (Wozniak, 2010). Political scandals of this magnitude not only undermine constituents’ trust in the individual politicians involved but also have a corrosive influence on constituents’ attitudes towards political institutions and the political process (Bowler, 2004).

The primary aims of this study are to: (1) Identify the types and sequencing of trust repair strategies used by leaders in the field, by exploring MPs responses to the UK expenses scandal, and (2) examine whether the severity of the transgression influenced the choice of trust repair response. The
paper contributes to the existing literature by providing insights into the range, types and sequencing of trust repair strategies used by leaders in real-life situations, and deepening understanding of when and why various trust responses are employed. The findings also contribute to our understanding of the role of power in trust transgressions and trust repair as well as informs the broader debate about how to revitalize public confidence in politicians.

UK Expenses Scandal

The UK Expenses Scandal shook the public’s confidence in British MPs and continues to appear on the front pages of British newspapers. The scandal broke in May 2009 when the Daily Telegraph newspaper in Britain began publishing accounts of how hundreds of the 646 British members of parliament had abused the privileges of their expenses system (Allen & Winnett, 2009). The majority of the abuses stemmed from the use of the additional costs allowance (ACA). Under Parliament rules, the ACA entitles MPs to claim the costs associated with renting or owning a home (e.g. mortgage repayments) in London for Parliamentary duties, as well as costs of certain household items for that property (e.g. utility bills, essential maintenance and repair, etc.), while personal items are to be exempt (Treasury, 2003). MPs can claim up to £23,083 for the expenses incurred (Rayner, 2009). When making claims, MPs are subject to the nine Green Book Principles regardless of their position in parliament (see Appendix A). Many MPs were accused of taking advantage of their allowance to maximize their financial gain by regularly flipping (e.g. selling their houses or changing their designated second homes), while others violated their privileges so severely that it lead to criminal charges (Colville, 2009). The Daily Telegraph reported that at least half of the MPs transgressed to some degree (Winnett et al., 2009).

We examine the UK expense scandal for several reasons. First, the scandal encapsulated key elements of trust identified in the literature, such as vulnerability and risk and led to a documented decline in the public’s trust in their political leaders. Second, the trust repair responses of the MPs were detailed extensively in British newspapers. Third, a quasi-experimental design is naturally occurring with a sample size of 646 MPs all subject to the same context and rules, yet demonstrating considerable variation in the severity of the transgression and trust repair responses. This enables
sufficient power for rigorous statistical analysis. In the next section, we define trust and review the literature on trust repair. We then set out a number of hypotheses which we test in this study.

**Defining Trust and Trust Repair**

Trust is defined by Rousseau, Sitkin, Burke & Camerer (2005) as “a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another” (p.395). Trust begins with the evaluator amassing a set of beliefs about the other party’s trustworthiness, based on assessments of that party’s *ability* (i.e. their competence to carry out a task), *benevolence* (i.e. whether the person being trusted has benign motives), and *integrity* (i.e. compliance to a set of principles valued by the trustor, such as honesty and fairness). This then leads to the “willingness to be vulnerable” to the trustworthy party, implying there is something important at stake should trust be broken. Indeed, it is commonly understood that risk is a necessary element of trust.

**Theoretical Perspectives on Trust Repair**

Dirks, Lewicki & Zaheer (2009) recently identified three different theoretical processes for understanding trust repair: *attributional*, *social equilibrium* and *structural*. Each of the three theoretical processes contains different implications and assumptions in regards to trust repair strategies. These three perspectives can be used in isolation or in combination. *The Attributional Approach*: Attribution theory explains how and why people explain events (Hewstone, 1983; Kelley & Michela, 1980). When a trust violation occurs, it changes the victims attributions of the actor’s behaviour from positive to negative (Kramer & Lewicki, 2010). From this perspective, trust repair focuses on restoring these attributions back to positive (Tomlinson & Mayer, 2009). Kim et al., (2009) developed a bilateral model based on attribution theory, to explain that both the trustee and the trustor play a significant role in repairing trust. The trustor – in our case, the British taxpayer – sets the threshold for acceptable trust repair, which the transgressor is obliged to satisfy. In their model, they identify three means of trust repair: 1) identification of innocence or guilt (where the trustee uses language to persuade the trustor to view them as not guilty, and hence facilitate trust restoration), 2) placing blame on internal factors (personal attributes that one can control) or external factors.
(situational factors i.e. politician casting the blame on a faulty expense system), and 3) attempting to
minimise the problem and convince the trustor that this type of transgression will not happen again
(e.g. minimizing the initial trust failure or fixing the consequences of the failure). Trust repair is much
easier if the violator can convince the trustor that they were innocent, or that the failure was due to
external factors beyond their control, and that failure is fixable and preventable in the future.

Social Equilibrium Approach: A trust transgression creates a social disequilibrium in the
relationship (Dirks et al., 2009). In order to repair the relationship, norms of equilibrium need to be
re-established back into the relationship. In an effort to restore equilibrium in the relationship,
vilators of trust can engage in social rituals such as, penance, denials and apologies. The magnitude
of the penance offered should be reflective of the magnitude of the transgression. Structural
Approaches: This approach focuses on using structures and organizational systems to regain trust and
prevent future trust violations (Dirks et al., 2009). The breakdown in positive exchanges and increase
in negative exchanges can be remedied by changes in the structural environment of the relationship
(Kramer & Lewicki, 2010). These mechanisms include correcting the faults in the system that
enabled the trust failure to occur (e.g. aberrant cultural norms, structure and processes and
management practices; Gillespie & Dietz, 2009) and using regulation and punishment of the
transgressor to increase trust after a violation. Tactics include; legalistic remedies, incentives and
social structures, which enforce punishments (demoted, fired, loss of membership status) on anyone
who engages in untrustworthy behaviour (i.e. demoted, fired, membership, status). These forms of
punishment send out a clear signal that untrustworthy behaviour is unacceptable and will not be
tolerated (Gillespie & Dietz, 2009). Regulatory mechanisms are particularly effective when they are
made voluntarily as it signals acknowledgement of the trust violation and commitment to act
differently (Sharpiro, 1987).

Empirical Research on Trust Repair Responses

There is a small emerging literature, empirically examining the effects of different trust repair
tactics on the violated party’s willingness to reconcile and even forgive. However these studies are
largely lab experiments (Gillespie & Dietz, 2009). The trust repair approaches can be divided into verbal and substantive responses. Five main verbal responses have been researched to date including apologies (responsibility for the transgression is admitted, normally accompanied with a statement of regret); denials (culpability is rejected outright, or blame is attributed elsewhere); excuses (responsibility is conceded, but in part, as mitigating circumstances are cited to account for the transgression); justifications (again, the transgression is acknowledged but the conduct leading to it is appraised as legitimate, and/or the transgression’s outcomes are reframed in a positive light) and, finally, reticence (saying nothing; adopting a ‘no comment’ stance).

Prior literature suggests that the nature of the trust transgression influences the effectiveness of the trust repair response (Bottom, Gibson, Daniels, & Murnighan, 2002; Dirks, Kim, Cooper, & Ferrin, 2005). A key finding is that apologies are more effective for competence-type violations, while denial is more effective for integrity-type failures (Kim, Ferrin, Cooper, & Dirks, 2004). In the UK expenses scandal, the Telegraph and other newspapers have portrayed the majority of transgressions as integrity rather than competence failures. Yet some of the transgressions were very serious (e.g. criminal) whereas others were more minor. To date, research has not examined how the severity of the transgression influences the choice of trust repair. We expect that MPs accused of more serious allegations that pose a higher threat to their reputation and position, will be more likely to choose defensive strategies such as denials and justifications over other responses, in an attempt to protect themselves. In contrast, when MPs are accused of relatively minor transgressions that pose less threat to their reputation and position, they will be more willing to accept responsibility for their transgressions and attempt to restore trust via ‘social equilibrium’ mechanisms such as apologies and displays of genuine contrition.

**Hypothesis 1:** MPs accused of serious transgressions will more likely than MPs accused of less serious transgressions to use a) justifications, b) denials and c) a defiant tone.

**Hypothesis 2:** MPs accused of less serious transgression will more likely than MPs accused of more serious transgressions to a) apologise and b) convey a contrite tone.

As noted in the above hypotheses, we also examine the emotional tone of the response, based on the view that the emotion conveyed during trust repair attempts may be just as important as the
type of trust repair strategy used. The emotional tone of a response conveys information about the sincerity and depth of emotions felt by the violator. We expect that tone of response will go hand-in-hand with the type of trust repair strategy used. For example, when an apology is offered, we expect that the offender will use a contrite tone in conveying their apology, while denials will use a more defiant tone.

In contrast to verbal responses, fewer studies have focused on substantive actions than verbal strategies. Substantive actions are tangible offers of penance, “hostage posting” and forms of regulation and punishment on the transgressor (Dirks et al., 2005). “Hostage posting” refers to when something of value to the potential violator are surrendered as a “hostage”, such that if the agreement is violated, then the transgressor loses their valued “hostage” and has found that people who demonstrate voluntary hostage posting raised participants’ perceptions of the trustworthiness, whereas involuntary hostage posting did not result in more positive evaluations. (Nakayachi & Watabe, 2005). While acts of penance, is a form of compensation or restitution in response to a trust violation (Bottom et al., 2002).

Acts of penance in the UK expenses scandal could take the form of repaying monetary amounts and/or resignation. A number of MPs either voluntarily stepped down from their parliamentary duties, while others were forced to step down for the greater good of the party as their negative reputation in the public may harm the party. In the context of the UK expenses scandal, the more serious the transgression, the more media coverage and emphasis on those specific MPs. For example, the Telegraph covered the most outrageous claims and expenses more extensively, then MPs who only had minor claims. Due to the immense media coverage, it is expected that MPs accused of more serious transgressions will more likely to either voluntarily resign or be forced to resign because the shame, reputation damage and embarrassment of their transgression makes their position untenable. Their reputation will be so severely harmed that it would make it difficult to stand for re-election successfully. Thus, the following hypothesis is made:

Hypothesis 3: MPs accused of serious transgressions will be more likely to resign than MPs accused of minor transgressions.
When a person commits a transgression, remedial work often takes place (Goffman, 1972). Remedial work usually involves a sequence of verbal moves used to restore equilibrium back into the relationship (Holtgraves, 1989). Bottom et al. (2002) found that apologies paired with penance were more effective than apologies alone. In line with this perspective, we suggest a single response will rarely be sufficient to restore trust in the context of the MP expenses scandal – rather multiple responses combining both verbal and substantive responses will typically be required. Yet most empirical literature to date has focused on singular response in a lab setting and has failed to consider multiple responses or the sequencing of responses. A key aim of this study was to examine the combination and sequencing of responses in a naturalistic setting.

In this study, we introduce the concept of the ‘congruence’ of the trust repair strategies and sequencing. When multiple trust repair strategies are used, they can be classified as congruent or incongruent based on the inherent logic of the response sequence. An example of a congruent strategy is a series of conciliatory responses that acknowledge responsibility for the trust breach, followed by an apology, then penance. An example of an incongruent strategy is a mix of defiant then conciliatory responses, such as a clear denial of the transgression, followed by an admission of guilt and finally acknowledgement and apology. We hypothesize that the severity of the transgression will impact on the congruence of an MP’s response. In line with the prior arguments made for H1, we expect that the greater the severity of the transgression, the more likely the MP will use a defiant has transgressed to a larger degree, they may have more to hide and are more likely to use an incongruent response as a tactic or strategy to try and cover up their wrongdoing. Essentially, the MP is using a variety of strategies to try to mislead the public into believing that they are innocent. Thus, the following hypothesis is made:

**Hypothesis 4:** MPs accused of serious transgressions will be more likely to use incongruent responses rather than a congruent response, whereas MPs accused of minor transgressions will more likely use a congruent response rather than an incongruent response.

**METHOD**

**Data Collection Protocol**
Demographic and background data on the MPs from the UK Fees Office was published by the *Telegraph*. The following information on each MP was obtained: age; gender; party, role in their political party (e.g. Party Leader, Junior Ministers, Opposition Shadow Spokesperson, and Backbencher); tenure, size of parliamentary majority (seat safety); the distance of their constituency from Parliament; and their total ‘ACA’ expenses claim for 2007-2008. Of the 646 MPs, a random sample of 200 MPs was selected for data coding. Analysis comparing the demographic profile of the random sample with the total MP population revealed that the sample was highly representative. The only notable deviation was that MPs in the selected sample held slightly more senior roles than the total population (17% vs. 9%). As expected, the majority of the sample represented the incumbent government at the time (Labor Party, 57%), followed by the Conservatives (26%), and the majority of MPs were backbenchers (129, 65%). MPs were typically male (85%), on average of 55 years of age (range 30-79), had a seat tenure of 12 years and held safe seats (64%).

**Data Coding: Trust Repair Responses, Tone and Congruence of Responses**

All newspaper articles published in ‘*The Telegraph*’ newspaper between February 2009 and December 2010 related to the expenses scandal and each selected MP were downloaded and coded for information on the nature of the transgression and the MPs trust repair responses. The NVivo Qualitative Software package was used to facilitate the organization and coding of the data. The *Telegraph* newspaper was chosen because it was the first newspaper to gain access to the original data from the fees office. The *Telegraph* Complete Expenses Guide was also used as an additional source of information on the transgressions of each MP.

Trust repair responses were coded in terms of: (a) type of trust repair response, (b) emotional tone of response, and (c) congruence of sequence of responses. An initial table of all possible trust repair responses was collated from the existing literature and expanded throughout the coding process. The final coding protocol is shown in Appendix B. Apology was broken down into three subcategories: (a) personal expression of remorse, (b) admission of personal responsibility, and (c) using direct words to apologize (e.g. “I’m sorry). As discussed in the literature review, many scholars view an apology to have these components. The idea behind separating these elements was to explore whether an apology always encompasses these three components or whether some components are
used more than others. Denial was redefined into two categories: ‘denial of behavior’: that is, denying engaging in the transgression, and ‘denial of wrongdoing’ that is, acknowledging the act but denying that it was wrong. Voluntary resignation referred to MP’s voluntarily stepping down from Parliament on their own account. Involuntary resignation occurred when an MP was forced to resign for the greater good of the party.

Based on preliminary analysis of the data, the emotional tone of response was broken down into three categories: (1) Defiance represented responses which were defensive, hostile, aggressive or indignant, (2) Neutral represented no or limited emotional expression, (3) Contrition represented responses that were remorseful, apologetic, regretful or conveyed shame. It is acknowledged that coder subjectivity may have influenced the coding of tone of response. Finally, MPs that employed multiple trust repair response strategies were coded for the internal coherence or congruence of the responses.

RESULTS

Descriptives

A frequency analysis (see Table 1) was run to determine the number and type of trust repair responses used. On average, MPs used three different types of trust repair responses, with a range from one to nine. Justifications (73%) were clearly the most frequently used trust repair response, followed by acts of penance (37%) and resignation (30%). Noteworthy is that excuses, acknowledgement and denials were used more frequently than apologies, which were only offered by 24% of MPs coded. Almost all MPs (93%) violated one or more of the Green Book Principles (see Appendix A).

Association between Trust Repair Responses

Kendall correlations between the trust repair responses (see Table 2) reveals that Acknowledgement was significantly associated with several other trust repair responses including apology (r=.36), support for regulation (r=.32), resignation (r=.18), acts of penance (r=.17), and transparency (r=.15) and negatively associated with justification (r=-.15). This indicates that acknowledgement is often used in combination with other conciliatory trust repair responses and less
likely to be used with a justification. Apologies were positively correlated with acts of penance but negatively correlated with excuses.

**Sequence and Tone of Trust Repair Responses**

Analysis of the order in which trust responses were used (e.g. first, second or third response) revealed an interesting pattern. As shown in Table 1 defiant type responses were typically used by MPs initially including justifications, denials, use of a spokesperson, attempts to recast attributions and reticence. That is, when MPs used these responses, they were most frequently used as a first response. Similarly, when more neutral strategies such as acknowledgement of the accusation and transparency were used, they were most frequently used as a first response. In contrast, the more contrite responses of apology, resignation, acts of penance and support for regulation were more frequently used as a later response. This trend suggests that MPs frequently tried to avoid acceptance of the allegations initially by using justifications, denials, reticence and spokespersons. It was only after attempting these strategies that most MPs then progressed to use more conciliatory and contrite responses, such as apology, resignation and acts of penance, perhaps as a last resort.

**Tests of Association between Transgression Severity and Trust Repair Response.**

Table 2 shows the Kendall’s correlation coefficient between severity of the transgression and each trust repair response. There was a small positive correlation between severity and denial ($r=.16$) and apology ($r=.11$) suggesting that the more serious the transgression, the more likely MPs were to use denials or apologies. In support of hypothesis 2, a Chi-square test for independence indicated a significant association between severity of transgression and use of denial, $\chi^2 (2, N=200) = 11.16$, $p < .01$. Kendall’s tau = .19, $p<.01$ indicated that there was a small positive effect, indicating that MPs accused of more serious transgressions were significantly more likely to use denial, than those accused of less serious transgressions. Contrary to hypotheses 1, 2 and 3, Chi-square tests for independence indicated no significant associations between severity of transgression and resignation, use of justification or apology.

In support of hypothesis 2, a Chi-square test for independence indicated a significant association between severity of transgression and tone of response, $\chi^2 (2, N=200) =7.89$, $p < .05$. 
Kendall’s tau = .17, p<.05 indicated a small effect showing that MPs accused of more serious transgressions were significantly more likely to convey a defiant emotional tone in their response than a contrite or neutral response, compared to MPs accused of less serious transgressions. Twelve percent of MPs coded used an incongruence response. A Chi-square test was conducted to test hypothesis 4 that MPs accused of more serious transgressions were more likely to use an incongruent sequence of trust repair responses, than a congruent sequence. This hypothesis was supported, \( \chi^2 (2, N=200) = 6.25, p < .05 \). Kendall’s Tau = .15, p<.05 indicated that this was a small effect size. Spearman correlation was .16, p<.05.

**DISCUSSION**

There were three key findings in this study. 1) Justifications were the most widely used trust repair responses, and denials were more frequently used than apologies, 2) Most MPs used an average of three trust repair responses, 3) MPs tended to use an incongruent sequence of responses rather than a congruent sequence of responses, 4) MPs accused of more serious transgressions were significantly more likely to use denial, convey a defiant emotional tone and use an incongruent sequence of trust repair responses, than those accused of less serious transgressions. The distinct trend suggests that the more serious the transgression, the more MPs try to deny or be defiant in their response – at least as a first response.

Our findings further contribute by broadening the research on the range of trust repair strategies. Three new trust repair responses were identified: transparency, resignation and spokesperson. Transparency was found on two levels: past transparency (making past expenses claims available), and future transparency (making future expense claims available). Spokesperson was discovered and deemed different from ‘support from social network’ because it offers a general statement on behalf of all MPs in the party, rather than a personal statement about a specific MP. Resignations were found on two levels: voluntary resignation (stepping down from Parliament on their own account) and involuntary resignation (forced to resign for the greater good of the party). A key difference was identified between an act of penance and a resignation. Acts of penance are used to rebuild trust with the aim of continuing the relationship. In contrast, by resigning, MPs have offered
an ultimate sacrifice by ending their career as politicians and signally to the victims that they are ending the relationship.

What are the Types of Trust Repair Strategies used by Public Leaders?

The findings indicate that justification was the most frequently used trust repair strategy. This finding does not support the literature that indicated justification is the least likely of all trust repair responses to be used and particularly ineffective for high status individuals (Scott & Lyman, 1972). In support of hypothesis 2, MPs accused of more serious transgressions were significantly more likely to use denial, than those accused of less serious transgressions. This trend suggests, by denying, MPs are able to appear innocent until proven guilty (if they are ever proven guilty). In regards to emotion tone employed by MP, it was found that defiant type response were typically used by MPs initially, In support of hypothesis 2, MPs accused of more serious transgressions were significantly more likely to convey a defiant emotional tone in their response than a contrite or neutral response, compared to MPs accused of less serious transgressions. For example, of the MPs using justifications, denials and reticence respectively, the majority of them used it as their first response. Similarly, more neutral strategies such as acknowledgement of the accusation, use of spokesperson, and transparency were typically used as a first response.

Another finding was that an apology was relatively infrequently used among the sample of MPs. This finding is interesting as the literature stresses the importance of an apology (Fehr & Gelfand, 2010; Kim et al., 2004). Scholars have also suggested that an apology is usually the first response after a trust violation (Ren & Gray, 2009). The current study suggests that this is not usually the case with public leaders. Apology was discovered to be one of the last trust repair strategies used and was only used by one MP (out of the 200 coded) as a first response. Since an apology acknowledges guilt, MPs appear more inclined to try another trust repair response first, such as justification or denial, to protect their reputation. Since MPs are voted into Parliament by the general public, their reputation is regarded above all as the essence of their professional existence. Maintaining the confidence and trust of their constituency is key to maintaining their position in
Parliament. It appears many MPs only use apologies, along with other conciliatory responses that infer guilt, such as acts of penance and resignation, when other more defensive responses fail.

In support of hypothesis 4, the more contrite responses of apology, resignation, acts of penance and support for regulation were more frequently used as a later response. This trend suggests that MPs frequently tried to avoid acceptance of the allegations initially by using justifications, acknowledgment and spokespersons. It was only after attempting these strategies that most MPs then progressed to use more conciliatory and contrite responses, such as apology, resignation and acts of penance, perhaps as a last resort. MPs coded were therefore more likely to use an incongruence response, than a congruent response. This suggests a disconnect between the way trust repair has been studied in the laboratory and how it works in practice. The consequences in laboratories are not real and they are not in public view.

Most studies categorize the transgressor’s response into a single response (e.g. either an apology or denial) at one point in time (Ferrin, Kim, Cooper, & Dirks, 2007; Kim, Dirks, Cooper, & Ferrin, 2006). However, it was found that MPs employ several trust repair strategies either simultaneously or over time. Contrary to hypotheses 1, 2 and 3, Chi-square tests for independence indicated no significant associations between severity of transgression and use of justification, use of apology, and use of resignation.

Future Research

The results to date are a preliminary investigation and we are now coding all 646 MPs and are using two coders to enable calculation of inter-rater reliability. We have broadened our sources to include three influential British newspapers (Telegraph, the BBC and the Guardian) to augment accuracy and completeness of data. Future research is planned to examine the relationship between transgression severity, types of trust repair responses and the outcome of 2010 UK Parliament election. In conclusion, this unique calamity in British public life has afforded us a rare opportunity to study trust repair in a real life, quasi-experimental design.
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### TABLES

**Table 1: Frequency and Sequence of Trust Repair Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust repair response</th>
<th>No. of MPs</th>
<th>% of MPs</th>
<th>TR1</th>
<th>TR2</th>
<th>TR3</th>
<th>TR4-9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>73 %</td>
<td>60 %</td>
<td>24 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act of Penance</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>33 %</td>
<td>36 %</td>
<td>21 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignation</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>27 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excuse</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23 %</td>
<td>36 %</td>
<td>43 %</td>
<td>17 %</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23 %</td>
<td>48 %</td>
<td>31 %</td>
<td>17 %</td>
<td>4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24 %</td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny Behaviour</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny Wrong</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokesperson</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11 %</td>
<td>50 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>13 %</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Regulation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>30 %</td>
<td>15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>TR1</td>
<td>TR2</td>
<td>TR3</td>
<td>TR4</td>
<td>TR5</td>
<td>TR6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast Attributions</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reticence</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TR1 indicates what percent of MPs who used this response, used it as their first response.
Table 2: Kendall Correlations between Trust Repair Responses (N=200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Justification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Act Penance</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Resignation</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Excuse</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acknowledge</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Denial</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Spokesperson</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Apology</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Support Reg.</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recast Attr.</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Transparency</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Reticence</td>
<td>-0.22**</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tone</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>-0.20**</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<0.01 (1-tailed)  * p<0.05 (1-tailed)
APPENDIX

Appendix A: The ‘Green Book’ principles

1. Claims should be above reproach and must reflect actual usage of the resources being claimed.
2. Claims must only be made for expenditure that it was necessary for a Member to incur to ensure that he or she could properly perform his or her parliamentary duties.
3. Allowances are reimbursed only for the purpose of a Member carrying out his or her parliamentary duties. Claims cannot relate to party political activity of any sort, nor must any claim provide a benefit to a party political organisation.
4. It is not permissible for a Member to claim under any parliamentary allowance for anything that the Member is claiming from any other source.
5. Members must ensure that claims do not give rise to, or give the appearance of giving rise to, an improper personal financial benefit to themselves or anyone else.
6. Members are committed to openness about what expenditure has been incurred and for what purposes.
7. Individual Members take personal responsibility for all expenses incurred, for making claims and for keeping records, even if the administration of claims is delegated by them to others.
8. The requirement of ensuring value for money is central in claiming for accommodation, goods or services – Members should avoid purchases which could be seen as extravagant, or luxurious. Claims must be supported by documentary evidence, except where the House has agreed that such evidence is not necessary.
## Appendix B: Trust Repair Response Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust Repair Response</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reticence</td>
<td>Adopted a ‘no comment’ stance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>Denial of behaviour (i.e. denying that engaged in the transgression.) Denial of any wrongdoing* (i.e. transgressed but deny that it was wrong; ‘open defiance’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Sought to explain or justify their actions and the legitimacy of the actions (with an internal locus of control).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excuses</td>
<td>Sought to explain their actions by minimizing responsibility, using an external locus of control. (e.g. not trying to say legitimate but rather that was not within their responsibility or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recasting Attributions</td>
<td>Attempting to recast the transgression from one of integrity failure to one of ability failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of transgression and/or consequences of the transgression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology</td>
<td>1. Personal expression of remorse or regret for the action. 2. Admission of personal responsibility for the failure (e.g. internal locus of control). 3. Using direct words to apologize for the transgression: ‘sorry’, ‘apologize’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act(s) of Penance</td>
<td>Repaying part of their allowance that was inappropriate used : (voluntary) or (involuntary/forced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from Social Networks</td>
<td>Identified a third-party commendation to vouch for their character and conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Regulation</td>
<td>Support for internal or external investigations into the scandal; support for structural reforms to the expenses system to prevent reoccurrence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>Past transparency: making expense claims from past publicly available (e.g. on website). Future transparency: making future expense claims publicly available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostage Posting</td>
<td>Committed to some form of self-regulation or external regulation, and suffering consequence if found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignation*</td>
<td>Stepping down from duties (voluntary) or forced to step down for the greater good of the party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokesperson*</td>
<td>Statement made on behalf of all or a group of MPs – (e.g. a statement made by Party leader about how MPs have/will respond.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>