

TABLE 1

Comparison of Those Completing Survey With Initial Frame and Mailout Sample*

Measure	Initial Frame	Surveys Mailed		Surveys Completed	
	N	N	% Found	N	% Completed
Number of Cases	105	86	81.9	51	59.3
Age of Case					
Recent (1992-94)	18	14	77.7	11	78.5
Less Recent (1989-91)	67	52	77.6	30	57.7
Remote (1988 and Earlier)	20	20	100.0	10	50.0
Who Conducted Inq/Inv					
Institution	85	67	78.8	42	62.6
ORI/OSI/NIH	19	18	94.7	9	50.0
Other	1	1	100.0	0	0.0
How Allegation Was Pursued					
Inquiry	64	57	89.0	35	61.4
Investigation	40	28	70.0	16	57.1
Don't Know	1	1	100.0	0	0.0
Field of Degree					
Medicine	37	31	83.7	16	51.6
Biochemistry	7	6	85.7	5	83.3
Psychology	4	3	75.0	3	100.0
Other	25	22	88.0	13	59.0
None Listed	32	24	75.0	14	68.3
Type of Degree					
PhD	59	48	81.3	34	70.8
MD	38	32	84.2	16	50.0
Other/None	8	6	75.0	1	16.6
Type of Allegation					
Falsification Only	26	19	73.0	12	63.1
Fabrication Only	8	5	62.5	4	80.0
Plagiarism Only	36	31	86.1	17	54.8
More Than One	16	15	93.7	10	66.6
Other	19	16	84.2	8	50.0

*Five respondents were added to the "total frame" after the initial screening and are not included in column 1. These and 18 others were sent surveys but are not counted in column 2. Three of this group of 23 completed surveys and are included in analysis later in this report. However, they are not included in column 3. Total completed surveys for this study, accordingly, is 54.

TABLE 2

Self Reported Characteristics of Exonerated Individuals Completing Surveys

Characteristics of Exonerated Individuals	Frequency	Percent
Total Number of Exonerated	54	100.0
Degree Held		
Doctorate (Ph.D. or Sc.D.)	33	61.1
Doctor (MD/Ph.D., M.D., M.B., or D.D.S.)	19	35.2
Other	2	3.7
Work Setting		
Academia	45	83.3
Government	3	5.6
Other	6	11.1
Type of Academic Department		
Basic Science	19	35.2
Clinical	19	35.2
Other	7	13.0
Non-Academic Setting	9	16.7
Continuity/Security of Position		
Tenured	28	51.9
Nontenured	26	48.1
Full/Part-time		
Full	54	100.0

TABLE 2 (Cont'd)

Self Reported Characteristics of Exonerated Individuals Completing Surveys

Characteristics of Exonerated Individuals	Frequency	Percent
Academic Rank		
Professor	24	44.4
Associate Professor	10	18.5
Assistant Professor/Instructor/Lecturer	9	16.7
Student/None	11	20.4
Institutional Position*		
Senior Administrator/Head of Department or Division	11	20.4
Lab or Section Chief	10	18.5
None	33	61.1

*Categories assigned sequentially. For example, a person who is a department chair and a lab chief is coded only as department chair.

TABLE 3

Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Numbers of Negative Actions

Number of Negative Actions Experienced	Exonerated Individuals	
	N	%
None	21	40.4
One	6	11.5
Two	6	11.5
Three-Five	13	25.0
Six or More	6	11.5
TOTAL	52	100.0

TABLE 4

Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Specific Negative Actions

Negative Actions Experienced	Exonerated Individuals	
	N	%
Total Respondents	52	100.0
Experienced Negative Actions	31	59.6
Loss of Position		
Fired	3	5.8
Not Renewed	1	1.9
Denial of Advancement		
Denial of Salary Increase	4	7.7
Denial of Promotion	5	9.6
Denial of Tenure	0	0.0
Loss of Research Resources/Opportunity		
Reduction in Research Support	9	17.3
Reduction in Travel Funds	0	0.0
Loss of Desirable Work Assignment	4	7.7
Reduction in Staff Support	3	5.8
Hassle/Pressure/Delay		
Pressure to Admit Allegations	5	9.6
Additional Allegations Made	18	34.6
Ostracism	11	21.2
Lawsuit Threatened	19	36.5
Delays in Clearing Manuscripts	6	11.5
Delays in Processing Grant Applications	9	17.3
No Negative Actions	21	40.4

TABLE 5

Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Specific Negative Actions During And/Or After Inquiry/Investigation of the Allegation

Negative Actions Experienced	Total	When Negative Action Occurred					
		Only During Inq/Inv		During & After Inq/Inv		Only After Inq/Inv	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Respondents	52						
Respondents Reporting No Negative Actions	21						
Total With Negative Action Experienced	31	8	25.8	20	64.5	3	9.7
Loss of Position							
Fired	3	2	66.7	0	0.0	1	33.3
Not Renewed	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Denial of Advancement							
Denial of Salary Increase	4	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0
Denial of Promotion	5	1	20.0	0	0.0	4	80.0
Loss of Research Resources/Oppportunity							
Reduction in Research Support	9	4	44.4	3	33.3	2	22.2
Loss of Desirable Work Assignment	4	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0
Reduction in Staff Support	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0
Hassle/Pressure/Delay							
Pressure to Admit Allegations	5	5	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Additional Allegations Made	18	8	44.4	9	50.0	1	5.6
Ostracism	11	6	54.5	3	27.3	2	18.2
Lawsuit Threatened	19	8	42.1	7	36.8	4	21.1
Delays in Clearing Manuscripts	6	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0
Delays in Processing Grant Applications	9	6	66.7	3	33.3	0	0.0

TABLE 6**Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Specific Persons Responsible for Negative Actions**

Person Responsible for Negative Actions	Exonerated Individuals	
	N	%
Total Respondents	31	100.0
Institutional Official		
University Administrator	9	17.3
Dean of College/School	5	9.6
Department Chair/Head	11	19.2
Laboratory Chief/Head	2	3.8
Center Director	1	1.9
Colleague	8	15.4
Complainant	23	44.2
Scientific/Professional Society	0	0.0
Funding Agency	5	9.6
Student/Other	12	23.1

TABLE 9

Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Who Reported Experiencing Any Negative Actions by Individual's Characteristics

Characteristics of Exonerated Individuals	Total	Severity of Actions					
		Severe		Less Severe		No Actions	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated	52	9	17.3	22	42.3	21	40.4
Degree Held							
Doctorate (Ph.D., D.Sc.)	32	5	15.6	14	43.8	13	40.6
Doctor (M.D./Ph.D, M.D., M.B., or D.D.S.)	19	4	21.1	8	42.1	7	36.8
Other	1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0
Work Setting							
Academia	43	7	16.3	19	44.2	17	39.5
Government	3	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7
Other	6	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3
Type of Academic Department							
Basic Science	19	3	15.8	9	47.4	7	36.8
Clinical	18	3	16.7	9	50.0	6	33.3
Other	6	1	16.7	1	16.7	4	66.7
Non-Academic Setting	9	2	22.2	3	33.3	4	44.4
Academic Rank							
Professor	23	2	8.7	13	56.5	8	34.7
Associate Professor	10	2	20.0	4	40.0	4	40.0
Assistant Professor/Instructor/Lecturer	9	2	22.2	4	44.4	3	33.3
Student/None	10	3	30.0	1	10.0	6	60.0
Continuity/Security of Position							
Tenured	27	2	7.4	14	51.9	11	40.7
Nontenured	25	7	28.0	8	32.0	10	40.0
Source of Funds							
University Funds Only	18	4	22.2	8	44.4	6	33.3
University/Extramural Funds	28	3	10.7	13	46.4	12	42.9
Extramural Funds Only	6	2	33.3	1	16.7	3	50.0
Unpaid/Don't Know/Inapplicable	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

TABLE 9 (Cont'd)

Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Who Reported Experiencing Any Negative Actions by Individual's Characteristics

Characteristics of Exonerated Individuals	Total	Severity of Actions					
		Severe		Less Severe		No Actions	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Institutional Position							
Senior Administrator/Head of Department or Division	10	1	10.0	5	50.0	4	40.0
Lab or Section Chief	10	5	50.0	3	30.0	2	20.0
None	32	3	9.4	14	43.8	15	46.9
Relationship to Complainant							
Superior/Supervisor	22	4	18.2	8	36.4	10	45.5
Collaborator/Colleague	15	2	13.3	8	53.3	5	33.3
Student/Subordinate	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0
Outside Researcher/Reviewer	8	0	0.0	4	50.0	4	50.0
Other	5	2	40.0	1	20.0	2	40.0

TABLE 10

Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Different Severity Levels of Negative Actions by Characteristics of Incident (Publicity)

Characteristics of the Incident	Total	Severity of Actions					
		Severe		Less Severe		No Actions	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated	52	9	17.3	22	42.3	21	40.4
Case Publicity							
Publicized	14	3	21.4	10	71.4	1	7.1
Not Publicized/No Answer	38	6	15.8	12	31.6	20	52.6
Where Case Was Publicized							
Print Only	8	1	12.5	6	75.0	1	12.5
Both Print and Electronic	3	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0
Print/Electronic/Other	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0
Other Only	1	0	0.0	1	100.0	0	0.0
Who was Responsible for Publicity							
Complainant Only	7	0	0.0	6	85.7	1	14.3
Complainant and Others	5	2	40.0	3	60.0	0	0.0
Others Only	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0

TABLE 11

Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Different Severity Levels of Negative Actions by Characteristics of Incident (Support)

Characteristics of the Incident	Total	Severity of Actions					
		Severe		Less Severe		No Actions	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Respondents	52						
From Whom Received Support							
University Official	26	4	15.4	12	46.2	10	38.5
Other Administrator	6	2	33.3	3	50.0	1	16.7
Colleagues	29	7	24.1	16	55.2	6	20.7
Students/Fellows	16	2	12.5	9	56.3	5	31.3
Family/Friends	34	8	23.5	18	52.9	8	23.5
Federal Officials/Congress Members, Staff, Committees	5	1	20.0	3	60.0	1	20.0
Your Attorney	20	5	25.0	11	55.0	4	20.0
Other	2	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
No One	8	0	0.0	2	25.0	6	75.0
Number of Different Types of People Providing Support							
None	8	0	0.0	2	25.0	6	75.0
One	6	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3
Two	10	2	20.0	3	30.0	5	50.0
Three - Five	25	5	20.0	12	48.0	8	32.0
Six or More	5	1	20.0	4	80.0	0	0.0

TABLE 12

Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Different Severity Levels of Negative Actions by Characteristics of Incident (Inquiry/Investigation Issues)

Characteristics of the Incident	Total	Severity of Actions					
		Severe		Less Severe		No Actions	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Respondents	52						
Representation by an Attorney							
No	29	1	3.4	11	37.9	17	58.6
Yes	21	8	38.1	9	42.9	4	19.1
Unknown	2	0	0.0	2	100.0	0	0.0
When Represented by An Attorney							
During Only	6	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3
During <u>and</u> After	13	5	38.4	6	46.2	2	15.4
After Only	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0
Response to Allegation							
Inquiry Only	12	2	16.7	4	33.3	6	50.0
Inquiry and Investigation	8	2	25.0	4	50.0	2	25.0
Investigation Only	26	4	15.4	10	38.5	12	46.2
None/Other/Don't Know	6	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7
Outcome of Allegations							
Inquiry Did Not Lead to an Investigation	15	1	6.7	9	60.0	5	33.3
Investigation Did Not Find Misconduct	36	5	13.9	14	38.9	17	47.2
Investigation Did Not Find Misconduct, but Did Find Academic/Professional Misconduct	3	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0.0

TABLE 26

**Whether Institution Did All It Could to Safeguard Confidentiality by
Characteristics of Exonerated Individuals**

Characteristics of Exonerated Individuals	Total	Institution Safeguarded Confidentiality					
		Yes		No		Don't Know	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated	54	25	46.3	19	35.7	10	18.5
Degree Held							
Doctorate (Ph.D., D.Sc.)	33	16	48.5	10	30.3	7	21.2
Doctor (M.D./Ph.D, M.D., M.B., or D.D.S.)	19	8	42.1	8	42.1	3	15.8
Other	2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0
Work Setting							
Academia	45	21	46.7	18	40.0	6	13.3
Government	3	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7
Other	6	3	50.0	1	16.7	2	33.3
Type of Academic Department							
Basic Science	19	12	63.2	6	31.6	1	5.3
Clinical	19	7	36.8	9	47.4	3	15.8
Other	7	2	28.6	3	42.9	2	28.6
Non-Academic Setting	9	4	44.4	1	11.1	4	44.4
Academic Rank							
Professor	24	14	58.3	8	33.3	2	8.3
Associate Professor	10	4	40.0	4	40.0	2	20.0
Assistant Professor Instructor/ Lecturer	9	2	22.2	4	44.4	3	33.3
Student/None	11	5	45.5	3	27.3	3	27.3
Continuity/Security of Position							
Tenured	28	16	57.1	9	32.1	3	10.7
Nontenured	26	9	34.6	10	38.5	7	26.9
Source of Funds							
University Funds Only	19	8	42.1	7	36.8	4	21.1
University/Extramural Funds	28	15	53.6	9	32.1	4	14.3
Extramural Funds Only	7	2	28.6	3	42.9	2	28.6
Unpaid/Don't Know/Inapplicable	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

TABLE 26 (Cont'd)

**Whether Institution Did All It Could to Safeguard Confidentiality by
Characteristics of Exonerated Individuals**

Characteristics of the Individual	Total	Institution Safeguarded Confidentiality					
		Yes		No		Don't Know	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Institutional Position							
Senior Administrator/Head of Department or Division	11	7	63.6	3	27.3	1	9.1
Lab or Section Chief	10	2	20.0	6	60.0	2	20.0
None	33	16	48.5	10	30.3	7	21.2
Relationship to Complainant							
Superior/Supervisor	23	12	52.2	8	34.8	3	13.0
Collaborator/Colleague	15	5	33.3	6	40.0	4	26.7
Student/Subordinate	2	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0
Outside Researcher/Reviewer	8	5	62.5	1	12.5	2	25.0
Other	6	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0

TABLE 13

Assessments of Overall Career Impact by Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced

Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced	Total	Overall Impact on Career					
		Negative		No Effect/Uncertain		Positive	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated	54	21	38.9	31	57.4	2	3.7
Negative Actions Experienced*							
No	21	5	23.8	16	76.2	0	0.0
Yes	31	14	45.2	15	48.4	2	6.5
Severity of Negative Action							
Severe Negative Action	9	5	55.6	4	44.4	0	0.0
Less Severe Negative Action	22	9	40.9	11	50.0	2	9.1

* 2 of 54 respondents had no opportunity to respond to the items used to create this variable. Therefore, the number of respondents in this section of the table is only 52.

TABLE 14**Specific Effects of Accusation on Career**

Effect Incident Had on Career (Total Respondents = 54)	Negative		No Effect/ Uncertain/Missing		Positive	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professional Reputation	25	46.3	28	51.8	1	1.9
Income	10	18.5	43	79.6	1	1.9
Promotions	8	14.8	45	83.3	1	1.9
Tenure	3	5.6	50	92.6	1	1.9
Job Mobility	16	29.6	37	68.5	1	1.9
Consulting	7	13.0	47	87.0	0	0.0
Collaborations	11	20.4	43	79.6	0	0.0
Networking	13	24.1	40	74.1	1	1.9
Field of Research	9	16.7	42	77.8	3	5.6

TABLE 15

Summary Assessments of Impact of Accusation on Career Dimensions by Severity Level of Negative Actions

Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced	Total	Summary of Impact on Career Dimensions							
		Mostly Negative		Mixed		Mostly Neutral		Mostly Positive	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated	54	4	7.4	16	29.6	33	61.1	1	1.9
Negative Action Experienced									
No	21	1	4.6	3	14.3	17	81.0	0	0.0
Yes	31	3	9.7	11	35.5	16	51.6	1	3.2
Severity of Negative Action									
Severe Negative Action	9	3	33.3	3	33.3	2	22.2	1	11.1
Less Severe Negative Action	22	0	0.0	8	36.4	14	63.6	0	0.0

TABLE 16**Specific Effects of Accusation on Participation in Professional Activities**

Effect Incident Had on Professional Activities (Total Respondents = 54)	Negative		No Effect/ Uncertain/Missing		Positive	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Publishing Papers	5	9.3	46	85.2	3	5.6
Presenting Papers	21	38.9	31	57.4	2	3.7
Chairing Sessions	16	29.6	37	68.5	1	1.9
Organizing Sessions	12	22.2	41	75.9	1	1.9
Reviewing Papers	11	20.4	41	75.9	2	3.7
Serving in Elected Offices	15	27.8	38	70.4	1	1.9
Committee Membership	12	22.2	41	75.9	1	1.9
Editorial Posts	8	14.8	45	83.3	1	1.9
Teaching	7	13.0	46	85.2	1	1.9
Research	20	37.0	31	57.4	3	5.6
Collegial Relations	13	24.1	39	72.2	2	3.7

TABLE 17

**Summary Assessments of Impact of Accusation on Professional Activities Dimensions
By Severity Level of Negative Actions**

Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced	Total	Summary of Impact on Professional Activity Dimensions							
		Mostly Negative		Mixed		Mostly Neutral		Mostly Positive	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated	54	10	18.5	6	11.1	37	68.5	1	1.9
Negative Actions Experienced*									
No	21	4	19.1	0	0.0	17	81.0	0	0.0
Yes	31	6	19.4	6	19.4	18	58.1	1	3.2
Severity of Negative Action									
Severe Negative Action	9	4	44.4	2	22.2	3	33.3	0	0.0
Less Severe Negative Action	22	2	9.1	4	18.2	15	68.2	1	4.6

*2 of 54 respondents had no opportunity to respond to the items used to create this variable. Therefore, the number of respondents in this section of the table is only 52.

TABLE 18**Specific Effects of Accusation on Personal Life**

Effect Incident Had on Personal Life (Total Respondents = 54)	Negative		No Effect/ Uncertain/Missing		Positive	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
	Physical Health	26	48.1	27	50.0	1
Mental Health	42	77.8	10	18.5	2	3.7
Finances	19	35.2	34	63.0	1	1.9
Self-identify	21	38.9	29	53.7	4	7.4
Self-esteem	25	46.3	23	42.6	6	11.1
Marriage	12	22.2	37	68.5	5	9.3
Family	13	24.1	37	68.6	4	7.4
Spouse/Partner	20	37.0	30	55.6	4	7.4
Friends	8	14.8	40	74.1	6	11.1
Children	7	13.0	43	79.6	4	7.4
Publishing	17	31.5	36	66.7	1	1.9

TABLE 19

Summary Assessments of Impact of Accusations on Personal Life Dimensions by Severity Level

Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced	Total	Summary of Impact on Personal Life Dimensions							
		Mostly Negative		Mixed		Mostly Neutral		Mostly Positive	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated	54	11	20.4	14	25.9	26	48.1	3	5.6
Negative Actions Experienced*									
No	21	4	19.1	3	14.3	14	66.7	0	0.0
Yes	31	5	16.1	11	35.5	12	38.7	3	9.7
Severity of Negative Action									
Severe Negative Action	9	3	33.3	4	44.4	1	11.1	1	11.1
Less Severe Negative Action	22	2	9.1	7	31.8	11	50.0	2	9.1

*2 of 54 respondents had no opportunity to respond to the items used to create this variable. Therefore, the number of respondents in this section of the table is only 52.

TABLE 25
Perception of Continuing Stigma Attached to Accusations by Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced

Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced	Total	Continuing Stigma Attached to Accusations					
		Unlikely		Likely		Don't Know	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated	54	28	53.8	20	38.5	6	11.5
Negative Actions Experienced*							
No	21	16	76.2	3	14.3	2	9.5
Yes	31	12	38.7	16	51.6	3	9.7
Severity of Negative Action							
Severe Negative Action	9	3	33.3	6	66.7	0	0.0
Less Severe Negative Action	22	9	40.9	10	45.5	3	13.6

*2 of 54 respondents had no opportunity to respond to the items used to create this variable. Therefore, the number of respondents in this section of the table is only 52.

TABLE 27

Severity Level of Negative Actions by Institutional Safeguard or Breach of Confidentiality

Institutional Actions	Total	Severity of Actions					
		Severe		Less Severe		No Actions	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated	52	9	17.3	22	42.3	21	40.4
Did the Institution Safeguard Confidentiality							
Yes	25	0	0.0	11	44.0	14	56.0
No	17	8	47.1	9	52.9	0	0.0
Don't Know	10	1	11.1	2	22.2	7	77.8
What Institution Did to Safeguard Confidentiality							
Limited Number of People Involved	25	3	12.0	13	52.0	9	36.0
Asked Complainant Not to Discuss	7	1	14.3	4	57.1	2	28.6
Conducted Inquiry/Investigation and Reached Conclusion Quickly	14	1	7.1	5	35.7	8	57.1
Made No Significant Changes in Work Assignment During Inquiry/Investigation	25	4	16.0	13	52.0	8	32.0
Other/ Don't Know	9	1	11.1	3	33.3	5	55.6
Did Not Safeguard Confidentiality	10	5	50.0	5	50.0	0	0.0
What Institution Did to Breach Confidentiality							
Involved Excess People	6	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0
Notified Outside Parties Early	5	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0
Did Not Conduct Inquiry/Investigation In Timely Manner	18	7	38.9	8	44.4	3	16.7
Did Not Control Leak of Information	17	8	47.0	9	52.9	0	0.0
Other/Don't Know	4	1	0.0	1	25.0	2	50.0
Did Not Breach Confidentiality	24	0	25.0	9	37.5	15	62.5

TABLE 28

Severity Level of Negative Actions by Effort to Restore Reputation

Institutional Actions	Total*	
	N	%
Total Respondents*	52	100.0
Did Institution Consult You About Measures for Restoring Your Reputation**		
Yes	9	17.3
No/Non-Response	41	78.8
Satisfaction with Institutional Effort to Restore Reputation		
Satisfied	13	25.0
Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied/Non-Response	19	36.5
Dissatisfied	20	38.5
What Institution Did to Restore Reputation		
Notified Officials of Findings	14	26.9
Nothing	26	50.0
Nothing at My Request	4	7.7
Other	4	7.7

*Number of respondents in this table sum to fewer than 54 due to missing data on items used to measure either row or column variables.

TABLE 30

Overall Level of Satisfaction with Handling of Case by Aspects of Handling and Outcome of Case

Aspects of Handling and Outcome	Total	Overall Level of Satisfaction with Handling					
		Dissatisfied		Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied*		Satisfied	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Respondents	54						
Handling							
Notification of allegations	28	13	46.4	4	14.3	11	39.3
Prompt institutional response	23	6	26.1	5	21.7	12	52.2
Confidentiality of proceedings	32	15	46.9	4	12.5	13	40.6
Length of inquiry	33	19	57.6	4	12.1	10	30.0
Expertise on panels	18	9	50.0	1	5.6	8	44.4
Protection against conflicts of interest	9	6	66.7	1	11.1	2	22.2
Opportunity to defend yourself	30	14	46.7	3	10.0	13	43.3
Legal representation	9	6	66.7	0	0.0	3	33.3
Length of investigation	23	14	60.9	2	8.7	7	30.4
Opportunity to review reports	22	15	68.2	1	4.5	6	27.3
Outcomes							
Outcome of Inquiry	30	11	36.7	2	6.7	17	56.7
Outcome of Investigation	24	10	41.7	3	12.5	11	45.8
Media Attention	4	3	75.0	0	0.0	1	25.0
Efforts to Restore Reputation	18	14	77.8	2	11.1	2	11.1

* Includes two respondents who did not answer this set of items at all.

TABLE 29

Overall Satisfaction with Handling of Case by Severity Level of Negative Actions

Severity Level of Negative Actions	Total	Overall Satisfaction With Handling of Case					
		Dissatisfied		Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied**		Satisfied	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated	54	24	44.4	6	11.1	24	44.4
Negative Actions Experienced*							
No	21	3	14.3	3	14.3	15	71.4
Yes	31	19	61.3	3	9.7	9	29.0
Severity of Negative Action							
Severe Negative Action	9	7	77.8	1	11.1	1	11.1
Less Severe Negative Action	22	12	54.5	2	9.1	8	36.4

*2 of 54 respondents had no opportunity to respond to the items used to create this variable. Therefore, the number of respondents in this section of the table is only 52.

** Includes two respondents who did not answer this set of items at all.

TABLE 31

Overall Satisfaction with Handling of Case by Costs

Costs	Total	Overall Satisfaction With Handling of Case					
		Dissatisfied		Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied		Satisfied	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Respondents	54						
Any Costs Incurred							
Yes	24	18	66.7	1	4.2	7	29.2
No	30	8	26.7	5	16.7	17	56.7
Legal Fees							
Yes	18	13	72.2	0	0.0	5	27.8
No	36	11	30.6	6	16.7	19	52.8
Other Costs							
Yes	11	8	72.7	1	9.1	2	18.2
No	43	16	37.2	5	11.6	22	51.2
Dollar Amount of Costs							
Less than \$5,000	6	2	33.3	0	0.0	4	66.7
\$5,000-\$49,999	10	7	70.0	1	10.0	2	20.0
\$50,000 or more	7	7	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

TABLE 20

Employment Setting by Severity of Negative Actions

Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced	Total	Employment Setting					
		Research University		Medical School		Other Place	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated*	53	19	35.8	23	43.4	11	20.8
Negative Actions Experienced**							
No	21	8	38.1	7	33.3	6	28.6
Yes	30	10	33.3	15	50.0	5	16.7
Severity of Negative Action							
Severe Negative Action	9	1	11.1	5	55.6	3	33.3
Less Severe Negative Action	21	9	42.9	10	47.6	2	9.5

*1 of 54 respondents did not respond to the item pertaining to employment setting. Therefore, the total number of potential respondents for this table is 53.

**2 of the 53 potential respondents had no opportunity to respond to the items used to create this "negative actions experienced" variable. Therefore, the number of respondents in this section of the table is only 51.

TABLE 21

Whether Exonerated Individual Is Conducting Research by Severity of Negative Actions

Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced	Total	Currently Conducting Research			
		Yes		No	
		N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated*	50	47	94.0	3	6.0
Negative Actions Experienced**					
No	18	17	94.4	1	5.6
Yes	30	29	96.7	1	3.3
Severity of Negative Action					
Severe Negative Action	9	9	100.0	0	0.0
Less Severe Negative Action	21	20	95.2	1	4.8

*4 of 54 respondents did not respond to the item pertaining to whether the exonerated individual was currently conducting research. Therefore, the total number of potential respondents for this table is 50.

**2 of the 50 potential respondents had no opportunity to respond to the items used to create this "negative actions experienced" variable. Therefore, the number of respondents in this section of the table is only 48.

TABLE 22**Location of Employment by Severity of Negative Actions**

Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced	Total	Location of Employment			
		Same Institution		Not Same Institution	
		N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated*	52	37	71.2	15	27.8
Negative Actions Experienced**					
No	20	16	80.0	4	20.0
Yes	30	19	63.3	11	36.7
Severity of Negative Action					
Severe Negative Action	9	4	44.4	5	55.6
Less Severe Negative Action	21	15	71.4	6	28.6

*2 of 54 respondents did not respond to the item pertaining to location of employment. Therefore, the total number of potential respondents for this table is 52.

**2 of the 52 potential respondents had no opportunity to respond to the items used to create this "negative actions experienced" variable. Therefore, the number of respondents in this section of the table is only 50.

TABLE 23**Perceived Desirability of Change by Severity of Negative Actions**

Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced	Total	Was Change Desirable			
		Yes		No	
		N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated*	16	12	75.0	4	27.8
Negative Actions Experienced**					
No	3	2	66.7	1	33.3
Yes	12	10	83.3	2	16.7
Severity of Negative Action					
Severe Negative Action	5	1	80.0	1	20.0
Less Severe Negative Action	7	1	85.7	1	14.3

*37 of 54 respondents correctly skipped the item pertaining to whether or not a change in job was desirable. However, one respondent incorrectly skipped the item. Therefore, the total number of potential respondents in this table is 16.

**2 of the 16 potential respondents had no opportunity to respond to the items used to create this "negative actions experienced" variable. One of those two respondents also skipped the item pertaining to whether or not a change in job was desirable. Therefore, the number of respondents in this section of the table is only 15.

TABLE 24

**Whether Allegation Is a Factor in Current Employment by
Severity of Negative Actions**

Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced	Total	Is Allegation a Factor in Current Employment			
		Yes		No	
		N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated*	52	15	28.8	37	71.2
Negative Actions Experienced**					
No	20	2	10.0	18	90.0
Yes	30	11	36.7	19	63.3
Severity of Negative Action					
Severe Negative Action	9	5	55.6	4	44.4
Less Severe Negative Action	21	6	28.6	15	71.4

*2 of 54 respondents did not respond to the item pertaining to whether allegation was a factor in current employment. Therefore, the total number of potential respondents for this table is 52.

**2 of the 52 potential respondents had no opportunity to respond to the items used to create this "negative actions experienced" variable. Therefore, the number of respondents in this section of the table is only 50.

TABLE 34

Perception by Exonerated of Confidentiality, Risk to Reputation, and Handling Case to Safeguard

Institutional Actions	Total	Continuing Stigma Attached to Accusations					
		Likely		Don't Know		Unlikely	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated	54	20	37	6	11.1	28	51.9
Institution Did Everything Possible to Safeguard Confidentiality							
Yes	25	6	24.0	4	16.0	15	60.0
No	19	12	63.2	32	10.5	5	26.3
Don't Know/Missing	10	2	20.0	0	0.0	8	80.0
Satisfaction With Institutional Effort to Restore Reputation*							
Satisfied	13	3	23.1	4	30.8	6	46.2
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied/ Non-response	19	6	31.6	0	0.0	13	68.4
Dissatisfied	20	10	50.0	1	5.0	9	45.0
Overall Satisfaction With Handling Of Case							
Satisfied	24	4	16.7	3	12.5	17	70.8
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	6	1	16.7	1	16.7	4	66.7
Dissatisfied	24	15	62.0	2	8.3	7	29.2
Overall Impact on Career							
Positive	2	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0
No Effect/Uncertain	31	4	12.9	3	9.7	24	77.4
Negative	21	16	76.2	2	9.5	3	14.3

*2 of 54 respondents had no opportunity to respond to the item pertaining to satisfaction with institutional effort to restore reputation. Therefore, the number of respondents in this section of the table is 52.

TABLE 33

Assessments of Overall Career Impact by Perceptions of Institutional Actions to Safeguard Confidentiality, Restore Reputation, and Handle Case

Institutional Actions	Total	Overall Impact on Career					
		Negative		No Effect/Uncertain		Positive	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Number of Exonerated	54	21	38.9	31	57.4	2	3.7
Safeguard Confidentiality							
Yes	25	7	28.0	17	68.0	1	4.0
No	19	11	57.9	7	36.8	1	5.3
Don't Know/Missing	10	3	30.0	7	70.0	0	0.0
Satisfaction with Institutional Effort to Restore Reputation*							
Satisfied	20	2	15.4	10	76.9	1	7.7
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	14	7	36.8	12	63.2	0	0.0
Dissatisfied	20	10	50.0	9	45.0	1	5.0
Overall Satisfaction With Handling of Case							
Satisfied	24	6	25.0	17	70.8	1	4.2
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	6	0	0.0	6	100.0	0	0.0
Dissatisfied	24	15	62.5	8	33.3	1	4.2

*2 of 54 respondents had no opportunity to respond to the item pertaining to satisfaction with institutional effort to restore reputation. Therefore, the number of respondents in this section of the table is 52.

TABLE 32

Overall Satisfaction with Handling of Case by Costs by Attorney Representation

Costs	Total	Overall Satisfaction With Handling of Case					
		Dissatisfied		Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied		Satisfied	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Respondents*	52						
Any Attorney Representation**							
No	29	7	24.1	5	17.2	17	58.6
Yes	21	14	66.7	1	4.8	6	28.6
When Represented by an Attorney							
During Only	6	5	83.3	0	0.0	1	16.7
During and After	13	8	61.5	1	7.7	4	30.8
After Only	2	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0

*2 of 54 respondents did not respond to the item pertaining to overall satisfaction with handling of case. Therefore, the total number of potential respondents for this table is 52.

**2 of the 52 potential respondents had no opportunity to respond to the items used to create the variable "any attorney representation". Therefore, the number of respondents in this section of the table is only 50.