Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the valuable contribution of several people to this overall effort and to its predecessor Whistleblower project. Lawrence Rhoades, Ph.D., our project officer on both studies, conceived of these studies and provided invaluable guidance on the issues of interest and the interpretation of results. In addition, his careful review of our reports significantly improved their clarity and relevance to ORI concerns and to the needs of the larger scientific community. His keen interest in the results helped us understand the novelty of our findings for those involved in oversight and assurance of research integrity in PHS-funded studies.

I would also like to acknowledge my collaborators and coauthors, Jennifer Matheson and Mary-Anne Ardini, for their hard work on the projects and insights in writing the reports. We all appreciate the contributions of Tabitha Hendershot and Sheila Dominick, who carried out many of the technical and clerical activities associated with this project, respectively. Finally, we all owe a great debt as well to Darlene Bostic who produced many versions of the reports and tables and created final copy that is clear and easily readable. Her hard work under and competence are greatly appreciated.

James Lubalin Project Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Execut	tive Summary
1.	Background and Purpose of the Project
	a. Legislative and Regulatory Background
2.	Study Methods
	a. Questionnaire Contents
3.	Analysis of Survey Response Rates
	 a. Overall Response Rates b. Response Rates of Different Types of Allegations c. Who Are the Exonerated Included in This Survey 16
4.	Findings: Consequences of Being Accused for Exonerated Individuals
	a. Specific Consequences of Being Accused of Scientific Misconduct
5.	Conclusions and Recommendations
Appen	dix A Survey Instrument and Recruitment Letters
Appen	dix B Script for Telephone Reminder Calls

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Sample
Table 2	Self Reported Characteristics of Exonerated Individuals Completing Surveys 17
Table 3	Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Numbers of Negative Actions
Table 4	Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Specific Negative Actions
Table 5	Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Specific Negative Actions During And/Or After Inquiry/Investigation of the Allegation 25
Table 6	Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Specific Persons Responsible for Negative Actions
Table 7	Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Specific Persons Responsible by Severity of Negative Action
Table 8	Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Specific Persons Responsible When Negative Actions Occurred
Table 9	Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Who Reported Experiencing Any Negative Actions by Individual's Characteristics
Table 10	Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Different Severity Levels of Negative Actions by Characteristics of Incident (Publicity) 37
Table 11	Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Different Severity Levels of Negative Actions by Characteristics of Incident (Support) 39
Table 12	Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Different Severity Levels of Negative Actions by Characteristics of Incident (Inquiry/Investigation Issues)
Table 13	Assessments of Overall Career Impact by Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

Table 14	Specific Effects of Accusation on Career
Table 15	Summary Assessments of Impact of Accusation on Career Dimensions by Severity Level of Negative Actions
Table 16	Specific Effects of Accusation on Participation in Professional Activities 49
Table 17	Summary Assessments of Impact of Accusation on Professional Activities Dimensions by Severity Level of Negative Actions
Table 18	Specific Effects of Accusation on Personal Life
Table 19	Summary Assessments of Impact of Accusation on Personal Life Dimensions by Severity Level of Negative Actions
Table 20	Employment Setting by Severity of Negative Actions
Table 21	Whether Exonerated Individual Is Conducting Research by Severity of Negative Actions
Table 22	Location of Employment by Severity of Negative Actions
Table 23	Perceived Desirability of Change by Severity of Negative Actions 61
Table 24	Whether Allegation is a Factor in Current Employment by Severity of Negative Actions
Table 25	Perception of Continuing Stigma Attached to Accusations by Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced
Table 26	Whether Institution Did All It Could to Safeguard Confidentiality by Characteristics of Exonerated Individuals
Table 27	Severity Level of Negative Actions by Institutional Safeguard or Breach of Confidentiality
Table 28	Severity Level of Negative Actions by Effort to Restore Reputation
Table 29	Overall Satisfaction with Handling of Case by Severity Level of Negative Actions

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

Table 30	Overall Level of Satisfaction with Handling of Case by Aspects of Handling and Outcome of Case
Table 31	Overall Satisfaction with Handling of Case by Costs
Table 32	Overall Satisfaction with Handling of Case by Costs by Attorney Representation
Table 33	Assessments of Overall Career Impact by Perceptions of Institutional Actions to Safeguard Confidentiality, Restore Reputation, and Handle Case 81
Table 34	Perception by Exonerated of Continuing Stigma by Institutional Actions to Safeguard Confidentiality, Restore Reputation, and Handle Case

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Overview of Surveys Mailed to Individuals Accused but Exonerated of Research Misconduct
Figure 2	Status of Surveys Mailed by Inclusion in Primary Sample and Supplemental Sample
Figure 3	Response Rate Calculation and Total Surveys Included in Analysis