

## **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

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary .....  | i  |
| 1. Background and Purpose of the Project .....   | 1  |
| a. Legislative and Regulatory Background .....   | 1  |
| b. Purpose of This Study .....   | 2  |
| 2. Study Methods .....   | 4  |
| a. Questionnaire Contents .....  | 4  |
| b. Data Collection .....   | 5  |
| c. Analyses .....  | 9  |
| 3. Analysis of Survey Response Rates .....   | 12 |
| a. Overall Response Rates .....  | 12 |
| b. Response Rates of Different Types of Allegations .....  | 12 |
| c. Who Are the Exonerated Included in This Survey .....  | 16 |
| 4. Findings: Consequences of Being Accused for Exonerated Individuals .....                          | 20 |
| a. Specific Consequences of Being Accused of Scientific Misconduct .....                             | 20 |
| b. Consequences Experienced by Different Exonerated Individuals .....                                | 30 |
| c. Consequences Experienced in Different Situations .....  | 36 |
| d. Overall Impact of Being Accused of Misconduct on the Exonerated Individuals ...                   | 42 |
| e. Safeguarding the Confidentiality and Restoring the Reputations of Exonerated<br>Individuals ..... | 64 |
| 5. Conclusions and Recommendations .....   | 84 |
| Appendix A Survey Instrument and Recruitment Letters   |    |
| Appendix B Script for Telephone Reminder Calls   |    |

## LIST OF TABLES

|          |  |    |
|----------|--|----|
| Table 1  | Comparison of Those Completing Survey With Initial Frame and Mailout Sample . . . . .  | 15 |
| Table 2  | Self Reported Characteristics of Exonerated Individuals Completing Surveys . .   | 17 |
| Table 3  | Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Numbers of Negative Actions . . . . .   | 21 |
| Table 4  | Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Specific Negative Actions . . . . .   | 23 |
| 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 . . . . .   | 27 |
| Table 7  | Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Specific Persons Responsible by Severity of Negative Action . . . . .   | 28 |
| Table 8  | Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Reporting Specific Persons Responsible When Negative Actions Occurred . . . . .   | 31 |
| Table 9  | Number and Percent of Exonerated Individuals Who Reported Experiencing Any Negative Actions by Individual's Characteristics . . . . .  | 32 |
| 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) . . . . . | 41 |
| Table 13 | Assessments of Overall Career Impact by Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced . . . . .   | 44 |

## LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

|          |   |    |
|----------|---|----|
| Table 14 | Specific Effects of Accusation on Career . . . . .  | 46 |
| Table 15 | Summary Assessments of Impact of Accusation on Career Dimensions by Severity Level of Negative Actions . . . . .                  | 47 |
| 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 . . . . . | 51 |
| Table 18 | Specific Effects of Accusation on Personal Life . . . . .   | 53 |
| Table 19 | Summary Assessments of Impact of Accusation on Personal Life Dimensions by Severity Level of Negative Actions . . . . .           | 54 |
| Table 20 | Employment Setting by Severity of Negative Actions . . . . .  | 57 |
| Table 21 | Whether Exonerated Individual Is Conducting Research by Severity of Negative Actions . . . . .                                    | 58 |
| Table 22 | Location of Employment by Severity of Negative Actions . . . . .  | 59 |
| 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 . . . . .                                    | 62 |
| Table 25 | Perception of Continuing Stigma Attached to Accusations by Severity Level of Negative Actions Experienced . . . . .               | 63 |
| Table 26 | Whether Institution Did All It Could to Safeguard Confidentiality by Characteristics of Exonerated Individuals . . . . .          | 65 |
| Table 27 | Severity Level of Negative Actions by Institutional Safeguard or Breach of Confidentiality . . . . .                              | 70 |
| Table 28 | Severity Level of Negative Actions by Effort to Restore Reputation . . . . .  | 72 |
| Table 29 | Overall Satisfaction with Handling of Case by Severity Level of Negative Actions . . . . .  | 73 |

**LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)**

|          |  |    |
|----------|--|----|
| Table 30 | Overall Level of Satisfaction with Handling of Case by Aspects of Handling and Outcome of Case . . . . .   | 75 |
| Table 31 | Overall Satisfaction with Handling of Case by Costs . . . . .  | 77 |
| Table 32 | Overall Satisfaction with Handling of Case by Costs by Attorney Representation . . . . .   | 79 |
| 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 . . . . .       | 82 |

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1 Overview of Surveys Mailed to Individuals Accused but Exonerated of Research Misconduct . . . . . 8

Figure 2 Status of Surveys Mailed by Inclusion in Primary Sample and Supplemental Sample . . . . . 10

Figure 3 Response Rate Calculation and Total Surveys Included in Analysis . . . . . 13