



FINNISH ADVISORY BOARD
ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY



Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity
Annual report | 2015
www.tenk.fi



Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity

Annual report | 2015

1 | COMPOSITION AND MEETINGS OF THE ADVISORY BOARD

The Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (TENK) is a body of specialists appointed by the Ministry of Education and Culture, which handles ethical issues concerning research. Its task is to promote responsible conduct of research and to prevent research misconduct (Decree on the Advisory Board on Research Integrity, 1347/1991). The ministry appoints the members of TENK for a three-year term based on a proposal from the scientific community.

The term of the Advisory Board ran from 1 February 2013 to 31 January 2016. **Krista Varantola**, Chancellor Emerita of the University of Tampere, served as Chair and Professor **Markku Helin** of the University of Turku was Vice Chair. There were also eight other members on the Advisory Board:

- Director **Arja Kallio**, Academy of Finland
- Senior Researcher **Jyrki Kettunen**, Arcada University of Applied Sciences
- University Lecturer **Pekka Louhiala**, University of Helsinki

- Research Director **Per Mickwitz**, Finnish Environment Institute
- Professor **Kirsi Saarikangas**, University of Helsinki
- Professor **Ari Salminen**, University of Vaasa
- Chief Legal Counsel **Ari Suomela**, Finnish Funding Agency for Innovation (Tekes)
- Professor **Pirkko Walden**, Åbo Akademi University

The Advisory Board convened six times during the period under review. The October meeting was held in conjunction with a two-day visit to the University of Tampere.

Doctor of Arts **Iina Kohonen**, the acting TENK Secretary General, stood in as the Advisory Board's secretary from 1 January to 30 April 2015, after which Docent **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**, TENK Secretary General, took over from 1 May onwards. **Terhi Tarkiainen**, MA, was employed as part-time Coordinator in the secretariat.

The TENK secretariat works in connection with the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV) at Snellmaninkatu 13, Helsinki.

TENK'S TASKS AND THE IMPACT OF ITS ACTIVITIES ON THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY AND THE SOCIETY



2 | PREVENTATIVE ACTION, EVENTS AND EDUCATION

TENK's preventative ethical instructions, *Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland. Guidelines of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity 2012* had a total of 72 committed signatories by the end of 2015: all the universities in Finland, a majority of universities of applied sciences, and almost all publicly funded research institutions. The trilingual RCR 2012 guidelines are available free of charge from the TENK office, and the PDF file can be downloaded from www.tenk.fi.

The coordination of education on research integrity at higher education institutions and research organisations, especially universities' doctoral programmes, was set as the most important task for this three year term of the Advisory Board. In line with this objective, *Väitöskirjan ohjaus- ja tarkastusprosessin tutkimuseettiset suositukset yliopistoille (Research integrity recommendations for universities regarding dissertation supervision and review)* were formulated in collaboration with Universities Finland (UNIFI), and sent for comment to institutions offering doctoral programmes. The recommendations were translated into English and will be published in 2016.

In addition to drafting these guidelines, the Advisory Board's activities focused on various national and international specialist tasks and networking, with a view

to improving the culture of research integrity. Counselling of researchers and postgraduate students continued, as did other preventative work. Higher education institutions and research organisations asked TENK to give lectures on the field of research integrity. The TENK Chair, certain members and the Secretary General provided training in research integrity around Finland (APPENDIX 1). Additionally, the Board advised various parties on the mechanisms employed to resolve allegations of RCR misconduct.

The TENK Secretary General acted as Vice Chair of the steering group of a new online course on research integrity and responsible scientific communication. The steering group was chaired by the Executive Director of TSV, **Lea Ryynänen-Karjalainen**, with the TENK Coordinator as secretary. The steering group convened five times during the year. An online course in Research Ethics, a course subject to entry fees produced by TSV and the University of Tampere, will be offered by universities' doctoral programmes from 2016. The course content and implementation were coordinated by **Henriikka Mustajoki**.

In 2015, TENK organised three seminars on the field of research integrity. The by now annual *Ethics Day* was held on 12 March at the House of Science and Letters in Helsinki (APPENDIX 4). TENK was the main organiser, and the theme of the event was *Good and Bad Information (Hyvä ja paha tieto)*. The topic of the Advisory Board's own autumn seminar, held on 25 November, was *Authorship in Science* (APPENDIX 6). The keynote speaker was Chief Executive Editor **Sabine Kleinert** of The Lancet. Due to

high demand, online real-time attendance of the seminar was offered. Video summaries of the presentations were also made available afterwards. Some presentations from all of the aforementioned seminars can be found on the TENK website.

In December 2015, TENK and the Committee for Public Information initiated a joint two-year project entitled *Tiedon jakaminen luo vaikuttavuutta (Information Sharing Creates Impact)*, focusing on issues related to responsible scientific communication and definition of authorship. The project is funded by the Ministry of Education and Culture.

3 | HANDLING OF ALLEGATIONS OF RCR MISCONDUCT

3.1. Allegations of RCR Misconduct Reported to TENK and Verified Violations

In 2015, 23 new allegations of misconduct in the responsible conduct of research (RCR) were reported to TENK by Finnish universities, universities of applied sciences and other research organisations that are committed to the RCR guidelines. Each allegation was investigated in the organisation where the research under suspicion was carried out. The processing of some of the allegations continued into 2016.

According to notifications received by TENK, a total of 24 RCR investigations were finalised at research organisations during 2015, some of which had started in the previous year. Of the investigated cases, 17 were verified as containing no RCR violations. However, a violation of responsible conduct of research was found in seven investigated cases. Of these, four were cases of plagiarism, two of issues regarding authorship and one a case of gross negligence of RCR.

Summaries of the verified cases are given in section 3.2 below.

3.2. Verified RCR Violations at Research Organisations

Case 1: Master's thesis substantially plagiarised from another Master's thesis in the same field

A preliminary inquiry found a university Master's thesis in behavioural sciences to have been plagiarised to a significant extent from another Master's thesis in the same field. Direct quotations made up around 45% of the investigated Master's thesis.

Case 2: Gross negligence discovered in doctoral thesis prior to public defence examination

Allegations of plagiarism were presented by the opponent of a doctoral thesis in technology completed at a university, after receiving the manuscript. This led to the cancellation of the scheduled public defence examination. The preliminary inquiry and investigation proper showed that the doctoral thesis manuscript contained extensive quotations from Wikipedia, among other sources, without appropriate references. The author of the thesis was found guilty of disregard for responsible conduct of research in the form of gross negligence and carelessness at various stages of the research.

Case 3: Slight RCR violation in exclusion of researcher from publication

According to researcher A in the medical field, his/her research contribution had not been sufficiently credited in

| RCR ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT REPORTED TO TENK AND VERIFIED RCR VIOLATIONS, NO. | | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 |
|--|------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Official reports from research organisations to TENK on new RCR allegations of misconduct | | 24 | 23 | 19 | 8 | 13 |
| Finalised RCR processes at research organisations during the year, in which the RCR violation (fraud or disregard for responsible conduct of research) was verified* | <i>Fraud</i> | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| | <i>Disregard</i> | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 |
| Finalised RCR processes at research organisations during the year, in which the RCR violation was not verified* | | 17 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 9 |

*These figures also include cases reported before 2015, which were finalised in 2015.

a research project or the resulting publication. A preliminary inquiry was conducted, which found that there had been no research misconduct. The researcher requested a statement from TENK. In its statement, TENK noted that the preliminary inquiry had brought to light practices that were not entirely irreproachable in terms of research integrity, which led to the university initiating an investigation proper on the case. The investigation found that the co-authors of the article were guilty of a slight RCR violation in excluding researcher A from the list of authors.

Case 4: Plagiarism of another researcher from the same faculty in licentiate and doctoral theses

A former doctoral student of a university presented the allegation that a researcher who had worked with him/her on a research project in the natural sciences had plagiarised his/her dissertation in the researcher's licentiate and doctoral theses. A preliminary inquiry and an investigation proper were conducted, demonstrating that the researcher in question had plagiarised the dissertation both directly and indirectly on several occasions. The researcher was found guilty of RCR misconduct.

Case 5: Theft of research material by research team leader and junior researcher

An international research team operating in the medical field at a university was suspected of a number of RCR violations related to the publication of their results. The investigation proper found that the professor leading the team and a junior researcher were guilty of disregard for responsible conduct of research in publishing research results with vague image captions and understating the contributions of the other researchers.

Case 6: Plagiarism in the methodological section of a doctoral thesis

A preliminary inquiry found a university doctoral thesis in the humanities to repeatedly quote a prior study directly and indirectly without providing source references. There were dozens of copied passages in all. The misconduct was limited to the methodological section of the thesis, of which around 15% was plagiarised.

Case 7: RCR violation found in Master's thesis, although with no concrete proof of plagiarism

A plagiarism checking tool found a university Master's thesis in the field of business to contain several uncredited quotations from research literature. After an investigation

proper was conducted on the case, the university's rector found the author guilty of an RCR violation. No concrete proof of plagiarism could be presented, however. The suspected violator could not be reached for a hearing.

3.3. RCR Statements Requested from and Issued by TENK

In 2015, TENK received a total of 11 new requests for a statement concerning allegations of misconduct in the responsible conduct of research. No statement was issued in one case, because the request was made after the six-month deadline given in the RCR guidelines. The processing of three cases was still ongoing at the year-end, which means that TENK issued a total of eight RCR statements in 2015.

Below are summaries of the RCR statements issued by TENK in 2015, with the names removed to preserve anonymity:

Statement 1: Statistical interpretation differences were due to scientific dispute

Researcher A alleged that research managers Y and B from a certain social science research institution were guilty of disregard for RCR in writing a report. In A's view, this took the form of distortion of concepts and carelessness in the formulation and interpretation of statistics from the field. Additionally, A alleged that the reporting of incorrect conclusions was misleading. Having received the RCR notification, the director of the research institution considered that the researchers' differing views concerning concept definition and related compilation of statistics were at the heart of the dispute. As this meant it was not an RCR violation case, there was no need to initiate a preliminary inquiry in accordance with the RCR process. In its statement, TENK agreed with this diagnosis and stated that the director of the research institution had acted in accordance with RCR guidelines, because the case was one of scientific dispute rather than research integrity.

Statement 2: Alleged misconduct was not related to research integrity

A university received an RCR notification in which person A suspected that his/her personal data and unpublished texts had been stolen. The university did not initiate an RCR process because it did not consider the alleged actions to constitute an RCR violation. In its statement, TENK concluded that the university had complied with the RCR guidelines in doing so.

| STATEMENTS RECEIVED AND ISSUED BY TENK, NO. | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| New requests for a statement received by TENK that concerned the RCR process | 11 | 11 | 5 | 8 | 8 |
| Statements issued by TENK that concerned the RCR process (also including different requests for a statement other than those found in the previous section) | 8 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 7 |
| Preparation of RCR statement in progress 31 December | 3 | 2 | - | 1 | 2 |
| Other specialist statements for TENK than those that concerned the RCR process | - | - | 1 | 4 | 1 |

Statement 3: Exaggerations on CV were irresponsible but did not constitute disregard

Adjunct professor A notified the rector of a university that humanities professor B from the university was guilty of making exaggerated claims on his/her curriculum vitae. A had been the researcher in charge of a project at the university. After A left the employ of the university, the credit for financial responsibility for the project in question had been changed in the university's internal research database from person A to person B, who was the head of department. B was credited with the acquisition of funding for the project on his/her CV, while A feels that the merit was his/hers.

TENK concluded that B's CV had been misleadingly formulated in such a way that it allowed the reader to believe that the acquisition of funding for the project in question was entirely thanks to B. Even though B had shared some of the financial responsibility for the project as the head of department, and although the misleading nature of the CV was partly due to unclear subheadings, B should have specified his/her contribution to the acquisition of funding more clearly on the CV. According to the university's RCR process, B had not been party to changing the information in the research database.

In its statement, TENK concluded that although B had acted irresponsibly, the act was not careless enough to constitute disregard. Therefore TENK agreed with the conclusion of the university's RCR investigation, i.e. that no RCR violation had occurred. Because the events in question had taken place prior to the publication of the RCR 2012 guidelines, the former RCR 2002 guidelines were used in reaching this conclusion.

Statement 4: Second author's contribution did not constitute disregard

According to a decision by the director of a research institution, senior researcher A was, together with specialist researcher Y, guilty of misconduct by theft in sending a manuscript containing research results and text from the field of natural resources formulated by project researcher

B, in their own names, for review to a scientific journal, with a view to possible publication. When it became evident that B would not accept the publication of the article in such a form that B was only mentioned in the acknowledgements, A offered to withdraw his/her authorship. Both A and Y received a warning related to theft. The investigation team that evaluated the case was not unanimous in its statement.

Senior researcher A requested a statement from TENK concerning his/her role as co-author of the article, whether the investigation team had been properly assembled, and whether it should have been unanimous in its decision.

Based on the materials submitted to TENK, it was not possible to prove any bias of any of the members of the investigation team. The requirement of an external member was also fulfilled, and investigation teams are not required to reach unanimity in their decisions. Therefore TENK found no fault with the RCR process.

TENK considered the withdrawal of authorship to have been an inappropriate reaction to the situation, but noted that for its part it demonstrates that A's intention was not to steal the credit for B's research results. A had also clearly indicated to Y his/her worries with regard to correctly crediting B's contributions. Therefore TENK concluded that A was not guilty of theft of research results.

Statement 5: Submission of an article to a publisher without one co-author's consent constituted disregard

TENK also received a request for a statement from the aforementioned specialist researcher Y in relation to the RCR investigation mentioned in Statement 4 above. Y was the manager in charge of the project, and the lead author of the article. Y requested a statement from TENK concerning the handling of the case at the research institution. According to the request for a statement, two of the members of the investigation team had been biased, and the team did not include any genuinely external members. Based on the materials submitted to TENK, it was not possible to conclude that any of the members of the investigation

team were biased. The requirement of an external member was also fulfilled, which meant that TENK found no faults with the composition of the investigation team or with the process in itself.

TENK concluded that Y had striven to act in a very difficult situation in such a way that the research results could get published. TENK finds it credible that Y's motivation in doing so was correct and that his/her primary objective was not to steal B's research results.

Regardless of this, TENK concluded that Y acted incorrectly in sending the article to a publisher without consent from B. Therefore TENK agreed with the decision of the research institution with regard to Y.

Statement 6: Further investigation of the translation of an article was needed

A, a postgraduate student in economics at a university, co-authored an article in Finnish with the leader of a research project, for inclusion in a Finnish series of scientific publications. A had collected and analysed the data on which the article was based. The project leader's spouse, who was also a postgraduate student in the department, was cited as a co-author of the article, even though according to A the spouse had mostly only proofread the article.

Later A noticed that the project leader and the postgraduate student had published an identical article in English without A's knowledge. Additionally, the second article cited the first article as a reference, as if it were a standalone article, which constitutes artificial exaggeration of references. Based on a preliminary inquiry, the chancellor of the university concluded that there had been no RCR violation, and no investigation proper was initiated.

TENK considered that a comparison of the similarities between the two articles was not sufficient grounds for deciding not to start an investigation proper. Therefore it demanded that the university initiate an investigation proper.

Statement 7: Evaluation process was unbiased, preliminary inquiry was in line with RCR guidelines

Professor A and adjunct professor B suspected the international evaluation of a project led by A to have been biased, and that professor X, who acted as an evaluator, should have been disqualified due to bias. A preliminary inquiry conducted at the university examined the claim and found no proof of bias on professor X's part.

It is not TENK's duty to assess the quality of the evaluation of the research team. Questions related to research integrity only arise if procedures have been careless and give the impression that the report has purposefully denigrated the researchers being evaluated. The preliminary inquiry found no proof of this, and the persons who requested the statement did not provide any additional information that would give TENK grounds to re evaluate the case or to conclude that the investigation had been insufficient.

Professor A and adjunct professor B also accused professor Y, who had conducted the preliminary inquiry, of bias. They provided no concrete proof to back up this claim, however. Based on the documents received by TENK, there was no cause to suspect an RCR violation. Therefore TENK considered the university to have been justified in deciding to conclude the handling of the case without an investigation proper.

Statement 8: Coming up with the idea for a research project did not automatically confer authorship

In an RCR notification, professor A from a university claimed that professor Y and postgraduate student B from the same field, who had worked on a project led by A, had misled A in the project collaboration and published results in their own names. According to A, Y and B had prepared a test series in secret from A and misused project funds, and had written an article on the basis of the test series which eventually made up the second part of B's doctoral thesis publication. A was B's main doctoral thesis supervisor. A claimed that B and Y had not informed A properly and therefore made his/her work as project leader and main thesis supervisor difficult. Based on a preliminary RCR inquiry and an investigation proper, the university's chancellor concluded that there had been no RCR violation.

Based on the original documents relating to the investigation, TENK concluded that the investigation had been completed according to its guidelines. In the request for a statement and his/her later letters, A was unable to provide proof of an original scientific idea that might have been stolen for the article in question. In TENK's view, coming up with the idea for a research project, leading the project or supervising the author are not in themselves automatic grounds for authorship of publications created during the project. The actions of various parties in the case were unusual in many ways, but the inquiry did not reveal any such disregard that could be considered to constitute an RCR violation. TENK considers the RCR investigation to have been appropriately conducted by the university.

4 | ETHICAL REVIEW IN HUMAN SCIENCES

A total of 61 organisations are committed to the Advisory Board's guidelines *Ethical principles of research in the humanities and social and behavioural sciences and proposals for ethical review*. TENK coordinates the ethical review of research in the field of human sciences, and promotes cooperation between regional and organisation-specific ethical committees that carry out assessments.

TENK annually monitors the state of ethical reviews in human sciences in higher education and research institutions by gathering information on the activities of ethical committees and on the cases they have handled. The TENK office also maintains a list of related committees' contact details.

The number of requests for a statement handled by ethical committees has grown steadily over recent years, which has put the committees under pressure. The biggest challenges have arisen from multidisciplinary and international research projects. Many incomplete requests for a statement are still submitted, and often research teams fail to set aside enough time for the review. Sometimes statements are requested on research that has already started. The distinction between research in the human sciences and in the medical sciences has become clearer, however.

During 2015, the committees paid particular attention to data management throughout the life cycles of the reviewed research studies, and to facilitating the further use of data. For many researchers, the formation of a personal data file in the research of human sciences is often an unclear subject. Universities of applied sciences have less need for ethical reviews, but questions have arisen for instance in relation to the dual role of the researcher who conducts research as part of his/her own work.

As in previous years, the most common cause behind requests for a statement made in 2015 was a demand from the publisher. The most common fields for requests for a statement were health care and psychology.

In the autumn of 2015, TENK and the Data Archive jointly organised a training and discussion event in Tampere

entitled *Research Data Management and Ethical Review (Aineistonhallinta ja eettinen ennakoarviointi)* (APPENDIX 5), directed at ethical committees. TENK has had good feedback from ethical committees on its events, and there is demand for similar events to be organised in the future.

5 | COOPERATION, INITIATIVES, AND PUBLICATION AND PR ACTIVITIES

TENK continued familiarising itself with the research integrity situation in university cities outside of Greater Helsinki. The University of Tampere was selected as the destination of a study trip for the Advisory Board members and secretariat, which took place on 26–27 October 2015. The visit was hosted by Rector **Kaija Holli** and Vice Rector **Pertti Haapala**. TENK met with representatives of the university's ethical committee, among others. An event directed at ethical committees in human sciences was arranged at the university in conjunction with the visit.

TENK worked with national ethical committees (the Council of Finnish Academies and the Committee for Public Information) on the arrangements for the Ethics Day, among other things. TENK was also an active member of the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV).

TENK actively followed and took part in publication activities and media discussions concerning research integrity. The Advisory Board also published a brochure for its activities in Finnish, Swedish and English. The Advisory Board's members and the Secretary General carry out networking and distribute information on TENK's activities by giving seminar presentations (APPENDIX 1), publishing articles and giving interviews (APPENDIX 2). The Secretary General attended the Turku Book Fair and Turku Science Fair, answering visitors' questions on research misconduct at the Committee for Public Information's stand.

TENK's members work actively in both national and local ethical committees and working groups (APPENDIX 3), and follow Finnish and international developments in open science and research.

| NO. OF CASES HANDLED BY ETHICAL COMMITTEES IN HUMAN SCIENCES | 2015 | 2014 | 2013 |
|--|------|------|------|
| Requests for statement related to ethical reviews | 341 | 303 | 265 |
| Statements given by ethical committees | 295 | 287 | 243 |
| Returned requests for statement (no statement given or negative statement with demand for amendment) | 49 | 52 | 42 |

6 | INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The TENK Chair serves as the Finnish representative in the Permanent Working Group on Science and Ethics, which handles research integrity as part of All European Academies (ALLEA). The Secretary General serves as a member of the strategy team in ENRIO, the European Network of Research Integrity Offices. ENRIO held general meetings Luxembourg (spring) and Athens (autumn). Additionally, TENK has active cooperation relationships with other Nordic operators, such as NordForsk, and other specialist bodies in the field.

The Chair and the Secretary General attended the 4th World Conference on Research Integrity in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 31 May to 3 June 2015. The Chair also made appearances in separate symposia organised by ENRIO and the US Office of Research Integrity (ORI).

The Ministry of Education and Culture granted TENK a total budgetary allocation of €132,000 for 2015. Of this, €36,000 was spent on actual operational expenses such as publication, seminar and travel costs. The project entitled *Tiedon jakaminen luo vaikuttavuutta*, run jointly by TENK and the Committee for Public Information, started in December 2015, having received total funding of €200,000.

In 2015, TENK had one full-time employee (the Secretary General) and a Coordinator shared with the Committee for Public Information. TSV offered TENK financial and personnel administration services, as well as network connections and IT services. The House of Science and Letters was used free of charge for meetings and seminars.

This annual report was presented at the meeting of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity held on 26 April 2016.

7 | PERSONNEL AND FINANCES

TENK draws up an action plan for each three-year term of the Advisory Board. Separate areas of focus are then defined for each calendar year in conjunction with budgeting.

Krista Varantola
Chair

Sanna Kaisa Spoof
Secretary General



Ethics Day seminar on 12 March 2015 at the House of Science and Letters in Helsinki.

APPENDIX 1

List of seminars and educational events in which TENK members or the Secretary General participated in 2015

Krista Varantola, chair:

- “Some RI issues – Any good solutions in sight?”, presentation, ENRIO Partner Symposium, Rio de Janeiro, 1–2 June 2015
- “The different approaches used by member states and national agencies,” presentation, ENRIO Partner Symposium, Rio de Janeiro, 1–2 June 2015
- “Differences in research cultures and systems for handling research misconduct,” commissioned speech, conference of the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, Oslo, 8 June 2015
- “Entäs se eettinen puoli? Eri toimijoiden vastuista ja oikeuksista väitöskirjaprosessissa” (“What about ethics? Rights and responsibilities of various parties in the doctoral thesis process”), presentation, Opintoasiainpäivät, Oulu, 30 September 2015

Sanna Kaisa Spoof, Secretary General:

- “Vilppiklinikka – tutkimusvilpin tunnistaminen,” advice on recognising research misconduct, Turku Book Fair and Turku Science Fair, Turku, 2 October 2015
- Opening of event and speech on collaboration between TENK and ethical committees, “Aineistohallinta ja eettinen ennakkoarviointi” (“Research Data Management and Ethical Review”), training and discussion event for ethical committees in human sciences (organised by TENK and the Data Archive), Tampere, 26 October 2015
- “Tutkimusvilpin ilmeneminen ja TENKin rooli sen torjunnassa” (“Manifestations of research misconduct and TENK’s role in its prevention”), presentation, seminar on research integrity, University of Tampere, 18 November 2015
- “Tekijyyteen liittyvät haasteet Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan arjessa” (“Challenges related to authorship encountered by TENK in its daily work”), presentation, Authorship in Science seminar (organised by TENK), House of Science and Letters, Helsinki, 25 November 2015
- “Scholars at Risk: Research ethics and challenging fieldwork,” panel discussion for the 375th anniversary of the University of Helsinki, Think Corner of the University of Helsinki, 8 December 2015

Iina Kohonen, Acting Secretary General:

- “Tutkimuseetiikka” (“Research integrity”), research methodology course, Aalto University School of Arts, Design and Architecture, Helsinki, 5 March 2014
- “Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland,” lecture, MATRENA, Doctoral Programme in Materials Research and Nanosciences, Heureka, Vantaa, 23 February 2015

Jyrki Kettunen, Member:

- “Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö ja tutkimuseetiikka” (“Responsible conduct of research and research integrity”), research methodology studies offered to students as part of Master’s degree studies in health care and social services, Arcada University of Applied Sciences
- “Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö ja tutkimuseetiikka” (“Responsible conduct of research and research integrity”), research methodology studies offered to students as part of Bachelor’s degree studies in health care and social services, Arcada University of Applied Sciences

Pekka Louhiala, Member:

- “Research ethics for health scientists,” course, Biomedicum, Helsinki, 13–22 January 2015
- “Tutkimuseetiikasta” (“On research integrity”), lecture, Academic Medical Centre, Helsinki, 23 April 2015
- “Julkaisemisen ja kirjoittamisen etiikka” (“Ethics in publishing and writing”), lecture, course on higher education pedagogy, Biomedicum, Helsinki, 7 October 2015
- “Who is the author,” lecture at TENK seminar, Helsinki, 25 November 2015

APPENDIX 2

Articles, publications and interviews in the field of research integrity by TENK members in 2015

Markku Helin, Vice Chair:

- "Oikeustiede ja tutkimusetiikka" ("Legal Science and Research Integrity"), Lakimies 6/2015

Sanna Kaisa Spoof, Secretary General:

- Humanist of the Day on 4 November 2015, and presentation on the "375 Humanists" website of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Helsinki (<http://375humanistia.Helsinki.fi/humanistit/sanna-kaisa-spoof>)
- "Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland," Research Integrity in the Nordic countries – national systems and procedures, NordForsk Expert Seminar, Oslo, 9 April 2014 (NordForsk 2015)

Pekka Louhiala, Member:

- "Lääketieteen opetus Helsingin yliopistossa 375 vuotta" ("375 years of medical science teaching at the University of Helsinki"), video interview, 22 October 2015

APPENDIX 3

Advisory Board members' membership in research integrity bodies external to TENK in 2015

Krista Varantola, Chair:

- All European Academies (ALLEA), Permanent Working Group on Science and Ethics, member

Jyrki Kettunen, Member:

- Ethical Committee of the universities of applied sciences in the Helsinki Metropolitan Area (Arcada, Diak, Humak and Metropolia), Chair
- Arcada University of Applied Sciences Ethical Committee, Chair
- Steering group of the online course in Research Integrity run by the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies and the University of Tampere, member
- Open Science and Research Initiative (ATT), specialist team, member

Pekka Louhiala, Member:

- Finnish Medical Association Ethical Committee, member
- Ethical Committee for Pharmaceutical Operations, Chair
- University of Helsinki Faculty of Medicine Ethical Committee, Chair

Kirsi Saarikangas, Member:

- University of Helsinki, Ethical Review Board in the Humanities and Social and Behavioural Sciences, deputy member

ETIIKAN PÄIVÄ 2015: HYVÄ JA PAHA TIETO

12.3.2015 Tieteiden talo, Helsinki

OHJELMA

9.30 Aamukahvit

10.00 Tervetuloa!

Akateemikko **Risto Nieminen**, Tiedonjulkistamisen neuvottelukunta

10.10 - 11.30 Tiede ja tutkimus myyttejä rakentamassa ja purkamassa

Keskustelu toimittaja **Anna-Liisa Haavikon** johdolla.

- professori **Tiina Kinnunen**, Oulun yliopisto
- professori **Heikki Hiilamo**, Helsingin yliopisto
- tutkija **Vienna Setälä**

11.30 - 12.30 Lounastauko (omakustanteinen)

12.30 - 14.00 Kun olisi puhuttava... mutta vaiennetaan

Perustuslaki turvaa tieteen, taiteen ja ylimmän opetuksen vapauden. Mikä saa vaikenemaan? Tiedetoimittaja **Satu Lipposen** johdolla keskustellaan, millaista on olla julkinen toimija, silloin kun se aiheuttaa henkilökohtaisen uhan.

- valokuvataiteilija **Harri Pälviranta**
- professori **Marjo Kaartinen**, Turun yliopisto
- toimittaja **Johanna Korhonen**
- historiantutkija **Oula Silvennoinen**, Helsingin yliopisto

14.00 - 14.20 Kahvitauko (2. krs)

14.20 - 15.20 Kun olisi puhuttava... mutta vaietaan

Tiedetoimittaja **Satu Lipposen** johdolla tarkastellaan tutkijayhteisön sisäistä keskustelua tutkimuksen negatiivisista seurauksista. Itsesensuuri voi olla perusteltu ratkaisu esimerkiksi tilanteissa, joissa tutkimustulosten julkaiseminen voisi edesauttaa pahojen sovellusten toteuttamista.

- professori **Matti Häyry**, Aalto-yliopisto
- professori **Veikko Launis**, Turun yliopisto
- erityisasiantuntija **Susanna Sissonen**, THL/Biologisten uhkien osaamiskeskus

15.30 - 17.00 Lääketieteen edistyminen - yhteiskunnan vai yksilön etu?

Keskustelua yhdestä lääketieteellisen tutkimuksen keskeisestä periaatteesta, joka on tutkimuslain (488/1999) 4 §:ssa ilmaistu seuraavasti:

”Lääketieteellisessä tutkimuksessa tutkittavan etu ja hyvinvointi on aina asetettava tieteen ja yhteiskunnan etujen edelle.”

- Avaus, ylilääkäri **Tapani Keränen**, THL/TUKIJA
- Lääketieteellisen tutkimuksen ominaispiirteet - henkilökohtainen riski vs. yhteisön etu? Esimerkkinä terveillä vapaaehtoisilla tehtävät tutkimukset. Professori **Mika Scheinin**, Turun yliopisto
- Potilastietojen käyttö tutkimuksessa - hoitojen kehittämistä vai arkaluontoisten tietojen urkkimista? Esimerkkinä potilasturvallisuus. Professori **Risto P. Roine**, Itä-Suomen yliopisto
- Yksilön ja yhteisön etu/hyvinvointi vastakkain? Filosofin näkökulma. Professori **Veikko Launis**, Turun yliopisto

Järjestäjät:

Tutkimuseettinen neuvottelukunta (TENK), Biotekniikan neuvottelukunta (BTNK), Geenitekniikan lautakunta (GTLK), Tiedonjulkistamisen neuvottelukunta (TJNK), Tiedeakatemiain neuvottelukunta (TANK), Valtakunnallinen sosiaali- ja terveysalan eettinen neuvottelukunta ETENE, Valtakunnallinen lääketieteellinen tutkimuseettinen toimikunta TUKIJA

Lisätietoja:

Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan pääsihteeri lina Kohonen, puh. 050 594 1909, tenk@tsv.fi

Aineistonhallinta ja eettinen ennakoarviointi - Ihmistieteiden eettisille toimikunnille tarkoitettu koulutus- ja keskustelutilaisuus

Aika: maanantai 26.10.2015 klo 12:00–15:00

Paikka: Tampereen yliopisto, Päätalon sali A2b

Järjestäjät: Tutkimuseettinen neuvottelukunta ja Tietoarkisto.

Aineistonhallinta on tullut yhä merkittävämmäksi osaksi tutkimusta. Sen taustalla ovat rahoittajien toiveet ja vaatimukset tieteen avoimuudesta. Eettisessä ennakoarvioinnissa aineistonhallinnan kysymykset ovat usein haasteellisia, sillä tieteen avoimuuden rinnalla on tarkasteltava myös eettisiä ulottuvuuksia ja tietosuojaa.

Tilaisuuden tavoite on antaa tietopaketti aineistonhallinnasta ja tarjota mahdollisuus keskustella aiheesta eettisen arvioinnin näkökulmasta esitysten lomassa ja niiden jälkeen.

Osallistujiksi toivomme erityisesti toimikuntien puheenjohtajia ja esittelijöitä, mutta myös toimikuntien jäsenet ovat lämpimästi tervetulleita.

Ohjelma

- Klo 12:00 Tilaisuuden avaus (Sanna Kaisa Spoof, tutkimuseettinen neuvottelukunta) ([esitys.pdf](#) [\(20151026_EEA_TENK.pdf\)](#))
- Klo 12:10 Tutkimusrahoittajien vaatimukset aineistonhallinnalle (Katja Fält, tietoarkisto) ([esitys.pdf](#) [\(20151026_EEA_Rahoittajat_KF.pdf\)](#))
- Klo 12:30 Tutkittavien informointi (Arja Kuula-Luumi, Tietoarkisto) ([esitys.pdf](#) [\(20151026_EEA_tutkittavien_informointi_akL.pdf\)](#))
- Klo 13:15 Tietoarkiston palvelut aineistonhallinnassa (Katja Fält, Tietoarkisto) ([esitys.pdf](#) [\(20151026_EEA_FSDn_palvelut_KF.pdf\)](#))
- Klo 13:30 Kahvitauko
- Klo 14:00 Keskustelu
- Klo 14:50 TENK:n ja eettisten toimikuntien yhteistyö ja keskustelutilaisuudet jatkossa (Sanna Kaisa Spoof)

Lisätiedot:

- [Arja Kuula-Luumi](http://www.fsd.uta.fi/fi/vhtevstiedot/henkilokunta.html#arja_kuula-luumi) (http://www.fsd.uta.fi/fi/vhtevstiedot/henkilokunta.html#arja_kuula-luumi)

viimeksi päivitetty 2015-10-30



Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan syysseminaari 25.11.2015, Tieteiden talo

TEKIJYYS TIETEESSÄ - AUTHORSHIP IN SCIENCE

Tieteellisten julkaisujen tekijyys kansainvälisenä tutkimuseettisenä haasteena

OHJELMA / PROGRAMME

9:30 Coffee

10:00 Authorship and research integrity

Does it matter who the author is?

Chair, Dr **Krista Varantola**, Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (TENK)

Authorship: reward and responsibilities

Chief Executive Editor, Dr **Sabine Kleinert**, *The Lancet*

Discussion

Who is the author? More questions than answers

Dr **Pekka Louhiala**, University of Helsinki; TENK

Discussion

12:00 - 13:00 Lounastarjoilu, 2. krs / Lunch, 2nd floor

13:00 Eri tieteenalojen näkökulmia tekijyyteen

Professori, biofysiikka, **Ilpo Vattulainen**, Tampereen teknillinen yliopisto

Professori (ma.), suomen kieli, **Anne Mäntynen**, Jyväskylän yliopisto, Suomen tiedekustantajien liitto (pj)

Julkaisukohtainen kirjoittajien lukumäärä tieteellisissä julkaisuissa: kansainvälinen kehitys ja tieteenaloittaiset erot OKM-julkaisuaineistossa

Suunnittelija **Janne Pölönen**, Julkaisufoorumi

Keskustelua

14:15 - 14:30 Tauko

14:30 Tekijyys, tutkimusetiikka ja tutkimusvilpin ennaltaehkäisy

Rahoittajaorganisaatio ja tutkimusetiikka

Johtaja **Pentti Pulkkinen**, Suomen Akatemia

Tekijyyteen liittyvät haasteet Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan arjessa

Pääsihteeri **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**, TENK

Keskustelua

15:15 Tarvitaanko tieteenalakohtaisia, kansallisia pelisääntöjä tekijyyden määrittämiseksi? Loppukeskustelu, puheenjohtajana **Krista Varantola**, TENK (pj)

15:30 Seminaari päättyy

