



FINNISH ADVISORY BOARD  
ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY



Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity  
**Annual report | 2014**  
[www.tenk.fi](http://www.tenk.fi)



# Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity

## Annual report | 2014

### 1 | ADVISORY BOARD COMPOSITION AND MEETINGS

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

The Advisory Board is at mid-term (duration: 1 February 2013 to 31 January 2016). **Krista Varantola**, Chancellor Emerita of the University of Tampere, is serving as Chair and Professor **Markku Helin** of the University of Turku is serving as Vice Chair. Eight other members are also serving on the Advisory Board:

- Director **Arja Kallio**, Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, Academy of Finland
- Docent, Senior Researcher **Jyrki Kettunen**, Health Sciences, Arcada

- Docent, University Lecturer **Pekka Louhiala**, Medical Ethics, University of Helsinki and University of Tampere
- Research Director **Per Mickwitz**, Finnish Environment Institute
- Professor **Kirsi Saarikangas**, Art History, University of Helsinki
- Professor **Ari Salminen**, Public Administration Theory, University of Vaasa
- Chief Legal Counsel **Ari Suomela**, Law, Tekes
- Professor **Pirkko Walden**, Business Administration, Åbo Akademi University

During the period for this annual report, the Advisory Board members convened six times. The new TSV Executive Director **Lea Ryyänen-Karjalainen** was a guest at the April meeting and the Rectors' Conference of Finnish Universities of Applied Sciences ARENE arrived on TENK's invitation to the August meeting to discuss research activities and RCR guidelines at the universities of applied sciences. The October meeting was held as a two-day visit at the University of Jyväskylä.

Docent **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**, TENK Secretary General,

served as the Advisory Board secretary from 1 January 2014 until 31 May 2014. Her stand-in while on leave has been Doctor of Arts **Iina Kohonen** beginning 1 June 2014. The title Assistant for MA **Terhi Tarkiainen** was changed in May to Coordinator to better correspond to her job description. In addition, Training Coordinator MEd **Heidi Hyytinen** worked at TENK from 1 May 2014 until 31 December 2014. Both Hyytinen and Tarkiainen were working part-time.

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

## 2 | PREVENTATIVE ACTION AND EDUCATION

The coordination of education on research integrity at higher education institutions and research organisations, especially in university Doctoral programmes, is the most important task outlined in the activities of the ongoing three-year term of the TENK members. An education working group was set up for this task in the summer of 2013, and it continued its activities until the end of 2014. The working group included Chancellor Krista Varantola (University of Tampere), Senior Researcher Jyrki Kettunen (Arcada), University Lecturer Pekka Louhiala (University of Helsinki), Professor Pirkko Walden (Åbo Akademi University), Professor **Riitta Keiski** (University of Oulu), Academy of Finland Research Fellow **Erika Löfström** (University of Helsinki) and Postdoctoral Researcher **Petteri Niemi** (University of Jyväskylä) as well as TENK Secretary General Sanna Kaisa Spoof (from 1 January to 31 May 2014) and acting Secretary General Iina Kohonen (from 1 June to 31 December 2014). Coordinator Terhi Tarkiainen (from 1 January to 30 April 2014) and Training Coordinator Heidi Hyytinen (from 1 May to 31 December 2014) both served as the working group's secretary. The working group convened four times during 2014.

The working group and TENK organised the seminar *Research integrity: a crucial resource for the academic community (Tutkimuseettikka on akateemisen yhteisön keskeinen resurssi)* in October. The seminar was coordinated for Doctoral programmes and concentrated on education in research integrity. Furthermore, the working group completed its instructions on research integrity education. The instructions focused on Doctoral education and have the objective of reinforcing the position of research integrity education and increasing educational uniformity. Although these instructions were intended particularly for Doctoral programmes, the universities and universities of applied sciences can use the guidelines as an aide in preparing research integrity courses for Bachelor's and Master's degree students and personnel.

The recommendation is in line with the 2012 revised RCR guidelines.

In cooperation with the Committee for Public Information, one of the most important topics on the actions concerning education in 2014 was the concrete initiation of a project involving an online course on research integrity and responsible science communication. The online course was coordinated for nationwide implementation at the universities and universities of applied sciences. By the end of the year, several bodies committed to the project, and TSV Executive Director Lea Ryyänen-Karjalainen committed herself to take on the responsibility of chair of its steering group. The group convened for the first time in January 2015. Coordinator Terhi Tarkiainen was selected as secretary of the group. The goal is to have the nationwide online course at a pilot stage in autumn 2015.

A joint working group between TENK and UNIFI that began its work on the initiative of TENK at the end of 2013, surveying research integrity problem areas in the counselling and review process of Doctoral dissertations, continued its activities. Krista Varantola served as chair, and its other members included University Lecturer Erika Löfström of the University of Helsinki and Professor **Pirjo Nuutila** of the University of Turku. Furthermore, UNIFI Executive Director **Leena Treuthardt** and Sanna Kaisa Spoof and also Iina Kohonen (starting 1 June 2014) of TENK are also included in the working group, serving as specialists. Chief Administrator **Heikki Eilo** of the University of Tampere is serving as the working group's secretary. The task of the working group is to provide recommendations to universities concerning the different stages of the Doctoral dissertation process. The working group convened six times.

TENK's "flagship" of 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 75 committed signatories by the end of 2014: all the universities, a majority of universities of applied sciences, nearly all research institutes and additionally 11 other bodies. The trilingual 2012 RCR guidelines are available free of charge from the TENK office and the PDF file can be found on its website.

By the end of 2014, a total of 62 universities, universities of applied sciences and research institutes had committed to the Advisory Board's document *Ethical principles of research in the humanities and social and behavioural sciences and proposals for ethical review*. TENK continued the coordination of this ethical review of research in the field of the so-called human sciences (IEEA) and the promotion

of cooperation between regional and organisation-specific ethical committees that carry out assessments.

Professor **Risto Turunen** of the University of Eastern Finland served as Chair and Development Manager **Arja Kuula-Luumi** of the Finnish Social Science Data Archive of the University of Tampere served as Vice Chair for TENK's follow-up working group on ethical review of the human sciences. Other members of the working group were Senior Teacher **Irma Mikkonen** of Savonia University of Applied Sciences and Research Professor **Jussi Simpura** of the National Institute for Health and Welfare. The TENK Secretary General and TENK Coordinator managed the working group's secretarial tasks and coordination of practical matters.

The follow-up working group surveyed the issuing of IEEA statements by drafting a questionnaire for the committees. A report entitled *Follow-Up on Ethical Review of the Human Sciences for Organisations Committed to TENK Guidelines 2013 (Ihmistieteiden eettisen ennakkoarvioinnin seuranta TENKin ohjeisiin sitoutuneille organisaatioille 2013)* was written on the basis of this. The chairs and secretaries of ethical committees were called to convene in April at the House of Science and Letters for discussion. The meeting showed that the follow-up working group has reached its activity objectives, and the meeting decided that it will convene again only when necessary. The follow-up on the ethical review of the human sciences will continue by amassing the annual reports of the ethical committees.

In addition to drafting the guidelines, the Advisory Board's activities were focused on various national and international specialist tasks and networking for improving the culture of research integrity. There was a continuation of researcher and student counselling and other preventative work.

Higher education institutions and research organisations requested TENK to give lectures concerning the field of research integrity. The TENK Chair, certain members, Secretary General and Training Coordinator served as educators of research integrity in different parts of Finland (APPENDIX 1). Furthermore, counselling was provided to different bodies on mechanisms employed to resolve RCR allegations of misconduct.

In 2014, TENK organised three seminars on the field of research integrity. The annual event *Ethics Day* was organised on 18 March 2014 at the House of Science and Letters in Helsinki (APPENDIX 4). TENK was the main organiser of the event. The event's theme was *Science, ethics, politics – decision-making based on research data ("Tiede, etiikka, politiikka - tutkimustietoon perustuva päätöksenteko")*. Professor **Anne Glover**, Chief Scientific Adviser of the European Commission, arrived as the main speaker. The theme of a closed seminar coordinated for Doctoral programmes, on 29 October 2014, was *Research integrity: a crucial resource for the academic community (Tutkimusetiikka on akateemisen yhteisön keskeinen resurssi)* (APPENDIX 5). The theme for the TENK autumn seminar on 11 November 2014 was *Ethics of research on minors (Alaikäisiin kohdistuvan tutkimuksen etiikkaa)* (APPENDIX 6). The presentations of all the aforementioned seminars were published (in Finnish) on the TENK website.

In addition, TENK organised a specialist workshop on the ethics of science, art and journalism on 3 November 2014 in cooperation with Committee for Public Information (TJNK) and the Public Information Cultural Factory TIUKU. Cooperation with TIUKU and TJNK will continue in 2015. TENK and TJNK organised a discussion forum with TSV on 16 December 2014 for Doctoral programmes and interest

Ethics Day 2014 brought in a full crowd at the House of Science and Letters. The main speakers in the morning were (l-r) Professor Anne Glover and Chancellor Kari Raivio, the mediator of the discussion was Professor Risto Nieminen. Photo: Tuukka Troberg



groups on the implementation of an online course on research integrity and responsible science communication. This served as a basis for starting up the implementation of an online course which is supposed to be in its pilot stage in autumn 2015.

### 3 | HANDLING ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT ON RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH (RCR)

#### 3.1. RCR allegations of misconduct reported to TENK and actual violations

In 2014, the Finnish universities, universities of applied sciences and other research organisations that have committed to the RCR guidelines reported 23 new allegations of misconduct on responsible conduct of research to TENK. The allegations were investigated in the organisations where the research under suspicion was being or had been carried out. The processing of some of the RCR allegations of misconduct continued on into 2015.

According to reports that have come to TENK, a total of 21 RCR investigations were finalised at research organisations during 2014, a part of which had started up in 2013. Of these investigated cases, 15 were verified as showing no RCR violations. However, a violation of responsible conduct of research was verified in six investigated cases. Of these, four were cases of plagiarism and two of the disregard for responsible conduct of research regarding authorship issues. The summaries of the verified cases are shown in section 3.2; the names in these RCR cases have been removed to preserve anonymity.

#### 3.2. Verified RCR violations at research organisations

##### Case 1: University of applied sciences lecturer's plagiarism in a non-fiction book

An RCR allegation of misconduct directed towards a lecturer was finalised at a university of applied sciences. According to the preliminary inquiry, the lecturer had directly used the Master's thesis of researcher X for a non-fiction book with no referencing. The non-fiction book was released by a commercial publisher. The lecturer admitted to the lack of referencing and direct usage without proper citation. According to the decision, the lecturer was proven guilty of disregard for responsible conduct of research.

##### Case 2: Plagiarising the text of several researchers in a Master's thesis

After a preliminary inquiry, a university came to a conclusion on a Master's thesis that fell under the suspicion of eight signatories. The thesis was in the humanities, and the author graduated in 2006. The signatories discovered that the thesis was based on large-scale copying. They identified nine wide-scale usages without proper referencing as well as minor plagiarising of ten other researchers. A preliminary inquiry was conducted on the case, and the conclusion was that MA X was guilty of misconduct by presenting the text of other researchers as his/her own writing. If the examiner would have been aware of the inadequacies of the thesis, it would not have been approved. The university can no longer do anything regarding the approval of the thesis, but the decision has been appended to it at the university's library.

RCR ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT REPORTED TO TENK AND VERIFIED RCR VIOLATIONS, NO.	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010
official reports from research organisations to TENK on new RCR allegations of misconduct	23	19	8	13	7
finalised RCR processes at research organisations during the year, in which the RCR violation (fraud or disregard for responsible conduct of research) was verified*	6	4	5	3	2
finalised RCR processes at research organisations during the year, in which the RCR violation was not verified*	15	10	5	9	5
RCR investigation on allegations reported to TENK in progress 31 December	6	6	2	3	1

\*These figures also include cases reported before 2014, which were finalised in 2014.

### Case 3: Plagiarism in a Master's thesis in business

A university stated, after a preliminary inquiry, that a business student's Master's thesis included text that was not properly referenced. The preliminary inquiry proved that for a significant portion of his/her thesis, the student plagiarised the structure, research questions, conclusions and text from researcher X's study as well as a significant number of publications from a certain bureau. In conclusion, the verdict was misconduct by plagiarism and there was no need to start an investigation proper.

### Case 4: Denigration of one researcher's contribution to the publications for an interdisciplinary project

An investigation proper was finalised at a university on researcher X's right to authorship in articles published between 2007 and 2011 for an interdisciplinary, international project. The subjects of the allegation included the first author of these articles, non-Finnish researchers who were part of the project and the leader responsible for the project. The rector's decision showed that the Finnish researcher and the leader were guilty of disregard for responsible conduct of research by denigrating researcher X's contribution to the study and the articles published on it. However, no signs of theft were established. The researchers working abroad who wrote for the publications were not found guilty of RCR violations, even though they were bound by Finnish instructions. The investigation committee's statement includes a differing opinion of one member.

### Case 5: RCR violation in the writing process of an article

Researchers X and Y at a research institute published a joint article without the consent and name of researcher Z who also took part in the writing process. The case was preceded by a dispute on whether the article was ready to be published. On the basis of an RCR investigation, the Director came to the decision that having this joint article examined by the publisher without researcher Z's consent and omitting his/her name from it were actions contrary to responsible conduct of research. According to the decision, researchers X and Y were found guilty of misconduct by theft in their academic activities. The investigation committee's statement includes a differing opinion of two members.

### Case 6: Plagiarism in a Master's thesis

A university suspected a Master's thesis of having plagiarism. The author of the thesis admitted to this undertaking in the preliminary inquiry, but stated that it was carelessness. According to the inquiry, it was a mistake, whereupon the author took notes in a hurriedly manner and did not cite the source of the texts in the process. The rector's decision stated that the case showed an RCR violation and there was no need for an investigation proper, provided the author makes the proper corrections with a separate addendum appended to the thesis.

### 3.3. RCR statements requested from and issued by TENK

In 2014, TENK received a total of 11 new requests for a statement concerning allegations of misconduct on responsible conduct of research. No statement was issued in four cases because the matter was not within the jurisdiction of TENK. One statement was withdrawn on the requestor's wishes before TENK was able to issue the statement. The processing of two requests for statements was still in progress on 31 December 2014. As a result, TENK issued a total of four RCR statements in 2014.

The following are summaries of RCR statements issued by TENK in 2014; the names have been removed to preserve anonymity:

#### Statement 1: Researcher's contribution as a criterion of authorship

A researcher in medicine sent TENK a request for a statement concerning an RCR violation report he/she made to a university. According to the researcher, his/her research contribution was not sufficiently taken into consideration in a medical research project and the publication based on it. The rector's decision stated that the case did not show research misconduct nor any such disregard that an investigation proper in terms of the RCR process should be started.

TENK, however, took note in its statement that the preliminary inquiry revealed such practices that were not irreproachable in terms of research integrity. According to TENK, the project leader, at his/her sole discretion, should not have removed the authors from the list on the grounds that the journal, to have the research published, accepts only a specific number of writers. In these types of cases, all of those whose contribution to the study reaches authorship must come to an agreement on procedures, and in borderline cases, other researchers must be

included, even if there is doubt whether they have reached the threshold of authorship. The university's preliminary inquiry did not include any outside specialist who could have assessed, on the basis of the article under dispute and statements of the parties, whether the researcher who requested the statement had given such contribution to the article sufficient to constitute authorship. In difficult cases concerning authorship, it is normally crucial to use an unbiased specialist who not only understands the academic content of the publication but also how it relates to other studies published for the same project.

For these reasons, TENK noted that on the basis of the preliminary inquiry, no one can rule out the possibility that the exclusion of the requestor from the list of authors was a violation of responsible conduct of research. **In conclusion, TENK attested that the university must begin an investigation proper on the matter under the RCR process to determine authorship.**

### Statement 2: Research institute did not follow TENK's instructions in an RCR investigation

Two researchers submitted a request for TENK to issue a statement on whether a research institute acted correctly in handling an allegation of an RCR violation directed towards their actions. The allegation concerned a project and a scientific article published for the project. One of the requestors served as leader of the project and the other as researcher. The researchers were dissatisfied with the procedures the research institute followed in this RCR process as well as the decision issued on the case. The researchers felt that they were not informed of the progress of the investigation and that it focused on internal disputes of the working community, something not within the sphere of RCR. The researchers explained that they did not receive written notification that the investigation had started. They were also not told who made the report and on what grounds. It was also unclear to them how the article was selected as a subject for an RCR investigation.

There were no references to RCR violations in the research institution's RCR investigation, but the final report showed that the research findings in the article were exaggerated to some extent.

In its statement, TENK concurred with the requestors' view, according to which, the research institute failed to carry out the RCR investigation properly in many ways. The suspects should have been given written notification on the subject of the allegation and who reported it, and they should have been informed of the progress of the investigation. The exaggeration noted in the final report of the investigation does not fall under the RCR process, only academic disputes. **Since transparency of the process forms the fundamental basis for fair handling, TENK concluded that the research institute did not comply with the RCR guidelines in its investigation. TENK's measures taken were to recommend that the research institute review its practices according to the guidelines.**

### Statement 3: Statement on engineering thesis is not within TENK's jurisdiction, objections to having a relative for an adviser

TENK received a request for a statement which expressed dissatisfaction with a preliminary inquiry conducted on an RCR allegation of misconduct at a university of applied sciences. The inquiry concerned engineering thesis reviewed at the institution in 2010. According to the report, there were several RCR violations concerning how the thesis and its instructions were carried out. According to the requestor, the adviser for the thesis was the father of the engineering student and also served as the student's superior during the time period when the thesis was being completed. According to the request for a statement, the father and the engineering student were working together, not in an advisory capacity. The requestor also made an accusation against the advising teacher on gross negligence of his/her duties in instructing the work and evaluating the thesis. According to the requestor, the father outsourced

<b>STATEMENTS RECEIVED AND ISSUED BY TENK, NO.</b>	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010
new request for a statement received by TENK that concerned the RCR process	11	5	8	8	2
statements issued by TENK that concerned the RCR process (also including different requests for a statement other than those found in the previous section)	4	5	5	7	1
preparation of RCR statement in progress 31 December	2	-	1	2	1
other request for a specialist's statement received by TENK	-	1	5	1	-
other specialist statements for TENK than those that concerned the RCR process	-	1	4	1	-
total issued statements	4	6	9	8	1

the work to a professional research company. Moreover, the preliminary inquiry was, according to the requestor, incorrectly conducted. Among others, the requestor noted that the institution's legal protection board meetings on the inquiry were not adequately documented.

In its statement, TENK declined to investigate claims pertaining to the organisation of the institution's educational administration as well claims on the incorrect application of legislation concerning administration. These claims are not within TENK's jurisdiction. Furthermore, TENK's statement noted that the RCR guidelines provide the investigating party with enough discretion in terms of procedures, so that the preliminary inquiry, which is an initial survey according to the guidelines, can be carried out in a manner as required by the nature of the case. TENK found that there was nothing to comment on in the process of the preliminary inquiry.

In the current RCR guidelines from 2012, Bachelor theses have been excluded from the sphere of RCR investigations. It is better to respond to research integrity problems involving these theses by turning to educational administration and the institution's internal quality control rather than an RCR investigation. This is because RCR investigations are conducted on allegations concerning the violation of science or another researcher's integrity. The previous RCR guidelines from 2002, which did apply to this case, did not have the same specified limitations. However, it also only involves the investigation of allegations of misconduct or disregard pertaining to academic activity. If an ethical problem does not, in the broadest sense, pertain to academic activity, it is not within TENK's jurisdiction to issue a statement on it. **After considering the engineering thesis subject to the request for a statement, TENK noted that its objectives were professional and that its evaluation was not within the jurisdiction of TENK's duties. As a result, TENK did not issue a statement on RCR violation claims made on the thesis. On a general level, however, TENK made a recommendation to the university of applied sciences to make its instructions more precise in engineering thesis advisement. Having a close relative for an adviser should be avoided, because this kind of advisory arrangement can cause problems in research integrity.**

#### Statement 4: Comparative research design was not plagiarism

TENK received a request for a statement which expressed dissatisfaction with an investigation on an RCR violation

conducted by a university. The RCR investigation involved a Master's thesis approved at the university in 2013. The requestor noted that there were non-cited points in the thesis from his/her own 2011 Master's thesis. According to the university's preliminary inquiry, the thesis did not show any signs of misconduct and disregard in relation to the requestor's thesis, nor was there a need to begin an investigation proper on the matter.

TENK was requested to give an opinion on the similarity of texts in particular depicting the research process in comparison to the requestor's text. The indisputable fact of the case was that the author of the thesis replicated the research design of the requestor's thesis in order to obtain comparable results with him/her. In its statement, TENK noted that comparative research design has led to similarity of language use, particularly in the chapters depicting research design and previous studies. As the purpose was the replication of a previously completed study, this was seen to be understandable. The use of long paraphrasing comprising several sentences without quotation marks can, however, be considered problematic because paraphrasing can easily blur the line between the author's and the quoted text. The thesis subject to the request for a statement could have made it clearer that not only research design was taken from the requestor's thesis, but also its depiction. **However, TENK noted that the Master's thesis did not aim to denigrate the significance of the requestor's work as its point of departure. On the contrary, its significance was highlighted in quite a proper manner in terms of research integrity. The request for a statement furthermore did not highlight topics which would not have been processed in the previous inquiry. For these reasons, TENK noted that the inquiry showed no such disregard which could have been considered a violation of responsible conduct of research.**

## 4 | COOPERATION, INITIATIVES AS WELL AS PUBLICATION AND PR ACTIVITIES

TENK continued in becoming familiarised with the research integrity situation in university cities outside of Greater Helsinki. The University of Jyväskylä was selected as the destination of a study trip for the Advisory Board members and secretariat. The two-day trip took place between 7 and 8 October 2014. University of Jyväskylä Rector **Matti Manninen** was the host for the visit. During the visit, there was orientation not only on the university's spaces and activities in general but also on the remit of its research integrity committee.



TENK actively followed publication activities concerning research integrity and media discussion in the field and also took part in them. In 2014, the introduction of the plagiarism checker system at all higher education institutions, for example, raised discussion in the media. The Advisory Board members and Secretary General network and distribute information on TENK activities by holding seminar presentations (APPENDIX 1) and by publishing articles and giving interviews (APPENDIX 2). Furthermore, TENK members work actively in both national and local ethical committees and working groups (APPENDIX 3). TENK also followed national and international development of open science and research and took note of it in its own activities by providing recommendations and by promoting ethical discussion and training on the matter. TENK member Jyrki Kettunen was selected as a strategy group member of the Open Science and Research Initiative of the Ministry of Education and Culture. Moreover, TENK member Per Mickwitz was selected as chair of the Strategic Research Council, which was set up by the Academy of Finland.

## 5 | INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The TENK Chair gave several international presentations during the year of operation. She spoke in Rome at the *World Congress for Freedom of Scientific Research* held between 4 and 6 June 2014 and in Ljubljana at *Ethical, Accountability, and Gender Perspectives* on 19 September 2014. The TENK Chair serves as the Finnish representative in the Permanent Working Group on *Science and Ethics* that handles research integrity in All European Academies ALLEA. The working group convened two times in 2014: in Budapest on 1 April and in Barcelona from 16 to 17 October. Furthermore, the TENK Chair participated in the joint meeting of the ALLEA Permanent Working Groups *Science and Ethics* and *Intellectual Property Rights* held in Munich, 24 November 2014.

TENK played a central role in coordinating and organising the specialist seminar organised by NordForsk *Research Integrity procedures and professional research ethics review processes in the Nordic countries - A Landscape Analysis*. The seminar was organised in Oslo on 9 April 2014. The TENK Chair and Secretary General participated in the conference by giving presentations.

The Secretary General serves as a member of ENRIO, the European Network of Research Integrity Offices, and participates in its meetings. The ENRIO spring general meeting was held in Brussels on 21 May 2014 and the autumn general meeting in Amsterdam from 26 to 28



Chair Krista Varantola, Ethics Day on 18 March 2014. Photo: Teija Riikola

October 2014. The meetings discussed, for example, establishing the status of ENRIO specialists in the European Union.

The TENK Chair and Secretary General paid a visit to the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences in Amsterdam, from 5 to 7 February 2014. They were becoming acquainted with the research integrity practices of the Netherlands and research integrity issues regarding *Open Access to data*.

TENK member Professor Markku Helin gave a presentation at a research integrity seminar organised by the Estonian Academy of Sciences and the University of Tartu in Tallinn, 6 June 2014. The theme was *The Finnish Guidelines on Responsible Conduct of Research*.

Training Coordinator Heidi Hyttinen participated in the EARLI (*European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction*) *Higher Education* conference in Belgium from 19 to 22 August 2014.

TENK has active cooperative relationships with both the other Nordic actors and the European Commission, OECD and other specialist bodies of the field.

## 6 | PERSONNEL AND FINANCES

In place of an annual action plan, TENK switched over to the process of drawing up its action plan to touch upon the three-year term of each appointed Advisory Board. The priorities of activities and the most significant measures shall, however, be separately confirmed for each calendar year in connection with drafting the budget. TENK participated in the process of the TSV strategy for 2014 to 2018 and also drafted its own strategy element for it.

OKM granted TENK a total of €128,690 in operating appropriations for 2014. Of this amount, €34,000 was used for actual operational expenses such as publication, seminar and travel costs.

In 2014, TENK had one full-time employee, a Secretary General, and a Coordinator working between the Advisory Board and the Committee for Public Information in Finland. In addition, TENK had a part-time Training Coordinator who began working 1 April 2014. TSV offered TENK financial and personnel administration as well as network connections and IT services. The House of Science and Letters was used for meetings and seminars.

This annual report was presented at the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity meeting held on 25 February 2015.

**Krista Varantola**

Chair

**Ilina Kohonen**

Acting Secretary General

## APPENDIX 1: LIST OF SEMINARS AND EDUCATIONAL EVENTS IN WHICH THE TENK CHAIR, CERTAIN MEMBERS, SECRETARY GENERAL OR TRAINING COORDINATOR HAVE PARTICIPATED IN 2014

### Chair **Krista Varantola:**

- Research integrity - Whose responsibility? - opening speech, *Etiikan päivä*, Helsinki 18.3.2014.
- What does the global scene look like? - presentation, *NordForsk Seminar on Research Integrity procedures and professional research ethics review processes in the Nordic countries - A Landscape Analysis*, Oslo 9.4.2014.
- The autonomy of science and responsible conduct of research - presentation, *World Congress for Freedom of Scientific Research*, Rooma 4. - 6.4.2014.
- Responsible conduct of research - whose responsibility? The Finnish experience - presentation, *Ethical, Accountability, and Gender Perspectives*, Ljubljana 19.9.2014.

### Vice Chair **Markku Helin**

- The Finnish Guidelines on Responsible Conduct of Research - presentation, Tallinna 6.6.2014.

### Member **Jyrki Kettunen**

- Tutkimusetiikka YAMK-opiskelijoille - lecture, Yrkeshögskolan Arcada Ab, Helsinki 27.2.2014
- Kehittäjän etiikka - presentation, Yrkeshögskolan Arcada Ab, Helsinki 2.4.2014.
- Tutkimusetiikka ammattikorkeakouluissa - presentation, TENK and ARENE meeting, Helsinki 25.8.2014.
- Opiskelun etiikka AMK-opiskelijoille - lecture, Yrkeshögskolan Arcada Ab, Helsinki 20.10.2014.

### Member **Pekka Louhiala**

- Tutkimusetiikkaa lääke- ja terveystieteilijöille - course, University of Helsinki, Faculty of Medicine, Helsinki 7.-21.1.2014.
- Introduction to research ethics - lecture, University of Helsinki, Faculty of Medicine, Helsinki 12.6.2014.
- Pakkopulla vai tutkijan voimavara? Kokemuksia tutkimusetiikan opettamisesta - presentation, *Research integrity: a crucial resource for the academic community*, Helsinki 29.10.2014.

### Member **Ari Salminen**

- Opiskelun etiikkaa - lecture, University of Vaasa, Vaasa, 20.9.2014.

### Secretary General **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**

- Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö ja eettinen ennakoarviointi ihmistieteissä. Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland - two presentations, University of Vaasa, Vaasa 24.1.2014.
- Tekijänoikeudet tutkimusjulkaisuissa - presentation, Theatre Academy, Helsinki 12.2.2014.
- Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö ja eettinen ennakoarviointi ihmistieteissä - presentation, Sibelius Academy, Helsinki 20.3.2014.
- Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland - presentation, *NordForsk seminar on Ethics*, Oslo 9.4.2014.
- Suku- ja kyläkirjaprojektien tutkimuseettiset haasteet - presentation, Museum of Hamina, Hamina 29.10.2014.

### Acting Secretary General **Iina Kohonen**

- Kenelle tutkimusetiikan koulutus kuuluu? - presentation with Heidi Hyytinen, *Research integrity: a crucial resource for the academic community*, Helsinki 29.10.2014.

- Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö ja uusi tapa tuottaa tietoa - presentation, specialist workshop on the ethics of science, art and journalism, Helsinki 3.11.2014.
- Good scientific practice and research ethics - *presentation, Good scientific practice and research ethics - Graduate School info, Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta 5.11.2014.*
- Joint presentation with Heidi Hyytinen concerning the project to produce an online course on research integrity, meeting of the Finnish Graduate School Network, University of Helsinki, Helsinki 19.12.2014.

Training Coordinator **Heidi Hyytinen**

- EARLI (European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction) Higher Education -conference, Leuven 19. - 22.8.2014.
- Presentation concerning the project to produce an online course on research integrity, meeting of the Finnish Graduate School Network, University of Helsinki, Helsinki 24.9.2014.
- Julkaiseminen ja hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö - presentation, Julkaisijan aamupäivä, Helsinki 25.9.2014.
- Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland - presentation, Sibelius Academy, Helsinki 26.9.2014.
- Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö - Mitä se on - lecture, University of Helsinki, Faculty of Behavioural Sciences, Helsinki 1.10.2014.
- Kenelle tutkimuseetiikan koulutus kuuluu? - presentation with Iina Kohonen, Research integrity: a crucial resource for the academic community, Helsinki 29.10.2014.
- Joint presentation with Iina Kohonen concerning the project to produce an online course on research integrity, meeting of the Finnish Graduate School Network, University of Helsinki, Helsinki 19.12.2014.

## APPENDIX 2: ARTICLES, OTHER PUBLICATIONS AND INTERVIEWS IN 2014

### Chair **Krista Varantola:**

- "Kenen integriteetti, kenen vastuu?" *ACATIIMI* 2/2014

### Member **Pekka Louhiala**

- "Kuka on kirjoittaja?" Louhiala P., Saloheimo P., Launis V., *Duodecim* 2014;130:198-9.

### Secretary General **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**

- Interview on plagiarism, *YLE Tiedeykkönen* 20.5.2014.

### Acting Secretary General **Iina Kohonen**

- Vilppi menee liian usein läpi - interview, *Karjalainen* 28.12.2014.

## APPENDIX 3: ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS' MEMBERSHIP OF NATIONAL AND LOCAL RESEARCH BODIES IN 2014

### Chair **Krista Varantola:**

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

### Member **Jyrki Kettunen**

- Ministry of Education and Culture, Open Science and Research Initiative (ATT), expert body, member.
- Ethical committee of the universities of applied sciences in the metropolitan area, chair.

### Member **Pekka Louhiala**

- University of Helsinki, Hjelt Institute, ethical committee, chair.

### Secretary General **Sanna Kaisa Spoof**

- European Network of Research Integrity Offices ENRIO, member.

### Acting Secretary General **Iina Kohonen**

- European Network of Research Integrity Offices ENRIO, member.

## APPENDIX 4



### **ETIIKAN PÄIVÄ 2014: TIEDE, ETIIKKA, POLITIIKKA ETHICS DAY 2014: SCIENCE, ETHICS, POLITICS 18.3.2014, Tieteiden talo (Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki)**

Etiikan päivä on vuosittain järjestettävä tieteen eettisiä kysymyksiä käsittelevä seminaari. Pääjärjestäjänä on Tutkimuseettinen neuvottelukunta (TENK).

Ethics Day is an annual seminar addressing ethical questions in science. Its chief organiser is the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (TENK).

Muut järjestäjät / co-organisers: Biotekniikan neuvottelukunta BTNK (Advisory Board on Biotechnology), Geenitekniikan lautakunta GTLK (Board for Gene Technology), Tiedeakatemiain neuvottelukunta TANK (Council of Finnish Academies), Tiedonjulkistamisen neuvottelukunta TJNK (Committee for Public Information in Finland, Valtakunnallinen sosiaali- ja terveysalan eettinen neuvottelukunta ETENE (National Advisory Board on Social Welfare and Health Care Ethics), Valtakunnallinen lääketieteellinen tutkimuseettinen toimikunta TUKIJA (National Committee on Medical Research Ethics)

#### **PROGRAMME (morning)**

- 9.30 Registration and Coffee**
- 10.00 Welcoming words from TENK: Research integrity - Whose responsibility?**  
Chancellor **Krista Varantola**, University of Tampere, Chair of the Finnish Advisory Board of Research Integrity (TENK)
- 10.20 Science and society: time for a new deal**  
Chair: Academician of Science, Dean **Risto Nieminen**, Aalto University, Chair of the Committee for Public Information in Finland (TJNK)
- What would an ethical approach to decision-making look like?**  
Professor **Anne Glover**, Chief Scientific Adviser to the President of the European Commission
- Questions*
- Evidence-based policy or policy-based evidence**  
Chancellor Emeritus **Kari Raivio**, appointed by the Prime Minister's Office to examine advisory functions in relation to decision-making in Finland
- Open discussion*
- 12.00 - 13.00 Break**

[www.etiikanpaiva.fi](http://www.etiikanpaiva.fi)

## OHJELMA (iltapäivä)

### 13.00 - 15.00 Rinnakkaissessiot

#### SALI 104 (1. krs) - Sessio 1 Cherry picking: Tiedon valikoiva käyttö

Järjestäjät: Tiedonjulkistamisen neuvottelukunta (TJNK) ja Valtakunnallinen sosiaali- ja terveysalan eettinen neuvottelukunta (ETENE)

Erilaisten mielipiteiden ja väitteiden esittäminen tietoverkkojen kautta on helppoa ja nopeaa. Tutkimustuloksia, faktaa, löytyy tukemaan lähes jokaista väitettä. ”Cherry picking” on tutkimustulosten valikoivaa käyttöä, jolloin perusteluina käytetään vain se osa tietoa, joka tukee omaa argumenttia. Poimitaanko Suomessa rusinat pullasta? Mitkä ovat luotettavan tiedon tuntomerkit? Löytyykö tutkimustieto helposti ja nopeasti, silloin kun sitä tarvitaan?

Keskusteluun johdattavat kansanedustaja **Sanna Lauslahti** (Tutkas), lääketieteen etiikan dosentti, yliopistonlehtori **Pekka Louhiala** (Helsingin yliopisto, Hjelt-instituutti, TENK) ja LKT, pääsihteeri emeritus **Harri Vertio** (Suomen Syöpäyhdistys). Keskustelun juontaa ja toimittajanäkökulman tarjoaa **Antti Bläfield**.

#### SALI 309 (3. krs) - Sessio 2 Kliiniset lääketutkimukset: Tiedettä vai tuotekehittelyä?

Järjestäjä: Valtakunnallinen lääketieteellinen tutkimuseettinen toimikunta (TUKIJA)

- Onko yhteistyö lääketieteellisuuden kanssa lähtökohtaisesti epäilyttävää?** Pääjohtaja **Juhani Eskola**, Terveyden ja hyvinvoinninlaitos THL
- Kliiniset lääketutkimukset – yliopistosairaalan näkökulma**, Tutkimusjohtaja **Lasse Viinikka**, Helsingin ja Uudenmaan sairaanhoitopiiri HUS
- Tutkijan näkökulma - rahanahneutta vai tiedettä?** Professori **Timo Strandberg**, Helsingin yliopisto, Oulun yliopisto
- Kliinisten lääketutkimusten tieteellisyys – lääketieteellisuuden näkökulma**, Lääketieteellisen yksikön päällikkö **Mikko Kuoppamäki**, Orion Pharma
- Keskustelun puheenjohtajana toimii TUKIJAn puheenjohtaja, professori **Heikki Ruskoaho**, Helsingin yliopisto.

#### SALI 505 (5. krs) - Sessio 3 Tutkimuksesta päätöksiksi: Onko eettistä olla hyödyntämättä tietoa?

Järjestäjät: Biotekniikan neuvottelukunta (BTNK) ja Geenitekniikan lautakunta (GTLK)

- Kuinka muuntogeenisten kasvien hyväksymismenettelyjä tulisi kehittää?** Dosentti **Osmo Kuusi**, Aalto-yliopisto, Turun yliopiston Tulevaisuuden tutkimuskeskus
- Tietämättömyys geenitekniikkavastaisuuden selityksenä: kriittisiä huomioita**, VTT **Marko Ahteensuu**, Luonnontieteellinen keskuksen museo, Helsingin yliopisto ja dosentti **Helena Siipi**, Turku Institute for Advanced Sciences ja Filosofian oppiaine, Turun yliopisto
- Miten suomalaiset suhtautuvat biopankkeihin?** Tutkijatohtori **Karoliina Snell**, Helsingin yliopisto
- Genomitieto kliinikon apuna nyt ja tulevaisuudessa**, professori **Helena Kääriäinen**, Terveyden ja hyvinvoinninlaitos THL

### 14.30 - 15.00 Kahvitarjoilu

### 15.00 - 16.00 Päivän yhteenveto

- Terveiset rinnakkaissessioista**, puheenjohtaja: VTT **Markku Lehto**, Valtakunnallisen sosiaali- ja terveysalan eettisen neuvottelukunnan (ETENE) puheenjohtaja
- Suomen Akatemian puheenvuoro**, pääjohtaja **Heikki Mannila**, Suomen Akatemia
- Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriön puheenvuoro**, neuvotteleva virkamies **Ilkka Turunen**, opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö

*Loppukeskustelu*

[www.etiikanpaiva.fi](http://www.etiikanpaiva.fi)

## APPENDIX 5



TUTKIMUSEETTINEN  
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA  
FORSKNINGSETISKA  
DELEGATIONEN  
FINNISH ADVISORY BOARD  
ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY

### KUTSUSEMINAARI TUTKIJAKOULUILLE ”TUTKIMUSETIikka ON AKATEEMISEN YHTEISÖN KESKEINEN RESURSSI”

Keskiviikkona 29.10 klo 9:15-15:30 Tieteiden talo (sali 505), Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki

#### OHJELMA:

- 9:15 Aamukahvi ja ilmoittautuminen
- 9:45 Seminaarinavaus  
Tutkimuseettistä koulutusta tarvitaan  
Kansleri emerita *Krista Varantola*, TENK, puheenjohtaja
- 10:00 Kokemuksia kaikille tohtorikoulutettaville yhteisestä tutkimuseetiikan opetuksesta  
koulutusdekaani *Kaisa Tasanen-Määttä*, UniOGS  
professori *Riitta Keiski*, Oulun yliopisto
- 10:30 Pakkopulla vai tutkijan voimavara? Kokemuksia tutkimuseetiikan opettamisesta  
Yliopistonlehtori *Pekka Louhiala*, Helsingin yliopisto
- 11:00 Plagiointivilppi ohjaustilanteissa opettajan kokemana  
Dosentti *Anne Nevgi*, Helsingin yliopisto
- 11:30-12:30 Lounas, omakustanteinen
- 12:30 Artikkeliväitöskirja tutkimusryhmässä — kenelle tekijyys?  
Professori *Pirjo Nuutila*, Turun yliopisto
- 13:00 Kenelle tutkimuseetiikan koulutus kuuluu?  
Koulutussuunnittelija *Heidi Hyytinen* ja pääsihteeri *Iina Kohonen*, TENK
- 13:30 Työskentelyä ryhmissä, teemoina:
1. Millaisia tutkimuseetiikkaan ja hyvään tieteelliseen käytäntöön liittyviä koulutustarpeita on jatko-opiskelijoilla ja ohjaajilla?  
Puheenjohtaja, professori *Riitta Keiski* (sali 505)
  2. Hyväksi havaittuja käytäntöjä tutkimuseettisestä koulutuksesta,  
Puheenjohtaja, tutkijatohtori *Petteri Niemi* (sali 405)
  3. Mitä korkeakoulujen yksikkötasolla voitaisiin tehdä akateemisen integriteetin lisäämiseksi?  
Puheenjohtaja, professori *Pirkko Walden* (sali 312)
- 15:00 Yhteenvedo päivän aiheista, keskustelua
- 15:30 Tilaisuuden päätös



## APPENDIX 6



TUTKIMUSEETTINEN  
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA  
FORSKNINGSETISKA  
DELEGATIONEN  
FINNISH ADVISORY BOARD  
ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY

Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan syysseminaari

### ***Alaikäisiin kohdistuvan tutkimuksen etiikkaa***

Aika: tiistai 11.11.2014 klo 9 - 13

Paikka: Tieteiden talo, sali 104 (Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki)

#### **OHJELMA:**

9.00 Kahvitarjoilu, 2. krs

9.30 *Tervetuloa!*

Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan vt. pääsihteeri **Iina Kohonen**

9.45 *Lapset tutkimuskohteena - oikeudellinen tarkastelu*

Yliopistonlehtori **Liisa Nieminen** (Helsingin yliopisto)

*keskustelua*

10.30 *Aineistonhallinta*

Kehittämispäällikkö **Arja Kuula-Luumi** (Yhteiskuntatieteellinen tietoarkisto)

*keskustelua*

11.15 *Kokemuksia lapsiin kohdistuvan väkivallan tutkimisesta*

Tutkija **Noora Ellonen** (Poliisiammattikorkeakoulu)

*keskustelua*

12.00 *Dialoginen tieto*

Tutkimusjohtaja **Leena Suurpää** (Nuorisotutkimusseura)

*keskustelua*

13.00 Seminaari päättyy