



FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON  
RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK

Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK

# Annual report | 2019

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





# Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity TENK Annual Report 2019

## 1 | COMPOSITION AND MEETINGS OF THE BOARD

The Finnish National 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 previous Board ended in 2019. From 1 February 2016 to 31 January 2019, **Krista Varantola**, Chancellor Emerita of the University of Tampere, served as Chair, and University Lecturer **Pekka Louhiala** of the University of Helsinki as Vice Chair. There were also eight other members of the Board:

- Principal Economist **Kari Hämäläinen**, VATT Institute for Economic Research
- Senior Researcher **Jyrki Kettunen**, Arcada University of Applied Sciences
- Professor **Erika Löfström**, University of Helsinki
- Professor **Rainer Oesch**, University of Helsinki
- Professor **Riitta Salmelin**, Aalto University
- Programme Manager **Sirpa Thessler**, Natural Resources Institute Finland (Luke)
- Professor **Risto Turunen**, University of Eastern Finland
- Legal Adviser **Meri Vannas**, Academy of Finland



The Ministry of Education and Culture appointed a new board whose term is from 1 February 2019 to 31 January 2022. Professor **Riitta Keiski** from the University of Oulu serves as Chair and Professor Erika Löfström from the University of Helsinki as Vice Chair. There are also eight other members of the Board:

- Principal Economist Kari Hämäläinen, VATT Institute for Economic Research
- General Counsel **Matti Karhunen**, VTT
- Development Director **Leena Liimatainen**, JAMK University of Applied Sciences
- Senior Advisor **Susanna Näreaho**, Metropolia University of Applied Sciences
- Professor Riitta Salmelin, Aalto University
- Programme Manager Sirpa Thessler, Natural Resources Institute Finland (Luke)
- Assistant Professor **Aleksi Tornio**, University of Turku (until August 2019 Clinical Teacher, University of Helsinki)
- Professor Risto Turunen, University of Eastern Finland

Chancellor Emerita Krista Varantola acts as permanent expert on the Board. TENK Secretary General, docent **Sanna-Kaisa Spoof** acts as secretary.

The previous Board held one meeting at the beginning of the year in which the present Board also was present. Subsequently, the present Board held seven meetings. The December meeting was held in Lappeenranta during a two-day visit on 18–19 December 2019 at the Lappeenranta-Lahti University of Technology LUT.



*Figure 1: TENK members during the term 2019-2021.*

## 2 | PREVENTATIVE ACTION, EVENTS AND EDUCATION

### 2.1. Responsible conduct of research (RCR)

All the universities and universities of applied sciences in Finland, nearly all publicly funded research institutions, the Academy of Finland, Business Finland and the Prime Minister's Office are committed to following TENK's preventative ethical guidelines *Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland. Guidelines of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity 2012* (RCR guidelines). The number of signatories by the end of 2019 was 81. The RCR guidelines apply to approximately 25 000–30 000 members of research staff in Finnish universities, universities of applied sciences and research institutions.<sup>1</sup>

The trilingual guidelines can be ordered free of charge from TENK's office. The PDF and an educational video about the RCR process are available at <http://www.tenk.fi>.

There are also a Chinese–English and a Russian–English edition, produced together with the Responsible Research project, and a Spanish edition, produced together with the Finnish Cultural Institute in Madrid. These RCR guidelines editions for international researchers in Finland and people otherwise interested in the Finnish guidelines are available on TENK's website: <http://www.tenk.fi>.

TENK began the updating process of the template for researcher's curriculum vitae. The updating itself was carried out by a team with TENK's Chair, Professor Riitta Keiski, Dean at the University of Oulu as chair and as members Senior Science Counsel **Tiina Petänen** representing the Academy of Finland, **Markku Ihonen** from Tampere University and Special Adviser **Erja Ämmälähti** from Aalto University representing Universities Finland UNIFI, and Research Manager **Seliina Päällysaho** from Seinäjoki University of Applied Sciences representing The Rectors' Conference of Finnish Universities of Applied Sciences Arene.

### 2.2. Research Integrity Advisers

By the end of 2019, the network of Research Integrity Advisers created by TENK included 64 research organisations and 124 integrity advisers. The advisers help with different questions concerning research integrity. The research integrity adviser training and networking events were held as a part of Open Science Spring Workshop Day in Tampere in May and in Helsinki in December.

---

<sup>1</sup> Vipunen - Education Statistics Finland – R&D activity, <https://vipunen.fi/en-gb/higher-rd-activity/Pages/Tutkimus--ja-kehitystyö.aspx>

## 2.3. Responsible research

TENK is executing the *Responsible Research* project (1 Jan 2018–31 Dec 2020) funded by the Ministry of Education and Culture in Finland in cooperation with the Committee for Public Information (TJNK). The website <http://www.vastuullinentiede.fi/en> produced by the project is a guide to best practice in research integrity and research communication in the Finnish research community. The website is also available in Swedish and English.

The first national Research Integrity Barometer was carried out as a collaboration between TENK, Responsible Research and the University of Vaasa. The barometer consisted of a survey about research misconduct within the research community in Finland. The principal investigator of the barometer was Professor Emeritus **Ari Salminen** from the University of Vaasa. The report for the Research Integrity Barometer 2018 (*Tutkimusyhteisössä kaikki hyvin? Tutkimusetiikan barometri 2018*) was published in Finnish in May 2019.



Figure 2: The report for the Research Integrity Barometer 2018 was published in Finnish on 7 May 2019. TENK Chair Riitta Keiski (left), Coordinator Anni Sairio, authors Lotta Pitkänen and Ari Salminen from the University of Vaasa and TENK Secretary General Sanna-Kaisa Spoof.



In 2019, the expert bodies for responsible research that operate in association with the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies launched a project to create a shared web portal. The new [www.vastuullinentiede.fi](http://www.vastuullinentiede.fi) website combines the Open Science Coordination, the Publication Forum, the Committee for Public Information, the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity, and the article website Responsible Research into one.

## 2.4. Events

On 10 January 2019, TENK organised a panel discussion on the topic “Intervene in research misconduct” (“Rohkeus puuttua tiedevilppiin”) for the Science Forum. In addition to Secretary General Sanna-Kaisa Spoof, the speakers were TENK Vice Chair Pekka Louhiala and TENK member Erika Löfström.

The annual Ethics Day seminar was organised on 13 March 2019 at the House of Science and Letters in Helsinki. The topic of the seminar was “Ethical review in flux” (“eettinen ennakoarvointi muutoksessa”). TENK organises the Ethics Day in cooperation with the national advisory boards on research ethics.

TENK’s open events for the research community in 2019 also include:

- Publication of the Research Integrity Barometer on 7 May 2019
- Publication of the renewed guidelines for the ethical review in human sciences on 16 September 2019
- Publication of the RCR guidelines in Chinese, Russian and Spanish and an event for discussion and networking for international researchers in Finland on 19 November 2019

All events were organised at the House of Science and Letters in Helsinki.

## 3 | HANDLING OF ALLEGATIONS OF RCR MISCONDUCT

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

The year 2019 was exceptionally busy concerning RCR processes. Master’s degrees in universities of applied sciences (YAMK) received special attention, which resulted in an increased workload at TENK.

In 2019, 34 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. 13 of these allegations concerned RCR violations in Master’s theses in universities of applied sciences.

Each allegation was investigated in the organisation where the research or thesis under suspicion was or had been carried out.

According to notifications received by TENK, a total of 21 RCR investigations were finalised at universities of applied sciences during 2018. A violation of responsible conduct of research was found in 11

investigated cases: nine cases of misconduct, four of which also included disregard for the responsible conduct of research. In two cases the decision of the university of applied sciences does not specify whether the RCR violation is misconduct or disregard for the responsible conduct of research.

In other research organisations, 26 RCR investigations were finalised, some of which had been started earlier. Violation was found in four of these cases: all cases of misconduct, two of which also included disregard for the responsible conduct of research.

In 11 of the reported cases the investigation was incomplete or interrupted.

Summaries of the verified RCR cases are given in Section 3.2.

*Table 1: RCR allegations of misconduct reported to the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK and verified RCR violations, number (number of cases concerning theses in universities of applied sciences are shown in parentheses).*

<b>Allegations of RCR misconduct reported to TENK and verified violations, no.</b>  (number of cases concerning theses in universities of applied sciences are shown in parentheses)	<b>2019</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2015</b>
Reports from research organisations to TENK on new allegations of RCR misconduct	34 (13)	40 (16)	21	20	24
Finalised RCR processes at research organisations, in which the RCR violation was verified: <b>misconduct</b>	13 (9)	12 (7)	1	2	4
Finalised RCR processes at research organisations, in which the RCR violation was verified: <b>disregard</b>	6 (4)	7 (0)	4	1	3
Finalised RCR processes at research organisations, in which no RCR violation was verified	21 (6)	15 (0)	17	16	17

### 3.2. Verified RCR Violations at Research Organisations

*Case 1: Plagiarism of a research idea and research data in a funding application was misappropriation*

Doctor A from the field of science and technology submitted two funding applications with the same content. It was suspected that Doctor A had plagiarised a funding application that doctor B, who worked in the same research project, had submitted earlier. The RCR investigation conducted by the university confirmed the allegation, and the rector found A to be guilty of misappropriating a research idea and research data. Additionally, A was found to be guilty of other irresponsible practices by submitting the same application in several funding calls. The university delivered the decision and the final report of the investigation team to the funding body for further measures.

*Case 2: Defects in an autoethnographic study were found to be misconduct and disregard for the responsible conduct of research*

University researchers A and B from the humanities were suspected of being guilty of several RCR violations in the ethnographic description in their publication. Although the names of the persons who were discussed in the article were changed, they were allegedly still easily recognisable. The people who were studied had not been told they were a part of a study. Additionally, the autoethnographic description in the publication was suspected of including factual errors. The university's preliminary inquiry found researchers A and B to be guilty of disregard for the responsible conduct of research by reporting research results and methods in a careless manner, and by misleading the research community. The publication was found to include fabrication and inappropriate hampering of the work of another researcher as the studied persons were also researchers.

*Case 3: Exaggerating achievements in the application documents for a professorship was misconduct*

While applying for a professorship, the chosen candidate A was suspected of exaggerating their achievements in the application documents. The university had already considered the situation twice during the recent years but found after both preliminary inquiries that no RCR violation had taken place. TENK gave a statement concerning the situation in 2017 and 2018. The latter resulted in the university conducting an investigation proper. Based on the new information revealed in the investigation, the university found A to be guilty of both misconduct by misrepresentation of achievements and publications and disregard for the responsible conduct of research by giving incorrect information in their work history. As A had transferred into another university before the verification of the RCR violation, the decision was delivered to A's current employer.

*Case 4: No basis for misleading allegations found in custom research, but error in references found to be plagiarism*

Company X notified a research institute of an alleged RCR violation concerning a report the institute had published. Company X had noticed several flaws in the report. According to company X, the research



institute did not have the necessary expertise to assess the subject of the report, and the report portrayed company Y, company X's rival, in a tendentious manner. After receiving a statement from TENK (TENK 2019:10), the research institute conducted a preliminary inquiry. It found that the report was a part of a custom research that the research institute had conducted for company Y. The preliminary inquiry found X's allegations to be mainly unspecified and to not fulfil the definition of an RCR violation. Only the report's references were found to have an error concerning a text passage, which was deemed plagiarism. The reference error was corrected, and the amended customer report sent to the original customer, company Y.

Rest of the verified RCR violations reported to TENK in 2019 concerned plagiarism in Master's theses in universities of applied sciences.



*Figure 3: TENK's documents for the term 2016-2019. The material is stored permanently in the National Archives of Finland as part of Ministry of Education and Culture's archives.*

### **3.3. RCR Statements Requested from and Issued by TENK**

In 2019, TENK received a total of 23 new requests for a statement concerning allegations of misconduct in the responsible conduct of research. TENK issued a total of 22 RCR statements, of which 12 concerned Master's theses in universities of applied sciences. The number of statements was the highest in TENK's history.

Table 2: Number of statements issued by the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK (numbers of statements requested and issued concerning theses in universities of applied sciences are shown in parentheses).

<b>Statements issued by TENK, no.</b>  (numbers of statements requested and issued concerning theses in universities of applied sciences are shown in parentheses)	<b>2019</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2015</b>
New requests for a statement received by TENK that concerned the RCR process	23 (10)	16 (2)	9	9	11
Statements issued by TENK that concerned the RCR process; also including different requests for a statement other than those found in the previous section	22 (12)	9 (0)	10	8	8
Other expert statements than those that concerned the RCR process	1	2	1	1	-

Below are summaries of the RCR statements issued by TENK in 2019:

*Statement 1 (TENK 2019:1): Exaggerating one's CV was irresponsible but not an RCR violation*

Researchers A and B from the field of science and technology deemed researcher C to have exaggerated their curriculum vitae (CV) in applying for a professorship, thereby being guilty of manipulating authorship. Based on the investigation proper conducted by the university, C's CV had some discrepancies and anomalies that should be corrected, but C was not guilty of violating the responsible conduct of research.

A and B requested a statement from TENK concerning whether C was guilty of exaggerating their CV and whether the investigation process was conducted in accordance with TENK's guidelines. Additionally, they wanted to hear TENK's view on whether C's sanctions were sufficient and whether the investigation process documents should be public.

TENK's statement deemed C's CV for the professorship application to have several inaccuracies and C to have acted irresponsibly by exaggerating their scientific accomplishments. However, the deed was not serious enough to be found a violation of the responsible conduct of research. TENK found that the university had acted according to TENK's guidelines in deciding that C was not guilty of an RCR violation.

As they do not fall within TENK's scope, TENK does not comment on the sanctions or consequences issued by research organisations. Concerning the RCR documents being public, TENK stated that in

accordance with the Act on the Openness of Government Activities, both TENK's and the university's documents are public, provided that they do not include secret information. TENK's statement emphasized that C must amend their CV to wholly comply with TENK's "Template for researcher's curriculum vitae".

*Statement 2 (TENK 2019:2): Allegation of RCR misconduct was not malicious, although it did not result in a verified RCR violation*

Researcher C from the field of science and technology, mentioned in the previous statement summary, requested a statement from TENK concerning the same decision by the university as researchers A and B. Researcher C was satisfied with the investigation at the university. However, C considered that A and B were guilty of maliciously accusing C of an RCR violation and inappropriately hampering their research career. Additionally, C saw that A and B had used the RCR process to manage disagreements and problems in the work community.

In its statement, TENK did not comment on the motives of the instigators of the RCR allegation. Concerning research integrity TENK stated that because the university's investigation team had found some discrepancies and anomalies in C's CV and advised C to amend them, the RCR allegation by A and B was not malicious. Therefore, instigating the RCR allegation was not inappropriate hampering of the work of another researcher.

*Statement 3 (TENK 2019:3): Similarity in subject matter in a research plan and an art project was not plagiarism or misappropriation*

Master of Arts A applying for doctoral studies in arts suspected that lecturer B had plagiarised and misappropriated a new idea developed in A's research plan. Allegedly B presented the misappropriated idea both in an artistic performance and in a programme leaflet. Additionally, A requested for TENK's view on whether the university had conducted the preliminary inquiry appropriately, as the recording A had provided had not been considered during the inquiry.

TENK's view was that the text passages in the programme leaflet had similarity in subject matter to A's research plan only on a general level. Therefore, no plagiarism had taken place. Other similarities were also general and incidental.

However, TENK did state that for the sake of the transparency and clarity of the process, the university should have considered the recording of the contested performance. According to TENK's assessment, as the alleged similarity was very general in nature, the additional material would not have brought to the process anything new that had given reason to re-examine the allegation. TENK agreed with the university in that lecturer B had not violated the responsible conduct of research.

*Statement 6 (TENK 2019:6): Insufficient references in a thesis was deemed disregard for the responsible conduct of research and misappropriation. University reprimanded for the prolonged RCR process.*

Researcher A from the field of social sciences suspected that doctoral student B had plagiarised A's doctoral dissertation in their licentiate thesis. The issue was first considered in 2010, when the examination process of the licentiate thesis was suspended. Later, the licentiate thesis was approved. According to A, only minimal changes had been made to the thesis, so A notified the university about the RCR violation allegation. The faculty Dean inspected the case and stated that the thesis did not include conscious or deliberate plagiarism. TENK was not notified about the process. A notified the university's Rector about the allegation again in 2017. After the investigation proper, no misconduct was verified in the matter.

Furthermore, according to TENK, the matter did not fulfil the definition of plagiarism in the RCR guidelines, as the licentiate thesis refers to A's dissertation several times. However, TENK found B to be guilty of disregard for the responsible conduct of research by denigration and insufficient references. The insufficient references were so frequent and misleading to the reader, that TENK found the conditions for misappropriation to be fulfilled to some extent.

TENK found much to reprimand in the university's conduct. Among other things, TENK saw that the university committed a procedural fault by not initiating a process in accordance with the RCR guidelines. According to TENK, there were no members genuinely independent of the university in the investigation team.

*Statement 9 (TENK 2019:9): Critical assessment of researcher's work was not inappropriately hampering*

Researcher A from the field of law suspected reviewer B to be guilty of inappropriately hampering the work of a researcher in the application process of A's title of docent. A alleged that B had diminished A's achievements and had not considered all the delivered material. Additionally, A suspected that the faculty administration had violated against RCR by not granting A a title of docent.

TENK stated that matters concerning the appointment process of a title of docent does not fall within its scope. The faculty had processed A's application for a title of docent at its discretion. By assessing the application, B performed the task given to them. Giving a critical review did not violate the responsible conduct of research. Based on the material delivered to TENK, there was no reason to conclude that B had diminished A's achievements, thereby hampering their work as a researcher.

*Statement 10 (TENK 2019:10): Allegation concerning an expert opinion in legal proceedings required an RCR process*

Company X alleged that a report written by researchers in the field of technology was not impartial. The report was used as an expert opinion in a trial concerning trade secret infringement, in which X was a party. Additionally, X suspected that the report's list of authors was expanded and that it included plagiarism.

A preliminary inquiry required in an RCR process was not initiated, which was justified by stating that the report was not a scientific publication. According to TENK, the allegation falls within the scope of the RCR

guidelines as it is binding to researchers even when they give expert opinions as representatives of their field. Therefore, an RCR process was to be initiated in accordance with TENK's guidelines.

*Statement 11 (TENK 2019:11): Using a plagiarism checker was not necessary for verifying the extent of plagiarism in a thesis*

Based on a preliminary inquiry, a university saw that Master of Arts A was guilty of a violation of the responsible conduct of research in their thesis in the field of pedagogy. However, the deed was not regarded as particularly serious (see TENK Annual report 2018, section 3.2. Verified RCR Violations at Research Organisations, statement 5).

Based on a new RCR notification the university then initiated a second preliminary inquiry that found A to be guilty of misleadingly presenting another person's results and conclusions as their own. The university found A guilty of both disregard for the responsible conduct of research and misconduct by plagiarism.

Private citizen B was dissatisfied with the university not initiating an investigation proper although the preliminary inquiry had raised questions about more extensive misconduct. In addition, a plagiarism checker could not be used in the preliminary inquiry, because A had not given permission to digitize their thesis.

TENK stated that the RCR guidelines have been compiled to ensure the quality of scientific research. When the issue is with a thesis and the preliminary inquiry has already verified the RCR violation, the investigation proper should only be initiated because the alleged person requests it or because of an otherwise justified reason. Plagiarism can also be verified without a plagiarism checker.

*Statement 18 (TENK 2019:18): Exaggerating a CV was not a gross violation, but allegations about manipulating the list of authors, plagiarism, and self-plagiarism should be investigated in an investigation proper*

Professor A suspected that researcher B from the field of technology has exaggerated their achievements in their curriculum vitae (CV). Additionally, A suspected that B was guilty of plagiarism and self-plagiarism as well as manipulation of the list of authors in a joint article by listing doctoral student C as the primary author without C's consent. The university conducted two separate preliminary inquiries that found no violation to the responsible conduct of research.

According to TENK, there were reproachable sections in B's CV, but as a whole B's actions had not been serious enough to be considered a violation of the responsible conduct of research.

However, based on the material concerning the joint article delivered to TENK, it could not be verified whether B had the consent of their joint authors to use the material in a new article without referring to the book that had previously been published based on it. Additionally, the hearing of C, who had been listed as the primary author, had been inadequate in the preliminary inquiry. Therefore, TENK saw that the university must conduct an investigation proper in accordance with the RCR process.

*Statement 19 (TENK 2019:19): University had to initiate an investigation proper to review the contribution of an editor. University reprimanded for the prolonged RCR process.*

Researcher A suspected researchers B, C and D of disregard for the responsible conduct of research by not including A in the list of editors in a handbook based on a pedagogical project report. A had participated in planning the handbook but had opted out before the book was published.

The university made the first decision concerning the matter in March 2017. According to the decision the matter did not fall within the scope of RCR. Therefore, the preliminary inquiry was not initiated. On A's request, TENK gave its first statement concerning the matter, stating that the university should initiate a preliminary inquiry in accordance with the RCR process. The preliminary inquiry found that no RCR violation had occurred. A was dissatisfied with the decision. In their second request for a statement, A asked for TENK's view on the RCR process conducted by the university which had taken a considerable amount of time.

According to TENK, A had participated in the handbook's editorial team, but the parties shared different views on what was agreed on concerning A's contribution. As the possibility of an RCR violation could not be ruled out, TENK found that the university must conduct an investigation proper in accordance with the RCR process to examine the matter.

TENK found reproachable that the RCR process at the university took such a long time.

*Statement 21 (TENK 2019:21): Not mentioning a work over 20 years old was not inadequate referring to earlier research results*

Researcher A from the field of social sciences saw that researcher B from the same field wrote a chapter in a web publication that had matching research methods and results with A's work published 20 years prior. The contested chapter was a summary of expert work concerning a custom research.

A saw that B should have mentioned A's work because a researcher must be acquainted with all the knowledge and prior research available about the research subject. As A's work was not mentioned in B's references, A saw that B was guilty of plagiarism.

The university conducted a preliminary inquiry that found no RCR violation in the matter. A requested a statement from TENK.

TENK stated that denigrating the role of other researchers in publications, such as neglecting to mention them, may be considered a violation of the responsible conduct of research only if the researcher's conduct has been gross. According to TENK, not mentioning a work published 20 years prior in an article's references does not fulfil the criteria of an RCR violation. Moreover, concerning the alleged plagiarism of research methods, TENK shared the university's view that the methods in question had been in common use in many different fields for a long time.

Rest of the statements in 2019 concerned plagiarism in Master's theses in universities of applied sciences.

## 4 | ETHICAL REVIEW IN HUMAN SCIENCES

TENK coordinates the ethical review of research in the field of human sciences and promotes cooperation between regional and organisation-specific ethical committees. The committees give review statements by researchers' requests concerning the ethical aspects of research plans and other risks in research. The statements are based on TENK's guidelines to which the organisations are committed.

TENK reformed the 2009 ethical principles of research with human participants and ethical review in the human sciences in Finland. The new guidelines factor in the changed data protections legislation. Furthermore, the scope of the guidelines was broadened, and the review guidelines were specified. The reform was prepared by a TENK workgroup chaired by **Arja Kuula-Luumi**, Development Manager of the Finnish Social Science Data Archive. The secretary of the workgroup was TENK's Specialist **Iina Kohonen**. *The ethical principles of research with human participants and ethical review in the human sciences in Finland. Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK guidelines 2019* was drawn up together with the scientific community. It came into effect on 1 October 2019 in the organisations that are committed to the guidelines.



Figure 4: Chair of TENK workgroup Arja Kuula-Luumi and TENK Vice Chair Erika Löfström presented the new guidelines for ethical review in the Ethics Day seminar on 3 March 2019



TENK's office is following up the status of ethical review by collecting data on the cases processed by the committees annually and maintaining a list of contact information of the committees. At the end of 2019, a total of 56 organisations were committed to TENK's new ethical principles in the human sciences.

According to the organisations committed to the guidelines, there is fluctuation in the number of statement requests. Although the total number of requests was lower than in the previous year, the amount of work significantly increased in some committees. The requirements of the changed data protection legislation resulted in an increased workload for the ethical committees. The cooperation between the organisation's data protection personnel and their lawyers has therefore been found useful. The committees are often requested for a statement even if ethical review is not necessary according to TENK's guidelines. In these cases, the person requesting a statement may be given a description of the Finnish system which the researcher may then give to a journal. All in all, the general awareness of ethical review was found to have increased.

*Table 3: Number of cases handled by ethical committees in human sciences.*

<b>Cases handled by ethical committees in human sciences, no.</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2015</b>
Requests for statement related to ethical reviews	432	468	412	392	341
Statements given by ethical committees	389	457	385	324	295
Negative statement <sup>2</sup>	0	13	27	24	24
No statement (ethical review not considered necessary or request for statement directed to another committee)	36	26	35	41	25
Organisations replying to the follow-up survey, no.	27	24	30	25	25

---

<sup>2</sup> During and after 2019, a negative statement means that no positive statement could be given, or the required revisions have not been made to the research plan, or the requested additional material for the statement has not been delivered. Before 2019, the numbers also included cases where the request for statement returned with a demand for amendment.

## 5 | COOPERATION, INITIATIVES, AND PUBLICATION AND PR ACTIVITIES

During 2019, TENK continued the discussion with the the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV) about TSV beginning to actively promote the responsible conduct of research. The TSV Board committed its staff to the RCR guidelines by signing them on 9 December 2019. Additionally, TSV will recommend that its member foundations commit to the guidelines.

TENK's members and Secretary General carried out networking and shared information about TENK's activities by giving seminar presentations, publishing articles and giving interviews (APPENDIX 1 and 2 in the Finnish version of the annual report).

TENK's members worked actively in both national and local ethical committees and working groups (APPENDIX 3 in the Finnish version of the annual report).

TENK established the series Publications of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK (ISSN 2490-161X (print), ISSN 2669-9427 (PDF)) in 2019. A total of six publications were published in the series, of which five both in print and in electronic form.

*Publications of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK:*

1. Ari Salminen and Lotta Pitkänen: Tutkimusyhteisöissä kaikki hyvin? Tutkimusetiikan barometri 2018. The report for the Research Integrity Barometer 2018
2. A Practical Model of the Self-Regulation of Academic Integrity: A Chinese-English Edition of the Code of Conduct for Research Integrity in Finland
3. The ethical principles of research with human participants and ethical review in the human sciences in Finland. Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK guidelines 2019 (in Finnish, Swedish and English)
4. A Practical Model of the Self-Regulation of Academic Integrity: A Russian-English Edition of the Code of Conduct for Research Integrity in Finland
5. Un modelo práctico de autorregulación en la deontología académica: edición en español del código finlandés de buenas prácticas en la investigación (as PDF only)
6. Agreeing on authorship. Recommendation for research publications. Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK recommendations 2018 (2nd revised edition; in Finnish, Swedish & English)

## 6 | INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

TENK's General Secretary Sanna Kaisa Spoof acts as the Chair of the European Network of Research Integrity Offices (ENRIO) for the term 2018–2021. Spoof is also the leader of ENRIO's whistleblowing workgroup. At the end of 2019, ENRIO had 32 member organisations from 24 European countries.

Led by TENK, ENRIO initiated an organisational change from an unofficial network to an association working under the Belgian legal system in 2019. The ENRIO association will be established during 2020, after which the activities of the old network will be merged into the association within a two-year transition period. TENK is one of the founding members of the ENRIO association together with approximately 15 other European national bodies for research ethics.



*Figure 5: Birgit Buschbom (left) from Austria's research integrity offices representing the ENERI project together with ENRIO Secretary Kalle Videnoja at the joint conference stand of ENERI, ENRIO and the Responsible Research project in Hong Kong, June 2019.*

Another objective for TENK's presidency was to initiate and establish a biennial congress for research integrity in Europe. The decision was made to organise the first ENRIO congress, the ENRIO 2020 Congress on Research Integrity Practice, by TENK together with ENRIO and Aalto University at Dipoli in Espoo, Finland on 5–7 October 2020. The congress programme committee held its first meeting in Finland on 19 June 2019.

TENK's Chair and Secretariat made several meeting and study trips during the year:

- The Flemish Commission for Research Integrity, Brussels 16–17 Jan 2019
- ENRIO meeting, Prague 25–27 Mar 2019
- The 6th World Conference on Research Integrity, Hongkong 2–5 Jun 2019
- The Norwegian National Research Ethics Committees, Oslo 11–12 Sep 2019
- ENRIO meeting, Krakow 25–26 Sep 2019
- Final conference of the ENERI project, Brussels 28–29 Oct 2019

## 7 | PERSONNEL AND FINANCES

The Ministry of Education, Science and Culture granted TENK special transfer for internationalisation for 2019–2021.

In addition to Sanna Kaisa Spoof, Secretary General, TENK's secretariat included Senior Adviser **Ilina Kohonen**, DFA, and part-time Planning Officer **Terhi Tarkiainen**, MA, and part-time Office Secretary **Kaisu Reiss**, BSc (Econ). From 18 March 2019 onwards, the Coordinator of International Affairs and ENRIO Secretary was **Kalle Videnoja**, MSc.

TENK's and TJNK's collaboration, the Responsible Research project included part-time Communications Coordinator **Maija Lähteenmäki**, MA, and Coordinator **Anni Sairio**, PhD. From 1 September 2019 onwards, Sairio was also the Conference Secretary for the ENRIO 2020 congress.



*Figure 6: TENK's secretariat: Terhi Tarkiainen (left), Kaisu Reiss, Anni Sairio, Kalle Videnoja, Sanna-Kaisa Spoof, Ilina Kohonen and Maija Lähteenmäki.*

TENK's secretariat works at the location of The Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV) at Snellmaninkatu 13, Helsinki. TSV offers TENK financial and personnel administration services, network connections, IT services as well as the office premises. The facilities of the House of Science and Letters are in TENK's use free of charge for meetings and seminars.

This annual report was approved at the meeting of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK held on 8 April 2020.

*Riitta Keiski*

Chair

*Sanna-Kaisa Spoof*

Secretary General