

**FINNISH NATIONAL  
BOARD ON RESEARCH  
INTEGRITY TENK  
ANNUAL REPORT  
2021**



FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON  
RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK

# CONTENTS

<b>1. Objectives and tasks of TENK</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Promotion of responsible conduct of research (RCR)</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. Responsible conduct of research (RCR)	<b>5</b>
2.2. Research integrity advisers	<b>6</b>
2.3. Communications and announcements	<b>6</b>
2.4. Events	<b>8</b>
<b>3. Handling of allegations of RCR misconduct</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1. Allegations of RCR misconduct reported to TENK and verified violations	<b>9</b>
3.2. Verified RCR violations at research organisations	<b>10</b>
3.3. RCR statements requested from and issued by TENK	<b>12</b>
3.4. Summaries of RCR statements issued by TENK	<b>13</b>
<b>4. Ethical review in human sciences</b>	<b>25</b>
4.1. Human sciences ethics committees and their coordination	<b>25</b>
4.2. Statements issued by TENK on ethical review in human sciences	<b>26</b>
<b>5. International activities</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>6. Personnel and finances</b>	<b>30</b>

## 1.

# OBJECTIVES AND TASKS OF THE FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK

THE FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK is an expert body appointed by the Ministry of Education and Culture in Finland 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). In addition, the Decree also states that the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK is responsible for 1) making proposals to and responding to governmental authorities on legislative and other matters concerning research integrity; 2) acting as an expert body working towards the resolution of ethical questions arising out of research; 3) taking initiatives for advancing research integrity and further discussion concerning research integrity in Finland; 4) monitoring international developments in the area and taking an active part in international co-operation; and 5) informing the public about research integrity. This annual report explores how TENK's tasks and objectives have been implemented in 2021.

The National Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK carries out the tasks assigned to it by preventing research misconduct related to research quality and ethical norms, drafting national guidelines, organising seminars and promoting education, coordinating ethical reviews in human sciences, and networking and carrying out advocacy work nationally and internationally. In addition, TENK monitors responsible conduct of research (RCR) by monitoring and compiling statistics on RCR violations, issuing statements on investigations of alleged misconduct, and providing advice in problem situations. The implementation of these measures is discussed in more detail in Chapters 2–6.

The Ministry of Education and Culture appoints the members of TENK for a three-year term based on proposals made by the scientific community.

During TENK's term of office running from 1 February 2019 to 31 January 2022, Professor **Riitta Keiski**, Dean of the University of Oulu, served as Chair, and Professor **Erika Löfström** from the University of Helsinki as Vice Chair. In addition, TENK had eight other members:

- Chief Researcher **Kari Hämäläinen**,  
Government Institute for Economic Research
- General Counsel **Matti Karhunen**,  
VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland
- Development Director **Leena Liimatainen**,  
JAMK University of Applied Sciences
- Senior Advisor **Susanna Näreaho**,  
Metropolia University of Applied Sciences
- Professor **Riitta Salmelin**, Aalto University
- Vice President, Natural Resources, **Sirpa Thessler**,  
Natural Resources Institute Finland
- Assistant Professor **Aleksi Tornio**, University of Turku
- Professor **Risto Turunen**, University of Eastern Finland

Chancellor Emerita **Krista Varantola** serves as permanent expert on the Board. TENK Secretary General, Docent **Sanna-Kaisa Spoo**, serves as secretary.

TENK met seven times during 2021. Five of the meetings were held online due to the coronavirus pandemic. During the year, TENK members and its secretariat networked and presented the activities of TENK by holding seminar presentations (ANNEX 1), publishing articles and giving interviews (ANNEX 2). TENK members are active in both national and local ethics committees and working groups (ANNEX 3).

## 2.

# PROMOTION OF RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH (RCR)

## 2.1. RESPONSIBLE CONDUCT OF RESEARCH (RCR)

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) provide all research practitioners with a model for responsible conduct of research. The objective of these guidelines is to promote the responsible conduct of research and to prevent misconduct in research in all organisations that carry out or support research work, such as universities, research institutes and universities of applied sciences.

The effectiveness of these RCR guidelines is based on a voluntary commitment by the research community to adhere to them and to increase awareness of the principles of research integrity. In Finland, the guidelines are applied in all fields of science, and a commitment to adhere to them has been made by all universities, all universities of applied sciences, almost all research institutes within the scope of public funding, the Academy of Finland, Business Finland and the Prime Minister's Office. All in all, the RCR guidelines apply to approximately 25,000–30,000 members of the research community spread across Finnish universities, universities of applied sciences and research institutions.

In the work to revise the RCR guidelines, particular attention was paid to feedback received through a survey directed at the scientific community in spring 2021. This feedback included requests that the new version would include areas such as subheadings, a widening of scope to include RDI activities, clarification of RCR terminology, more precise definitions of RCR violations and a shortening of the RCR process. There was also a desire to highlight organisations' responsibility for RCR alongside that of researchers. The revision process will continue in 2022. The aim is to publish the revised guidelines in December 2022.

The members of the revision group were TENK chairpersons **Riitta Keiski** and **Erika Löfström**, members **Susanna Näreaho**, **Kari Hämäläinen**

and **Matti Karhunen**, and permanent expert **Krista Varantola**. The revision work is being coordinated by **Sanna-Kaisa Spoo**, **Iina Kohonen**, **Terhi Tarkiainen** and **Minna Aittasalo** from the TENK secretariat.

## 2.2. RESEARCH INTEGRITY ADVISERS

TENK coordinates the activities of research integrity advisers, a service which it launched in 2017. A key starting point for the research integrity advisers is the need to strengthen awareness of Finnish RCR among an increasingly international body of researchers. By the end of 2021, the network of research integrity advisers included 74 research organisations and 146 integrity advisers.

The most important task of the integrity advisers is to provide confidential advice to the personnel of their organisation in situations of alleged RCR misconduct. It is also hoped that integrity advisers' activities will lower the threshold for submitting an RCR report in possible cases of serious misconduct.

Each year, TENK organises various training and networking events aimed at research integrity advisers. In 2021, training and networking events for research integrity advisers were organised as online events in March, May and November. **Päivi Seppälä**, MA, provided work guidance for integrity advisers in autumn 2021. A total of 12 integrity advisers participated in the work guidance, and they met five times in Zoom. The participants had not had many advice-giving situations during the period in question, but the general questions on research integrity generated much discussion and the peer group experience proved to be very significant.

Each year, TENK conducts a survey of integrity advisers. The survey of their activities in 2021 was conducted in February 2022. The response rate was 50%. The survey revealed that the tasks of integrity advisers in 2021 particularly involved providing advice and information on research integrity. There had been relatively few actual suspected RCR violations and RCR processes. Among other things, respondents expressed a desire that TENK would develop peer support and networking. The results of the survey were discussed in the integrity advisers development group led by **Erika Löfström**.

## 2.3. COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

One of the tasks of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK is to disseminate information on issues related to research integrity. TENK communicates and disseminates information about its activities and about research integrity guidelines in Finnish, Swedish and English on its own website, on the Responsible Research website and in its *News from TENK*

newsletter. In addition, TENK members and the secretariat present and make visible TENK activities and research integrity issues by holding seminar presentations (ANNEX 1), publishing articles and giving interviews (ANNEX 2). TENK also organises various expert events aimed at the scientific community (see section 2.4).

In 2021, the communications work of the Research Ethics Advisory Board involved deepening cooperation with Responsible Research actors. Responsible Research combines the activities and communications of the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV) and the research support bodies operating in connection with it: TENK, the Committee for Public Information (TJNK), Open Science and the Publication Forum. In 2020, the above-mentioned Responsible Research actors established a joint group of websites with the aim of promoting reliable and commonly accepted ways of producing, publishing and evaluating research data. In 2021, the Responsible Research website group consolidated its activities.

The deeper cooperation between Responsible Research actors was visible on the sites of TENK and the Responsible Research website group through developments such as increasingly diverse and active production of articles and news. The articles on responsible research discussed areas such as research integrity, science communication, openness of science, and evaluation. A total of 23 responsible research articles were published, seven of which were also available in translated versions. The joint website group has supported cooperation between actors and promoted the visibility, presence and use of responsible research and research integrity themes within society. In 2021, a total of 20 topical news pieces and articles were published in Finnish on the TENK website. Of these, three were also published in Swedish and five in English. New functions for users were also added to the website, such as a search function for statements issued by TENK that relate to suspected violations of responsible conduct of research (RCR). The summaries can be found in the search service in Finnish, Swedish and English. It is hoped that the summaries will provide assistance in areas such as teaching of research integrity.

During the past year, new language versions were added to TENK's teaching videos. These animated videos are intended for teaching use, and they present RCR and ethical review in human sciences. They were previously available only in Finnish, Swedish and English. In 2021, the videos also became available in French and Russian. With these translated versions, TENK aims to better serve the needs of Finland's increasingly international research community. 2021 saw the multilingual teaching materials being actively used for communication purposes. The materials also received visibility among international audiences, for example through the event platform for the ENRIO 2021 Congress on Research Integrity Practice, which was held in September 2021. In addition to the teaching videos, Responsible Research

actors and TSV also jointly produced short videos on the activities, goals and values of TENK, TJNK, Open Science and the Publication Forum for presentation at the ENRIO Congress.

In 2021, TENK developed its Finnish-language stakeholder communications. After the joint newsletter for Responsible Research actors came to an end in spring 2021, TENK launched a new regular newsletter. The News from TENK newsletter is sent 3–5 times a year to all organisations and organisational leaders who are committed to adhering to TENK guidelines, all research integrity advisers, other stakeholders, and those who have joined TENK mailing list. In 2021, the *News from TENK* newsletter was published in June, September and December. The purpose of the newsletter is to communicate to stakeholders about topical subjects and issues that relate both to TENK and more broadly to research integrity and responsible research.

## 2.4. EVENTS

In March, TENK organised Ethics Day 2021 (ANNEX 4) in cooperation with national ethical advisory boards. This time, the theme for the annual seminar was the rights of research participants. Speakers at the Ethics Day seminar included **Riitta Keiski, Iina Kohonen, Helena Eronen, Kari-Matti Piilahti, Maija Miettinen, Peija Haaramo, Olli Carpen, Henriikka Mustajoki, Markus Torvinen, Päivi Topo** and **Rauna Kuokkanen**.

Ethics Day 2021 was held online due to the coronavirus pandemic, and it attracted record number of people. A total of nearly 500 people followed the Zoom webinar and YouTube live broadcast. The theme of the day was examined from the perspective of both human sciences and medicine science. The seminar also discussed the rights of special groups both to be researched and also to remain unresearched. The recording of the webinar was available for 14 days on the Science TV Youtube channel of the Federation of Finnish Learning Societies. Ethics Day is a multidisciplinary seminar on questions of research integrity which has been bringing together representatives of different disciplines since 2011.

In September 2021, TENK and the European Network of Research Integrity Offices ENRIO organised the first ENRIO Congress on Research Integrity Practice in partnership with Aalto University. Nearly 400 experts on research integrity met at the European Congress on Research Integrity Practice, which was held from 27 to 29 September 2021. Experts from 32 different countries participated in the congress, which focused on practical questions of research integrity. Research ethics education and the development of a good research culture were prominent topics at the ENRIO Congress (for more about Congress, see Chapter 5).



# 3.

## HANDLING ALLEGATIONS OF RCR MISCONDUCT

### 3.1. ALLEGATIONS OF RCR MISCONDUCT REPORTED TO TENK AND CONFIRMED VIOLATIONS

In 2021, a total of 53 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. 10 of these allegations concerned RCR violations in Master's theses in universities of applied sciences.

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

According to the notifications received by TENK, 38 RCR processes were completed during the year, some of which had already been started in the preceding years. Of these, 31 concerned cases investigated in universities or other organisations and seven concerned Master's theses at universities of applied science. In regards to YAMK Master's theses, two were found to involve plagiarism and one was found to involve disregard for responsible conduct of research.

Five of the cases investigated in universities or other research organisations were found to involve RCR violations. Three cases involved misconduct and two involved disregard for responsible conduct of research.

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

<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>2021</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2017</b>
Reports from research organisations to TENK on new allegations of RCR misconduct	53 (10)	43 (2)	34 (13)	40 (16)	21 (0)
Finalised research organisation RCR processes in which a RCR violation was verified: <b>misconduct</b>	5 (2)	6 (3)	13 (9)	12 (7)	1 (0)
Finalised research organisation RCR processes in which a RCR violation was verified: <b>disregard</b>	3 (1)	9 (2)	6 (4)	7 (0)	4 (0)
Finalised research organisation RCR processes in which no RCR violation was found	21 (3)	24 (0)	22 (6)	15 (0)	17 (0)

*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).*

### **3.2. VERIFIED RCR VIOLATIONS AT RESEARCH ORGANISATIONS**

#### **Case 1: The misappropriation of a research idea was verified as a violation of responsible conduct of research through misconduct**

Humanities docent A suspected that professor B and their working group had misappropriated the research idea of docent A and plagiarised A's research plan. The preliminary inquiry carried out by the university considered that the possibility of a RCR violation could not be ruled out, and thus the investigation proper was initiated.

Based on the investigation proper and overall assessment, the university decided that B was guilty of violating responsible conduct of research by

misappropriating the research idea of another researcher. Misappropriating a research idea means the unjustified presentation or use of another person's research result, idea, observations or material in one's own name. On the other hand, the investigation did not support the claims of plagiarism made by A.

In its statement, TENK cleared B of this suspected misconduct; see TENK 2021:19.

### **Case 2: Plagiarism, or unacknowledged borrowing, found in a master's thesis led to a warning for misconduct**

Humanities student A suspected that student B had plagiarized A's thesis, published in 2017, in their thesis published in 2019.

Based on the investigation proper, the university concluded that the Master's thesis in question contained sections that did not comply with principles of research integrity in the manner required for ethically sustainable research. Based on the investigation, the case was found to involve RCR misconduct in the form of plagiarism, which is unacknowledged borrowing.

### **Case 3: Unacknowledged borrowing of material created by another party was found to be plagiarism**

In an RCR notification from a technical field, it was suspected that Dr A had used Dr B's texts without permission, thus violating responsible conduct of research. According to the notification, A's text contained a considerable amount of text that was identical to B's texts. In addition, A was also suspected of having stolen B's research idea and research layout.

In its decision, the university considered the activities of A to be reprehensible and found A guilty of misconduct as plagiarism in research activities.

### **Case 4: A conference publication violated authorship rights**

In 2020, the university received an RCR notification from a technical field that alleged a violation of responsible conduct of research in the form of plagiarism or misappropriation and/or a violation of authorship. According to the notification, three master's theses had been copied into conference publications without any changes being made. In addition, it seemed that the suspect had added their name to the first conference publication, even though there did not appear to be any new contribution compared when comparing the text to the other person's master's thesis.

In its decision, the university considered that the actions had been contrary to responsible conduct of research, as the conference publications had not properly referred to the master's theses on which they were based and the texts of the conference publications had also been fully copied from the theses in question. In addition, the university considered that the authorship order in the conference publications had been misreported.

### Case 5: Inadequate citations found in research and reporting communications

Technical researcher A was suspected of neglect in their research and reporting work and of misleading their own work community and funders. The allegations included, among other things, neglect in documentation work, inadequate recording and storage of results and research data, self-plagiarism, improper utilisation of others' results, plagiarism, fabrication or falsification of results, and misleading presentation of results.

On the basis of the preliminary study, the research organisation concluded that there had been violations of responsible conduct of research with regard to the inadequate citations mentioned in the RCR notification. Because A admitted their disregard for responsible conduct of research, no investigation proper was initiated. They were required, however, to take appropriate action to remedy the inadequate citations.

\*\*\*

The remaining verified RCR violations at research organisations reported to TENK in 2021 concerned plagiarism or disregard of responsible conduct of research found in Master's theses at universities of applied sciences.

### 3.3. RCR STATEMENTS REQUESTED FROM AND ISSUED BY TENK

2021 was a record-breaking year for allegations of RCR violations and for RCR statements requested from and issued by TENK. In 2021, TENK received 37 new requests for statements on investigation processes regarding responsible conduct of research.

Seven of these concerned Master's theses at universities of applied sciences. In addition, TENK received for the first time a request for a statement on a ethical review statement issued by a human sciences ethics committee. In 2021, TENK issued a total of 23 statements. One of these concerned an ethics review in human sciences (IEEA). The summary for the IEEA statement is presented in section 4.2.

Due to the large number of requests for statements, the five-month processing time specified in the RCR guidelines was exceeded in some cases. In order to alleviate the backlog, TENK held one extraordinary meeting in November and strengthened the secretariat with one temporary expert.

The summaries of the RCR statements issued by TENK in 2021 are presented in section 3.4.

<b>TENK statements, no.</b> (numbers of statements requested and issued concerning theses in universities of applied sciences are shown in parentheses)	<b>2021</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2017</b>
New requests for a statement received by TENK that concerned a RCR process	37 (7)	14 (2)	23 (10)	16 (2)	9 (0)
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 (0)	13 (0)	22 (12)	9 (0)	10 (0)
Other expert statements than those that concerned the RCR process	1	7	1	2	1

*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).*

### 3.4. SUMMARIES OF RCR STATEMENTS ISSUED BY TENK

#### **Statement 1 (TENK 2021:1): Preliminary inquiry of suspected plagiarism in a non-fiction book was not based on the RCR guidelines**

A group of researchers suspected that the human sciences non-fiction book published by professor A and docent B contained plagiarism and self-plagiarism. In its preliminary inquiry, the university concluded that A and B were guilty of disregard for responsible conduct of research, but the seriousness of the act did not amount to plagiarism. Due to the nature of the work as republished material, no self-plagiarism was found in the case. In their request for a statement from TENK, the researchers expressed their dissatisfaction with the RCR process carried out, and they also contested the key results of the preliminary inquiry.

In its statement, TENK considered that the preliminary inquiry on the suspected plagiarism had not been sufficiently comprehensive and had not been based on the RCR guidelines. TENK therefore considered that the university should launch an investigation proper on the matter, as the suspicion of misconduct in scientific research could not be completely ruled out. In the future, the university should also instruct the persons appointed to

carry out the preliminary inquiry to base their work on the RCR guidelines. The guidelines are binding on researchers writing non-fiction books regardless of how scientific the works are or the form of publication.

**Statement 2 (TENK 2021:2): The supervisors of a dissertation were not found guilty of a RCR violation in an authorship dispute**

A university's natural sciences (biomedicine) doctoral candidate X suspected that professor A, who had supervised the dissertation, and postdoctoral researcher B had manipulated the author list of the articles by including as authors persons whose contribution was insufficient for authorship. The allegations primarily concerned four joint articles and one unpublished manuscript. X was the author of two articles and the manuscript and felt that they should also have been added to the list of authors for the other articles.

X was dissatisfied with the university's decision that no RCR violation had taken place.

According to TENK's guidelines, the principles concerning authorship must be agreed upon within the research project between all parties before the research is begun. The agreement must be reviewed and supplemented as the project progresses. The principal investigator or the responsible researcher of the project is responsible for the agreement.

In the RCR guidelines, manipulation of authorship is one type of irresponsible practice, and in its most serious form it can meet the criteria for a RCR violation. According to the RCR guidelines, denigrating the role of other researchers in publications can be examined as disregard for the responsible conduct of research. In order to establish an RCR violation in such a case, the actions of the researcher alleged of a violation should constitute gross negligence and carelessness in various stages of the research. However, in TENK's view, the matter had been thoroughly investigated during the preliminary inquiry and had taken into account established practices specific to the field of science in question. For each article mentioned in the notification, the matters that had influenced the drafting of the list of authors had been sufficiently clarified and the actions of the suspects did not show such gross negligence or carelessness in the various stages of the research work that the criteria for a RCR violation would be fulfilled.

**Statement 3 (TENK 2021:3): The error in a dissertation was larger than a single bibliographical citation, but not so serious that it would constitute a RCR violation. The corrective actions taken were sufficient.**

A suspected that B's doctoral dissertation in the field of human sciences contained incorrect information and an incorrectly marked source reference, and thus public access to it should be withdrawn. The university carried out

a preliminary inquiry on the matter, according to which there was an error in the bibliography, but it was not so significant that the dissertation should be re-evaluated. The inquiry also concluded that B had not violated responsible conduct of research. B had contacted the library to correct the error in the dissertation.

A was dissatisfied with the university's decision that no RCR violation had taken place and demanded that the dissertation be rejected.

TENK agreed with A that the case involved an error greater than a single bibliographical reference, but considered credible B's explanation that this had been a technical observation error which was then repeated in different parts of the research text. In TENK's view, this was not a matter of gross negligence or carelessness that would give reason to examine the matter as a RCR violation.

TENK took the view that the measures taken to remedy the matter were sufficient. However, TENK considered that a note on the corrections made should be added to the electronic versions of the dissertation.

#### **Statement 4 (TENK 2021:4): Failure to cite a study on the same topic in a Master's thesis was not a RCR violation**

A suspected that B's technical master's thesis included plagiarism of A's master's thesis, which was published in 2007. According to A, the title of B's thesis, the main research topic and some of the contents were very similar to those of A's thesis. A considered that A themselves should be mentioned as the second author of the work. The university carried out a preliminary inquiry of the matter and concluded that there was no plagiarism in the thesis.

When assessing whether a violation of responsible conduct of research has occurred, the RCR guidelines in force at the time must be applied in the assessment. According to A, the alleged plagiarism under review took place in 2011. TENK's RCR guidelines for 2002 were therefore applied to this case.

According to the guidelines, plagiarism refers to the most serious form of RCR violations: fraud in science [now referred to as research misconduct]. It means presenting someone else's research plan, manuscript, article or text, or parts thereof, as one's own.

In order for the RCR process to establish that plagiarism has occurred, the deed must fulfil the characteristics of plagiarism or unacknowledged borrowing, as well as being intentional and deliberately misleading the scientific community.

According to the RCR guidelines, denigrating the role of other researchers in publications can also be regarded as disregard for the responsible conduct of research. In order to establish an RCR violation in such a case, the actions of the researcher alleged of a violation should constitute, in addition to disregard

for the responsible conduct of research, gross negligence and irresponsibility at the various stages of research.

In the view of TENK, failure to refer to an individual study on the same topic does not, according to the RCR guidelines, indicate such misconduct or disregard for RCR norms that the criteria for an RCR violation would be met. Moreover, there was no mention of such gross negligence or carelessness in B's activities that there would have been reason to investigate the matter as an RCR violation. As a result, TENK agreed with the conclusion of the preliminary inquiry view that no RCR violation had taken place.

**Statement 5 (TENK 2021:5): A joint article cited the author's previous joint publications in a deficient and inappropriate manner. Nevertheless, the criteria for plagiarism were not met.**

Professor A suspected that technical researcher B had plagiarised a chapter of a book in a joint article and marked X as the first author of the article without their consent. The university conducted an investigation proper after receiving a statement (2019:18) from TENK. The investigation proper revealed that the case involved a total of four publications, all of which dealt with the same research results. B was an author for all four publications. X could not be contacted during the investigation proper.

Based on the rector's decision, B was found guilty of both disregard for responsible conduct of research and plagiarism. In order to rectify the consequences of the RCR violation, the rector decided that the university would contact publishers to have both the article and the book chapter removed from the publication channel.

Joint article co-author C article was dissatisfied with the rector's decision to contact the publisher and requested a statement from TENK on the matter. TENK handled the matter in the statement TENK 2021:22.

In TENK's opinion, the review article inadequately and inappropriately referenced previous research results. However, the criteria for plagiarism were not met, as B was the author of each article in the case in question. The discovered misconduct could not therefore be used as a justification for removing the article from the publication channel.

TENK also issued a second statement on this decision by the rector (TENK 2021:22).

**Statement 6 (TENK 2021:6): The list of authors for the translated versions had to also be corrected. The rector's decision should have named those responsible for the RCR violation.**

Researcher A suspected that researchers B, C and D were guilty of disregard for responsible conduct of research when they did not mention A in the list



of editors for a handbook drawn up on the basis of a project report from the field of educational science. A had participated in the planning of the handbook but had left the project before the publication of the handbook. The university issued its first decision on the matter in March 2017. According to this decision, the case did not relate to RCR and thus a preliminary inquiry was not initiated.

At the request of A, TENK issued a first statement on this decision (TENK 2018:3), according to which the university had to initiate a preliminary inquiry in accordance with the RCR process.

This preliminary inquiry concluded that there had been no RCR violation. A was dissatisfied with this decision and requested a second statement from TENK (TENK 2019:19). In its statement, TENK ruled that the university must initiate an investigation proper in line with RCR guidelines. TENK also considered it reprehensible that it had taken the university so long to deal with the suspected RCR violation.

On the basis of the investigation proper, the rector made two decisions in the matter. The first decision stated that there had been a RCR violation. According to this decision, A should have been mentioned as a person involved in compiling the project report. However, the decision did not specify who had committed the RCR violation. The second decision stated that A had to be marked as one of the compilers of the handbook. In addition, a note referring to the aforementioned rector's decision had to be added to the publication.

A requested a statement from TENK on whether the university has acted incorrectly in the RCR process by failing to name the party or parties responsible for the RCR violation in its decision. In addition, A asked TENK to confirm A's view that they should also be added as an author of the translated versions of the handbook. TENK took the view that the RCR process decision must identify any disregard for responsible conduct of research or misconduct that took place. In addition to this, the decision must state who has committed the violation in order for the possible consequences of the violation to be directed at the right parties. TENK also stated that A's name should be entered also in all translated versions of the work as one of the compilers of the publication. The publications also had to have a note added to them that refers to the rector's decision on the matter.

### **Statement 9 (TENK 2021:9): A co-author could not retrospectively question the authorship order of a joint article**

According to a RCR notification made by Professor A, grant-funded natural sciences researcher B was guilty of manipulating the authorship of an article in order to make themselves the first author of a joint scientific article published by several authors. The documents showed that A had acted as B's doctoral

supervisor. In their request for a statement, A expressed dissatisfaction with the university's decision that B was not guilty of a RCR violation.

In its statement, TENK affirmed that A had accepted that their name would be listed together with B's name in the list of authors for the joint article. Therefore, A could not later on question B's authorship nor the authorship order for the article in question. The university was considered to have investigated the matter in accordance with the TENK guidelines.

At the general level, TENK stated that the writers of joint articles that will be published in scientific journals should jointly agree on both the content of the article and which names should be included in the list of authors. According to the TENK guidelines, consensus on the matter must be reached no later than when the manuscript is sent for evaluation by the publication in question. Authorship must therefore be agreed upon in advance, and the responsibility for agreeing on the matter is primarily in the hands of the head of the research group in question or the researcher responsible for the project.

#### **Statement 10 (TENK 2021:10): Organisation suspected of bias and RCR violations**

Technical professor A suspected that university X's management was guilty of stealing their research ideas and plans. According to A, they had forbidden X's staff from drafting new joint articles with A because A was no longer an employee of X. A had not, however, indicated in the notification that misappropriation had taken place in practice or that the suspects had committed other RCR violations.

In its statement, TENK considered that, when publishing scientific manuscripts towards which A had made a significant scientific contribution, the employer must adhere to RCR principles when exercising its right of direction. In addition, TENK stated that only a named person, not an organisation, can be guilty of an RCR violation.

In their request for a statement, A also considered that the vice rector of X would not be able to make unbiased decision on the RCR process, as their immediate superior, the university rector, was suspected of misconduct. TENK also stated its position on this issue at a general level, ruling that if the management of a research organisation is suspected of RCR violations, it is very important to ensure the right conditions for the RCR processes, including areas such as decision-making. This in turn ensures that the legal protection of the researchers or other parties to the case is not compromised. TENK considered that the RCR process in question had been carried out in accordance with TENK guidelines.

**Statement 11 (TENK 2021:11): Leaving out expressions of gratitude from a foreword to a doctoral thesis was not a RCR violation**

Professor A had acted as the Phd supervisor of natural sciences doctoral researcher B and co-author in all of the separate publications of B's doctoral dissertation. In addition, B had made the corrections proposed by A for the conclusion section of his doctoral dissertation. For this reason, A considers that they should have been taken into account in the foreword of the dissertation in question. As this was not the case, A had made a notification of a suspected RCR violation. A was dissatisfied because the university had chosen not to launch a preliminary inquiry.

According to the university's decision, B should be allowed to decide for themselves who they thank in the foreword of their dissertation and how they do so. Although it was exceptional for a doctoral candidate not to mention their supervisor in this context, the RCR process could not be launched because it did not constitute a RCR violation. In its statement, TENK agreed with the university's view.

**Statement 13 (TENK 2021:13): The teachers' activities on a course did not require an ethical review. The rector was allowed to transfer assessment of the case to the University Examination Board.**

According to A, the university's economics teachers B and C had given an illegal assignment in their course. It was alleged that completing the assignment required the student to disclose private matters. In A's view, the teachers should have asked the students for their informed consent. A also claimed that the teachers did not have permission from the Ethics Committee to conduct an investigation, survey or data collection that measures and tests psychological matters.

The rector of the university decided not to launch a preliminary inquiry, as they considered that decisions on university teaching activities and the teaching itself did not fall within the scope of the RCR guidelines. A was dissatisfied with the rector's decision and requested a statement from TENK on the matter.

Freedom of research and teaching fall within the scope of the autonomy of universities, and TENK is not competent to take action in matters related to the content of teaching. However, researchers must comply with responsible conduct of research when acting as teachers and instructors. In addition to research activities, these policies also apply to teaching materials.

After receiving A's notification, the university had established that it was a study attainment related to the course, not data collection for research purposes. As a result, the activities were not covered by TENK guidelines for ethical review.

In the view of TENK, the rector had exercised the discretion afforded him by the RCR guidelines as to legitimate reasons for not initiating an RCR preliminary inquiry and transferring the matter to be handled elsewhere, in this case by the University Examination Board.

**Statement 15 (TENK 2021:15): Misconduct found in the use of a non-peer-reviewed article for marketing a health test.**

The RCR process used to investigate the matter followed the RCR guidelines. Doctor A had directed his allegations at the authors of a medical science joint article, researchers B and C of university X. They were suspected to have used a non-peer-reviewed article to support the scientific validity of a health test. During the RCR process initiated for the case by university X, B and C published an article which was essentially identical to the contested article and which passed the peer review.

On the basis of the investigation proper, the rector of X had decided that B and C had committed several RCR violations. These were misconduct as falsification, and disregard for responsible conduct of research in that the research results and methods had been reported in a careless manner, resulting in misleading claims. The suspects were also found guilty of misleading the public with regard to their own research.

On the other hand, no RCR violation was found regarding the ethical review required by the sample study. Since, according to the Rector, only B and C had overall responsibility and perception for the implementation of the study, the other co-authors of the controversial articles were not considered to have been involved in the RCR violation. B and C contested the RCR violations in their request for a statement from TENK. According to them, the background to the notification was their scientific dispute with A.

The statement request questioned the RCR investigation team's knowledge of the matter and expressed suspicions of its members' unbiased stance due to a state of commercial competition between them and B and C. TENK took the view, however, that the investigation team had acted appropriately. In the conclusion to its statement, TENK stated that the university had carried out the RCR process in question in accordance with the TENK guidelines. TENK did not comment on the questions that the parties requesting the statement had identified as scientific disputes.

**Statement 16 (TENK 2021:16): Commissioned research report found to contain plagiarism – company urged to name the guilty parties**

Company X suspected that the commissioned research report of technology company A had exaggerated the list of authors, engaged in plagiarism and neglected to name those responsible, and falsified research results. In addition, company X doubted the expertise of the working group and the appropriateness of the RCR process in the investigation proper carried out by company A.

In a decision made by the CEO of company A based on the investigation proper, it was found that the RCR violation of plagiarism had taken place. The decision did not identify those involved in the plagiarism, however, even

though TENK had required this in its previous statement. According to the CEO's decision, none of the other RCR violations suspected by company X took place. No shortcomings were found in the expertise of the investigation proper team nor in the RCR process.

TENK noted that the RCR violation of plagiarism took place and issued company A with another request to name the parties involved. TENK did not verify any of the other RCR violations suspected by company X. However, TENK urged company A to pay attention in future to the division of responsibilities and agreement on authorship in its projects, and it issued a reprimand for minor shortcomings in the investigation proper that were nevertheless not of significance for the outcome of the RCR process.

**Statement 17 (TENK 2021:17): Doctoral supervisor did not inappropriately hamper the dissertation work**

University doctoral candidate X suspected Professor A, who was the supervisor of his doctoral dissertation, of inappropriately hampering his doctoral dissertation. According to X, A had questioned the validity of A's work and proposed changes to a manuscript intended as a partial publication of the dissertation which hampered and delayed its publication. The university made a decision according to which the activities of A did not involve a RCR violation, but rather a critical assessment that was part of dissertation supervision work and which was aimed at furthering X's doctoral dissertation. X was dissatisfied with the university's decision and requested a statement from TENK.

In its statement, TENK did not comment on the differences in views between the parties on the validity of the dissertation, as differences in scientific interpretations and assessments are part of scientific discussion and do not violate responsible conduct of research. TENK based its statement on the section of the RCR guidelines which state that other irresponsible practices may occur in research work, one of which is "other inappropriate hampering" of the work of another researcher. According to the guidelines, such practices can at their most serious meet the criteria for an RCR violation. On the basis of the information available to TENK, it could not verify that A was guilty of such actions. TENK therefore agreed with the decision of the university that this was not a RCR violation.

**Statement 18 (TENK 2021:18): An article's use of sources was irresponsible, but it did not constitute a RCR violation. TENK did not comment in advance on the content of the dissertation.**

A suspected that doctoral candidate B had expressed the topic of his doctoral dissertation in a misleading way and thus obtained a research permit for confidential material. B had published an article which did not state that it was based on data obtained through a research permit. A had found out that,

in A's view, B had detailed in their research permit application a different topic to the one which B themselves claimed to be studying. A also suspected that B had misled the funder in the same way in B's grant application, and that Professor Emeritus C, who was B's supervisor, had given B favourable statements despite being aware of what was happening. The university carried out a preliminary inquiry which concluded that there had been no RCR violation. A was dissatisfied with this decision and requested a statement from TENK.

In its statement, TENK pointed out that, at the general level, it is the responsibility of the researcher to ensure that they use research data acquired through permits for the purpose given in their permit application and the purpose for which it was granted. B had stated in his research permit applications that he would use the data in his doctoral dissertation, which deals with topic X. He had also received research permits for this purpose. According to TENK, B should have indicated that the article used data obtained through a research permit. However, B had clarified their use of sources in a discussion within the publication that began after the article was published.

In this respect, TENK considered that B's activities could be considered irresponsible. However, it was not sufficiently gross or careless in nature that it could be considered to be a case of misconduct or disregard for responsible conduct of research as defined in the RCR guidelines. As the events must be examined in the RCR process before submitting a RCR notification, TENK did not comment in advance on the content of B's doctoral dissertation and, for example, how the data concerned will be used in the dissertation.

In general, TENK considered that the clarification or adjustment of a research topic during the doctoral dissertation process is fairly common and does not in itself violate responsible conduct of research. In connection with the preliminary inquiry, B had stated that they would include the article as part of the doctoral dissertation dealing with this topic. The preliminary inquiry considered such use to be appropriate. TENK agreed with this view.

### **Statement 19 (TENK 2021:19): The grounds for misappropriation identified in the RCR process were not sufficient**

The university investigated a notification stating that the project application prepared by humanities professor A and his team was guilty of plagiarism of the research plan and misappropriation of the research idea of docent B, who works in the same field. On the basis of the investigation proper, the university's rector ruled that A was guilty of stealing B's research idea. TENK received A's request for a statement in which A stated that the alleged RCR violation had not been proved and the TENK guidelines had not been followed in the RCR investigation.

In its statement, TENK ruled that because misappropriation is an extremely severe RCR violation, the grounds for it must be unquestionable.

As such certainty was not attained in the case in question, TENK disagreed with the university's decision and took the view that A was not guilty of misappropriation. A should, however, have informed B of the contested project application. There had been shortcomings in the RCR process carried out, including in the consultation of the parties.

**Statement 21 (TENK 2021:21): Conflict of interest in RCR process decision-making**

TENK received a request for a statement from professor A expressing dissatisfaction with the university's handling of a suspected RCR violation. A's allegations were directed at director B because B had not consulted A as part of the preliminary inquiry. A also argued that rector C would be biased in taking decisions on A's case due to conflict of interest.

According to the RCR guidelines, one of the key starting points for responsible conduct of research is that researchers refrain from all decision-making situations related to science and research if there is reason to suspect that they are biased. However, bias is not an RCR violation in accordance with the RCR 2012 guidelines. According to TENK, C had, at his own discretion, been able to either excuse himself or not in this RCR process launched by A, because the allegation discussed in it did not concern him.

TENK stated that B had not committed an RCR violation and that X had carried out the RCR process in accordance with the TENK guidelines.

**Statement 22 (TENK 2021:22): A joint article cited the author's previous joint publications in a deficient and inappropriate manner. Nevertheless, the criteria for plagiarism were not met.**

Professor A suspected that technical researcher B had plagiarised a chapter of a book in a joint article and marked X as the first author of the article without their consent. The university conducted an investigation proper after receiving a statement (2019:18) from TENK. The investigation proper revealed that the case involved a total of four publications, all of which dealt with the same research results. B was an author for all four publications. X could not be contacted during the investigation proper.

Based on the rector's decision, B was found guilty of both disregard for responsible conduct of research and plagiarism.

B was dissatisfied with the rector's decision and requested a statement from TENK on the matter. In B's view, the investigation proper did not take into account the difference between the contributed article, book chapter and survey. According to B, only the contributed articles contain research results that have not previously been published. Publications such as a review article do not tend to refer to chapters in the book that draw together the results of the contributed article. B also stated that he was also not properly consulted during the process.

TENK dealt with this matter also in the statement TENK 2021:5. In the view of TENK, both the review article and the book chapter should have made clearer reference within its images and tables to the contributed articles in which they were first published. The references to previous research results was inadequate and inappropriate in this respect, and B had been guilty of disregard for responsible conduct of research in this area. However, TENK found that the criteria for plagiarism as research misconduct were not fulfilled. In other respects, the university had conducted the investigation proper in accordance with the RCR guidelines.

**Statement 23 (TENK 2021:23): Author of a non-fiction work did not violate responsible conduct of research**

A university's humanities docent A wrote a book that passed its peer review and was published in a scientific publication series. In the opinion of X, a person outside of the university, references were incorrectly cited in the book, non-scientific sources were used without source criticism, and readers were misled by covering up information. In their RCR notification to the university on the suspected violations, X alleged that A had engaged in fabrication, falsification and other disregard for responsible conduct of research.

The university decided that A was not responsible for the RCR violations alleged by X because the inaccuracies in the book were insignificant. In addition, some of X's allegations related to differences of interpretation, which are not matters of research integrity. X was dissatisfied with the university's decision and requested a statement from TENK on the RCR process and decision. According to the documents received by TENK, the university had handled the allegations appropriately. TENK also agreed with the university's decision that A had not acted in violation of responsible conduct of research, as the suspected actions did not reflect gross negligence as defined in the HSH guidelines, and some of the allegations were related to issues not connected with research integrity.



## 4

# ETHICAL REVIEW IN HUMAN SCIENCES

## 4.1. HUMAN SCIENCES ETHICS COMMITTEES AND THEIR COORDINATION

TENK coordinates ethical review in human sciences in Finland and promotes cooperation between regional and organisation-specific ethics committees in human sciences.

The task of human sciences ethics committees is to issue, upon researchers' request, ethical review statements concerning the ethical aspects of research plans and other research risks. The statements are based on TENK's guidelines *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*, to which the organisations have committed. The guidelines have been prepared together with the scientific community.

The TENK office monitors the status of ethical reviews by collecting data on the cases processed by the human science ethics committees annually and maintaining a list of the committees' contact information. At the end of 2021, a total of 77 organisations were committed to TENK's ethical principles in the human sciences.

It is becoming ever clearer that awareness of the need for statement requests is on the increase. Questions related to data protection and data management are giving the committees much to consider. The complexity of multidisciplinary international research projects also causes a lot of work in the evaluation process.

The committees are often asked for a statement at the publisher's request also in cases where according to TENK's guidelines an ethical review is not required. In such cases, a description of the Finnish system may be given to the person requesting the statement. The researcher can submit the description to a journal, for example, if they so wish. For these situations, a template for the use of organisations committed to the guidelines can be downloaded from the TENK website.

On 21 April 2021, TENK organised an online discussion event for the human science ethical review committees. The topic of the discussion was

social media research from the perspective of the ethical review in the human sciences (ANNEX 5).

<b>Cases handled by human science ethics committees, no.</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2017</b>
Requests for statement related to ethical reviews	589	432	432	468	412
Statements given by ethics committees	582	395	389	457	385
Negative statement <sup>1</sup>	3	7	0	13	27
No statement (ethical review not considered necessary or request for statement directed to another committee)	36	21	36	26	35
Organisations replying to TENK's follow-up survey, no.	34	25	27	24	30

*Table 3: The number of cases handled by human science ethics committees each year.*

## **4.2. STATEMENTS GIVEN BY TENK ON ETHICAL REVIEW IN THE HUMAN SCIENCES**

The *ethical principles of research with human participants and ethical review in the human sciences in Finland* guidelines published by TENK state that a person requesting a ethical review statement may request a statement from TENK if they do not accept the decision of the human sciences ethics committee or the proposed changes contained in the statement. At its meeting of 15 April 2021, TENK approved a policy on how to process the statement requests it receives. The first request received by TENK for a statement on an ethical review statement issued by a human sciences ethics committee (IEEA) was processed in accordance with the agreed policy. A summary of the IEEA statement issued by TENK is presented below.

1 For 2019 and thereafter, 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.

**IEEA statement, statement 14 (TENK 2021:14): A human sciences ethics committee had partly misinterpreted TENK guidelines on investigations involving minors, but was justified in its request for additional information.**

Humanities researchers A and B requested a statement from TENK on the statement of their university's human sciences ethics committee. In its statement, the committee had ruled that those under the age of 15 could not participate in the study without informing a guardian. The committee had asked for more solid grounds for not informing guardians. The committee had also requested that the application be accompanied by a consent form and a privacy notice.

According to the researchers, the planned study was to be carried out as a survey and its subject was such that the guardians could not be informed. The researchers also argued that the privacy notice was not necessary because the purpose of the survey was to target a large number of respondents and the respondents' personal data would not be collected. TENK's position on this topic is that the participation in the study of a person aged under 15 without their guardian's separate consent or knowledge is justified if the matters under study are those for which it would not otherwise be possible to obtain comprehensive research data. In such cases, the research must be subject to an ethical review and the researcher must substantiate the reason why it is not possible to inform the guardian or obtain their consent. In addition, it must be ensured that the study does not cause harm to the research participants and that the minors who are asked to participate are able to understand the subject matter of the study and what participation in the study specifically requires of them.

In this case, TENK took the view that the topic of the study was such that it was justified not to seek consent from the guardians. The topic was thus subject to the guidelines on ethical reviews. However, the committee had acted in accordance with TENK guidelines when requesting additional justifications and supplementary information for the application appendices, which were still partly incomplete even after this information was provided. For example, the researchers had reason to note that personally identifiable information may be collected from background information and responses even if the subjects were instructed not to provide personally identifiable information.

Both providing application appendices that conformed to the TENK guidelines and more precisely assessing the criteria would have facilitated the ethical review work of the Ethics Committee, prevented key interpretative disputes, and sped up the processing of the statement and initiation of the study.

## 5.

# INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

THE FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY'S Secretary General **Sanna-Kaisa Spoo**, has chaired the European Network of Research Integrity Offices (ENRIO) since 2018. The secretary of ENRIO is **Kalle Videnoja**, TENK's Coordinator of International Affairs. TENK is one of the founding members of the ENRIO association, together with approximately 15 other European national research integrity offices. At the end of 2021, ENRIO had 32 member organisations from different European countries.

One of the key objectives of TENK's ENRIO Presidency has been to establish an international series of ENRIO congresses addressing practical questions related to research integrity. TENK organised the first ENRIO Congress from 27 to 29 September 2021 as a virtual event, with Coordinator **Anni Sairio** serving as Congress Secretary. The Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK acted as the main organiser of the ENRIO Congress in partnership with Aalto University.

The Programme Committee of the Congress was chaired by TENK Expert **Krista Varantola**, and the committee members were **Hjördis Czesnick** from Germany, **Vidar Enebak** from Norway, **Joël Eyer** from France, **Nicole Föger** from Austria, **Maura Hiney** from Ireland, **Panagiotis Kavouras** from Greece and **Helga Nolte** from Germany as well as **Riitta Keiski**, **Iina Kohonen**, **Erika Löfström**, **Anni Sairio**, **Riitta Salmelin**, **Sanna-Kaisa Spoo** and **Kalle Videnoja** from Finland and TENK.

Participating in the Congress were nearly 400 registered visitors from 32 different countries. The Congress focused on practical questions of research integrity, with the discussions focusing particularly on different perspectives for promoting research integrity education and responsible conduct of research. The programme consisted of 18 different sessions that included a total of 50 presentations. In addition, the Congress programme included nine workshops and 21 virtual poster presentations.

The planning for the ENRIO Congress began in 2019 and was originally scheduled to take place live in Otaniemi, Espoo, at the end of 2020. Due to the coronavirus pandemic, the Congress was first postponed by one year, then finally the decision was made to hold it entirely online in 2021. The Congress's virtual event platform was created by Finnish virtual event organiser

Prospectum LIVE. Although the arrangements for the conference faced challenges because of the pandemic, the process nevertheless provided the TENK secretariat with valuable experience of producing virtual events and of developments taking place in this field. The benefits of the experience gained through the ENRIO Congress will further accumulate in future planning work for accessible, inclusive and interactive events, seminars and trainings.

The next ENRIO Congress will be held in Paris in 2023. The arrangements are being handled by the French Research Integrity Office OFIS and the University of Sorbonne.

In 2021, TENK began planning the ENRIO online publication based on the ENRIO Congress. The online publication will be published in 2022.

In addition to the ENRIO Congress, TENK organised in summer 2021 a smaller ENRIO webinar on the long-term impacts of the coronavirus pandemic on research integrity and trust in science.

From 25 to 27 October 2021, TENK received visitors from the Office of the Ombudsperson for Academic Ethics and Procedures of the Republic of Lithuania as part of the Nordic-Baltic Mobility Programme for Public Administration. With support from this programme, Lithuanian Ombudswoman for Academic Ethics and Procedures **Loreta Tauginiene** and experts **Monika Sernovaite** and **Egle Ozolinciute** were able to visit Finland.

During their stay, discussions were held on the current research integrity systems of Lithuania and Finland and their development. The Lithuanians also familiarised themselves with the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters, the Science Advice Initiative of Finland (SOFI), and the Academy of Finland's Strategic Research Council.

During the past year, the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity also participated in the Horizon Europe project application consortium. The consortium was granted funding of EUR 4.9 million for the three-year PREPARED project, which begins in autumn 2022.

## 6.

**PERSONNEL AND FINANCES**

IN 2021, THE FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES within the secretariat of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity were Secretary-General and Docent **Sanna-Kaisa Spoof**, PhD, and Specialist **Iina Kohonen**, DFA. Working as part time employees were Coordinator **Terhi Tarkiainen**, MA, and Office Secretary **Kaisu Reiss**, BSc (Econ). In August 2021, after Tarkiainen had begun a leave of absence, **Meri Vainiomäki**, MA, came in as her substitute. The secretariat also included Coordinator, ENRIO Congress Secretary and Docent **Anni Sairio**, PhD, and ENRIO Secretary and Coordinator of International Affairs **Kalle Videnoja**. As of 16 August, further help with ENRIO Congress arrangements and international affairs was provided by Assistant **Lien Nguyen**, MSc.

Due to the workload created by the high number of RCR statements, Docent of Health Promotion **Minna Aittasalo**, DSc (Tech), joined the TENK secretariat in August 2021 in a fixed-term expert role. In November 2021, **Eero Kaila**, DSc (Pol), started in a new fixed-term expert role in the secretariat, serving as a substitute for Kohonen, who had started a leave of absence.

The secretariat was located at the TSV office at Snellmaninkatu 13, Helsinki. TSV offers TENK financial and personnel administration services, network connections and IT services in addition to the office premises themselves. Due to the coronavirus pandemic, the secretariat worked remotely for most of 2021.

\*\*\*

This annual report has been approved at the meeting of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK held on 25 April 2022.

*Riitta Keiski*  
Chairman

*Sanna-Kaisa Spoof*  
Secretary General

---

EDITORIAL WORK: Meri Vainiomäki  
LAYOUT: Anne Haapanen



TUTKIMUSEETTINEN  
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA

FORSKNINGSETISKA  
DELEGATIONEN

FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON  
RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK

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