

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK

2024



TUTKIMUSEETTINEN
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chair's review	3
1. Objectives and tasks of TENK	5
2. Promotion of research integrity	7
2.1. Research integrity (RI)	7
2.2. Research integrity advisers	7
2.3. Research Integrity Barometer 2023	8
2.4. Communication	9
2.5. Events	9
3. Handling alleged violations of research integrity	11
3.1. Alleged and verified RI violations reported to TENK	11
3.2. Statements requested from and issued by TENK	12
3.3. Summaries of RI statements issued by TENK	13
4. Ethical review	27
4.1. Coordination of ethical review in human sciences	27
4.2. Ethical review statements in human sciences requested from and issued by TENK	29
4.3. Ethical guidelines and ethical review for research on nature and the environment (LYTE project, 2023–2025)	31
4.4. Ethics of using AI in research (AI project, 2024–2026)	31
4.5. Ethical guidelines for research involving the Sámi people in Finland	32
5. International activities	33
6. Personnel and finances	35

CHAIR'S REVIEW

The statutory tasks of the **FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK** are defined by the Decree issued in 1991. Over these 30 years of operation, TENK has assumed new responsibilities, which is why it is necessary to amend the decree. In 2024, we analysed the future position of TENK, our role in the field of science and research, and the wishes of our stakeholders. We set the aim of ensuring TENK's independence and strengthening its operating conditions while laws and organisations are reformed.

TENK's work in preparing national guidelines, organising seminars and promoting training, coordinating the ethical review in human sciences, and in networking both internationally and nationally is built on solid foundation. TENK's role in the monitoring and compiling of statistics of research integrity and as a provider of statements and advice is valued, and the organisations committed to the RI Guidelines trust TENK. The activities benefit both research quality and the researchers: it is an advantage that research integrity and its violations are defined clearly and there are processes in place for handling alleged misconduct.

TENK's research integrity adviser system has been developed based on the findings of the research integrity barometer and feedback from the advisers, and the organisations committed to the 2023 RI Guidelines have received this system well. Research integrity adviser activities play a key role in our aim for high-quality research environments where researchers can perform their work without having to worry. This helps to prevent research misconduct in all fields.

Year 2024 also concluded TENK's busy term of 1 February 2022–31 January 2025. During my term as the Chair of TENK, I made several heartwarming observations. We grew increasingly certain in our perception that TENK's work is in fact ahead of its time and can absolutely promote researchers' wellbeing in their research community. The statement of the World Conference on Research Integrity 2024 showcases the principles of research integrity in the interface between research and business and the role of official recommendations in quality assurance. That research data is reliably transferred into innovations and decision-making is one of TENK's focal points. Research ethics of AI require extensive discussions within the research community, set criteria, and potentially the ethical review of the research in question. TENK's visit to Inari and the *Ethical Guidelines for*

Research Involving the Sámi People in Finland brought up much to reflect on and communicate to the researcher community.

I would like to express my utmost thanks to TENK's Secretary General and the Secretariat, the members of the board, and the research community as a whole for their expert work and active participation in discussions. I am delighted to see how the work we do for research integrity leads to young researchers developing their skills, a desire to follow good research practices and a commitment to the 2023 RI Guidelines. There is no better way to end my long term with TENK – with a peace of mind.

Riitta Keiski
Professor (Emerita)
TENK Chair 2019–2022 and
2022–2025



Photographer: Mikko Törmänen

1.

OBJECTIVES AND TASKS OF TENK

THE FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK is an expert body appointed by Finland's Ministry of Education and Culture, which handles ethical issues concerning research. Its task is to promote the responsible conduct of research and to prevent research misconduct (Decree on the National Board on Research Integrity 1347/1991). In addition, pursuant to the decree, TENK is tasked with 1) making proposals and issuing statements to the authorities on legislative matters and other issues related to research integrity, 2) acting as an expert body when research integrity issues are investigated, 3) taking initiatives to promote research integrity and discussion on research integrity in Finland, 4) monitoring international development in relevant fields and actively participating in international cooperation, and 5) carrying out communications on research integrity topics.

TENK carries out the tasks assigned to it by ensuring the ethical nature and quality of research and, thus, preventing research misconduct in all fields of research. TENK prepares national guidelines, organises seminars, promotes education, coordinates the ethical review in human sciences, builds networks and maintains a presence both nationally and internationally. In addition, TENK oversees research integrity by monitoring and compiling statistics on violations of research integrity, by issuing statements on the investigation of alleged violations of research integrity, and by providing advice when problems arise. The implementation of these tasks 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 a proposal from the scientific community. During TENK's term of office from 1 February 2022 to 31 January 2025, Professor **Riitta Keiski** from the University of Oulu served as Chair, and **Sirpa Thessler**, Vice President of the Natural Resources Institute Finland, served as Vice Chair.

In addition, there were eight other board members:

- Manager **Veikko Ikonen**, VTT
- University Lecturer **Simo Kyllönen**, University of Helsinki
- Professor **Jari Laurikka**, University of Tampere
- University Lecturer **Matti Muukkonen**, University of Eastern Finland
- Senior Advisor **Susanna Näreaho**, Metropolia University of Applied Sciences
- Professor **Riitta Salmelin**, Aalto University
- Assistant Professor **Aleksi Tornio**, University of Turku
- Professor **Risto Turunen**, University of Eastern Finland

Chancellor Emerita **Krista Varantola** served as a permanent expert on the board. TENK Secretary General, Docent **Sanna-Kaisa Spoof**, served as the secretary. TENK and its Secretariat work at the offices of the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV).

TENK met eight times during 2024. The meetings were mainly held remotely. The April meeting was held at the University of Tampere in connection with a visit on 25 April 2024. The December meeting took place at the University of Helsinki on 13 December 2024, also in connection with a visit. In addition to their duties in the board, TENK members promote research ethics and research integrity in many ways, for example by teaching and giving presentations and through speaking engagements, by taking part in publishing activities, by giving interviews and other media performances, and by actively working in international, national and local ethics committees and working groups.

As the decree that governs TENK is largely outdated, TENK began to work on reforming its regulatory base in 2024, in connection with the legislation reform project of TSV. In connection with this, TENK also began to review its tasks and position under the Ministry of Education and Culture. To receive feedback from the scientific community, TENK organised stakeholder meetings and a discussion event on its future, in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and Culture, at *Ethics Day* on 24 October 2024. Based on these discussions, TENK set the objective of achieving a status as an auxiliary governmental body. With its future position in mind, TENK's policy is that ensuring the independence and neutrality of TENK is essential. Ensuring sufficient resources and achieving modern services and synergy benefits is also important for TENK's ability to perform its duties.

2.

PROMOTION OF RESEARCH INTEGRITY

2.1. RESEARCH INTEGRITY (RI)

This year marked 30 years from the publication of the first research integrity guidelines by TENK. From 1994 onwards, the guidelines that TENK draws up together with the research community have provided researchers and higher education students with a model of research integrity (RI) in Finland and on how alleged RI violations are handled (the RI process). *The Finnish code of conduct for research integrity and procedures for handling alleged violations of research integrity in Finland* (RI Guidelines) is based on the self-regulation of the research community. It is a general guideline that must be applied in all research activities and fields of research in the organisations that are committed to it.

By the end of 2024, nearly one hundred organisations of different sizes had committed to the 2023 RI Guidelines.

2.2. RESEARCH INTEGRITY ADVISERS

TENK coordinates the national *research integrity adviser system*, launched in 2017. Research integrity advisers promote research integrity and good research practices in their organisations and provide confidential advice to members of their organisation in problematic situations.

The research integrity adviser network continued to grow in 2024. This follows a provision in the 2023 RI Guidelines, according to which organisations committed to the guidelines also commit to appointing a research integrity adviser. In December 2024, there were 157 research integrity advisers in 85 organisations.

The research integrity adviser development group completed the updates to the research integrity adviser guideline. The group's chair was Simo Kyllönen, member of TENK's board, from the University of Helsinki. The new guidelines (*2024 RIA Guidelines for Organisations and Research Integrity*)

Advisers) were published in Finnish, Swedish and English. A group for internal discussions and networking was launched on the Teams platform of the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies. Research integrity advisers were also provided with a work journal template to make the general-level documentation of activities easier.

A spring meeting for research integrity advisers was organised in Helsinki at the House of Science and Letters (Tieteiden talo) on 29 May 2024, and a training and news event was organised on 26 November 2024. The activities were also presented in an open English-language webinar on 4 December 2024.

A survey charting research integrity adviser activities in 2024 was carried out in January–February 2025, and it received responses from 66 research integrity advisers (response rate of 42%). Of the respondents, 75% reported having provided personal advice on research integrity at least once or twice in 2024. 60% of the respondents said that the contact requests had involved topics other than research integrity; for some of them, there was a considerable amount of these requests.

According to the responses, advice and guidance was sought often proactively, and some respondents reported that the contact requests had become more frequent and more serious than before. Similarly to previous years, most respondents assessed that the research integrity adviser system is helpful and felt that they had succeeded in their work. The challenges reported included the inherent complexity of the advice requests and the diverse problems connected to the cases, only some of which are related to research integrity. Resources for the activities, the scope of the tasks, and issues related to artificial intelligence were also mentioned. 80% of the respondents considered that TENK had been successful or very successful in developing the research integrity adviser system.

2.3. RESEARCH INTEGRITY BAROMETER 2023

TENK released the second national research integrity barometer report *Tutkimusetiikkaa koronan aikaan: Tutkimusetiikan barometri 2023* in May 2024. Research integrity barometers chart the state of research integrity and responsible conduct of research and related problems in the research community in Finland. The *barometer survey* was carried out by TENK's Secretariat. The data was collected through an anonymous e-survey that was sent to organisations committed to the RI Guidelines in spring 2023. The results highlight problems with authorship in particular. The role of organisations and work communities surfaced as the primary source of information on research integrity.

The English translation of the barometer *Research Integrity in the Time of COVID-19: Finnish Research Integrity Barometer 2023* was published in November 2024. The summary in Swedish, *Forskningsetik i coronatider: En sammanfattning av den forskningsetiska barometern 2023 i Finland*, was published in December 2024.

2.4. COMMUNICATION

TENK's tasks include communicating and disseminating information about research integrity. Communication is inherent in all activities and expert tasks that TENK and its Secretariat carry out. TENK provides information about its activities, its guidelines and recommendations and, more broadly, national and international questions related to research ethics and research integrity, in Finnish, Swedish and English, *on its website*, its *TENK tiedottaa newsletter*, and on the *Responsible Research website*.

The newsletter subscribers consist mainly of the management of organisations committed to TENK's guidelines and other key stakeholders. In 2024, the newsletter was published in May (1/2024), September (2/2024), and December (3/2024). By the end of 2024, the newsletter had a total of 658 subscribers.

In addition, TENK members and its Secretariat provide information on and raise awareness of TENK's activities and research integrity by giving presentations, publishing articles, and giving interviews.

2.5. EVENTS

TENK organised the *Ethics Day 2024* on 24 October 2024 in Helsinki, at the venue of the House of Science and Letters. The seminar could also be followed remotely. Ethics Day is a multidisciplinary seminar on research ethics and research integrity which has brought together representatives of different research disciplines since 2011.

Topics of the Ethics Day included a discussion of the current RI Guidelines and an initiating session on the *Ethics of Using AI in Research* project, funded by the Ministry of Education and Culture. The ALLEA *European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity 2023* guidelines and the *Research Integrity Guidelines of the Natural Resources Institute Finland* were also publicised at the event.

The Ethical Review in Human Sciences Subcommittee of TENK held *a meeting for human sciences ethics committees* at the House of Science and Letters on 15 November 2024. The meeting focused on settings that challenge the conventional role of a researcher, such as co-research or ethnographical research. About 60 people from 14 committees attended the event.

The English-language webinar *Research Integrity Morning* was organised on 10 September 2024. The topic of event was research integrity especially in the context of research groups, and results of the Research Integrity Barometer and TENK's activities were also presented.

On 4 December 2024 another English-language information event took place, titled *TENK's lunchtime webinar: Research integrity advisers in Finland*. This webinar was aimed especially at researchers and research organisations unfamiliar with the Research Integrity Adviser system.

3.

HANDLING ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF RESEARCH INTEGRITY

3.1. ALLEGED AND VERIFIED RI VIOLATIONS REPORTED TO TENK

In 2024, a total of 27 new alleged RI violation notifications were reported to TENK by Finnish universities, universities of applied sciences and other research organisations committed to the RI guidelines. None of these concerned Master's theses in universities of applied sciences.

According to the notifications received by TENK, 19 RI processes were completed in universities or other organisations during the year, some of which had already been started during preceding years. The allegations were investigated in the RI process by the organisation where the research under suspicion was carried out.

A total of five RI violations were verified in 2024, one of which was a case of research misconduct and four were cases of disregard for good research practices.

Number of alleged RI violations reported to TENK, and verified violations (number of cases concerning UAS Master's theses shown in parentheses)

	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020
Notifications from research organisations of new alleged RI violations	27	38 (4)	31 (5)	53 (10)	43 (2)
Research organisations' concluded RI processes with a verified RI violation: research misconduct	1	7 (2)	2 (1)	5 (2)	6 (3)
Research organisations' concluded RI processes with a verified RI violation: disregard for good research practices	4	3 (0)	0	3 (1)	9 (2)

Table 1: Number of alleged RI violations reported to TENK and verified violations (number of cases concerning UAS Master's theses shown in parentheses).

3.2. STATEMENTS REQUESTED FROM AND ISSUED BY TENK

In 2024, TENK received 23 new requests for statements related to the investigation processes of alleged RI violations. Overall, TENK issued a total of 22 RI statements in 2024.

The summaries of statements issued by TENK in 2024 are presented in section 3.3. In addition, TENK received two requests for a statement concerning ethical review statements issued by a human sciences ethics committee. The summaries of statements issued by TENK for ethical review in human sciences are presented in section 4.2. The summaries are also published on the TENK website.

TENK also provided statements on the amendments to the legislation on the Research Council of Finland, the reference architecture of research data control for CSC, and the ethical guidelines for neurotechnology for UNESCO.

Number of TENK statements

(number of statements requested and issued concerning UAS Master's theses shown in parentheses)

	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020
New requests for a statement received by TENK concerning the RI process	23	13	8	37 (7)	14 (2)
Statements issued by TENK that concerned the RI process; also including different requests for a statement other than those in the previous section	22	7	19	22 (0)	13 (0)
Expert statements not concerning RI processes	5	2	2	1	1

Table 2: Number of statements issued by TENK (number of statements requested and issued concerning UAS Master's theses shown in parentheses).

3.3. SUMMARIES OF RI STATEMENTS ISSUED BY TENK

Statement 2 (TENK 2024:2): Similarities between projects were not sufficient to determine misappropriation because the similarities were considered to be common in university research projects.

Doctors A and B from University X presented suspicions of Professor C and Assistant Professor D engaging in plagiarism, misappropriation and insufficient references to previous research results. According to A and B, a key idea of their project was misappropriated to a larger project that was launched later. Assistant Professor D had been involved in both projects.

The Rector of University X ruled that the allegations were unfounded and, thus, decided not to launch the RI process. The request for a statement questioned whether the process had been carried out according to the 2023 RI Guidelines.

TENK found that the similar elements between the projects were common in the research projects of University X and an individual project could not be identified from the elements in question. It was found that there were

shortcomings in the projects' management, but these were not considered to be severe enough to constitute an RI violation.

TENK found that the RI process had been carried out by University X according to the TENK guidelines. However, TENK prompted University X to aim for better compliance with the recommended time limits.

Statement 3 (TENK 2024:3): The publication of a project's results led to a long-term dispute. However, the criteria for an RI violation were not met.

Assistant Professor A suspected that Doctoral Researcher B had slandered A, hindered the publication of joint articles, and prevented productions from being presented to the public. Later, A added suspicions about authorship to their notification of this case. Doctoral Researcher B also filed a notification of the same case, suspecting A of fabrication, falsification of observations, plagiarism or misappropriation, and misleading the research community.

The Rector of the university combined all three notifications into one decision. According to the decision, B had, to some degree, committed the alleged RI violations presented by A in the notifications. The nature of the violations misled the research community about the respondent's research, which was connected to B's erroneous understanding of the content and extent of copyright and their severe negligence of research integrity due to ignorance. The RI violations presented in B's notification had not been committed by A.

In TENK's view, the rector's decision was partially based on an erroneous interpretation of the TENK 2023 Guidelines. Ignorance as potential grounds for an RI violation is defined in the TENK 2023 Guidelines, but this RI process should have followed the 2012 RI Guidelines. However, the investigation of the case was otherwise carried out according to TENK's guidelines.

Even though the dispute had been prolonged, it was not possible to determine such gross negligence or irresponsibility in either party's actions that the actions could be assessed as an RI violation. Generally, a project manager does not have the authority to define the scientific or artistic results independently achieved by individual members or the manner in which the results are made public.

Statement 4 (TENK 2024:4): The negligence of a dissertation supervisor was not gross, and publishing visual materials similar to the supervisee's was not an RI violation.

Doctoral Researcher of humanities A from University X suspected their dissertation supervisor, Professor B of a technological field in X, of plagiarising and misappropriating A's research and publications. According to the notification, B had allegedly plagiarised the visual materials presented by A at

a lecture, for example. Furthermore, it was alleged that the interview materials for the article were fabricated.

The RI process followed the 2012 RI Guidelines. The person who conducted the preliminary inquiry found that, while B had been careless in their reference practices, they had sent the article in question to A for commenting before publication. Even though the images by A and B, respectively, were similar, models for A's image were also found.

The investigation proper found that B had acted carelessly and reprehensibly both as a researcher and a supervisor. There were no records of the email and phone discussions mentioned in the disputed article. However, B had admitted to being careless and attempted to rectify the observed shortcomings. The investigation conclusions stated that B's actions had been close to negligence, but the threshold for an RI violation was not crossed. The Rector of X reached the same conclusion.

A was unhappy with both the RI process and the Rector's decision.

In its statement, TENK found that the preliminary inquiry and the investigation proper were sufficient and carried out with care. After reviewing the documents and the disputed publication, TENK agreed with the Rector's conclusion that B had not committed an RI violation as a whole.

At a general level, TENK stated that an RI violation can only be determined if the actions meet both the criteria for a specific RI violation and the general criteria for RI violations. As such, the RI process must also prove that the respondent has been guilty of intentionally misleading the scientific community, gross negligence or irresponsibility in their research.

Statement 5 (TENK 2024:5): A researcher using their previous publications in a dissertation was not considered to have committed an RI violation.

Postgraduate Student A from University X was suspected of self-plagiarism. The complainants were Dean B, University Lecturer C and Education Specialist D. The dissertation by A in the preliminary examination stage had included material from A's previous publications unmarked as citations, according to the preliminary examiners.

Based on the preliminary inquiry, the Rector of University X decided that this was not an RI violation. A requested a statement about the initiation of the process and questioned whether the RI process had been carried out according to the 2023 RI Guidelines.

TENK found that it an undisputed fact that A had not committed an RI violation. However, the statement from the person conducting the preliminary inquiry was seen as sufficient grounds for launching an RI process. The severity of the actions was deemed to be so low that they did not constitute an RI violation.

TENK found that the RI process had been carried out according to the TENK guidelines by University X, except for the mistake of not sending the RI notification to the respondent without delay once the process was launched. After allegations are overturned, the conclusion of the RI process should be published in an appropriate channel.

Statement 6 (TENK 2024:6): Based on an email from a close relative, there was no evidence that the respondents had actively impeded a researcher's career.

Lecturer A and Dean B from University 1 suspected Researcher C from University 2 and two other persons of inappropriately impeding a researcher's career. According to A, C and their associates had made unfounded claims of plagiarism and attempted to influence a research funding organisation so that it would stop funding A's research project.

The Rector of University 2 decided, based on a preliminary inquiry, that the impeding of the researcher's career could not be proven and there were no grounds to launch an investigation proper. In their request for a statement from TENK, Lecturer A claimed that the connection of Researcher C's close relative, D, to the case proved that inappropriate impeding had taken place.

According to TENK, the materials presented by the complainant, based on which the party that emailed the funding organisation was a relative of the respondent who had also worked on joint projects, did not transfer responsibility for the actions to the respondent. According to TENK, there was no evidence that the respondents had been proactive in the matter.

Statement 7 (TENK 2024:7): A previous RI notification did not intend to manipulate authorship.

Assistant Professor A of University X suspected Researcher B of an authorship violation and a malicious RI notification.

The Rector of University X decided that the allegations were unfounded, which is why the RI process was concluded. A was unhappy with the decision and asked in their request for a statement whether the process had been carried out according to the 2012 RI Guidelines.

According to A, B had committed an RI violation when they claimed to be a co-author of a joint article and when they filed a malicious RI notification regarding A. B had compiled a table for the article that A had co-authored, based on which B considered themselves to be one of the authors. When the RI process began, acknowledgements for the work done by B had been added to the digital version of the disputed article.

According to TENK, B's RI notification was not malicious and B did not intend to manipulate authorship. TENK found that B had not committed

an RI violation and that University X carried out the RI process according to guidelines.

Statement 9 (TENK 2024:9): Insufficient acknowledgement for material collection in a conference abstract was deemed to be irresponsible conduct.

Professor of Practice A, Doctoral Student B and Professor C from University X suspected Professor D and Doctoral Student E from University Y of plagiarism or misappropriation. According to A, B, and C, D and E had used the data of an interview survey compiled by B in a conference abstract without a citation.

The Rector of Y ruled that D and E had been careless in not mentioning the role of the University X researchers in compiling the data in the extended conference abstract. However, this was not a case of an RI violation, but instead, the decision found that the actions were other irresponsible practices as defined in the 2012 RI Guidelines.

TENK found that the RI process had been carried out by University Y according to the guidelines. TENK stated the respondents had responded to the allegations of RI violations and had taken action to rectify the matter. TENK agreed with the decision of University Y's Rector in that this was a case of irresponsible practice as defined in the 2012 RI Guidelines.

Statement 10 (TENK 2024:10): A research group was unable to fully agree on the principles of authorship. However, the criteria for an RI violation were not met.

Doctoral Researcher A suspected that Research Project Manager B had added themselves to a list of authors of joint articles under wrong contributions. A did not deny B's authorship, apart from stating that B had not contributed in the way they claimed. Furthermore, according to the complainant, B had manipulated the articles' list of authors by including authors whose contributions were not sufficient for authorship to the extent that B claimed. According to A, B's behaviour was repetitive.

In TENK's view, including persons who had not participated in the study in the list of authors constituted manipulation of authorship, which the 2012 RI Guidelines define as one of the 'other irresponsible practices'. At their worst, other irresponsible practices can be RI violations. In a case like this, the activities of the respondent must also constitute gross disregard and irresponsibility during various stages of the activities.

According to the preliminary inquiry, the respondent had "a very flexible view of defining authorship that pushes the limits of authorship. The flexibility is based on the aim to support co-authorship between the research group members and the success of the group." There had been attempts to settle

the case, but A had refused the discussions proposed. After the preliminary inquiry, the Rector ruled that B had not committed an RI violation.

According to TENK, the parties in B's research group had widely different views of the grounds for authorship, and it had not been possible to fully agree on the principles of authorship. The position of power between B and A also required attention. Even though the parties' views of B's contributions differ, it was undisputed that B and the other members of the working group participated in working on the articles, and no persons who had no role in preparing the publications were included in the articles as authors.

In TENK's view, B's actions did not constitute such gross negligence, irresponsibility in various stages of research, or intentional misleading of the scientific community that would meet the criteria for an RI violation.

Statement 11 (TENK 2024:11): The inclusion of research publications in a final report should have been agreed between project teams. However, the criteria for an RI violation were not met.

Professor A suspected that Professor B and University Lecturer C from the same field had reported such publications in the final report for the research project led by B that were not publications of the project in question or that only a small proportion of the reported publications were connected to the project in question. The events were related to two partially overlapping research projects that partially involved the same researchers.

In A's view, presenting the publications completed in one project as being completed in the other project was exaggerating the project results and gave wrong information to the funders.

Based on the preliminary inquiry carried out at the university, no RI violation had been committed.

The parties' differing views were related to the role of the final report. In B's and C's view, they were obligated to report where the project resources had been used. Not reporting the publications would have misled the funder.

A had a different view. According to A, this was a case of exaggerating the results of the project led by B by using the results of the project led by A. A believed that presenting the publications in B's report reduced their value in relation to A's project. B and C should have discussed the reporting of the publications with A.

Exaggerating one's scientific merits is classified as *other irresponsible practice* in the 2012 RI Guidelines, which may meet the criteria for an RI violation, at its most severe. In order to conclude that an RI violation has occurred in a case like this, the activities of the respondent must also constitute gross disregard and irresponsibility during various stages of the activities.

The matter can also be viewed as misleading the scientific community in other ways with regard to one's own research, which the 2012 RI Guidelines classify as *disregard for good research practices*. Also in such a case, in order to conclude that an RI violation has occurred, the activities of the respondent must show gross negligence and carelessness during various stages of the research process in addition to meeting the criteria for disregard.

In TENK's view, B and C should have negotiated on the reporting of the publications in more detail with A. However, the respondents' actions did not constitute such gross negligence, irresponsibility in the different stages of research, or intentional misleading of the scientific community that would meet the criteria for an RI violation.

Statement 12 (TENK 2024:12): Intention to omit a researcher's name from the list of authors does not constitute an RI violation.

A few years ago, Researcher A had worked in a research project in pharmaceuticals and health sciences in the position of a coordinating research nurse. They also said they had performed the tasks of a junior researcher in the project. They suspected three people of an authorship violation: the head researcher of the research group in question, Doctoral Researcher B from University X, and Specialist Physician C, who led the research group. According to A, B and C had denied A access to co-authoring a new publication in the same field and excluded A from the research group at the same time.

The Rector of X had decided that a preliminary inquiry would not be launched, because the article which the notification of an alleged RI violation concerned had not been published, and as such, A's name had not been omitted from the article's list of authors. A was unhappy with the decision of not launching an RI process for the case.

After receiving the request for a statement, TENK asked the parties if the disputed manuscript, albeit not published, had already been sent to a potential publisher for peer review at the time when the Rector decided on the case. According to the responses, the manuscript had not been sent for peer review because it did not even exist.

In its statement, TENK declared that it can only take a stand on what has occurred, but not on intentions possibly expressed by a researcher. At a general level, TENK finds that a researcher's right to be acknowledged as the author of a scientific publication is not dependent on their employment relationship and does not expire even if the study or project, which the published results are from, has been concluded.

Since there was no reason to suspect an RI violation, the Rector of X was able to decide to not launch an RI process.

Statement 13 (TENK 2024:13): TENK made a statement on misappropriation and authorship manipulation, but not on communicating RI violations or terminating employment.

Professor A from University X had filed a notification of seven alleged RI violations related to authorship violations and impeding a researcher's career, all of which featured the same respondent, Professor B of a technological field from the same university. The investigation committee of the investigation proper stated in their report that B had added extra authors to a joint article's list of authors, manipulated the review process, and attempted to mislead the publication process. According to the Rector of X, two of the cases investigated involved misappropriation and two involved disregard of good research practices. In the three other cases, no RI violations were determined.

In their request for a statement from TENK, B denied having committed RI violations, but did not provide justifications on a case-by-case basis. However, B found that both the allegations of RI violations and the RI process were related to their termination, which they considered to be illegal and unprofessional. According to B, their employer at the time, University Y, was informed of the conclusion of the RI process before B was able to give their own comments on the investigation committee's report and before the Rector of X had decided on the conclusion of the RI process.

In its response to TENK, University X stated that it had consciously separated the process of B's termination and the RI process related to their actions. X emphasised that the RI process had followed the Administrative Procedure Act and the documents produced in the RI process are public.

In its statement, TENK only reviewed the cases investigated in the RI process in question where an RI violation had been determined. TENK did not take a stand on B's termination or the allegations directed at other parties involved in B's process.

It was stated in the RI process, for example, that B had added a person to the list of authors of a scientific article to boost the person's research career. In their decision, the Rector found that this was a case of misappropriation. According to TENK, the case mostly had characteristics of other irresponsible practices, i.e., manipulation of authorship by including persons who had not participated in the study in the list of authors. In terms of severity, TENK found that the events could constitute disregard for good research practices. Because misappropriation is an extremely severe form of RI violation, the grounds for it must be undisputable.

TENK does not comment on the consequences of RI processes in its statements. As such, it also does not comment on the timing of Organisation 1 providing information about the investigation committee's report to Organisation 2, if the researcher being investigated in the RI process has changed workplaces from Organisation 1 to Organisation 2.

In connection to this, TENK also refers to the Act on the Openness of Government Activities (621/1999), section 9.2 of which states that “Access to a document which is not yet in the public domain under sections 6 and 7 shall be granted at the discretion of the authority. The provisions in section 17 shall be taken into account when discretion is exercised.”

TENK concluded that University X had carried out the RI process in question according to TENK guidelines. B was guilty of disregard for good research practices. The process followed the 2012 RI Guidelines.

Statement 14 (TENK 2024:14): A grant sum reported incorrectly and the transfer of a degree student to another project did not constitute an RI violation.

Senior Researcher A from University X suspected Professor B of disregard for good research practices, especially regarding unnecessarily delaying and impeding researchers’ work. According to A, B had allegedly committed an RI violation by reporting an incorrect sum granted to a project in a joint meeting between the parties to the notification. Furthermore, according to A, B had impeded A’s career as a researcher by organising, without A’s approval, a transfer to another project for Degree Student C, who had worked on the project.

The Rector of University X ruled that B had not committed an RI violation and the RI process was thus concluded. A was unhappy with the conclusion and requested a statement on whether B had committed an RI violation and whether the RI process had been carried out according to the 2023 RI Guidelines.

TENK found that these two events were separate from each other. The materials submitted were not sufficient to prove misleading with regard to the sum granted. Similarly, Student C was free to choose where they worked.

TENK found that this was primarily a case of a work community dispute and an RI violation could not be established. According to TENK, the RI process had been carried out by University X according to the guidelines.

Statements 15 and 16 (TENK 2024:15 and 2014:16): The denigration of others’ contributions constituted disregard for good research practices, but not misappropriation. The investigation took unreasonably long, and the suspicions of misleading research funders must be investigated in the RI process.

A and B suspected that post-doc Researcher C had presented joint projects as their own for years without acknowledging the other authors’ contributions. According to the rector’s decision, C was guilty of disregard for good research practices by denigrating the contributions of other authors and partners in publications, in their CV and in other reporting. The investigation of the case

in the university took a considerably long time. Both A and B together and C requested a statement on the matter from TENK.

In the 2012 RI Guidelines, misappropriation refers to the unlawful presentation of another person's result, idea, plan, observation or data as one's own research. Misappropriation is taken very seriously and must be proven undeniably. In order to conclude that an RI violation has occurred in a case like this, the activities of the respondent must also constitute gross disregard and irresponsibility during various stages of the activities and the violation must be intentional and serious.

In TENK's view, the criteria for misappropriation as defined in the RI guidelines were not met. Instead, this was a case of disregard for good research practices. The suspicion of misleading research funders had not been investigated in the process, and it should also be investigated according to the RI process.

Statement 17 (TENK 2024:17): Missing acknowledgements related to the collection of interview data did not alone constitute an RI violation.

Researcher A from University X suspected Assistant Professor B of plagiarism. According to the preliminary inquiry, no RI violation had occurred. According to A, B had utilised interview survey material collected by A in a book chapter without acknowledging their work or crediting them appropriately. B had published the book chapter based on the interview material collected by A but had not acknowledged A.

The Rector of University X ruled that B had not committed an RI violation, and thus the RI process was concluded. A expressed dissatisfaction with the decision and asked in their request for a statement whether B had committed an RI violation.

Based on the material provided, TENK could not find any new information supporting the position that B had committed an RI violation. TENK shared the view expressed in the decision of the Rector of University X stating that no RI violation had been committed in the case.

At a general level, TENK recommended that it should be considered carefully whether the launching of multiple overlapping RI processes is necessary.

Statement 18 (TENK 2024:18): Which university carries out the RI process and is responsible for the consequences of an RI violation?

The complainant, A, filed a notification of a suspected RI violation with University X regarding Student B who had worked there as a research assistant and then moved to University Y. The suspicions concerned two publications by B and involved manipulation of authorship and exaggerating the bibliography of a study. According to A, it was unclear how B had contributed to

the study and in which role they participated in it. Furthermore, one of the manuscripts published in scientific journals was allegedly purchased from a ‘paper mill.’

In the preliminary inquiry carried out by University X, B admitted to the alleged RI violations and also said they had paid their co-author to have their name in the list of authors for the articles. However, the Rector of X stated in their decision that because B was not employed by University X at the time of the alleged violations, the case should be resolved by University Y.

A had also filed an RI notification with University Y. However, according to Y, it did not have authority in processing the case because B had not been an employee or a student there at the time of the alleged violations. Similarly, the publications under suspicion were not recorded in Y’s research data system.

In their request for a statement from TENK, A asked what the course of action should have been. As a general rule, TENK states that the RI process should primarily be carried out by the research community in which the respondent operated at the time of the suspected violation. In this case, one of B’s disputed articles was found in the research data system of University X, and X was marked as B’s affiliation there. As such, University X was the right party to carry out the RI process. As a sanction based on the RI Guidelines, the university had to request the journal to withdraw the article in question.

Statement 19 (TENK 2024:19): Changing the order of authors before sending the manuscript to a publisher did not cross the threshold of an RI violation.

Researcher A suspected Assistant Professor B from University 1 of manipulation of authorship. Based on a preliminary inquiry, the Rector of University 1 found that Professor B committed authorship manipulation by changing the order of authors of the unpublished manuscript without agreeing upon it with all the authors.

According to the rector’s decision, changing the order of authors shows irresponsibility, but is not severe enough to meet the criteria for an RI violation. In their request for a statement from TENK, Researcher A questioned the Rector’s decision and wished to know if the case met the criteria for misappropriation.

According to TENK, the criteria for misappropriation were not met in the case, as the complainant’s name was mentioned in the list of authors of the manuscript. TENK found that Assistant Professor B had committed manipulation of authorship as specified in the 2012 RI Guidelines, but changing the list of authors of an unsent manuscript does not meet the criteria of an RI violation as defined in the 2012 RI Guidelines.

Statement 20 (TENK 2024:20): Occasional negligence in using the title of Associate Professor and reprehensible actions as the leader of a research group did not meet the criteria for an RI violation.

Assistant Professor A suspected that university researcher, Associate Professor B had committed an RI violation when B ended their cooperation in a research project led by B. B had unilaterally excluded A from the research project that B was leading, left A's emails unanswered and communicated with the project funder in a manner that A saw as misleading. A also suspected B of occasionally using the title 'Associate Professor' erroneously.

In the investigation proper carried out by the university, it was found that such actions had taken place, but the actions were not severe enough to meet the criteria for an RI violation. The Rector decided that B had not violated research integrity.

A was unhappy with the rector's decision.

TENK found that the university had carried out the RI process in the case carefully and according to TENK guidelines. TENK stated that the RI process should not cover any matters related to personal relations and harassment. TENK found that the carelessness and reprehensible characteristics of B's actions did not meet the criteria of an RI violation as specified in the 2012 RI Guidelines and B had not committed an RI violation in the case.

Statement 21 (TENK 2024:21): Adding acknowledgements to the digital version of an article was deemed a sufficient correction in an RI dispute.

Researcher A from University X suspected Assistant Professor B of plagiarism or misappropriation.

The Rector of University X ruled that B had not committed an RI violation, and thus the RI process was concluded. A expressed dissatisfaction with the decision and asked in their request for a statement whether B had committed an RI violation.

According to A, B had used a table compiled by A in their article without crediting A. According to A, leaving out their name constituted an RI violation. During the RI process, acknowledgements for the work towards the table compilation were added to the digital version of the article. Based on the decision of the Rector of University X, the use of the table did not meet the criteria for an RI violation after the remedying measure.

TENK agreed with the Rector's view. TENK found that the process had been carried out by University X according to the guidelines.

Statement 22 (TENK 2024:22): The application documents of a doctoral student did not contain an exaggeration of merits, and the application process did not involve abuse of influence.

The complainant, A, suspected that Doctoral Student B had misled the scientific community and exaggerated their merits in a situation where they were selected into the research group of Assistant Professor C. According to A, joint articles in which B was involved as a co-author contained poor-quality texts, as well as texts purchased from ‘paper mills.’

The RI process carried out by the university revealed that B had been selected in an international call for applications for doctoral students. The information provided by B in the application process was accurate with regard to publications. B had allegedly served as a referee for researchers who were their colleagues. Even though the ex-colleagues no longer worked together at the time of the assessment, the university reminded B not to assess researchers that are too close to them.

A also suspected that C had inappropriately exerted influence in the situation where B was recruited to the research group. In A’s view, C should have rejected B’s application due to the apparent shortcomings in the application documents. However, the RI investigation showed that B had been selected by a selection committee and C had not participated in assessing B’s application.

According to the 2012 RI guidelines, exaggerating one’s scientific merits falls under the category of *other irresponsible practices*, while misleading the research community falls under the category of *disregard for good research practices*. In order to conclude that an RI violation has occurred with regard to the aforementioned, the criteria for the allegation must be met, the allegation and the violation must be serious, and the violation must involve gross negligence and irresponsibility. As such, TENK agreed with the university’s assessment of the course of events and the decision, according to which neither B nor C was guilty of RI violations. – TENK does not comment on its statements on the selection of doctoral students.

Statement 23 (TENK 2024:23): Scientific differences of opinion are not investigated in an RI process.

Three professors and researchers from different universities suspected that a humanities dissertation involved fabrication and falsification because a term had been misused in it. In addition to this, it was claimed that the dissertation included falsified information about the complainants’ background. According to the complainants, the actors involved in the dissertation process and the project behind it were close relatives of each other. The respondents were both the doctoral candidate and the researchers who participated in the supervising and review process of the dissertation. Based on the preliminary inquiry, the Rector of the university decided that the respondents had not

committed RI violations and they had not had a conflict of interest. The differences in opinion related to the interpretation of the term were not investigated in the RI process.

In their request for a statement from TENK, the complainants claimed that this was a case of research ethics, on which a proper RI investigation should be launched. However, TENK stated that scientific differences of opinion are not within the scope of application of the RI process, as specified in the 2023 RI Guidelines. Scientific disputes should be processed in scientific forums. Any factual errors in the disputed dissertation should have been corrected in the dissertation review process. The RI process must follow the principles of good governance and regulations on disqualification in the Administrative Procedure Act. TENK does not take a stand on legal matters in its statements.

Statement 24 (TENK 2024:24): A preliminary inquiry was not necessary based on discussions held over a short period several years ago.

Professor A suspected that Doctoral Researcher B and professors C and D had violated A's authorship in publications intended for B's dissertation. In A's view, the publications were based on their research idea that they had given to an aspiring doctoral researcher five years ago in discussions between them, which is why A should have been mentioned in the publications' list of authors.

The Rector of the university decided that a preliminary inquiry would not be launched into the case. Professor A requested a statement from TENK regarding whether an RI process should have been initiated in the case.

TENK's view was that, considering that the dissertation research had been carried out for several years under another supervisor after the conversations between Professor A and Doctoral Researcher B had taken place, it was not believable that the conversations that had taken place during a short period in the early stages of the dissertation project constitute in their quality and scope such a substantial contribution that A should be referred to in the dissertation or that they should be included in the list of authors of the individual articles constituting it. TENK's view was that the university acted in accordance with the 2023 RI Guidelines when deciding that no preliminary inquiry would be initiated in the case.

4.

ETHICAL REVIEW

4.1. COORDINATION OF ETHICAL REVIEW IN HUMAN SCIENCES

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

When requested by researchers, human sciences ethics committees issue ethical review statements concerning the ethical aspects of research plans and other risks in research. 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 (2019)* to which the organisations are committed. The guidelines have been prepared together with the scientific community.

TENK's office monitors the state of ethical review by collecting data on cases processed by the human sciences ethics committees annually and by maintaining a list of the committees' contact information. At the end of 2024, *a total of 83 organisations* were committed to TENK's ethical principles for human sciences.

The number of requested ethical review statements broke yet another record. There are great differences in the number of requests for statements processed between the committees: in the largest organisations, the committees process over a hundred requests every year, whereas some committees only process a few individual requests. The most common reasons for requests for a statement are research settings that require an ethical review and demands from publishers. If a statement is requested only due to a requirement by the publisher, the committees may process the requests for statements on an accelerated schedule. The committees may also provide a description of the Finnish ethical review system. Ethical questions require the committees to engage in constant dialogue and to develop their competencies. New challenges arise, especially from research settings making use of artificial intelligence. There is also a constant need to provide training for and communicate about ethical review to the staff of organisations.

Number of cases handled by human sciences ethics committees	2024	2023	2022	2021	2020	2019
Requests for a statement on ethical reviews	816	802	690	589	432	432
Statements given by ethics committees	723	819	611	582	395	389
Negative statement ¹	6	4	4	3	7	0
No statement (ethical review not considered necessary or request for statement directed to another committee)	33	20	57	36	21	36
Number of organisations that replied to TENK's follow-up survey	30	27	25	34	25	27

Table 3: Number of cases handled by human sciences ethics committees each year

If necessary, a statement can be requested from TENK on the decisions issued by the human sciences ethics committees. In 2024, the **subcommittee for ethical review in human sciences** handled requests for statements of ethical reviews and prepared statements. The other task of the subcommittee is to develop ethical review in human sciences and the work of the committees in the field in Finland, and to monitor the international development of field-specific, non-medical research ethics.

In 2024, TENK member **Risto Turunen** served as the chair of the subcommittee and TENK member **Riitta Salmelin** served as the vice chair. Other members included members Veikko Ikonen and Susanna Näreaho.

Senior Adviser **Iina Kohonen** acted as the secretary until 26 August 2024, at which point Senior Adviser **Petra Falin** assumed the secretary's position. The subcommittee met five times in 2024.

1 In 2019 and thereafter, a negative statement means that no positive statement could be given, or the required revisions to the research plan had not been made, or the requested additional material for the statement had not been delivered. Before 2019, the numbers also include cases where the request for a statement was returned with a request for amendment.

4.2. ETHICAL REVIEW STATEMENTS IN HUMAN SCIENCES REQUESTED FROM AND ISSUED BY TENK

In TENK's guidelines *The ethical principles of research with human participants and ethical review in the human sciences in Finland*, it is stated that if a person who has requested an ethical review statement does not accept the proposed changes in the statement, or the decision of the human sciences ethics committee, they may request a statement on the matter from TENK.

In 2024, TENK received two requests for a statement related to ethical review in human sciences. TENK issued statements on both cases. Summaries of the issued statements are presented below.

TENK's Secretariat also received many queries about ethical review in Finland, especially from international researchers.

Ethical review statement in human sciences 1 (TENK 2024:1): The Human Sciences Ethics Committee acted in accordance with the 2019 guidelines when requesting a researcher to specify the selected research method.

The researcher was unhappy with the decision of the Human Sciences Ethics Committee which asked them to specify the selected research method. The committee's statement was negative (with requests for amendment).

The key difference of opinion between the ethics committee and the person requesting a statement concerned the participatory observation method selected by the researcher. According to the Ethics Committee, the research method raised too many questions about the right of self-determination, informing the subjects, protection of privacy, and potential negative impact. Because of this, the committee encouraged the researcher to reflect on whether the research could be carried out in another way.

In the researcher's view, the Committee's statement, according to which the subjects would be unable to tell their consent to the study apart from the consent to other activities, was condescending and based on the Committee members' lack of information on the study subjects.

According to the committee, the application did not reflect on the ethical aspects and challenges of the research setting in a sufficiently profound fashion. For example, the application did not include a plan in case some subjects to be observed did not consent to participation. TENK agreed with this view. TENK also required justifications for why it was essential for the research questions to collect data on the ethnic background of the study subjects.

In TENK's view, the Human Sciences Ethics Committee acted in accordance with the 2019 guidelines when requesting the researcher to reflect on the selected research method. The committee may review the research plan again once the researcher has amended the plan as requested.

Ethical review statement in human sciences 2 (TENK 2024:8): The Human Sciences Ethics Committee followed the guidelines when it asked a researcher to reflect on the ethical risks of their study in more detail.

Doctoral Researcher A and University Lecturer B were unhappy with the way in which the university's Human Sciences Ethics Committee processed the request for a statement related to A's dissertation. A's research setting did not include characteristics due to which an ethical review would have been required, according to TENK's guidelines. The statement was requested to support the researcher's own reflection and at the demand of the publisher and funder.

A key difference of opinion between the Ethics Committee and the person who requested the statement concerned the manner and extent in which the Committee asked the researcher to elaborate on their request for a statement. After the first processing, the Committee felt they were unable to form a sufficient understanding of the study's impact on its subjects. Thus, they were unable to assess the clarity of the information provided to the subjects and the voluntariness of their consent. In addition to this, the information sheets and consent forms attached to the request for a statement were linguistically lacking and the data protection statement was incomplete, according to the Committee. The committee processed the request for a statement in three meetings, after which it ruled in favour of the study.

In TENK's view, the Committee's task is to ensure that the subjects receive sufficient and clear information about the study and are able to decide on their participation independently and that the study does not cause harm to any party. The follow-up discussion and various specifying questions after the request for a statement are a typical and essential part of the statement process of the Human Sciences Ethical Committees.

The Committee is also responsible for notifying the researcher of shortcomings in the research plan, especially in a situation where the researcher has explicitly requested a statement from the Committee to support their own ethical reflection. The committee did not exceed their authority by doing so. Similarly, the committee's processing time did not deviate significantly from a typical statement process.

In TENK's view, the university's ethical review committee followed TENK's guidelines when it asked the researcher to reflect on the ethical risks of their study in more detail.

4.3. ETHICAL GUIDELINES AND ETHICAL REVIEW FOR RESEARCH ON NATURE AND THE ENVIRONMENT (LYTE PROJECT, 2023–2025)

In 2023, TENK launched a project with an objective to draw up national ethical principles and an operating model of ethical review for the fields of natural and environmental research in Finland. The project concerns all research on nature and the environment.

The Ethical guidelines and ethical review for research on nature and the environment (LYTE) project, funded by the Ministry of Education and Culture, aims to harmonise and develop research ethics practices in natural sciences, life sciences, and environmental and technical research and, at the same time, to increase ethical discussion on the impacts of research on nature and the environment.

In August 2024, TENK launched a series of discussion events on the ethical aspects of natural and environmental research. In 2024, the key themes were aquatic environments, terrestrial environments, and atmosphere and outer space. The aim of the discussion series, which was targeted particularly at researchers, was to chart which special ethical considerations are involved in research in different fields. The events were attended by hundreds of researchers, experts, administrative personnel, officials, and others interested in research integrity. The content from the online discussion series will be used for the preparation of the ethical guidelines. More information on the project, its content and the related events is available on the TENK website.

The project has a steering group chaired by TENK Chair Riitta Keiski. The 15-member working group that represents various fields and organisations is chaired by the Vice Chair of TENK, Sirpa Thessler. TENK Advisors Veera Launis (on leave as of 20 September 2024) and Oona Myllyntaus acted as secretaries for the project's steering group and working group.

4.4. ETHICS OF USING AI IN RESEARCH (AI PROJECT, 2024–2026)

A survey produced by TENK, guidelines based on the survey, and follow-up measures

In 2024, TENK launched a project on the ethics of artificial intelligence (AI) in research (2024–2026). The initiative aims to produce a report on ethical issues related to the use of AI in various stages of research in Finland. Based on this report, TENK will draft a recommendation (a living document) on best practices for the ethical use of AI in research.

This recommendation will complement TENK's guidelines on research integrity (RI) and ethical review in human sciences in Finland. It is specifically

designed to provide ethical review committees in the human sciences with tools to assess the need for ethical review in research utilising AI.

The project has received funding from the Ministry of Education and Culture from 1 December 2023 to 30 June 2026. An initial discussion on the project was held during the Ethics Day event (Etiikan päivä) in autumn 2024. The main activities of the project are scheduled for 2025–2026.

4.5. ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING THE SÁMI PEOPLE IN FINLAND

The *Ethical Guidelines for Research Involving the Sámi People in Finland* were completed and published in 2024 in cooperation with TENK. The working group for drafting the guidelines consisted of researchers in Sámi and Indigenous Studies at the Universities of Lapland, Oulu, and Helsinki and representatives of the Sámi Parliament, the Sámi Education Institute and the Sámi Museum Siida. TENK's Secretary General Sanna-Kaisa Spoof was a member of the advisory board that supported the drafting of the guidelines. TENK member Risto Turunen gave a speech on TENK's behalf at the publication event of the guidelines on 30 May 2024. TENK also commented on the drafts of the guidelines.

The guidelines apply to any discipline where research involving the Sámi people, Sámi society and Sámi communities is conducted. The guidelines also apply to research carried out in the Sámi Homeland that has or could potentially have an impact on Sámi people. The guidelines are available online in Finnish, North Sámi, Inari Sámi, Skolt Sámi, and English.

5.

INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

TENK conducted a study trip to Ottawa, Canada, on 29 September–4 October 2024. TENK and the LYTE project were represented by Sirpa Thessler, Simo Kyllönen, Sanna-Kaisa Spoofo and **Eero Kaila**. The participants extended their knowledge about research integrity practices in different fields, the ethical review of research, and indigenous peoples studies. TENK and its Canadian counterpart, the *Secretariat of Responsible Conduct of Research (SRCR)*, learned from each other's activities and observed many similarities in their ways of working. The collaboration is to continue.

TENK's board members and members of TENK's Secretariat participated in the World Conference on Research Integrity 2024 in Athens on 2–5 June 2024.

TENK is a partner in the EU-funded Horizon Europe project PREPARED, which started in September 2022. The three-year project aims to create research-ethical guidelines for research carried out in times of crisis when results must be made available on an accelerated schedule. The premise of the project is to respond to research-ethical challenges encountered during the COVID-19 pandemic, and the consortium has a strong emphasis on biosciences and medicines. The guidelines drafted in the project need to be applicable to non-biomedical and non-medical research as well, and TENK plays a key role in this task.

One of TENK's key tasks in PREPARED is to chart the research integrity regulation in European countries and to engage in stakeholder cooperation with ENRIO and other research integrity actors. In addition, TENK ensures that the PREPARED guidelines are in accordance with European research integrity practices and guidelines. In 2024, TENK collected and provided feedback on the guidelines.

TENK is also a partner in the three-year EU project BEYOND (2023–2025). The BEYOND project uses methods of behavioural science to determine what institutional and career path factors make researchers more

susceptible to research misconduct and to create models to dismantle such factors. TENK is responsible for communication and dissemination activities in this international project. TENK also provides consultation on the usefulness of existing training models intended to reduce research misconduct and the impact of research misconduct investigations and statements processes on the researchers involved. The project is coordinated by the University of Oslo. The project's other Finnish partner is the University of Helsinki.

TENK continued to work with the European Network of Research Integrity Offices (ENRIO). TENK participated actively in ENRIO's strategy work and the Ethics in Humanities and Social Sciences working group, for example. Until the end of the year, TENK was also responsible for editing the *Research Integrity Practice in Europe* online publication.

6.

PERSONNEL AND FINANCES

In 2024, members of the Secretariat of TENK included Secretary General, PhD, Docent Sanna-Kaisa Spoof, Senior Adviser, DA Iina Kohonen (until 31 August 2024) and Senior Adviser, DA Petra Falin (as of 15 August 2024). The Secretariat also included Advisor, DSocSci Eero Kaila, Senior Coordinator, PhD, Docent **Anni Sairio**, Expert, MSSc. **Kalle Videnoja**, Advisor, MA Veera Launis (on leave as of 20 September 2024) and Advisor, PhD Oona Myllyntaus (as of 23 September 2024).

Part-time employees were Planning Officer, MA **Terhi Tarkiainen** (until 30 June 2024) / MA Meri Vainiomäki (until 31 March 2024) and BSc (Econ) **Kaisu Reiss** as the HR Planner.

TENK's Secretariat works at the office of the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (TSV) at Kirkkokatu 6, Helsinki. TSV provides TENK with office space, financial and HR administration and IT services. TENK had at its disposal a general grant and project funding from the Ministry of Education and Culture, as well as additional project funding from the European Union.



TUTKIMUSEETTINEN
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA

FORSKNINGSETISKA
DELEGATIONEN

FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON
RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK

www.tenk.fi