The Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity, TENK

is appointed by the Ministry of Education and Culture. It promotes the responsible conduct of research, prevents research misconduct, promotes discussion and spreads information on research integrity.

All Finnish universities signatories = have agreed to follow the procedures in the TENK guidelines for handling allegations of misconduct

www.tenk.fi
Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland - RCR guidelines 2012

• The guiding principle – self-regulation of the research community
• Violations of the responsible conduct of research
  • Research misconduct
  • Disregard for the responsible conduct of research
  • Other irresponsible practices
Authorship – why is it important?

Authorship

• allows for the attribution of credit for an idea or a discovery
• allocates moral rights
• assigns responsibility
• provides a basis for peer recognition
Authorship – why is it important?

Authorship

• An criterion and indicator used to measure individual academic productivity
  • collective performance
    • reputation
    • funding

→ “Publish or perish” (publication frenzy)
**Authorship – why is it important?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OKM Päätieteena</th>
<th>Julkaisuja 2012-2014</th>
<th>Tekijöitä</th>
<th>Tekijöitä/julkaisu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luonnontieteet</td>
<td>6582</td>
<td>132930</td>
<td>20,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio- ja ympäristötieteet</td>
<td>2716</td>
<td>17155</td>
<td>6,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekniikka</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>6799</td>
<td>5,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lääke- ja terveystieteet</td>
<td>8979</td>
<td>95330</td>
<td>10,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maatalous- ja metsätieteet</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>9297</td>
<td>5,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yhteiskuntatieteet</td>
<td>7088</td>
<td>20503</td>
<td>2,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanistiset tieteet</td>
<td>3780</td>
<td>8637</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yhteensä</strong></td>
<td><strong>32024</strong></td>
<td><strong>290651</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Authorship disputes

Massive increase in co-authorship
• misguided expectations
• unclear arrangements
• poor communication

→ Actual authorship = contribution = accountability
Authorship disputes

Genuine abuse

• deliberate omission
• inappropriate placement of co-authors
• granting of undeserved authorship

(the three G’s: guests, ghosts and gifts)
RCR guidelines 2012:

Before beginning the research or recruiting the researchers, all parties within the research project or team (the employer, the principal investigator, and the team members) agree on the researchers’ rights, responsibilities, and obligations, principles concerning authorship, and questions concerning archiving and accessing the data. These agreements may be further specified during the course of the research (TENK 2012)
Current project at TENK/TJNK

• The finished document will include
  – A recommendation about how to agree about right to authorship

Issues:
- How right to authorship is defined in different contexts and disciplines
- What is authorship in research (research idea, research data)
International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (Vancouver protocol)

Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals.

The ICMJE recommends that authorship be based on the following 4 criteria:

1. **Substantial contributions** to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
2. Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
3. Final approval of the version to be published; AND
4. Agreement to be **accountable for all aspects of the work** in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

- **What counts as substantial contribution?**
- **Can you be accountable for all aspects of the work?**
Substantial contribution?

Conception or design of the work
Data collection
Data analysis and interpretation
Drafting the article
Critical revision of the article
Final approval of the version to be published

Contributorship statement:
Systematically recorded list of the specific contributions of each listed author

How to avoid disputes?

Authorship should be justified by work, not by position!
RCR guidelines and manipulation of authorship

..manifests itself as gross negligence and carelessness during the research process, e.g.

• denigrating the role of other researchers in publications, such as neglecting to mention them, and referring to earlier research results inadequately or inappropriately;
• reporting research results and methods in a careless manner, resulting in misleading claims;
• publishing the same research results multiple times ostensibly as new and novel results (redundant publication, also referred to as self-plagiarism)
Other irresponsible practices, e.g.

- Manipulating authorship, for example, by including in the list of authors persons who have not participated in the research, or by taking credit for work produced by what is referred to as ghost authors.

- Exaggerating one’s own scientific and scholarly achievements, for example, in a CV or its translation, in a list of publications, or on one’s homepage.

*(TENK: Other irresponsible practices, p. 33)*
The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity 2017 by ALLEA (All European Academies)

• The Commission will support the take-up of the Code at national level and, at European level, will implement it as the required standard of research integrity for projects funded by Horizon 2020, the EU's research and innovation funding programme.

• Available at allea.org
The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity on authorship, publication and dissemination (a selection)

• All partners in research collaborations take responsibility for the integrity of the research.

• All partners in research collaborations agree at the outset on the goals of the research and on the process for communicating their research as transparently and openly as possible.

• All partners in research collaborations are properly informed and consulted about submissions for publication of the research results.
The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity on authorship, publication and dissemination (a selection)

• All authors are fully responsible for the content of a publication, unless otherwise specified.
• All authors agree on the sequence of authorship, acknowledging that authorship itself is based on a significant contribution to the design of the research, relevant data collection, or the analysis or interpretation of the results.
• Authors acknowledge important work and intellectual contributions of others, including collaborators, assistants, and funders, who have influenced the reported research in appropriate form, and cite related work correctly.
• All authors disclose any conflicts of interest and financial or other types of support for the research or for the publication of its results.
• Authors and publishers issue corrections or retract work if necessary, the processes for which are clear, the reasons are stated, and authors are given credit for issuing prompt corrections post publication.
The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity on misconduct and unacceptable practices (a selection)

- **Plagiarism** is using other people’s work and ideas without giving proper credit to the original source, thus violating the rights of the original author(s) to their intellectual outputs.
- Manipulating authorship or denigrating the role of other researchers in publications.
- Re-publishing substantive parts of one’s own earlier publications, including translations, without duly acknowledging or citing the original (‘self-plagiarism’).
- Misusing seniority to encourage violations of research integrity.
- Establishing or supporting journals that undermine the quality control of research (‘predatory journals’).

In their most serious forms, unacceptable practices are sanctionable, but at the very least every effort must be made to prevent, discourage and stop them through training, supervision and mentoring and through the development of a positive and supportive research environment.
To appear in a year’s time: Open webpage for research ethics, integrity and science communication

• To provide introductions, recommendations to and guidance on the main issues in research ethics, integrity and science communication

• A recommendation for authorship in scientific publishing

vastuullinentiede.fi (to be published in March 2018)

For more information, contact lina Kohonen@tsv.fi
Useful sources on authorship and data management

- Authorship in scientific publications. Analysis and recommendations. Published by Scientific Integrity Committee of the Swiss Academies of Arts and Sciences. [info@akademien-schweiz.ch](mailto:info@akademien-schweiz.ch). [www.swiss-academies.ch](http://www.swiss-academies.ch)