Publications of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK
2
2019

A Practical Model of the Self-Regulation of Academic Integrity: a Chinese-English edition of the Code of Conduct for Research Integrity in Finland

学术诚信自律的应用模式:
芬兰学术诚信准则之汉英版

TUTKIMUSEETTINEN NEUVOTTELUKUNTA

FORSKNINGSETISKA DELEGATIONEN

FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK

A Practical Model of the Self-Regulation of Academic Integrity: a Chinese-English edition of the Code of Conduct for Research Integrity in Finland

学术诚信自律的应用模式:
芬兰学术诚信准则之汉英版

Publications of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK 2/2019

芬兰学术诚信国家委员会 TENK 2019年2月出版

Publications of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK 2/2019
ISSN 2490-161X (print)
Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK
Snellmaninkatu 13
00170 Helsinki
Finland

Editorial staff: Anni Sairio and Sanna-Kaisa Spoof.

Sanna-Kaisa Spoof's "A framework for self-regulation in research integrity: the Finnish model step by step" was originally published in the Responsible Research website in 2018. Link: https://www.vastuullinentiede.fi/en/planning/framework-self-regulation-research-integrity-finnish-model-step-step

The Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland was originally published in 2013 in Finnish, Swedish and English as "Hyvä tieteellinen käytäntö ja sen loukkausepäilyjen käsitteleminen Suomessa. Tutkimuseettisen neuvottelukunnan ohje. God vetenskaplig praxis och handläggning av misstankar om avvikelser från den i Finland. Forskningsetiska delegationens anvisningar. Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland. Guidelines of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity. Helsinki 2013."
Link: https://www.tenk.fi/sites/tenk.fi/files/HTK_ohje_2012.pdf

contents

Preface 5

A framework for self-regulation in research integrity: the Finnish model step by step, by Sanna-Kaisa Spoof 6

Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland. Guidelines of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity. A version edited in 2019 for the international research community. 17

Introduction 17

The responsible conduct of research 20

Violations of the responsible conduct of research 24

Research misconduct 25

Disregard for the responsible conduct of research 27

Other irresponsible practices 27

Guidelines for handling alleged violations of the responsible conduct of research 29

The process of handling alleged violations of the responsible conduct of research, otherwise known as the RCR process 32

内容

Preface 5

学术诚信自律框架:芬兰模式,循序渐进 6

芬兰负责任的科研行为和处理不端行为指控的程序。年芬兰国家科研诚信委员会准则。2019年针对国际科研界编辑的版本。简介 17

负责任的研究方式 20

违反负责任的研究方式的行为 24

学术不端行为 25

对负责任的研究方式的忽视 27

其他不负责任的做法 27

对涉嫌违反负责任的研究方式的行为的处理准则 29

处理对违反负责任的研究方式的指控的程序(RCR程序) 32

Preface

This volume introduces the framework of academic integrity in Finland for the international audience, especially for Chinese readers. The work consists of two parts: 1) an introduction of the Finnish research integrity guidelines and its practical application in Finland, and 2) the code of conduct for research integrity in Finland. Apart from the preface, the contents are side by side in Chinese and in English.

The first section is an introduction by Sanna-Kaisa Spoof, Secretary General of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK. This section outlines the basis of the self-regulation model that is used to monitor academic integrity in the Finnish research community, and the requirements for establishing a similar framework in other countries. The Finnish model is one of the oldest national frameworks, in place since 1994, and as such a pioneering model of scientific self-regulation in Europe.

The second section introduces the guidelines on responsible conduct of research (RCR) in Finland. How is it defined? What constitutes research misconduct? How are allegations of research misconduct investigated in Finland? This information of the Finnish framework of academic integrity is intended especially for the benefit of Chinese students and researchers in Finland. The guidelines presented here are based on a lightly edited version of the Responsible Conduct of Research and Procedures for Handling Allegations of Misconduct in Finland. Guidelines of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity (2012), published also in Finnish and Swedish.

This volume has been produced and published by TENK. TENK has the mandate to monitor research misconduct and promote the responsible conduct of research in Finland; see www.tenk.fi/en for more information.

The translation and publication of this volume was made possible by the Responsible Research project (www.responsibleresearch.fi), funded by the Ministry of Culture and Education in Finland. TENK and the Responsible Research project would like to express their gratitude to Mr Ni Jiamu and Mr Jani Kohonen for language-checking the Chinese translation.

A framework for self-regulation in research integrity: the Finnish model step by step

Sanna-Kaisa Spoof

One of the oldest sets of guidelines on the national level for research integrity, which define and investigate scientific misconduct, have been established in Finland. The Finnish model is a pioneering, internationally recognised and respected model of a European self-regulation framework on research integrity concerning the scientific community. This article introduces the background and the main features of the model as well as how it works in practice. This article also provides steps on how a similar framework can, where applicable, be launched in another country or research culture. It provides an overview of the Finnish method for investigating scientific misconduct, written with the international reader in mind. It can be read in conjunction with the Responsible Conduct of Research and Procedures for Handling Allegations of Misconduct in Finland, or the so-called RCR guidelines, drawn up by the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK.

In 2019, various national approaches are in place in Europe for investigating violations of research integrity. Some countries still do not have any national framework for these investigations. There are two courses of action for determining scientific misconduct, investigating allegations, and imposing sanctions: a model based on legislation, and a self-regulation model overseen by the scientific community. When an RCR investigation is based on national

学术诚信自律框架：芬兰模式，循序渐进

Sanna-Kaisa Spoof

学术诚信，芬兰是全世界率先制定国家层次学术诚信准则的国家之一。这些准则定义并调查学术不端行为。芬兰模式得到了国际公认，是欧洲针对学术团体的学术诚信制定自律框架的先驱。本文将介绍芬兰模式的背景、主要特点及如何在实践中运用。本文还将介绍在另一个国家或另一种研究文化中启用类似框架（如果适用）的步骤，并对芬兰调查学术不端行为的方法进行评估。本文在写作时考虑到了国际读者，并可结合由芬兰学术诚信国家委员会拟定的《在芬兰负责任的研究方式以及对不端行为指控的处理程序》（Responsible conduct of research and procedures for handling allegations of misconduct in Finland）（RCR准则）。

2019年，欧洲将出台数个不同的国家措施，用以调查违反学术诚信的行为。但仍有一些国家尚未出台国家性框架。在查明学术不端行为、对指控开展调查和进行处罚时，有两种基本处理方式：法律模式和学术团体的自律模式。当依据国家法律实施RCR调查时，严重的学术不端行为同时也是犯罪行为，但在自律框架下并非如此。学术团体自身将依据学术实践对不端行为进行纠正，并根据双方同意的规则，开展调查并实施处罚。

芬兰采用的框架基于国家性的准则，于1994年首次发布，被用以确认及调查违反负责任的研究方式（RCR）的行为。除了学术团体的内部规范外，该框架的出发点是实现学术的开放性和透

legislation, serious research misconduct is, in this case, also a crime. This is not the case in a self-regulation framework. In a self-regulation framework, the scientific community itself rectifies the situation in accordance with academic practices. The scientific community carries out an investigation and imposes sanctions, using mutually agreed rules.

Finland employs a framework which is based on the national guidelines, first published in 1994, on the identification and investigation of responsible conduct of research (RCR) violations. In addition to the internal regulations within the scientific community, the Finnish model is based on the openness and transparency of science as well as the mutual trust between researchers and research organisations. The framework would work well in democracies akin to Finland.

TENK monitors academic integrity and the quality of research in Finland

The activities of Finnish universities are based on self-administration and academic freedom. The Ministry of Education and Culture directs the activities of higher education institutions and research institutes in Finland and also serves as their primary financer. The Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK was founded in 1991 by parliamentary decree. TENK is an autonomous body of experts under the Ministry of Education and Culture, and its duty is to promote research integrity and to prevent scientific misconduct in Finland.

The Ministry appoints ten members for a three-year term in TENK. These members are a group of experts nominated by the scientific community on the basis of their academic – not

明性，以及研究人员与研究机构之间的相互信任。该框架可在与芬兰相似的民主国家中发挥有效作用。

在芬兰TENK对研究人员的学术诚信及科研质量进行监督

芬兰各大学的活动以自治和科学自由为基础。芬兰教育文化部负责指导芬兰高等教育机构和研究机构的活动，并作为主要出资方。芬兰学术诚信国家委员会（TENK）于1991年根据议会法令成立。TENK是教育文化部下属的一个专家组织，主要负责在芬兰促进学术诚信并防止学术不端行为。

教育文化部根据科学界的建议任命10名专家担任学术诚信国家委员会成员，任期三年。相关成员的任命基于学术因素而非政治因素。他们是科学界受人尊敬的男性或女性科学家。根据该法令，TENK的成员必须能够代表不同学科和研究方法，并在学术诚信及法规领域起到表率作用。

political – merits. They are respected members of the scientific community, of both genders. According to the decree, TENK members must represent different academic disciplines and research methods as well as research integrity and jurisprudence.

TENK matters are managed by a small secretariat. Even though TENK is financed by the Ministry, the members are not paid a salary. They attend meetings and deal with misconduct cases alongside their own jobs.

Surveys have shown that citizens in Finland have a high level of trust in science and in researchers. TENK has the important social duty of ensuring that this trust in science and research is maintained. To ensure scientific credibility and impartiality, it is vital for TENK to operate independently outside of research institutes, higher education institutions, and the Ministry of Education and Culture. The Ministry does not interfere with TENK's activities or ethical courses of action.

In addition to monitoring scientific misconduct, TENK plays an important role in preventing it. This objective is supported by a local advisory system launched in Finland in 2017. In this system, research organisations appoint research integrity advisers, who are trained by TENK. The research integrity advisers report to their organisation on RCR matters and provide confidential, low-threshold counselling for the researchers in their organisations.

Applying the Finnish model and defining RCR violations

In Finland, the definitions of responsible conduct of research and the investigations of alleged misconduct are based on the Responsible Conduct of Research and Procedures for

TENK事务由一个小型秘书处负责管理。尽管全国委员会受教育文化部资助，但委员会成员并没有工资。他们会参加研讨会，在做好本职工作的同时熟悉各种学术不端行为的案例。

监督民调显示，芬兰公民对科学和研究人员表现出高度的信任。TENK承担重大社会责任，确保芬兰民众始终相信科研成果。在学术信誉和公正性方面，TENK独立于研究机构、高等教育机构及教育文化部之外运作，这一点至关重要。教育文化部不得干预全国委员会或道德规范的行动方针。

除了监督学术不端行为，TENK也在预防相关行为方面发挥重要作用。芬兰于2017年成立的本地咨询系统可帮助实现这一目标。在该系统中，各组织可自行任命学术诚信辅助人员，并由TENK负责培训。辅助人员就RCR相关事项向所属机构报告，并为机构内研究人员提供基础的、受保密的咨询服务。

实际应用该模式与定义违反RCR准则的行为

在芬兰，负责任的科研行为的定义和对相关案件的调查基于由芬兰学术诚信国家委员会拟定的《在芬兰负责任的研究方式以及对不端行为

Handling Allegations of Misconduct in Finland, also known as the RCR guidelines. TENK has drawn up these guidelines together with the scientific community in Finland. Finland has over twenty years' experience in the application and functionality of the guidelines. They were last updated in 2012.

The effectiveness of these guidelines is based on the voluntary commitment to adhere to them by all universities, universities of applied sciences and other research organisations in Finland, in the sphere of public funding as well as regarding the most important financers.

The first section of the guidelines defines the premise for the responsible conduct of research, for example taking into due account the work and accomplishments of other researchers, the principles concerning authorship in a research group, the principle of not having a conflict of interest or bias, or the description of an employer's informative responsibilities and other obligations. The guidelines then define RCR violations and explain the process of investigating misconduct allegations in Finland.

In Finland, there are two categories of violation regarding responsible conduct of research. The more serious category or misconduct includes the three subcategories fabrication, falsification and plagiarism, internationally known as FFP. An additional distinguished Finnish feature in this category is the misappropriation of another researcher's research idea, dataset, or observation.

The second, less severe category is the disregard for responsible conduct of research, which refers to gross negligence in various stages of the research process. This includes, for example, self-plagiarism or the intentional omission of a researcher's name from the list of

指控的处理程序》(或称RCR准则)(参见www.tenk.fi)。这套准则由TENK与学术界成员合作起草。芬兰在相关准则的应用和功能性方面拥有超过20年的经验,这套准则最近一次更新是在2012年。

这些准则的有效性是建立在所有大学、专科院校和其他基于公共资金及重要资助方的研究机构自愿承诺遵守的基础上的。

该套准则首先描述了负责任的研究方式的特点,包括例如适当考虑其他研究人员先前的研究、研究团队成员之间的著作权协议、无利益冲突或偏见的原则或者对雇主的信息责任及其他义务的描述等。然后,这些准则阐明了违反RCR准则的行为以及对涉嫌不端行为的指控的调查程序。

在芬兰,违反负责任的研究方式的行为可被分为两类。较严重的学术不端行为的类别包括杜撰(Fabrication)、篡改(Falsification)和剽窃(Plagiarism)三个子类,国际上简称为FFP。另外一种芬兰国内定义的不端行为是盗用另一位研究人员的想法或学习计划。

第二种严重程度较低的类别是对负责任的研究方式的忽视,包括涉及研究过程各阶段的重大疏忽。其中包括自我剽窃或故意在合著文章的作者名单中遗漏某位研究人员的姓名等。此类应予以谴责的行为也已纳入2017年修订的《欧洲学术诚信行为准则》(欧洲科学院联盟,即ALLEA)。

此外,芬兰准则还列举了其他不负责任的行为,例如研究人员夸大其简历中的信息或通过媒体误导公众。这些行为中的最严重者可被视为对RCR准则的侵犯。

RCR准则适用于芬兰的所有学科。相关准则

authors in a joint article. Such condemnable actions have also been incorporated into the 2017 revised European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (All European Academies, ALLEA).

Moreover, the Finnish guidelines list other irresponsible practices, such as exaggerating one's scholarly and scientific achievements in a CV, or misleading the general public through the media. In their most serious forms, these practices may be considered RCR violations.

The RCR guidelines apply to all academic disciplines in Finland. They apply not only to regular research and publishing activities, but also to all decision-making and evaluation concerning research, such as referee activities and teaching. The guidelines apply to doctoral dissertations and Master's theses, but do not apply to Bachelor's and Master's degree students.

Investigation of misconduct in Finland: the RCR process

When there is an allegation of scientific misconduct, the investigation is always a strenuous ordeal. A researcher's career – their reputation and honour – is at stake. The process is strenuous for both the person making the allegation, usually the "victim" of the case, and the person suspected of the violation, even if the allegation is ultimately proven to be unfounded. It is therefore extremely important to resolve the case thoroughly and impartially and to hear all the parties in the investigation. The Finnish RCR process ensures the legal protection of all the parties involved.

Under the Finnish RCR process, the investigation of an allegation is carried out in the research organisation where the suspected researcher works. Every serious allegation of misconduct is investigated by its own

既适用于普通的研究和出版活动，也适用于研究人员进行的所有学术决策和评估，如评审活动和教学工作，包括硕士论文和博士论文。该准则不涉及学士学位和硕士学位学生。

芬兰的不端行为调查或RCR程序

对学术不端行为的调查过程非常艰难，因为这会危及到研究人员的职业生涯（其名誉和荣誉）。对指控方（通常是案件的"受害者"）和涉嫌违规者而言，都是如此，即便最终相关指控被证明不成立。因此，谨慎公正地处理相关指控，各方在调查中表达的所有意见都能被听取，至关重要。芬兰的RCR程序确保各有关方得到法律保护。

基于RCR程序对指控进行的调查，将在涉嫌违规的研究人员所在的研究机构进行。每项对不端行为的严肃指控都将得到一个单独的调查委员会，该调查委员会包括相关学科的专家、符合资格的法人以及至少两名组织外成员。该程序由出现问题的相关研究机构的负责人-大学校长-负责。其责任是监管整个组织的利益，并确保整个组织的利益优先于个别部门、个别学院或个别学科的利益。通过快速实施初步调查，负责人可

investigation committee. This committee includes experts from the academic discipline in question, qualified legal persons and at least two members outside the organisation. The process is led by the head of the research organisation in question – usually the rector of a university – whose duty it is to oversee the interests of the whole organisation and to put them before those of individual departments, faculties or academic disciplines. The head can resolve clear misconduct or less severe cases through the quicker process of a preliminary inquiry. It is in the interest of the organisation whose actions have been brought under suspicion that all allegations taken into consideration are investigatedtransparently through the RCR process. At the same time, the scientific credibility and reputation of the organisation must be ensured. In the Finnish model, the investigating organisation is responsible for all of the costs resulting from the investigation.

If the investigation finds a severe RCR violation, the reputation of the researcher implicated of misconduct is tarnished. Furthermore, any errors and unfairness found must be rectified as defined in the RCR guidelines, for example concerning authorship questions. The parties involved, the scientific community of the discipline in question, TENK and the funders of the research must be provided with a report on the findings of an investigation. The research organisation will make the decision concerning other consequences. If the case includes, for example, suspected financial abuse or other legal infractions, these issues will be handled in separate judicial proceedings under Finnish law.

One crucial part of the RCR process is that parties dissatisfied with the procedure or the outcome may submit a request for a

以解决显而易见的不端行为或严重程度较低的案件。委员会将通过受监督的RCR程序对所有相关指控进行清晰透明的调查，这首先是为了维护受怀疑的组织的利益，同时确保该组织的科学信誉和声誉得到维护。在芬兰模式中，调查组织负责承担调查产生的所有费用。

如果调查发现存在严重违反RCR准则的行为，被判定违规的研究人员的声誉将受到损害。此外，在调查中发现的错误和不公平行为必须根据RCR准则的规定予以纠正，例如更改出版物的作者署名。各有关方、与相关规定有关的学术团体、TENK及其资助方必须获得关于调查结果的报告。所涉及的研究组织将就其他后果作出决定。如果案件包括例如涉嫌财务滥用或其他的违法行为，则将根据芬兰法律，在不同的司法程序中予以处理。

对程序或结果不满的当事人可在六个月内向独立的外部机构（即TENK）提交关于该案件的声明请求，这是RCR程序的一个关键部分。然后，TENK将就此案作出最终决定。在发表声明时，TENK只会就有关学术诚信的问题表明立场，而不会干涉与案件相关的科学观点分歧或雇佣纠纷。

如有任何新的指控和疑问，TENK必须获知，以便该机构在芬兰监督学术不端行为的演变。

statement from an unaffiliated outside party, in other words TENK, within six months. The final decision-making on the case is then given to TENK. When issuing statements, TENK will only take a stance on matters concerning research integrity. TENK does not interfere in differences in scientific opinion or employment disputes that are often associated with the cases.

TENK must be informed of all allegations and inquiries so that it can monitor the state of scientific misconduct in Finland.

The special features of the Finnish self-regulation framework

How to create a framework for self-regulation that is credible and trustworthy? In comparison to other countries, the unique aspect of the Finnish model is that Finnish universities and research institutes have voluntarily signed and committed to following the guidelines. Today, it would be completely unthinkable in Finland that a university would not make this commitment. Finnish research organisations also comply with the RCR guidelines and the recommendations of TENK statements, usually to the letter.

In order to build a successful system of self-regulation within the scientific community there must be a national-level organisation that oversees the functionality of the framework and to whom complaints can be submitted. In Finland, TENK serves in this capacity. TENK does not investigate cases itself, because it cannot process complaints about its own activities: that would be a conflict of interest. Costwise, the Finnish framework is rather conservative, taking into consideration that the reputation of research organisations is on the line. A framework

芬兰自律框架的特点

如何创建一个可靠并获得研究人员信任的自律框架？与其他国家相比，芬兰模式的独特之处在于其大学和研究机构自愿签署并承诺遵守相关准则。如今，很难想象芬兰国内会有大学拒绝作出该承诺。芬兰研究机构通常也会不折不扣地遵循TENK声明中的RCR准则和建议。

为了在学术界实现成功的自律，必须有一个国家层面的组织，负责监督框架运行并能够受理投诉。在芬兰，TENK承担学术诚信委员会的职责。TENK自身并不参与案件调查，因其不能处理与自身活动有关的投诉，否则会产生利益冲突。考虑到会影响研究机构的声誉，芬兰框架在成本方面相当保守。与芬兰相似的框架可在任何地方分小步、低成本地启用。

自律框架如要发挥作用，至少需要以下四个因素：

1. 国家定期修订准则，明确定义学术不端行为，并解释调查对不端行为指控的程序

comparable to the Finnish one can be launched anywhere, in small steps and at a low cost.

For a framework for self-regulation to work, at least the following four factors are required:

1. National, regularly revised guidelines that define both scientific misconduct and the process used for investigating allegations of misconduct

2. Universities and research organisations that have committed themselves to the guidelines (and will investigate suspected allegations in accordance with the guidelines)

3. Researchers who are aware of the guidelines and adhere to them

4. A national committee that draws up the guidelines and handles complaints involving them

Building a self-regulation framework for the investigation of research misconduct step by step

How would a self-regulation framework like the Finnish model be launched? How does this framework work in practice, and how is it revised? The following steps show how to start implementing the framework.

- A national decision should be made to launch a self-regulation framework for research integrity and to establish a research integrity committee amongst the scientific community and the ministry that sees to matters in science and higher education, or a similar national body that handles matters in science. The scientific

2. 大学和研究组织承诺遵守这些准则(并将根据准则调查嫌疑指控)

3. 研究人员了解并遵守这些准则

4. 一个起草准则并处理相关投诉的全国委员会

逐步制定调查学术不端行为的自律制度

如何启用芬兰模式自律框架?该框架如何运作?实际中如何修改?以下步骤展示如何实施该框架:

- 应做出一项关于在学术诚信方面启用自律框架的国家性决定,并在学术界及负责监督科学和高等教育事务的部门或国内其他处理科学事务的类似国家机构中设立学术诚信委员会。学术团体包括研究人员、大学及其他高等教育机构、科学研究机构以及为科学事业提供资助的重要国家机构。

- 学术诚信委员会的建立可基于法律或议会决定,以此确保其活动的连续性。这些活动可基于

community includes researchers, universities and other higher education institutions, science and research institutes, and important national bodies that finance science.

- The existence of a research integrity committee can be legislated by law or established by a parliamentary decision to ensure the continuity of its activities. These activities may be based on, for example, a common body that is established and financed by a network of research organisations and universities, such as what is found in Austria.

- The position of a research integrity committee secretary-general should be filled and an office established. The office should be physically located outside of organisations carrying out research; in the beginning, a one- to two-person secretariat should be enough for planning and implementing committee matters.

- Research integrity committee procedural rules should be drafted, and permanent financing for the committee should be confirmed.

- A chair and several other members should be appointed on the basis of research and science policy for this scientific committee.

- The secretary-general should produce a draft of national RCR guidelines together with the committee. These guidelines would include, at the very least, the definition of research misconduct and the procedure for carrying out an investigation. The committee should ask for feedback from the scientific community and the ministry or similar body that handles science

一个由研究机构及大学网络建立并资助的共同机构，例如在奥地利成立的相关组织。

- 任命学术诚信委员会秘书长并设立办公室。该办公室在地理上应位于进行研究的组织之外；在启动阶段，配备一两到人的秘书处应该就足以规划和执行委员会事务。

- 应起草学术诚信委员会程序规则，并确定委员会的长期资金来源。

- 应该根据科学委员会的研究和学术政策任命主席和其他成员。

- 秘书长应与委员会一起编写国家RCR准则的草案，其中至少应包括对不端行为的定义和开展调查的程序；委员会应该征求学术界和处理学术事务的部委或类似机构的反馈意见；委员会将对这套准则做最终认可。

- 这套准则应以该国的官方语言以及英语（至少英语，还可包括其他语言）公布。

- 高等教育机构和研究机构应签署承诺表，开始遵守准则。可以组织一项集体签名活动。

- 这一承诺将促使研究机构在其内部推广负责任的研究方式和学术诚信行为，为员工提供学术诚信培训，并在员工涉嫌学术不端行为时启动RCR程序。在这个过程中应倾听各方意见

matters. The committee would make the final approval of the guidelines.

- The guidelines should be made publicly available in the national language(s) of the country and (at least) in English.

- Higher education institutions and research organisations should begin to adhere to the guidelines by signing a commitment form. A collective signing event could be organised.

- This commitment would obligate research organisations to promote responsible conduct of research and research integrity, to offer research integrity training for their members, and to begin the RCR process if a member is suspected of research misconduct. All parties must be heard in this process.

- The names of the organisations that commit themselves to the guidelines, recommendations and other activities of the research integrity committee should all be displayed on the committee's website.

- The national research integrity committee would oversee the RCR processes and serve as a body that handles appeals.

- The RCR guidelines would be revised as needed.

- Alongside the RCR guidelines, other national recommendations on special issues regarding research integrity could be drafted.

Dr. Sanna-Kaisa Spoof, Secretary General,
Finnish National Board on Research
Integrity TENK

- 承诺参加学术诚信委员会活动的机构名称应被公示在委员会网站上。

- 国家学术诚信委员会监督RCR程序的实施过程，并会成为处理申诉的机构。

- RCR准则将根据需要修订。

- 除了RCR准则外，还可针对有关学术诚信的特殊议题起草其他全国性建议。

秘书长Sanna-Kaisa Spoof
芬兰国家科研诚信委员会（TENK）

Responsible Conduct of Research and Procedures for Handling Allegations of Misconduct in Finland. Guidelines of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity. A version edited in 2019 for the international research community.

Introduction

The Finnish National Board on Research Integrity (TENK) has drawn up the guidelines for the responsible conduct of research and for handling alleged violations of conduct (the RCR guidelines) in co-operation with the Finnish research community. The guidelines were taken into use in 1994 and the most recent update took place in 2012. The objective is to promote the responsible conduct of research while ensuring that any alleged violations are handled with competence and fairness and as quickly as possible.

The RCR guidelines provide researchers with a model for the responsible conduct of research. The effectiveness of these 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. The RCR guidelines apply to all academic disciplines in Finland, and a list of the organisations that have committed to these guidelines can be found on TENK's website www.tenk.fi.

The objective of these guidelines is to promote the responsible conduct of research

芬兰负责任的科研行为和处理不端行为指控的程序。年芬兰国家科研诚信委员会准则。2019年针对国际科研界编辑的版本。

简介

芬兰学术诚信国家委员会(TENK)与芬兰学术界研究团体合作制定了关于负责任的研究方式和对涉嫌违规的行为的处理方法准则(RCR准则)。该准则于1994年启用，最近一次的更新是在2012年。其目标是提倡负责任的研究方式，同时确保对涉嫌违规的行为进行恰当、公平及快速的处理。

RCR准则为研究人员提供了一个负责任的研究方式的模式。这套准则的有效性基于学术界自愿承诺遵守相关准则并提高对学术诚信原则的认识。RCR准则适用于芬兰的所有学科，在TENK官网可以找到承诺遵守该准则的机构的名单。

这套准则旨在提倡负责任的研究方式，并在所有参与研究工作的组织里防止学术不端行为，这些组织包括大学、专科院校和由公共资金支持的研究机构。如果适用，在与国内或国际企业及其他合作伙伴开展合作时，这套准则也应被遵守。

RCR准则的前提是，提倡负责任的研究方式和处理涉嫌违反负责任的研究方式的行为。这些组织完成RCR程序，做出最终决定之后，对决定不满的一方可以要求TENK发表声明。在其他活动中，TENK专注于提倡负责任的研究方式，并与研究机构合作制定和宣传共同准则。

除了RCR准则之外，TENK还发布了其他国

and to prevent misconduct in research in all organisations involved in research work, such as universities, universities of applied sciences and research institutes under public funding. These guidelines are also to be adhered to, whenever applicable, when co-operating with enterprises and other partners, either nationally or internationally.

The premise of the RCR guidelines is that promoting the responsible conduct of research and handling alleged violations of the responsible conduct of research are primarily the responsibility of the organisations conducting research. When the RCR process has been finalised by the organisation, if any party is dissatisfied with the ruling, it may request a statement from TENK. In its other activities, TENK focuses on promoting the responsible conduct of research, as well as formulating and publicising common guidelines in co-operation with the research organisations.

In addition to the RCR guidelines, TENK has published other national guidelines, such as Ethical principles of research in the humanities and social and behavioural sciences and proposals for ethical review and, in co-operation with the research community, has formulated a model CV for researchers, Template for researcher's curriculum vitae.

In Finnish, the term research ethics is a general concept that covers all the ethical viewpoints and evaluations that are related to science and research. The scope of these guidelines is, however, narrower and refers to following and promoting an ethically responsible and proper course of action in research, as well as identifying and preventing violations and dishonesty in all research. In English, this concept is usually referred to as

家准则，如《人文社会科学和行为科学科研伦理原则及伦理审查建议》(Ethical principles of research in the humanities and social and behavioural sciences and proposals for ethical review)，并与学术界合作，为研究人员制定了模范简历，即“研究人员简历模板”。

在芬兰语中，“学术伦理”一词是广义概念，涵盖所有与学术研究有关的伦理观点和评估。但这套准则的适用范围较窄，仅指在研究中提倡和遵循在伦理道德上负责任的、恰当的行动方针，以及在所有研究中发现和预防违规行为和不诚实行为。在英语中，这个概念通常是指“学术诚信”，这个术语强调所有研究人员在其研究活动中必须保持诚实和正直。

如果违反特定学科的规范的行为并没有同时成为RCR准则所述的违规行为，则TENK不会干预。此外，TENK不处理涉嫌违反法律的行为，比如版权法或专利法。

鉴于TENK仅关注上述学术诚信问题，其声明仅评论RCR调查是否符合相关准则，以及是否违反了负责任的研究方式规定。换言之，TENK不对科学观点、不同思想流派之间的争议或职业道德问题发表评论。

在芬兰，某些学科有自己的道德准则和治理机构，比如全国社会福利和医疗伦理咨询委员会(ETENE)、全国医学研究伦理委员会(TUKIJA)和生物技术咨询委员会(BTNK)。这些委员会能够就职业道德提供更详细的建议，例如提供研究人员与研究课题间的关系的信息。此外，一些机构，诸如医院、大学、专科和研究机构等，设有区域和机构专门的学术诚信咨询委员会。

此外，关于学术诚信的共同原则以及如何鉴

research integrity, a term that emphasises the honesty and integrity that all researchers are required to adopt in their research activities.

TENK does not intervene when there are violations of the norms of a specific academic discipline if these violations do not at the same time constitute a violation as described in the RCR guidelines. Furthermore, TENK does not address alleged violations of the law, such as copyright law or patent law.

As TENK focuses solely on the research integrity issues mentioned above, its statements comment only on whether the RCR investigation has been conducted in compliance with these guidelines, and whether there has been a violation of the responsible conduct of research. In other words, TENK does not comment on matters of opinion regarding science, disputes between different schools of thought, or issues of professional ethics.

In Finland, certain academic disciplines have their own ethical norms and governing bodies, such as the National Advisory Board on Social Welfare and Health Care Ethics (ETENE), the National Committee on Medical Research Ethics (TUKIJA) and the Advisory Board on Biotechnology (BTNK). These boards and committees offer advice on professional ethics in more detail, for example, by offering information on the relationship between the researcher and the research subject. In addition, some institutions, such as hospitals, universities, universities of applied sciences and research institutes, have regional and organisation-specific advisory boards on research integrity.

Moreover, there has been extensive international debate on the common principles of research integrity and on how to identify violations of the responsible conduct of research.

定违反负责任的研究方式的行为存在着广泛的国际性辩论。部分共同制定并达成共识的行为准则包括《欧洲学术诚信行为准则》(欧洲科学院联盟ALLEA，2017年修订版)、《学术诚信新加坡声明》(新加坡2010年世界学术诚信会议)、《生物医学期刊投稿的统一要求》(国际医学期刊编辑委员会，ICMJE)和《期刊编辑行为准则和最佳实践准则》(出版道德委员会，COPE 2011)。

RCR准则符合国际行为准则。RCR准则还为芬兰境内针对涉嫌违反RCR准则的行为的调查提供指导。

Codes of conduct that have been jointly created and agreed upon include The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ALL European Academies ALLEA, Revised edition 2017), the Singapore Statement on Research Integrity (World Conference on Research Integrity 2010, Singapore), the Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals (International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, ICMJE), and the Code of Conduct and Best Practice Guidelines for Journal Editors (Committee on Publication Ethics, COPE 2011).

The RCR guidelines are in accordance with the international codes of conduct. The RCR guidelines also provide the guidelines for investigating alleged RCR violations in Finland.

The responsible conduct of research

In order for research to be ethically acceptable and reliable and for its results to be credible, the research must be conducted according to the responsible conduct of research. Applying the guidelines for the responsible conduct of research within the research community constitutes a form of self-regulation that is bound by legislation. Furthermore, the responsible conduct of research is an integral part of the quality assurance of research organisations.

From the point of view of research integrity, the premises for the responsible conduct of research are the following:

1. The research follows the principles that are endorsed by the research community: that is, integrity, meticulousness, and accuracy in conducting research, and in recording, presenting, and evaluating the research results.

负责任的研究方式

为了使学术研究能够在伦理上被接受且值得信赖，并使其结果可信，该研究必须在遵守负责任的研究方式准则的基础上开展。在学术界团体内部应用负责任的研究方式准则可以构成一种受立法约束的自律形式。此外，负责任的研究方式是研究机构质量保证必不可少的一部分。

从学术诚信的角度来看，负责任的研究方式的前提如下：

1. 在开展研究及记录、展示和评估研究结果方面，遵循学术界认可的原则，即诚信、细致和准确。

2. 数据采集、研究和评估所采用的方法既符合科学标准，也符合道德规范。公布研究结果时，要以传播科学知识固有的方式，即公开和负责任的方式公布。

2. The methods applied for data acquisition as well as for research and evaluation conform to scientific criteria and are ethically sustainable. When publishing the research results, the results are communicated in an open and responsible fashion that is intrinsic to the dissemination of scientific knowledge.

3. The researcher takes due account of the work and achievements of other researchers by respecting their work, citing their publications appropriately, and by giving their achievements the credit and weight they deserve in carrying out the researcher's own research and publishing its results.

4. The researcher complies with the standards set for scientific knowledge in planning and conducting the research, in reporting the research results and in recording the data obtained during the research.

5. The necessary research permits have been acquired and the preliminary ethical review that is required for certain fields of research has been conducted.

6. 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 their rights, responsibilities, and obligations, principles concerning authorship, and questions concerning archiving and accessing the data in a manner that is approved by all parties. These agreements may be further specified during the course of the research.

3. 研究人员必须对其他研究者的工作和成就给予充分的重视，具体表现为：尊重他人的工作，适当引用他人发表的论文，在开展自己的研究及发布成果时，给予他人的成果足够的肯定与重视。

4. 研究人员在规划和开展研究，以及在公布研究结果及记录研究期间获得的数据时，遵守针对科学知识制定的标准。

5. 已获得必要的研究许可，并已按照规定对某些研究领域进行了初步的伦理审查。

6. 在开始研究或招募研究人员之前，研究项目或团队（雇主、主要调查人员和团队成员）内的各方就下列事项达成一致：各自的权利、责任、义务、著作权的相关原则和以各方认可的方式归档及访问数据等。这些协议可能会在研究过程中得到进一步明确。

7. 向研究项目的所有成员和研究对象宣布资金来源、利益冲突或与开展研究有关的其他承诺，并在公布研究结果时公布上述事项。

8. 当有理由怀疑利益冲突存在时，研究人员避免参与所有科学相关和研究相关的评估和决策。

9. 研究机构遵守良好的人事和财务管理常规，并考虑到与数据保护相关的问题。

此外，研究人员在担任教师或导师时，在申请研究职位或研究经费时，以及在研究机构内外担任

7. Sources of financing, conflicts of interest or other commitments relevant to the conduct of research are announced to all members of the research project and the research subjects and reported when publishing the research results.

8. Researchers refrain from all science- and research-related evaluation and decision-making situations when there is reason to suspect a conflict of interest.

9. The research organisation adheres to good personnel and financial administration practices and takes into account questions related to data protection.

In addition, researchers also need to comply with the practices listed above when working as teachers or instructors, when applying for research positions or for research funding, as well as when functioning as experts in their field both inside and outside the research community.

Besides research activity, the principles of responsible conduct of research apply to teaching materials, written and spoken statements, evaluations, CVs and publication lists, as well as to societal interaction in both printed and electronic publication channels, including social media.

Each individual researcher and research group member is primarily responsible for complying with the principles of the responsible conduct of research. Nonetheless, the responsibility also rests on the whole research community: research groups and their principal investigators, the directors of research units and the management of research organisations.

本领域专家时，需遵守上文列出的常规。

除研究活动外，负责任的研究方式原则适用于教材、书面和口头声明、评估、简历和出版物清单，并适用于与包括社交媒体在内的印刷和电子出版渠道之间的社交互动。

遵守负责任的研究方式原则主要是每位研究人员和科研组织成员的责任。尽管如此，这项责任也要靠整个学术界承担，当中包括研究组织及其主要研究人员、研究单位的负责人和研究机构的管理人员。

大学和专科院校应确保本校学生熟悉负责任的研究行为原则，并将学术诚信教学纳入其本科生和研究生课程。研究机构则应确保其员工能获得学术诚信培训。此外，每个博士研究培训单位需负责处理与各自教育领域有关的负责任的研究方式的相关特殊问题，并以此作为其博士研究培训计划的一部分。为保证实践负责任的研究方式，大学和专科院校应向其教师、论文主管、研究人员、研究小组负责人及其他专家提供学术诚信方面的继续教育。

芬兰的学术团体可以通过学术和科学出版物的同行评审系统，提倡负责任的研究方式。此外，基金会、基金、芬兰科学院、芬兰科技与创新资助机构（Tekes）及芬兰总理办公室等科研资助机构也可以鼓励受其资助的项目研究人员承诺遵守负责任的研究方式准则，并尽可能在处理涉嫌违反负责任的研究方式的行为时，遵循RCR准则。

Universities and universities of applied sciences should ensure that their students are well-versed in the principles of the responsible conduct of research and that the teaching of research integrity is integrated into their graduate and postgraduate programmes. Research institutes, for their part, should ensure that research integrity training is available for their staff. In addition, it is the task of every doctoral research training unit to handle special questions regarding the responsible conduct of research that are pertinent to the respective field of education as part of their doctoral research training programme. In order to guarantee the practice of the responsible conduct of research, universities and universities of applied sciences should offer continuing education in research integrity to their teachers, thesis supervisors, researchers, heads of research groups and other experts.

Learned societies in Finland can promote the responsible conduct of research, for example, through a peer review system for scholarly and scientific publications. In addition, research funding organisations, such as foundations, funds, the Academy of Finland, the Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation (Tekes), as well as Finland's Prime Minister's Office, can also encourage the researchers on projects funded by these organisations to commit themselves to the responsible conduct of research, and consequently, when feasible, to follow the RCR guidelines in the handling of alleged violations of the responsible conduct of research.

Violations against the responsible conduct of research

For a researcher to be professionally competent, they need to master the knowledge and the methodology associated with their field as well as to comply with ethically sustainable research practices.

Lack of competence in the field and negligence in conducting research and in recording, archiving and reporting research results are a sign of the poor professional skills of a researcher, decrease the reliability of the results obtained by the researcher, and may even invalidate the research itself. However, negligence and shortcomings in knowledge do not necessarily mean that a researcher's professional practices are questionable in terms of research integrity.

Violations of the responsible conduct of research refer to unethical and dishonest practices that damage research and, in the worst cases, invalidate the research results. Violations of the responsible conduct of research consist of actions that may have been committed either intentionally or through negligence. While it is difficult to define these types of violations in detail and unambiguously, it is possible to characterise ethically irresponsible practices with the help of examples.

In Finland, violations of the responsible conduct of research can be classified into the following two categories:

- Research misconduct
- Disregard for the responsible conduct of research

违反负责任的研究方式

为了使研究人员具备胜任的专业能力，他们需要掌握与其领域相关的知识和方法，并遵循道德伦理上可持续研究的惯例。

缺乏相关领域的专业能力，在研究、记录、归档和公布研究结果上有所疏忽，是研究人员专业技能差的体现，会降低研究人员所得出的结果的可靠性，甚至可能导致研究本身无效。然而，知识方面的疏忽和缺陷并不一定意味着研究人员的专业实践存在学术诚信方面的问题。

违反负责任的研究方式是指会损害学术，而且在最坏的情况下会导致研究结果无效的、不道德、不诚实的做法。违反负责任的研究方式包括可能有意或因为疏忽而导致的行为。虽然很难详细而明确地定义这种违规行为，但可以通过实例来描述这种不道德的、不负责任的行为的特征。

在芬兰，违反负责任的研究方式的行为可被分为以下两类：

- 学术不端行为
- 对负责任的研究方式的忽视

在规划和执行研究及展示研究结果和结论时，可能会发生学术不端行为和对负责任的研究方式的忽视。关于学术不端行为和对负责任的研究方式的忽视的指控，可通过处理涉嫌违反负责任的研究方式的程序予以处理，该程序被称为RCR程序。对负责任的研究方式的忽视和学术不端行为不但违反负责任的研究方式准则，同时也可能违法。

除了不端行为和疏忽之外，学术界还可能会

Research misconduct and disregard for the responsible conduct of research may occur in planning and performing the research and in presenting the research results and conclusions. Allegations of research misconduct and disregard for the responsible conduct of research are dealt with through the procedure for handling alleged violations of the responsible conduct of research. This is referred to as the RCR process. Disregard for the responsible conduct of research and research misconduct violate the responsible conduct of research, but they may also violate the law.

In addition to misconduct and disregard, other types of ethically irresponsible research practices may occur in the research community. However, sincere differences of opinion that result from the interpretations and assessments of research results belong to academic and scientific debate and do not violate the responsible conduct of research.

Research misconduct

Research misconduct refers to misleading the research community and often also to misleading decision-makers. This includes presenting false data or results to the research community or spreading false data or results in a publication, in a presentation given at a scientific or scholarly meeting, in a manuscript that is intended to be published, in study materials or in applications for funding. Furthermore, misconduct refers to misappropriating other researchers' work and to representing other researchers' work as one's own.

Research misconduct is further divided into the following four subcategories:

出现其他类型的在道德伦理上不负责任的研究方式。然而，解释和评估研究成果所产生的真实的意见分歧属于学术和科学争论，不违反负责任的研究方式准则。

学术不端行为

学术不端行为是指误导学术界的行为，也经常指误导决策者的行为。这包括向学术界提供虚假数据或结果，或通过以下途径传播虚假数据或结果：出版物、学术会议陈述、拟发表手稿、研究材料或资助申请。此外，这类不端行为也指盗用其他研究人员的工作成果，将他人研究展示为自己的研究。

学术不端行为可被细分为以下四个子类：

- 杜撰是指向学术界提供捏造的观察结果。换言之，杜撰的观察结果并非通过使用研究报告中声称的方法获得。杜撰也意味着在研究报告中发布捏造的结果。

- Fabrication refers to presenting invented observations to the research community. In other words, the fabricated observations have not been made by using the methods as claimed in the research report. Fabrication also means presenting invented results in a research report.

- Falsification (misrepresentation) refers to modifying and presenting original observations deliberately so that the results based on those observations are distorted. The falsification of results refers to the scientifically unfounded modification or selection of research results. Falsification also refers to the omission of results or information that are essential for the conclusions.

- Plagiarism, or unacknowledged borrowing, refers to representing another person's material as one's own without appropriate references. This includes research plans, manuscripts, articles, other texts or parts of them, visual materials, or translations. Plagiarism includes direct copying as well as adapted copying.

- Misappropriation refers to the unlawful presentation of another person's result, idea, plan, observation or data as one's own research.

In international guidelines, misconduct is usually divided into three categories: fabrication, falsification and plagiarism, which is also referred to as the FFP categorisation. The tradition in Finland has been to maintain a more comprehensive and analytical categorisation; hence, misappropriation is separated from plagiarism and is considered to be a distinct category.

- 篡改(虚假陈述)是指故意修改和以某种方式展示原始观察结果,使基于这些观察所得出的结果受到歪曲。篡改结果是指对研究结果进行无科学依据的修改或截取。篡改也指删除对结论必不可少的结果或信息的行为。

- 剽窃或未确认的借用,是指在没有恰当引用的情况下将他人的材料作为自己的材料。这些材料包括研究计划、手稿、文章、其他文本(或文本的部分内容)、视觉材料或译文。剽窃包括直接复制和改编复制。

- 盗用是指将他人的结果、想法、计划、观察或数据非法呈现为自己的研究。

在国际准则中,不端行为通常分为三类:杜撰(Fabrication)、篡改(Falsification)和剽窃(Plagiarism),也称为FFP分类。芬兰的传统一直是坚持使用更详尽、更具分析性的分类;因此盗用是独立于剽窃之外的一个单独类别。

Disregard for the responsible conduct of research

Disregard for the responsible conduct of research manifests itself as gross negligence and carelessness during the research process. This type of behaviour can be identified when researchers engage in:

- 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;

- inadequate record-keeping and archiving of results and research data;

- publishing the same research results multiple times ostensibly as new and novel results (also referred to as self-plagiarism);

- misleading the research community in other ways in terms of one's own research work.

Other irresponsible practices

Other irresponsible practices may also occur in research. For example, researchers may engage in:

- 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;

对负责任的研究方式的忽视

对负责任的研究方式的忽视在研究过程中表现为重大疏忽和草率行为。当研究人员从事下列活动时，可被确认已忽视了负责任的研究方式：

- 诋毁其他研究人员在出版物中的作用，例如并未提及这些研究人员，以及不充足或不适当地提及前期的研究成果；

- 以草率的方式公布研究结果和方法，产生具有误导性的声明；

- 研究数据和结果的不当记录保存和存档；

- 多次将同样的研究结果伪装成新的研究结果予以发布（也称为自我剽窃）；

- 从自己的研究成果的角度以其他方式误导研究界。

其他不负责任的做法

研究中也可能出现其他不负责任的做法。例如，研究人员可能会从事下列活动：

- 操纵著作权，例如在作者列表中包含未参与研究的人员，或者将所谓的影子作者的成果归功于自己

- 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;

- expanding the bibliography of a study to artificially increase the number of citations;

- delaying the work of another researcher, for example, through refereed peer reviewing;
- falsely and maliciously accusing a researcher of RCR violations;

- hampering inappropriately the work of another researcher by other means;

- misleading the general public by publicly presenting deceptive or distorted information concerning one's own research, its results or the scientific importance or applicability of those results.

In their most serious forms, these practices may meet the criteria of an RCR violation mentioned above.

- 在简历或简历译文中、在出版物列表中，或在个人主页上夸大自己的科学和学术成就

- 扩大研究所涉及的的参考书目，以此人为地增加引用的数量

- 拖延另一位研究人员的工作，例如，通过参评同行评审

- 虚假和恶意地指控某位研究人员违反RCR准则

- 以其他方式不适当地妨碍其他研究人员的工作

- 公开显示涉及自己的研究、其结果、其科学重要性以及其适用性的欺骗或歪曲的信息，以此误导公众

此类行为中情节严重的可能符合上述违反RCR准则的行为标准。

Guidelines for handling alleged violations of the responsible conduct of research

It is in the mutual interests of society, the research community, and the researchers, to resolve all allegations of research misconduct. The RCR guidelines published by TENK are internal ethical guidelines for the Finnish research community and are used to address allegations of violations of the responsible conduct of research at universities, universities of applied sciences, research institutes, and in other research organisations under public funding. The research organisations that have signed the agreement have committed themselves to applying the procedures in question to cases of alleged violations of the responsible conduct of research.

The guidelines apply to investigations into the alleged violations of the responsible conduct of research. In addition to research and publications, they also apply to all other types of written works in conjunction with academic activities, irrespective of their form of publication. These works include textbooks, funding applications, project applications, poster presentations, evaluations of academic theses, and referee statements.

These guidelines also apply to investigations of alleged RCR violations in academic theses submitted for a Master's degree or a higher academic degree, including the higher degrees in the universities of applied sciences, even when the thesis is not published. If the approval of the thesis is pending, or the candidate has not yet been granted permission to defend the thesis, the institution can investigate the allegations by following another procedure, unless the researcher suspected of an RCR

对涉嫌违反负责任的研究方式的行为的处理准则

处理所有对学术不端行为的指控，符合社会、学术界和研究人员的共同利益。TENK发布的RCR准则是芬兰研究界的内部道德准则，用于处理对大学、专科院校、研究机构及其他由公共资金支持的研究机构中对违反负责任的研究方式的指控。已经签署协议的研究机构承诺将有关程序应用于涉嫌违反负责任的研究方式的案件。

该套准则适用于对涉嫌违反负责任的研究方式的案件调查。除了研究和出版物外，该套准则也适用于和学术活动相关的所有其他类型的书面作品，无论以何种形式发表。这些作品包括教科书、资助申请、项目申请、展示海报、学术论文评估和审阅声明。

这些准则也适用于对硕士学位或更高学位的学术论文涉嫌违反RCR准则的调查，包括专科院校的高等学位，即使在论文未发表时也同样适用。如果该论文尚待处理，或论文作者尚未获得论文答辩的许可，则可通过另一程序来调查对涉嫌违规的指控，除非涉嫌违反RCR准则的研究人员坚持依据这套准则开展调查。

追究学术不端行为和对负责任的研究方式的忽视没有期限规定。但如果涉嫌违规的行为已过去很长时间，并且相应调查将不会影响道德伦理上的可持续研究实践、研究质量保证或对其他各方的法律保护，大学、专科院校或研究机构可决定不进行RCR调查。TENK将针对该机构所作决的定发表声明（请参阅RCR程序准则）。

除了遵循这套准则之外，对涉嫌违反RCR准则的行为的调查还需参照立法通例。对涉嫌违反

violation insists on an investigation according to these guidelines.

Research misconduct and disregard for the responsible conduct of research will not expire. However, universities, universities of applied sciences or research institutions can decide not to conduct an RCR investigation when a significant amount of time has passed since the alleged violation and the investigation would no longer affect ethically sustainable research practices, research quality assurance or the legal protection of other parties. On request, TENK will provide a statement regarding the decision made by the institution (see guidelines for the RCR Process).

In addition to following these guidelines, investigations into alleged RCR violations also need to take general legislation into account. Investigations into alleged RCR violations do not handle issues that are related to criminal law, copyright law, or labour law, or into other legal issues that may be related to the alleged violation.

The investigation procedure for alleged violations of the responsible conduct of research involves three steps:

- A written notification
- A preliminary inquiry
- The investigation proper

The most crucial factors ensuring legal protection are:

- The fairness and the impartiality of the process
- The hearing of all the involved parties
- The competence and quickness of the process

RCR准则的行为的调查不会处理与刑法、版权法或劳动法有关的法律问题，也不会处理其他与涉嫌违规的行为有关的法律问题。

对涉嫌违反负责任的研究方式的调查程序包括三个步骤：

- 书面通知
- 初步调查
- 彻底调查

确保获得法律保护的最关键因素是：

- 程序的公平性和公正性
- 所有相关方的听证
- 程序的权限和高效

这就要求对程序的每个阶段进行细致的记录，并且尊重当事各方的信息权和其他权利。如果其中一方对芬兰语或瑞典语的掌握不够熟练，那么在调查过程中使用的语言（例如听证会和文件）应是研究人员与其组织之间日常使用的语言。

大学院校负责人、名誉校长（如果大学有这样的安排）、专科院校负责人或研究机构负责人将负责遵守程序准则，并负责在整个程序过程中作出决定。该决定不能委托他人做出。

关于涉嫌违反RCR准则的通知将被发送至开展研究的大学、专科院校或研究机构。如果涉嫌违规的人员曾在多个研究领域工作过，涉嫌违规行为的处理需要各机构相互合作，并就如何进行调查达成协议。

在芬兰进行的RCR调查程序必须遵循《芬兰行政程序法》（434/2003）法则。这些法则还是判

This requires that each phase of the procedure be carefully documented and that the parties' right to information and their other rights concerning the procedure are respected. If a party of the procedure does not have a sufficient command of Finnish or Swedish, then the language used during the investigation, for example, in hearings and documents, is the language commonly used by the researcher with the organisation.

The person responsible for adhering to the guidelines of the procedure and for making the decisions during the whole process is the rector of the university, or if the university so decides, the chancellor, or the rector of a university of applied sciences, or the director of the research organisation. The decision-making cannot be delegated to another person.

The notification of an alleged RCR violation is to be sent to the respective university or university of applied sciences or to the research institute at which the research has primarily been conducted. If those alleged to have committed a violation have worked in several research communities, the handling of the alleged violation requires co-operation between the respective organisations, which are to agree amongst themselves as to how to conduct the investigation.

Any RCR investigation procedure that takes place in Finland must follow the principles of the Finnish Administrative Procedure Act (434/2003). These principles determine, among other matters, the grounds for good administration and for disqualification.

An allegation regarding an RCR violation and the decisions related to this allegation during the various phases of the RCR process are to be reported to TENK, so that it can monitor

断良好的行政管理和取消资格的依据。

实施调查的机构应将就违反RCR准则的行为的指控，以及RCR程序过程各阶段涉及该指控的相关决定向TENK汇报，这样，TENK才能监督对准则的遵守和芬兰的学术诚信状况。根据《芬兰政府活动公开法案》(621/1999)，向权利机构发送的或由权力机构制作的所有文件通常都是公开的，但研究机构在向TENK发送文件时，必须将文件的信息所涉及到的保密协议纳入考量范畴。

国际合作项目如果含有在芬兰科研机构工作的研究人员，在这种特殊情况下，相关调查不必遵守芬兰的准则，而是根据负责该项目的外国机构使用的准则进行实施。参与该项目的芬兰一方有义务配合对涉嫌违反RCR准则的行为所进行的正当调查。

更多有关RCR准则的应用的信息可从TENK秘书长处获取。

compliance to the guidelines and the state of research integrity in Finland. Although all documents sent to the authorities or produced by them are generally public, in accordance with the Finnish Act on Openness of Government Activities (621/1999), the research organisation is, when sending the documents to TENK, obliged to take into account the secrecy obligations that apply to the information included in the documents.

For joint international projects that include researchers working in Finnish research communities, in special cases, the investigation does not have to adhere to the Finnish guidelines, but may be conducted according to the guidelines used by the foreign organisation in charge of the project. The Finnish party participating in the project is obliged to contribute to the appropriate investigation of the alleged RCR violation.

Additional information on applying the RCR guidelines can be obtained from the Secretary General of TENK.

The process for handling allegations of the responsible conduct of research, otherwise known as the RCR process

1. The allegation of a violation of the responsible conduct of research must be communicated in writing to the rector or to another person responsible for the decision-making as stated above (hereafter the rector). This notification must be submitted to the organisation at which the alleged violation has occurred or is presumed to occur. The notification must specify the type of the alleged violation of responsible conduct of research, as well as the

处理对违反负责任的研究方式的指控的程序（RCR程序）

1. 关于对违反负责任的研究方式的指控必须以书面形式通知机构负责人或上文列出的各主要决策制定者（以下称为机构负责人）。此通知必须提交给发生违规或被怀疑发生违规的机构。通知必须明确说明涉嫌违反负责任的研究方式的 类型，以及指控的理由。通知不得匿名发送。

机构负责人还可以对从其他渠道获悉的指控启动调查。如果TENK有理由怀疑有关机构存在违规行为，则TENK也可建议开展调查。

grounds for the allegation. The notification cannot be submitted anonymously.

The rector can also initiate an investigation of allegations that have come to their attention from other channels. TENK can also recommend an investigation if it has reason to suspect a violation within the organisation in question.

2. The rector decides whether to initiate a preliminary inquiry. A preliminary inquiry is unnecessary when:
   - the allegation does not constitute a violation that falls within the scope of the RCR guidelines
   - it becomes clear without further action that the notification is unfounded, or
   - there is another justified reason for not proceeding, such as a preliminary inquiry that has already been initiated by another research organisation

A reasoned decision not to initiate a preliminary inquiry must be communicated to the instigator of the allegation, to the person alleged of a violation, and to TENK. If any party is dissatisfied with the decision, they may request a statement from TENK within six months of the date of being notified of the decision (see Point 12).

If a decision is made to conduct a preliminary inquiry, the instigator of the allegation, the person alleged to have committed a violation and TENK must be notified immediately of the inquiry and of the grounds for it.

3. The purpose of the preliminary inquiry is to initially determine the validity of the allegations of a violation that are stated in the

2. 机构负责人将决定是否开始初步调查。以下情况无需初步调查：

- 该指控并不构成属于RCR准则范围内的违规行为
- 无需进一步的行动即可确认相关通告没有根据，或
- 还有另一个可以不开展初步调查的理由，比如其他研究机构已开始了初步调查

关于不开展初步调查的合理决定必须向指控方、被控方和TENK传达。对该决定不满意的当事方可在收到决定通知之日起的六个月内要求TENK发表一份声明（参见第12点）。

如果决定开展初步调查，指控方、被控方和TENK必须立即收到调查通知和调查理由的通知。

3. 初步调查的目的是初步确定通知中所述的对违规的指控及已出示的相关证据的真实性。在初步调查期间，将听取指控方、被控方、专家（如需

notification and the evidence that has been presented to support these allegations. The instigator of the allegation, the person alleged to have committed a violation, and, if necessary, experts and other persons involved, will be heard during the preliminary inquiry. The preliminary inquiry must be conducted within three months of receiving the notification, unless there are specific reasons to grant additional time for the completion of the inquiry.

要）和其他相关人员的意见。除非有具体理由确信完成调查需要额外的时间，初步调查必须在收到通知后的三个月内完成。

4. On the basis of the preliminary inquiry, if the allegation turns out to be unfounded, the rector will make a reasoned decision to discontinue the investigation process. This decision must be communicated to the person alleged to have committed a violation, to the instigator of the allegation, as well as to TENK. This decision may also be made public if so requested by the person alleged to have committed a violation or if the publishing of it is otherwise deemed necessary.

   This decision must state that any party dissatisfied with the decision can request a statement from TENK within six months of being notified of the decision (see Point 12).

   The rector will decide on the potential consequences should the allegations regarding the violation of the RCR be unfounded.

4. 在初步调查的基础上，如果该指控被证明是毫无根据的，那么机构负责人将作出合理决定来终止调查程序。这一决定必须传达给被控方、指控方以及TENK。如果被控方提出要求，或者出于其他原因认为有必要公布相关决定，则该决定也有可能被公布。

   该决定必须声明，任何对决定不满的当事方可在收到决定通知后的6个月内请求TENK发表声明（参见第12点）。

   如果对违反RCR准则的指控是毫无根据的，则机构负责人将决定后续的处理结果。

5. If after the preliminary inquiry, there is still reason to suspect disregard for the responsible conduct of research or research misconduct, the rector must initiate the investigation proper. Conducting this investigation is unnecessary when the preliminary inquiry has revealed that a violation of the RCR has occurred, the person alleged to have

5. 如果在初步调查完成后，仍有理由怀疑可能存在对负责任的研究方式的忽视或学术不端行为，则机构负责人必须启动进彻底调查。如果初步调查发现违反RCR准则的行为确实存在，被控方同意初步调查结果且没有其他开展进一步调查的具体理由，则没有必要开展彻底调查。在这种情况下，机构负责人将依据第9点的规定，基于

committed a violation agrees with the results of the preliminary inquiry, and there is otherwise no other specific reason to conduct the investigation. In this case, the rector will make the decision based on the preliminary inquiry, as stipulated in Point 9.

An investigation proper is, however, warranted if the preliminary inquiry has revealed indications of wider-ranging misconduct than was initially suspected.

初步调查做出决定。

但如果初步调查发现比初步怀疑范围更广的不端行为，则应该开展彻底调查。

6. For the investigation proper, the rector will establish an investigation committee and invite expert members to join, one of whom will be appointed as head of the committee. The investigation committee must have the necessary expertise in the academic discipline in question, as well as the legal or other expertise required. At least two members of the committee must be external to the organisation conducting the investigation. The appointment of the investigation committee and its activities must be in accordance with the Finnish Administrative Procedure Act and its general stipulations about disqualification. The parties concerned and TENK must be notified of the initiation of the investigation proper.

6. 为了彻底调查，机构负责人将设立调查委员会，并邀请专家成员加入，其中一位成员将被任命为委员会负责人。调查委员会必须具备所涉学术领域的必要专业知识以及所需的法律或其他专业知识。委员会必须有至少两位来自调查组织外的成员。调查委员会成员的任命及其活动必须符合《芬兰行政程序法》以及该法案有关取消资格的一般规定。各有关方和TENK必须获悉彻底调查的启动。

7. The investigation needs to be conducted as quickly as possible. Each phase, such as the hearing of the different parties, must be carefully documented. If the investigation committee has not completed the investigation within six months of it being established, it must submit a report concerning the delay to the rector, who will then make a decision regarding the additional time required.

7. 相关调查需尽快进行。调查的每个阶段，比如各方的听证会，都必须仔细记录在案。如果调查委员会在成立后的六个月内尚未完成调查，则必须向机构负责人提交延迟报告，然后机构负责人将对所需的额外时间作出决定。

8. The investigation committee is to submit a final report on its work. This report needs to include:
   - An account of the events prior to establishing the investigation committee, such as an account of the research or the activities alleged to represent a violation, as well as the evidence for the allegation
   - An account of the investigation committee's tasks and activities and of the hearing of the parties
   - A reasoned assessment of the investigation committee to determine whether the suspected activity in each specific allegation in the written notification constitutes research misconduct or disregard for the responsible conduct of research. If a violation has been uncovered, a reasoned assessment needs to be included concerning the nature, severity and frequency of occurrence of the violation of the responsible conduct of research
   - When necessary, a list of the research material, results and publications that, in the opinion of the investigation committee, contain research misconduct or disregard for the responsible conduct of research
   - A proposal concerning the publishing of the conclusions of the final report as stipulated in Point 9, and possible proposals on how the consequences of the violation should be rectified.

   The rector will ask that both the person alleged to have committed a violation and the instigator of the allegation submit responses to the final report.

8. 调查委员会将提交最终的工作报告。这份报告需要包含以下内容：

- 记述在设立调查委员会之前发生的事件，例如，介绍相关研究、涉嫌违规的活动以及提出指控所需的证据

- 调查委员会的任务和活动，以及各方听证的记录

- 调查委员会的合理评估，用以确定书面通知中的每项具体指控所提及的可疑活动是否构成学术不端行为或对负责任的研究方式的忽视。如果发现违规行为，则需要对违反负责任的研究方式的行为的性质、严重程度和发生频率进行合理评估

- 必要时，可以用一份清单列出调查委员会认为存在学术不端行为或对负责任的研究方式的忽视的研究材料、研究结果和出版物

- 第9点中规定的有关最终报告发布的建议，以及对如何纠正违规所造成的后果的可行建议。

机构负责人将要求被控方和指控方提交对最终报告的回应。

9. The rector will decide on whether or not a violation of the responsible conduct of research has occurred. This decision must be communicated to the person alleged to have committed a violation, to the instigator of the allegation, as well as to TENK. This decision must mention that any party dissatisfied with the decision can request a statement from TENK within six months of the decision (see Point 12).

If the investigation finds that research misconduct has occurred, measures must be taken to publish the conclusions of the final report in a manner deemed appropriate by the investigation committee and, when possible, at least in the publication channel where the fraudulent research findings or results based on fraudulent means have already been published.

In addition, the reported RCR violation can lead to other sanctions that the rector is justified or obligated to impose on the basis of, for instance, administrative, criminal, or labour law or on the grounds of contract law.

If a violation of the responsible conduct of research has occurred, the sanction for that violation must be in just proportion to the severity of the violation.

9.机构负责人将判断是否发生了违反负责任的研究方式的行为。这一决定必须通告被控方、指控方以及TENK。该决定必须提及，对决定不满的一方可在收到决定通知后的六个月内请求TENK发表声明（参见第12点）。

如果调查确认发生了学术不端行为，则必须以调查委员会认为适当的方式公布最终报告的结论，并且在可能的情况下，至少应在发表了欺诈性研究结果或基于欺诈性手段得出的研究结果的出版渠道中公布最终报告的结论。

此外，机构负责人有理由或有义务做出其他的处罚，例如基于行政、刑事或劳动法或合同法的规定做出的处罚，通报的违反RCR准则的行为可能会受到这些处罚。

如果确实发生了违反负责任的研究方式的行为，对违规行为的处罚必须与其严重程度成正比。

10. If the investigation finds that the person alleged to have committed a violation has not violated the responsible conduct of research, the person alleged to have committed a violation and the instigator of the allegation must be notified of this decision. Furthermore, an effort must be made to publish the findings of the investigation in an appropriate publication channel if the person alleged to have committed a violation so desires, or if there are other compelling reasons.

10.如果调查发现涉嫌违规者没有违反负责任的研究方式的准则，则必须通知被控方和指控方。此外，若被控方认为有必要，或者有其他令人信服的理由，则必须尽力在适当的发布渠道公布调查结果。

11. If the person alleged to have committed a violation works at a research organisation other than the one in which the allegation has been handled or receives external research funding, the final report of the investigation must be submitted to the employer or the funding organisation.

11. 如果被控方在处理指控的机构以外的研究机构工作，或者在获得外部研究经费的研究机构工作，则必须向相关雇主或资助机构提交调查的最终报告。

12. The person alleged to have committed a violation or the instigator of the allegation can request a statement from TENK if said party is dissatisfied with the rector's decision, with the procedures adopted in the preliminary inquiry or the investigation proper, or with the conclusions of the final report. This request must be justified and it must address the specific questions that are the basis for the statement requested. If the RCR process is not yet completed, no statement regarding the procedures or decisions of the interim phases can be requested. The request for a statement must be submitted within six months of the decision.

12. 如果上述当事人对机构负责人的决定、初步调查或彻底调查所采用的程序或最终报告的结论感到不满，则被控方或指控方可以请求TENK发表一份声明。该请求必须合理且必须阐明声明请求所基于的具体问题。如果RCR程序尚未完成，则不得请求提供有关中间阶段程序或决定的声明。声明请求必须在收到决定后的六个月内提交。

TENK must process the matter without delay, within five months of receiving the request for a statement, on the basis of the documents submitted to it. Furthermore, TENK must issue a statement addressed to the party that has contacted TENK, and this statement must also be delivered to the rector and to the other parties involved.

When compiling the statement, TENK may, if needed, request a written response to the request for a statement from the parties concerned and from the organisation with whose decision or procedures the person requesting the statement is dissatisfied. The person requesting the statement is to be given an opportunity to comment on these responses. TENK's statement and the documents, including the appendices, used in compiling this statement are, in principle, publicly available after the statement has been issued.

In its statement, TENK may propose that the rector conduct an additional investigation if there are well-founded reasons for this in the material provided for the preliminary inquiry, in the final report of the investigation proper, or in the information provided by an involved party in its request for a statement.

TENK may, for well-founded reasons, recommend an additional investigation without a request for a statement.

TENK does not take part in the preliminary inquiry or the investigation proper and it does not arrange hearings.

The guidelines for formulating a request for a statement can be found on TENK's website, www.tenk.fi/en.

TENK必须在收到声明请求后的五个月内，根据所提交的文件尽快进行处理。此外，TENK必须向联系TENK的一方做出声明，并且该声明还应提交给机构负责人和其他相关方。

在编写声明时，如有需要，TENK可要求各有关方，以及声明请求提交方，对其决定或程序不满的机构，做出对声明请求的书面回应。声明请求提交方应有机会就这些回应发表评论。TENK声明及其所使用的文件，包括附录，原则上将在声明发布后被公开。

如果初步调查所提供的材料、彻底调查的最终报告或相关方在其声明请求中提供的信息，显示出充分理由，证明需要开展更多调查，TENK可能会在声明中建议机构负责人开展更多调查。

在未收到声明请求的情况下，TENK也可能出于有充分根据的理由，建议开展更多调查。

TENK不参与初步调查或彻底调查，也不安排听证会。

TENK的网站，www.tenk.fi，提供了关于撰写声明请求的指导原则。

The Finnish National Board on Research Integrity TENK
is a body of specialists as appointed by the Ministry of Education and Culture in Finland on the proposal of the scientific community. TENK was founded in 1991 by decree to handle ethical issues on scientific research and to promote research integrity. Universities, universities of applied sciences and other research organisations in Finland have voluntarily committed to comply with TENK's guidelines on responsible conduct of research.


TUTKIMUSEETTINEN
NEUVOTTELUKUNTA
FORSKNINGSETISKA
DELEGATIONEN
FINNISH NATIONAL BOARD ON
RESEARCH INTEGRITY TENK

www.tenk.fi