Correction to: Inconsistent Responses to Notifications of Suspected Plagiarism in Finnish Higher Education

Erja Moore¹

Published online: 6 March 2021
© Springer Nature B.V. 2021

Correction to: Journal of Academic Ethics (2020) 18:207–222
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-020-09366-1>

The original version of this article unfortunately contained a mistake. Out of an abundance of caution, we have removed Table 4 of Appendix 1 and replaced it with an anonymized table. Here is the corrected Table 4 of Appendix 1:

Appendix 1

Table 4 Notifications of suspected plagiarism in Master’s theses (2018) and the content of rectors’ decisions (2018–2019)

	Year	Decision made by rector of the university	
1	2003	XY	Decision published with appendices. Thesis marked with plagiarism statement. (TENK)
2	2017	XY	Re-evaluated, grade lowered. Thesis marked with plagiarism statement
3	2017	XY	Revoke of degree applied from Higher Administrative Court. Thesis marked with plagiarism statement. (TENK)
4	2017	XY	Student did not accept the preliminary inquiry. Investigation proper started
5	2017	XY	Re-evaluated, grade lowered. Thesis marked with plagiarism statement. Thesis removed from Theseus. (TENK)
6	2018	XY	Re-evaluated, grade lowered. Thesis marked with plagiarism statement. (TENK)
7	2015	XY	Should not have been accepted in the first place. Thesis marked with plagiarism statement. (TENK)
8	2016	XY	Re-evaluated, grade lowered. Thesis marked with plagiarism statement. Thesis removed from Theseus

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-020-09366-1>.

✉ Erja Moore
erja.moore@pkarjala.net

¹ Joensuu, Finland

Table 4 (continued)

Year	Decision made by rector of the university		
9	2015	XY	According to the decision the thesis will be marked with plagiarism statement which has not been done by 9.9.2019
10	2017	XY	Preliminary inquiry report attached to decision. Re-evaluated. Thesis marked with plagiarism statement
11	2017	Z	No violation found. Due to carelessness thesis re-evaluated, degraded. Grade was X, is now X. Notification inappropriate. (TENK)
12	2017	X	Re-evaluated. Thesis marked with plagiarism statement (an extra page after cover page)
13	2012	V	"The thesis has not in all respects fulfilled good scientific practice." Removed from Theseus
14	2018	Z	Carelessness > Annotation to student. Notification both in/appropriate (no understanding of plagiarised references)
15	2010	Y	A little disregard. No sanctions
16	2017	Y	Violation of good scientific practice found, "more disregard for responsible conduct of research than purposeful deception". (TENK)
17	2014	X	Re-evaluated, grade lowered. Thesis marked with plagiarism statement
18	2017	0	Rector answered by email after reminder. No investigation, not considered a violation
19	2014	Z	No violation, no sanctions. Student very upset. (No understanding of plagiarised references.) (TENK)
20	2012	0	No inquiry. According to decision inquiry took place in 2013 (not attached), violation not found. Removed from Theseus
21	2017	X	39% similarity with a previous thesis. Violation > re-evaluation. Thesis marked with plagiarism statement. Removed from Theseus
22	2017	Z	Preliminary enquirer did not find a violation (no understanding of plagiarised references). (TENK)
23	2018	Y	Preliminary inquiry: reason to doubt disregard of good scientific practise. Investigation proper started
24	2012	0/X	Email from the rector after reminder. No inquiry. Plagiarism was already found before acceptance
25	2012	0	No inquiry due to time lapse. (TENK)
26	2017	XY	Re-evaluation
27	2015	0	No inquiry, case too old. Only the person whose text has been plagiarised can make a notification. (TENK)
28	2015	0	No inquiry, case too old. Only the person whose text has been plagiarised can make a notification. (TENK)
29	2012	0	No inquiry, case too old. Only the person whose text has been plagiarised can make a notification. (TENK)

X=plagiarism stated, Y = disregard stated, Z=no violation found, V = violation, not specified, 0=no investigation, (TENK)=Statement requested from TENK

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.