



21. Student Academic Integrity Policy

Purpose	Sets out the Institute's approach to academic integrity.
Location	The policy is maintained on owncloud (original: Pydio)
Responsible executive	The Dean
Responsible office	Academic Office
Effective date	30 November 2016
Review date	16 October 2019, 30 November 2021, 30 November 2025
Modification history	Jun 2013 (V1), Nov 2016 (V2), Nov 2019 (V3), Apr 2020 (V4), 06 Oct 2020 (V5), 06 Mar 2023 (V6)
Related documents	Student Code of Conduct, Institutional Academic Integrity Framework, Student Grievance Mediation Policy
Authority	Approved by Council

1. Purpose

Academic integrity, honesty, and a respect for knowledge, truth and ethical practices are fundamental to the business of the Institute. These principles are at the core of all academic endeavour in teaching, learning and research. Dishonest practices contravene academic values, compromise and devalue the quality of learning. This policy is intended to reinforce the importance of integrity in an academic environment.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all staff and students of the Institute.

3. Definitions

3.1. **Academic Integrity** is the moral code of academia and means acting with the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in learning, teaching and research. In simple terms Academic Integrity means that you will earn your degree with honest effort, and that your degree will be a true accomplishment reflecting years of your own hard work and genuine learning. The Institute identifies key responsibilities of students to uphold academic integrity as follows:

- Honesty - Be truthful, encourage honesty and maintain transparency.
- Responsibility - Take ownership and hold yourself and others accountable.
- Trust & Support - Seek clarification to ensure that you clearly understand expectations or requirements and trust that you are treated fairly.
- Respect - Listen to understand and follow the Institute's Rules and Requirements at all times.

3.2. **Academic misconduct** is a conduct by which a student seeks to gain for himself, herself or another person an unfair or unjustified academic advantage in a course or unit of study and includes, cheating, collusion and plagiarism (see 3.3 – 3.6 for further explanation). It may be intentional or reckless (see Item 4.1 for further information).



- 3.3. **Cheat/Cheating/Contract Cheating** occurs when a student obtains an unfair advantage in an examination or written, oral or practical work, required to be submitted or completed for assessment in a course or unit of study. This includes but is not limited to the resubmission of work that has already been assessed in another unit or the purchasing of essays, assignments or similar from a third party.
- 3.4. **Collusion occurs** when students collaborate on assessable written, oral or practical work with another person or persons without authorization by the examiner.
- 3.5. **Plagiarism** happens when a student uses another person's ideas and or manner of expressing them and passes them off as one's own ideas (and or manner of expressing them) and fails to give appropriate acknowledgement. This includes the use of material from any source, staff, students or the Internet, published and unpublished works.
- 3.6. **Proofreading** is the process of having someone proofread your work for the purpose of identifying errors and suggesting corrections to a text. A proofreader is not permitted to rewriting passages of text in order to clarify meaning; amend the words used by the author (except to identify the correct spelling of the word used); rearrange passages of text or code, or reformat other material; contributing additional material to the original; and checking calculations or formulae. Proofreading is acceptable when conducted in accordance with the above definition.

4. Principles

4.1. Roles & Responsibilities

4.1.1. All staff and students must ensure that they understand and comply with legal restrictions and obligations (e.g., copyright) relating to Academic Integrity.

4.1.2. In accordance with the Institute's Staff Academic Integrity Policy, the Institute has a responsibility to:

- a) Promote the values of Academic Integrity;
- b) Ensure that staff are sufficiently equipped to support students in acquiring and demonstrating the values of academic integrity; and
- c) Provide students and staff with resources to ensure that students are supported to develop the skills required to uphold the values of Academic Integrity in all academic endeavours.

4.1.3. Students have a responsibility to:

- a) Submit only work which properly acknowledges the ideas, designs, words or works of others in what is otherwise their own original work;
- b) Avoid lending or otherwise providing original work to others for any reason other than where work is provided to another student in the course of collaboration in connection with group work assessment, and subject to any requirements imposed on students in connection with such collaboration;
- c) Have a clear understanding of the conditions of assessment, including assessment task requirements, appropriate source acknowledgement practices, and marking criteria;
- d) Provide, when requested (and where the item of work has been prepared using electronic means), an electronic copy of any work to academic staff involved in marking the work;
- e) Be clear about the acknowledgement practices that are appropriate for their field of study;
- f) Be aware of the collective responsibility of proper source acknowledgement within group assignments, and be able to support their claims of authorship in a group assignment; and
- g) Encourage other students to uphold the values of academic integrity and discourage other students from plagiarising or carrying out other forms of academic misconduct.



4.1.4. The responsibility to carry out investigations of student academic misconduct in accordance with the Policy is provided in Section 3.4 of this policy and summarised in **Appendix 1: Academic Integrity Levels of Violations**.

4.2. Prevention and Detection of Plagiarism and Other Forms of Academic Misconduct

The Institute will take steps to detect plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct. These may include manual searches of resources, as well as the use of electronic text matching software (e.g., Turnitin) to compare work submitted for assessment against electronic text on the publicly accessible internet, in published works, on commercial databases, and in student previously submitted assignments and CCTV monitoring of examinations as well as strict invigilation processes.

4.3. Actions and Penalties

4.3.1. Actions are outlined in section 4.2 and summarised in **Appendix 1: Academic Integrity Levels of Violations**.

4.3.2. If any form of student misconduct is found to have occurred, a range of actions may be taken or penalties imposed, such as:

- a) Remedial action such as counselling or training on proper academic conventions and techniques and/or allowing the student to re-attempt the assessment item without loss of marks;
- b) Allowing the student to re-attempt the assessment item with a capped mark;
- c) Allowing the student to complete a new piece of work with a capped mark;
- d) Excluding any parts resulting from dishonest practices and referring the assessment item for remarking appropriate to the work completed;
- e) Awarding no marks for the assessment item;
- f) Awarding a fail grade in a course or courses;
- g) Imposing a suspension, with or without conditions, for a specified period of time;
- h) Imposing an exclusion, with or without conditions, for a specified period of time, after which the student will be required to apply for re-admission to the Institute; and/or
- i) Expelling the student from the Institute.

Appendix 1 to this policy provides a table to assist fair and consistent application of penalties across levels of seriousness of breach of academic integrity.

4.3.3. Students under investigation for student academic misconduct will not be eligible to graduate until the matter is resolved.

5. Breaches of Academic Integrity

5.1. Academic misconduct includes but is not limited to conduct that involves plagiarism and any other dishonest conduct by a student to gain academic or general advantage; or conduct that otherwise contravenes the provisions of the Institute's academic rules, policies, procedures and/or guidelines. Dishonesty in the preparation or presentation of any assessable work is regarded as student academic misconduct. Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to:

- (a) Cheating: behaving deceitfully or dishonestly in examinations, in the preparation of assessable items and during in-class tests;



- (b) Fabrication: intentional and unauthorised falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise;
- (c) Intentionally or recklessly facilitating academic dishonesty by other students;
- (d) Providing an assessment item, or providing access to an assessment item to others, either directly or indirectly, in circumstances where it is reasonably foreseeable that it will be used dishonestly.
- (e) Deceitful behaviour by which it is sought to gain some unfair or dishonest advantage either for yourself or for another person;
- (f) Misleading ascription of authorship (including claiming authorship of parts of a group assignment prepared by other students);
- (g) Misrepresentation: misrepresenting data or information incorrectly, improperly or falsely;
- (h) Behaving in any way that limits the academic opportunities of other students by improperly impeding their work or their access to educational resources;
- (i) Re-using one's own work without appropriate acknowledgement;
- (j) Using unauthorised equipment or material in an assessment item; and
- (k) Using another person to undertake an examination or assessment item in your name.
- (l) Using Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools and technologies without appropriate referencing can result in plagiarism (Refer to UNSW's "Guide for Referencing & Acknowledging the Use of Artificial Intelligence tools")

5.2. Levels of Violations

Determining a level of seriousness for a breach of academic integrity and determining appropriate penalties: The Institute refers all breaches of academic integrity according to a five-level classification framework according to the nature of the infraction. For each level of violation, a corresponding set of penalties is recommended. A table showing examples at each level is contained at **Appendix 1: Academic Integrity Levels of Violations**.

5.2.1. Level Zero Violations

Level Zero Violations are dealt with by the Academic Integrity Officer (AIO). A level zero allegation is either dismissed and/or unfounded or results in a verbal / informal warning and/or resubmission following investigation.

5.2.2. Level One Violations

- (a) Level One Violations are dealt with by the AIO.
- (b) These violations usually occur because of inexperience or lack of student knowledge of the principles and requirements of academic integrity. Examples include:
 - (i) inadequate referencing;
 - (ii) poor paraphrasing;
 - (iii) repeated Level 0 violations.
- (c) Level One Violations should be treated formally to ensure that the student understands the seriousness of the issue in an academic environment.
- (d) Penalties may include one or more of:
 - (i) Informal or formal warning;
 - (ii) Resubmission;
 - (iii) Reduced grade if a repeated offence.



5.2.3. Level Two Violations

- (a) Level Two Violations are dealt with by the AIO.
- (b) Level Two Violations are characterised by dishonesty including false statements made by the student during any investigation.
The following are examples:
 - (i) quoting directly or paraphrasing, to a moderate extent, without acknowledging the source;
 - (ii) submitting the same work or major portions thereof to satisfy the requirements of more than one unit without permission from the lecturer;
 - (iii) using data or interpretative material for a laboratory report without acknowledging the sources or the collaborators;
 - (iv) receiving assistance from others without acknowledging such assistance;
 - (v) repeated Level One Violations, especially where these occur after explanation and counselling.
- (c) Penalties may include:
 - (i) Formal warning; and/or
 - (ii) Reduced (or 0/fail) grade if repeated offence; and/or
 - (iii) Entry of student's name into the Institute's Misconduct Register and recorded on the student's file; and/or
 - (iv) Referral to an Institute Counsellor.
- (d) Records of students who commit Level Two Violations must be maintained by the Registrar of the Institute until the student's graduation.

5.2.4. Level Three Violations

- (a) Level Three Violations are dealt with by the AIO.
- (b) Level Three Violations include dishonesty that affects a major or essential portion of assessable requirements including false statements made by the student during any investigation. Examples include:
 - (i) cheating in examinations;
 - (ii) acting to facilitate copying during an examination;
 - (iii) using impermissible materials during an examination;
 - (iv) collaborating before an examination to develop methods of exchanging information and implementation thereof;
 - (v) using a purchased essay;
 - (vi) using unethical or improper means of acquiring data;
 - (vii) repeated Level Two Violations.
- (c) Penalties may include one or more of:
 - (i) Formal warning if requires; and/or
 - (ii) Reduce (or 0 / fail) grade; and/or
 - (iii) Suspension from the Institute for a period not exceeding 10 working days; and/or
 - (iv) Student to sign a Learning Contract; and/or
 - (v) Entry of student's name into the Institute's Misconduct Register and recorded on the student's file; and/or
 - (vi) Referral to a counsellor.
- (d) The Registrar must keep a record of all findings of violations of Academic Integrity matters and all penalties imposed in respect of such findings.



5.2.5. Level Four Violations

- (a) Level Four Violations represent the most serious breaches of academic integrity and all cases must be investigated by the AIO. Level violations are very serious breaches carried out with the full knowledge of the offence, including false statements made by the student during any investigation.
- (b) Examples of Level Four Violations include:
 - (i) any academic integrity violations committed after return from suspension for a previous violation of academic integrity;
 - (ii) any involvement in criminal activity
 - (iii) repeat Level Three Violations;
 - (iv) violation of Academic Integrity involving or resembling criminal activity (such as forging a grade form, stealing an examination from a lecturer or from an Institute office; purchasing an examination, essay or other piece or work; falsifying a transcript; acquiring or distributing an examination from unauthorised sources prior to the examination;
 - (v) having a substitute take an examination or taking an examination for someone else;
 - (vi) sabotaging another student's work through actions designed to prevent the student from successfully completing an assignment;
 - (vii) at the Institute's complete discretion, any instance of violation of academic integrity in graduate and postgraduate work which includes but is not limited to coursework assessment, theses, dissertations, scholarly articles submitted to refereed journals.
- (c) Penalties may include one or more of:
 - (i) Formal warning if required; and/or
 - (ii) Fail grade; and/or
 - (iii) Suspension of up to 20 working days; and/or
 - (iv) Possible exclusion for the Trimester in certain circumstances; and/or
 - (v) Change of academic status (e.g., to Conditional); and/or
 - (vi) Student consultation file note on student record; and/or
 - (vii) Referral to a Counsellor; and/or
 - (viii) Expulsion in extreme cases (e.g., where criminal conduct involved); and/or
 - (ix) Other penalty as deemed fit by the AIO.
- (d) On completion of the investigation, the AIO will advise, in writing to the following individuals, of its decision and any penalties imposed:
 - (i) The student and party making the allegation;
 - (ii) The CEO;
 - (iii) The Registrar;
 - (iv) The Course Coordinator of the course in which the student is enrolled;
 - (v) The DVC (Teaching & Learning)
 - (vi) The Chair of Council
 - (vii) The DVC (Quality and Compliance)
- (e) The Registrar must keep a record of all findings of violations of Academic Integrity matters dealt with by the AIO, and all penalties imposed in respect of such findings; this information is recorded on the student's file and forms part of the student's disciplinary record.

5.3. Recording Outcomes

5.3.1. Once a determination has been made on a misconduct matter, the Registrar will document the decision and relevant conditions of an imposed penalty.

5.3.2. The student will be informed in writing of the decision.



5.3.3. The student administration and enrolment staff will be informed of this for the purposes of appropriately recording the misconduct on the student's academic record and/or amending the student's enrolment.

5.4. Appeal Process (please also refer to the Student Grievance Mediation Policy)

5.4.1. An appeal against a determination in a student misconduct matter can be lodged by the student if there is:

- a) Evidence of a breach of this policy or general principles of procedural fairness; and/or
- b) The suggestion that the decision was affected by a conflict of interest or personal bias; and/or
- c) New information that could not reasonably have been provided prior to the hearing and it is probable that this information would have affected the decision.

5.4.2. An appeal on the grounds of penalty alone will not be considered.

5.4.3. An appeal against a penalty may be made in writing to the DVC (T&L) within 20 days of Notice of the If the appeal is against a decision made by the DVC (T&L) him- or herself, the appeal will be submitted to the CEO for review. A decision and the grounds for appeal must be clearly set out.

5.4.4. Upon receipt of the Appeal, the DVC (T&L) shall undertake a preliminary review to determine the validity of the appeal. Once determined, and within 10 days of receiving the Appeal, the DVC (T&L) may:

- a) Dismiss the Appeal if not valid;
- b) Make a decision in relation to the Appeal; or
- c) Refer the Appeal to the Academic Board for determination

5.4.5. The Appeal Decision (made by the DVC (T&L) or relevant authority) is final and there is no further avenue of appeal within the Institute. However, the student has the right to further appeal outside the Institute to the NSW Ombudsman.

5.4.6. In making a decision in relation to the Appeal, the original decision may be confirmed, varied or set aside.

5.4.7. The student will be informed in writing of the Appeal's Decision outlining reasons for the decision.

5.4.8. Relevant staff within the Institute will be informed of the Appeal's Decision and appropriate records will be made.

Elite Education Institute Pty Ltd trading as Elite Education Institute

ABN 65 162 298 580 CRICOS Provider Code: 03390A
 Head Office & Sydney CBD Campus: Level 6, 8 Quay Street, Haymarket NSW 2000
 Tel: +61 2 9211 4958
 Website: www.ee.edu.au Email: info@ee.edu.au



Appendix 1 – Levels of Violations

Levels	Responsible Officer	Typical Offences	Conclusion	Possible Penalties and possible actions to be taken (if substantiated)	Notification/Record
0	Academic Integrity Officer (AIO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Careless referencing 	Allegation investigated: Dismissed &/or unfounded, or made out Due to in-experience/lack of knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informal Warning (verbal reprimand); and or Resubmission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misconduct Register
1	AIO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate referencing Poor paraphrasing Repeated Level 0 violation 	Allegation investigated: dismissed &/or unfounded, or made out Due to in-experience/lack of knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informal warning, or a formal warning if repeated offence; and or Resubmission; or Reduced grade if a repeated offence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misconduct Register Student File (if Formal Warning)
2	AIO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not acknowledging source(s) Same work submitted for more than one assignment Misuse of data Repeated Level 1 violations 	Characterised by dishonesty, including false statements made by student, during any investigation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal warning; and or Additional paper; and or Reduced (or 0/fail) grade if repeated offence; and or Referral to a counsellor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misconduct Register Student File
3	AIO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract & other cheating Banned materials in examination Collaborating in, and facilitating cheating Dishonest use of materials or data Repeated Level 2 violations 	Dishonesty that affects a major portion of assessable requirements, including false statements made by student, during any investigation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal warning; and or Reduced or 0 (fail) grade; and or Suspension of up to 10 working days; and or Student to sign a Learning Contract; and or Referral to a counsellor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misconduct Register Student File
4	AIO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any violation after suspension Involves criminal activity Using a substitute for examination Sabotage of work of another student Violation of AI in postgraduate work Repeated Level 3 violation 	Very serious breaches carried out with full knowledge of the offence, including false statements made by student, during any investigation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal warning; and or Fail grade; and or Suspension of up to 20 working days; and or Possible exclusion for the trimester in certain cases; and or Change of academic status; and or Student consultation file note; and or Referral to a counsellor; and or Expulsion in certain extreme cases e.g., where criminal conduct involved (and student to apply for reinstatement in all other cases); and or Any other penalty as deemed fit by the AIO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misconduct Register Student File



Appendix 2

Guide for Referencing & Acknowledging

The Use of Artificial Intelligence tools

1. Introduction and FAQs

This guide covers how to cite and reference AI tools according to UNSW policy. The Harvard style of referencing will be used as an example, though there will also be relevant links to other common referencing styles such as MLA, APA, Vancouver, AGLC and Chicago. If you have any questions about this resource, please contact [Academic Skills](#).

IMPORTANT NOTE: The use of AI tools in your assessments may or may not be permissible. It is important to consult your course outline or discuss with your relevant course coordinator/tutor to determine whether AI tools are permitted, and to what degree they may be used. If you are working on a thesis, it is recommended you consult with your supervisor.

Referencing and Acknowledging AI

Referencing is a way to acknowledge sources you have used in your writing. This may include books, journal articles, website, newspaper articles, personal communication, and more recently, the use of Artificial Intelligence tools and technologies. Failure to reference correctly can result in plagiarism.

According to the University of New South Wales' [Plagiarism Policy](#), *copying material* from other sources without acknowledgement, as well as *incorrectly paraphrasing* (changing a few words around while retaining the original structure and/or progression of ideas) are both grounds for plagiarism. This means if you use outputs generated by AI in your assessment, you must cite and attribute this information accordingly.

Do I need to acknowledge generative AI tools like ChatGPT if I have used them?

Yes. At university, it is important to let others know where you get your information and who authored the work. This is so others can ensure the work is yours and can locate and verify the sources you are using. If AI outputs (text generated by AI) feature in your work, you need to flag this material with proper referencing.

Is ChatGPT a reliable source?

Thinking about generative AI tools like ChatGPT as a source can be problematic. Large language models like ChatGPT use a multitude of data to inform its outputs, and in some cases, the information these tools provide may not be up-to-date or accurate.

AI tools may also, unknowingly, plagiarise other sources, meaning it may not have correctly cited or attributed original author(s). In addition, these tools might suggest sources that look and sound legitimate, but are in fact fake. These are known as “hallucinations”.



You should never rely on generative AI outputs as a source for high-quality information. In fact, you should assume all AI outputs are incorrect until proven otherwise.

Why is it important to cite AI tools?

It is important to cite and acknowledge the use of AI tools if you have used them as part of an assessment because it ensures the integrity of your work. **If parts of your work have been detected as 'AI generated', referencing this material appropriately does not necessarily guarantee you won't have breached academic integrity guidelines.** If you have used an AI tool's output in your work and are unsure whether to cite it, it is always better to reference this material rather than leave it unacknowledged.

Should I cite AI tools if I have not included their outputs in my work?

When utilising AI tools in academic work, it's important to consider the influence this has had on your research and ideas. Even if you don't directly quote or include AI-generated content Academic integrity requires transparency about significant resources that have shaped your work. Acknowledge the role of AI tools if they have been crucial in developing your understanding, research, or ideas, by mentioning them in an acknowledgment. AI's assistance could include clarifying concepts, identifying relevant literature, or shaping the direction of your research in a significant way. To be clear, whether AI tools have directly provided content, significantly influenced the themes and arguments or your work, or been instrumental in your research and analysis, acknowledging their contribution upholds the principles of academic integrity and transparency.

Should I cite an AI tool if I have used it for editing or translating my work?

Before using AI to edit or translate your work, make sure you have been given permission to do so. If an assignment allows it, you may be able to use certain AI tools to provide editing assistance or advice. If an AI tool has changed or altered your work in any way, or you have included its suggestions as part of your final submission, you should acknowledge the use of AI with a brief acknowledgement statement.

Remember it is important to check the edits these tools provide and approve them yourself. Ultimately, you are responsible for the work you submit and the suggestions made by AI tools may not always be accurate or reflect the quality of your ideas. When it is allowable to do so, and you have used AI tools to edit, alter, or translate your work, you should acknowledge this with a brief acknowledgment submitted underneath your reference list or at the bottom of the document.



EXAMPLE OF AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Acknowledgement:

I would like to acknowledge the assistance provided by [Name of AI tool] which offered editorial suggestions. Some examples of prompts I used include [list prompts here].

2. How to Cite, Reference or Acknowledge use of AI Tools in Your Work

UNSW embraces the ethical and critical use of AI tools where appropriate, which is why it is important to know how to reference and acknowledge these tools correctly. If you are using AI outputs in your work as part of your assessment, please adhere to the following:

1. If you are [quoting, paraphrasing or summarising](#) material directly from an AI tool, it is important to cite this information as you would any other source. This includes an in-text citation or footnote (depending on your referencing system). In some referencing styles, a full bibliographic entry is required.
2. **If you have been given permission to use AI tools to edit or translate your work**, you should still acknowledge this by providing a brief acknowledgment statement at the end of your document.
3. If you are unsure whether you need to reference an AI tool you have used, you should consult your relevant course convenor/tutor or supervisor. You may also [book an appointment](#) with the Academic Skills team to discuss.

RECOMMENDATION: Generative AI tools are not high-quality sources. Relying on information provided by an AI tool could reflect poorly on the quality of your academic work. For this reason, we suggest avoiding using a generative AI tool like ChatGPT as a primary source for factual information.

Citation guides offer varied advice on how to cite AI. Some guides suggest citing generative AI as “personal communication” or “correspondence” while others suggest citing it as a “website” or “software”. Traditionally, “personal communication” refers to information obtained directly from one person to another through informal means. Citing AI tools as personal communication is, thereby, problematic due to the lack of traditional authorship and the nature of the communication. To address this, we recommend citing AI tools as software. By doing so, the focus shifts to the organisation or company responsible for the AI's development and



acknowledges the absence of a human being within the communication process. This approach aligns with standard citation practices for software, acknowledging the collaborative efforts of development teams and ensuring transparency in scholarly communication.

We suggest citing AI tools as a “software”, whereby, the company is considered the author, and the software is the product’s name.

Below is a list of examples of various referencing styles and the instructions they have provided. It is good practice to always check the style authority website before adding citations to your work. It is also important to consult this guide and others regularly as such information may be updated.

2.1 When to cite AI tools in your work

If AI tools have played a significant role in shaping your understanding or research process or you have included outputs from an AI tool, citing or acknowledging this material is always best practice. However, knowing what constitutes ‘significant’ in this context can be tricky. If you aren’t sure whether AI has made a significant contribution to your work, consider the following:

Direct Incorporation of AI-Generated Material

Do you include AI-generated text, data, or material in your work? This includes verbatim quotes, paraphrased ideas, or data generated by AI tools. If yes, citation is necessary regardless of the size of the contribution to acknowledge the source of the content clearly.

Significant Influence on Content Creation or Conceptualisation

Has an AI tool played a significant role in shaping the major themes, arguments, or conclusions of your work? If yes, even if AI-generated content is not directly quoted, its substantial influence on the development of your ideas, research direction, or analytical framework requires acknowledgment.

Critical Assistance in Research or Analysis

Have you used AI tools for critical research tasks such as finding relevant literature, analysing data, or interpreting findings? Where the AI’s input significantly contributes to the scholarly work you should acknowledge the role of AI in facilitating the research process, especially if there is a direct impact on your findings or conclusions.

2.2 Harvard Referencing System



UNSW
SYDNEY

DISCLAIMER: The Harvard Referencing System is not affiliated with Harvard University and so no official guide exists. As such, there are multiple versions of Harvard referencing with slight variations between them. When selecting a Harvard referencing style (if one hasn't already been assigned to you) you should remain consistent with its instructions. UNSW adheres to the following Harvard Referencing principles for citing and attributing AI tools.

The Harvard Referencing system is an author-date citation system made up of two parts:

1. In-Text Citations
2. Reference List

As part of the Harvard in-text referencing style, when quoting, paraphrasing or summarising an AI tool's output, you must include the company name, followed by the date the response was given. The list of sources or 'Reference List' is then provided on a separate page at the end of the document.

Below are some examples of citing ChatGPT using the Harvard in-text referencing system. In each of the examples you would also want to provide full bibliographic details at the end of the document as part of your Reference List.

Quoting

User Question: Can you explain the concept of zombies in anthropological terms?

ChatGPT Response: Zombies in anthropological terms are often seen as a manifestation of cultural anxieties about the unknown and the boundary between life and death.

[Example Citation: ChatGPT highlights that in anthropological discourse, "zombies \[...\] are often seen as a manifestation of cultural anxieties about the unknown and the boundary between life and death" \(OpenAI 2023\).](#)

Paraphrasing

User Question: What role do zombies play in cultural studies?

ChatGPT Response: Zombies serve as a metaphor in cultural studies for societal issues, reflecting deep-seated fears and contemporary anxieties.

[Example Citation: ChatGPT indicates that in cultural studies, zombies are metaphorically used to represent societal issues and contemporary fears \(OpenAI 2023\).](#)

Summarising

User Question: Can you provide an overview of the various theories surrounding what zombies symbolise?

ChatGPT Response: In cultural theory, zombies are significant as they symbolise various aspects of human nature and societal concerns, often serving as a critique of consumerism, conformity, and the loss of individuality.

[Example Citation: A synthesis of discussions on ChatGPT about cultural theories suggests that zombies are portrayed as reflections of human characteristics and societal issues, frequently used to comment on consumer culture and the diminishing sense of personal identity \(OpenAI 2023\).](#)



REFERENCE LIST

Format for a Harvard citation for AI

Company. Year, *Product Name* in italics [Type of AI model], Retrieved Month Day, Year, from URL.

Example of a Harvard citation for AI

OpenAI. 2023, *ChatGPT* [Large language model], Retrieved October 19, 2023, from <https://chat.openai.com/chat>.

2.3 APA (7th edition) Referencing system

Format for an APA citation for AI

Name of Company/creator of generative AI Tool. (Year. *Name of generative AI tool* (Month Date version [Large language model]). URL.

Example of an APA citation for AI

OpenAI. (2023. *ChatGPT* (June 16 version [Large language model]). <https://chat.openai.com/chat>

In-text citation example

A common example of a programming language is C++ (OpenAI, 2023).

In-text citation example

According to OpenAI (2023, when prompted with “Does the human brain have computational power than the most powerful computer?”, it appears there are ...

2.4 Citing AI Tools using the Chicago (17th edition Referencing system

Format for a Chicago style citation for AI

Number. Originator of the communication, medium, Day Month, Year.

Example of a Chicago style citation for AI

¹ OpenAI's ChatGPT AI language model, response to “summarise quantum computing”, 7 February, 2023, OpenAI, <https://chat.openai.com/chat>.

2.5 IEEE Referencing system

Format for an IEEE citation for AI

[Citation number] Author (Program Name, response to author query. Publisher [Online]. URL, (Accessed date.

Example of IEEE citation for AI

[1] ChatGPT, response to author query. OpenAI [Online]. <https://chatgpt.pro/> (accessed February 15, 2023).

Example of IEEE in-text citation for AI

Powerful research tools lead to better results (OpenAI's ChatGPT, private communication, 10 October 2023).



2.6 MLA Referencing system

Format for an MLA citation for AI

“Title of source” prompt. Name of AI Tool, version, Company, Date content was generated, URL

Example of an MLA citation for AI

“Describe the symbolism of the green light in the book The Great Gatsby by F. Scott Fitzgerald” prompt. ChatGPT, 13 Feb. version, OpenAI, 8 Mar. 2023, chat.openai.com/chat.

In-text citation style

(Short form Title of source)

2.7 Australian Guide to Legal Citation 4th Edition (AGLC4) style Referencing system

Format for an AGLC4 citation for AI

[Citation number] Output from (Program Name) (Program Owner) to (Recipient), (full date), (pinpoint).

Example of AGLC4 in-text citation for AI

¹ Output from ChatGPT, OpenAI to Roy Batty, 14 November 2019.

2.8 Australian Guide to Vancouver Referencing system

Format for Vancouver citation for AI

Company Name, personal communication, Day Month Year.

Example of Vancouver citation for AI

(OpenAI, personal communication, 20 September 2023)



Table 1: How to Cite, Reference or Acknowledge use of AI Tools

Citation Style	Format	Example
Harvard (UNSW)	Company. Year, <i>Product name in italics</i> , [Type of AI model], Retrieved Month Day, Year, from URL.	OpenAI. 2023, <i>ChatGPT</i> [Large language model], Retrieved October 19, 2023, from https://chat.openai.com/chat .
APA (7th edition)	Name of Company/creator of generative AI Tool. (Year). <i>Name of generative AI tool</i> (Month Date version) [Large language model]. URL.	OpenAI. (2023). <i>ChatGPT</i> (June 16 version) [Large language model]. https://chat.openai.com/chat
Chicago (17th edition)	Number. Originator of the communication, medium, Day Month, Year.	1. OpenAI's ChatGPT AI language model, response to question from author, 7 February, 2023.
IEEE	[Citation number] Author (Program Name), response to author query. Publisher [Online]. URL, (Accessed date).	[1] ChatGPT, response to author query. OpenAI [Online]. https://chatgpt.pro/ (accessed February 15, 2023).
MLA	"Title of source" prompt. Name of AI Tool, version, Company, Date content was generated, URL	"Describe the symbolism of the green light in the book <i>The Great Gatsby</i> by F. Scott Fitzgerald" prompt. ChatGPT, 13 Feb. version, OpenAI, 8 Mar. 2023, chat.openai.com/chat .
Vancouver	Company Name, personal communication, Day Month Year.	(OpenAI, personal communication, 20 September 2023)
AGLC	[Citation number] Author (Program Name), response to author query. Publisher [Online]. URL, (Accessed date).	Citation: [1] ChatGPT, response to author query. OpenAI [Online]. https://chatgpt.pro/ (accessed February 15, 2023). In-Text Citation: Powerful research tools lead to better results (OpenAI's ChatGPT, private communication, 10 October 2023).



Developed: November 2023

Authors:

James Bedford, Martin Parisio, Mervyn Lim, William Scates Frances, Peter Smith (from Academic Skills (Student Success, PVCESE) and UNSW Library)

Feedback Contact: For feedback and suggestions please contact Academic Skills

academicskills@unsw.edu.au



UNSW
SYDNEY