

Dear Exam Commission,

I wanted to write out the supporting evidence I found for my suspicion of the use of AI by my student, [REDACTED] 5.1.2e. I have attached the drafts of the thesis, with my comments as well.

English Language Skills

Unfortunately the only way for you to evaluate this is to invite [REDACTED] 5.1.2e in person for a conversation. Anything in writing will of course be subject to the potential use of AI tools or translation software (with or without AI) in [REDACTED] 5.1.2e correspondence. I would strongly suggest an in-person interaction to understand the context in which my observation was made.

Writing Process

Again, here I think an in-person meeting would help. The student has submitted two drafts:

First substantive draft

Submitted: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

Meeting: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

The first substantive piece (graded as pass/fail) had two substantive issues in terms of a suspicion of the use of AI (detailed below). When I asked the student about this, [REDACTED] 5.1.2e answers were unclear and indicated that [REDACTED] 5.1.2e did not remember [REDACTED] 5.1.2e writing process, or did not know (I suspect that this was also – at least in part – due to [REDACTED] 5.1.2e poor English skills and that [REDACTED] 5.1.2e struggled to understand the question). Due to the timeline (just 11 days between the submission and the meeting) it seemed unreasonable that [REDACTED] 5.1.2e ‘could not remember’. In the end, after further questioning, [REDACTED] 5.1.2e said [REDACTED] 5.1.2e had read papers and written the draft.

First full draft

Submitted: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

Meeting: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

The first full draft (not graded, feedback moment) had two substantive issues in terms of a suspicion of the use of AI (detailed below). When I asked the student about this, [REDACTED] 5.1.2e told me that [REDACTED] 5.1.2e wrote [REDACTED] 5.1.2e thesis entirely in [REDACTED] 5.1.2e and then translated the piece using Google Translate. While this is problematic as such, I do not think that it accounts for the suspicions of AI (in part nor in full).

In general, all drafts submitted have had major issues with (the lack of) citations, although this has improved over time.

Citation issues

The main issue with both drafts are the ‘hallucinated’ sources. There are varying degrees in both pieces with some clearly been cited incorrectly, but in a way that

indicates more than just having typed up the wrong name of a journal for example. I have indicated the specific examples in each draft below.

Note: I do not have the capacity to check all footnotes in all thesis I supervise and so this is effectively a spot check, but there might well be additional problematic sources which I have not found.

First substantive piece

- Quote from thesis: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
[REDACTED] 5.1.2e
- My comment: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
[REDACTED] 5.1.2e
- Quote from thesis: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
[REDACTED] 5.1.2e
- My comment: "Citation is incorrect"
- Actual citation: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
[REDACTED] 5.1.2e
- Context: After finding the information somewhat suspect, I decided to check the paper. It then turned out it was a real paper but published in a different journal, on different pages, in a different volume/edition, and in a different year. Even if translation software was used, it seems very unlikely that it would change the journal name substantively to another [REDACTED] 5.1.2e and that it would change the year of publication. This also isn't the only instance of such an error, and is part of an emerging pattern of sources that either don't exist or are not accurate. Both telltale signs of the use of AI.

I did not find other instances in the first substantive piece, but I also wasn't 'looking' for them. I found these two by chance as the sections of the thesis they were connected to struck me as odd. Hence, I wanted to check the main source to make sure that the text of the thesis adequately covered what the source stated.

First full draft

- Quote: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
[REDACTED] 5.1.2e

- Actual citation: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
- Context: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
- Quote: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
- Actual citation: (not possible)
- Context: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e
- [REDACTED]