

## BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

2025-2026 Second Term Wednesday 7:00pm-9:30pm ELB 206

Course Code: THEO5912  
 Title in English: Biblical Theology  
 Title in Chinese: 聖經神學

### Course Description:

This course is an introduction to the discipline of “Biblical Theology,” with focus on Old Testament theology. It aims to (1) survey the historical development of the discipline from the late 18<sup>th</sup> century through the 20<sup>th</sup> century; (2) examine the main expressions, major issues, and critiques of the discipline in the light of modern and postmodern approaches to biblical studies; and (3) engage students in constructing a biblical theology that is sensitive to various literary reading strategies of biblical texts, and sympathetic to effects of contemporary and cultural interpretative frameworks in biblical studies.

### Learning Outcomes:

- After completing this course, students should be able to:
- Demonstrate a familiarity of the historical development of “Biblical Theology”
  - Describe the main presuppositions, methods, and objectives of the discipline
  - Identify the key persons and concepts in the discipline
  - Deepen their awareness of the impact of modern and postmodern approaches to biblical studies on the discipline
  - Critique the pros and cons in various expressions of the discipline
  - Formulate an expression of Biblical Theology that is relevant to their social locations

### Learning Activities:

The course consists mainly of lectures, interwoven with class discussion, independent reading, student presentation, and research activities. The time allocation (per week) of the learning activities is as follows:

Lecture		Class Discussion		Group Presentation		Reading and Research		Written Assignments	
In class	Out of Class	In class	Out of Class	In class	Out of Class	In class	Out of Class	In class	Out of Class
2 hrs		0.25 hr	0.5 hr	0.25 hr			3 hrs		2.5 hrs
M		M		M		M/O		M	

M: Mandatory activity in the course      O: Optional activity

### Assessment Scheme:

Task nature	Purpose	Learning Outcomes
<b>Student Presentation (20%)</b>  A pdf version of the PowerPoint presentation <i>due by 6:00pm on the presentation day</i> on Blackboard Discussion Forum	To facilitate the students’ critical review of the reading materials and the exchanges of ideas among them.	Students are to work in pairs. Each pair is to give a 25-minute PowerPoint presentation on one of the assigned topics marked with an asterisk (*) in the course schedule. Each group is required to give a summary of the assigned reading, highlight the issues at stake, and conclude with their position(s) to the debate.

<p><b>Blackboard Reflection Posts</b> (30%; @5%)</p> <p>Each reflection post <i>due at 10:00pm on the day prior to the corresponding lecture</i> on Blackboard Discussion Forum.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To facilitate the students to critically synthesize and analyze the reading materials and to engage the content reflectively.</li> <li>2. To summarize and compare the scholars' different views and main arguments.</li> <li>3. To analyze their strengths and weaknesses.</li> <li>4. To engage the readings by relating them to the student's contemporary contexts. What are questions raised that are relevant to your situation? What are the challenges posed to your faith or preconceived notions? How do you reposition yourself?</li> </ol>	<p>Write 6 reflection posts each of 400–800 words (English) or 480–960 words (Chinese) and engage the course reading materials on each assigned topic marked with a pound (#) in the course schedule.</p>
<p><b>Class Participation</b> (10%)</p> <p>Blackboard Discussion on each topic <i>closes at 6:59pm on the day of the corresponding lecture.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To encourage learning collaboration and exchanges of ideas among the students, both in class and through Blackboard's discussion forum.</li> <li>2. To consolidate the students' understanding of the reading materials.</li> <li>3. To develop critical attitude toward the reading materials.</li> <li>4. To deepen students' awareness of how their own social locations and presuppositions may affect the process of theologizing.</li> </ol>	<p>Students are required to participate in the class discussion and the online discussion forum by posting their questions, critiques, and opinions on the methods and the exegetical papers posted by their classmates.</p>
<p><b>Term Paper</b> (40%)</p> <p>Term paper proposal <i>due on Apr 8 (W)</i> on Blackboard.</p> <p>Term Paper <i>due on Apr 29 (W)</i> on Blackboard and VeriGuide.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To evaluate the students' ability to critically engage current scholarship in Biblical Theology.</li> <li>2. To analyze and critique different models of doing Biblical Theology.</li> <li>3. To apply a current method in doing Biblical Theology or in their exegesis of a biblical text from a theological perspective.</li> </ol>	<p>Write a term-paper proposal that includes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A tentative title</li> <li>2. An abstract of about 400 words, with a tentative thesis statement</li> <li>3. A tentative outline</li> <li>4. A preliminary bibliography</li> </ol> <p>Submit a term paper of 4000–5000 words in English or 4800–6000 words in Chinese on one of the following topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A critique of a model of doing Biblical Theology.</li> <li>2. An exegesis of a biblical text or an exposition of a biblical theme from a theological and reader-contextual perspective.</li> </ol>

## Recommended Learning Resources:

### Textbooks (required):

- Barr, James. 1999. *The Concept of Biblical Theology: An Old Testament Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress. [CC BS1192.5.B373 1999]
- Brueggemann, Walter. 1997. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress. [CC BS1192.5 B80 1997]
- Lemche, Niels Peter. 2008. *The Old Testament between Theology and History: A Critical Survey*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox. [CC BS1171.3 .L46 2008]

### Books:

- Collins, John J. 2005. *Encounters with Biblical Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress. [CC BS543 .C58 2005]
- Frei, Hans. 1974. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study of Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven: Yale University Press. [CC BS500.F73]
- Gnuse, Robert Karl. 1997. *No Other Gods: Emergent Monotheism in Israel*. JSOTSup 241. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press. [CC BS1192.6 G68 1997]
- Gorman, Frank H. 1990. *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time, and Status in the Priestly Theology*. JSOTsupp 91. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press. [CC BL600 .G67]
- Kwok, Pui-lan. 1995. *Discovering the Bible in the Non-Biblical World*. The Bible & Liberation Series. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis. [CC BS521.4 K95 1995]
- Muffs, Yochanan. 2005. *The Personhood of God: Biblical Theology, Human Faith and Divine Image*. Woodstock, VT: Jewish Lights. [CC BS1192.6 .M84 2005]
- Patrick, Dale. 1999. *The Rhetoric of Revelation in the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress. [CC BS1199.R5 P37 1999]
- Perdue, Leo G. 1994. *The Collapse of History: Reconstructing Old Testament Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress. [CC BS1192.5.P47 1994]
- Perdue, Leo G. 2005. *Reconstructing Old Testament Theology: After the Collapse of History*. Minneapolis: Fortress. [CC BS1192.5.P47 1994]
- Schmid, Konrad. *Is There Theology in the Hebrew Bible?* Critical Studies in the Hebrew Bible 4. Translated by Peter Altmann. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015. [Online]
- Smith-Christopher, Daniel L. 2002. *A Biblical Theology of Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress. [CC BS1199.B3 S55 2002]

### Collection of Essays:

- Ollenburger, Ben C., ed. 2004. *Old Testament Theology: Flowering and Future*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns. [Online]

### Essays and Articles:

- Alt, Albrecht. 1989a. "The Gods of the Fathers." In *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, 1–77. Sheffield: JSOT Press. [CC BS1188.A433]
- Alt, Albrecht. 1989b. "The Origins of Israelite Law." In *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*, 79–132. Sheffield: JSOT Press. [CC BS1188.A433]
- Brueggemann, Walter. 2015. "Futures in Old Testament Theology: Dialogic Engagement." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 37: 32–49. [Online]
- Emmert, Kevin P. 2014. "Seeing Too Much Jesus in the Bible: Why a Seminary is Sending an Old Testament Scholar into Early Retirement." *Christianity Today* 58, no.7: 23.
- Gerstenberger, Erhard S. 2005a. "Pluralism in Theology? An Old Testament Inquiry, Part I: Sojourners We Are: Social Rootings of Biblical Witnesses." *Scriptura: International Journal of Bible, Religion and Theology in Southern Africa* 88: 64–72. [Online]

- Gerstenberger, Erhard S. 2005b. "Pluralism in Theology? An Old Testament Inquiry, Part II: That All May Become One: Global Responsibility in Christian Thinking." *Scriptura: International Journal of Bible, Religion and Theology in Southern Africa* 88: 73–84. [Online]
- Gnuse, Robert Karl. 2002. "A Process Theological Interpretation of the Primeval History in Genesis 2–11." *Horizons* 29, no.1: 23–41. [Online]
- Levenson, Jon Douglas. 1993. "The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism." In *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism*, 1–32. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox. [CC BS476.L48 1993]
- Mayes, A.D.H. 1999. "Deuteronomistic Ideology and the Theology of the Old Testament." *JSOT* 82: 57–82. [Online]
- Mtshiselwa, Ndikho, and Lerato Mokoena. 2018. "Human Created God in Their Image? An Anthropomorphic Projectionism in the Old Testament." *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 74, no.1: 5017. <http://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v74i1.5017>.
- Nelson, Richard D. 2009. "The Old Testament and Public Theology." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 36: 85-94. [Online]
- O'Connor, K. M. 2016. "Stammering Toward the Unsayable: Old Testament Theology, Trauma Theory, and Genesis." *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 70: 301–313. [Online]
- Ollenburger, Ben C. 1985–86. "What Krister Stendahl "meant"—A Normative Critique of "Descriptive Biblical Theology." *Horizons of Biblical Theology* 7-8: 61–98. [Online]
- Ollenburger, Ben C. 2003. "Discoursing Old Testament Theology." *Biblical Interpretation* 11: 618–628. [Online]
- Peter, James. 1970. "Salvation History as a Model for Theological Thought," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 23: 1–12. [Online]
- Preus, Christian. 1950. "The Contemporary Relevance of Von Hofmann's Hermeneutical Principles." *Interpretation* 4: 311–321. [CC Periodical BS410 .I6]
- Sandys-Wunsch, John, and Laurence Eldredge. 1980. "J. P. Gabler and the Distinction between Biblical and Dogmatic Theology: Translation, Commentary and Discussion of His Originality." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 33: 133–158. [Online]
- Schüle, Andreas. 2008. "Theology as Witness: Gerhard von Rad's Contribution to the Study of Old Testament Theology." *Interpretation* 62: 256–267. [Online]
- Snyman, S. D. (Fanie). 2014. "Some Thoughts on the Relationship between Old Testament Studies and Systematic Theology." *Verbum et Ecclesia* 35: n.p. [Online]
- Stendahl, Krister. 1962. "Biblical Theology, Contemporary." In *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. 1 Edited by G. A. Buttrick, 418–432. Nashville: Abingdon, 1962. [CC BS440.I63]
- Van Leeuwen, Raymond C. 1992. "Wealth and Poverty: System and Contradiction in Proverbs." *Hebrew Studies* 33: 25–36. [Online]
- von Rad, Gerhard. 1996. "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch." In *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, 68–74. New York: McGraw-Hill. [CC BS1188.R313]

#### **Supplementary Books:**

- Albright, William Foxwell. 1946. *From Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. [CC BL221 .A47 1957]
- Childs, Brevard S. 1970. *Biblical Theology in Crisis*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970. [CC BS543.C45]
- Fretheim, Terence E. 2005. *God and World in the Old Testament: A Relational Theology of Creation*. Nashville: Abingdon. [CC BS1199.C73 F74 2005]
- Goldingay, J. 1987. *Theological Diversity and the Authority of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. [BS1192.5 .G65]
- Hasel, Gerhard. *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*. 4th edition. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1991. [BS1192.5 .H37 1991]
- Martin, Dale B. 2017. *Biblical Truths: The Meaning of Scripture in the Twenty-First Century*. Yale University Press. [Online]

Rendtorff, Rolf. 1994. *Canon and Theology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. [CC BS1192.R4313 1994]

von Rad, Gerhard. 1962–65. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Row. [CC BS1192.5.R3132]

Vriezen, Theodorus Christiaan. 1958. *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*. Translated by S. Neuijen. Oxford: Blackwell. [BS1192.5 .V713 1958]

Weems, Renita J. 1995. *Battered Love: Marriage, Sex, and Violence in the Hebrew Prophets*. Minneapolis: Fortress. [CC BS1505.2 .W38 1995]

Wright, George Ernest. 1952. *God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as Recital*. London: SMC. [CC BS543.W68]

Wright, N. T. 2013. "Narrative Theology: The Evangelists' Use of the Old Testament as an Implicit Overarching Narrative." Pages 189-200 in *Biblical Interpretation and Method*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. [Online]

**Course Schedule:**

Class	Date	Topic	Reading Requirements
Week 1	Jan 7 (W)	1. Syllabus 2. Introduction to "Biblical Theology"	Barr: 1-26
Week 2	Jan 14 (W)	Biblical Hermeneutics from the Reformation to the Enlightenment  # Blackboard Reflection 1: Respond to Collins's "Is a Critical Biblical Theology Possible?"	Brueggemann 1997: 1-15 Lemche: 31-43 Collins: 11-23
Week 3	Jan 21 (W)	The Origins of "Biblical Theology" 1. J. P. Gabler's oration in 1787 2. "What It meant" and "What It Means" 3. Descriptive vs. normative  Key Figures: J. P. Gabler; K. Stendahl  # Blackboard Reflection 2: Should Biblical Theology be descriptive or normative? Any other alternatives?	Barr: 62-84,172-208  <u>Recommended:</u> Ollenburger 2004: 497-506 Sandys-Wunsch: 133-158 Stendahl 1962: 418-432 Ollenburger 1985-86: 61-98 Snyman 2014: 1-7
Week 4	Jan 28 (W)	Historical-Genetic Approach and History-of-Religion Approach  Key Figures: G. F. Oehler; Julius Wellhausen  * Student Presentation 1: Schmid 2015 (Is There a Theology in the Hebrew Bible?)	Barr: 100-139, 222-252  <u>Recommended:</u> Lemche: 31-163, 186-211 Collins: 24-33 Schmid
----	Feb 4 (W)	<b>Instructor on Academic Leave. No Class.</b>	
Week 4	Feb 11 (W)	Before and Since Karl Barth 1. 18th and 19th century Hermeneutics 2. The influence of dialectic Theology 3. The notion of revelation  * Student Presentation 2: Patrick 1999 (The Rhetoric of Revelation)	Brueggemann 1997:15-31  <u>Recommended:</u> Patrick 1999 Frei 1974: 1-65
----	Feb 18 (W)	<b>Lunar New Year Holiday. No Class.</b>	

Week 5	Feb 25(W)	<p>Issues: Theology and history; systemization; the use of central theme as an organizing principle</p> <p>Key Figures: Albrecht Alt, Martin Noth, William Foxwell Albright, Walther Eichrodt</p> <p><b># Blackboard Reflection 3:</b> What are the pros and cons of using a central theme as an organizing principle?</p>	<p>Barr: 27-51, 330-344</p> <p><u>Recommended:</u> Lemche: 165-254, 284-298 Albrecht 1989a &amp; 1989b</p>
----	Mar 4 (W)	<b>Reading Week. No Class.</b>	
Week 6	Mar 11 (W)	<p>Issues: Theology, history, and story; “Salvation History” as the topos of revelation</p> <p>Key Figures: J. Chr. K. von Hofmann; Gerhard von Rad, G. Ernest Wright</p> <p><b># Blackboard Reflection 4:</b> Critique the presuppositions of the “salvation history” model to Biblical Theology.</p>	<p>Brueggemann 1997:31-42 Lemche: 257-269, 299-312, 339-350 Barr: 345-361, 497-512</p> <p><u>Recommended:</u> Brueggemann 1997: 117-144 von Rad 1996; Preus; Peter; Schüle</p>
Week 7	Mar 18 (W)	<p>Issues: The Unity of OT and NT; Christianization of the OT; and “Christotelic” interpretation of the OT</p> <p>Key Figures: Th. C. Vriezen, Tremper Longman III</p> <p><b>* Student Presentation 3:</b> Muffs 2005 (Divine Personhood)</p>	<p>Barr: 172-188, 253-265, 362-377 Lemche: 365-392 Emmert</p> <p><u>Recommended:</u> Muffs</p>
Week 8	Mar 25 (W)	<p>Canonical Approach to Biblical Theology; alternative methods</p> <p>Issues: Biblical Theology as a Christian Enterprise? An Academic Discipline?</p> <p>Key Figures: B. S. Childs, Jon D. Levenson</p> <p><b>* Student Presentation 4:</b> Smith-Christopher (The Theology of Exile)</p>	<p>Barr : 378-438, 563-580 Lemche : 270-283. 327-338</p> <p><u>Recommended:</u> Barr : 266-311 Brueggemann 1997: 42-60, 89-98 Levenson Ollenburger 2003: 617-628 Mtshiselwa &amp; Mokoena; Smith-Christopher</p>
Week 9	Apr 1 (W)	<p>1. Block/Book/Layer and Thematic Approaches to Biblical Theology 2. Biblical Theology and Process Theology</p> <p>Key figure: Robert K. Gnuse</p> <p><b>* Student Presentation 5:</b> Gorman (The Ideology of Ritual)</p>	<p>Barr: 586-603 Van Leeuwen; Mayes Gnuse 1997: 298-320 Gnuse 2002</p> <p><u>Recommended:</u> Gorman O’Connor 2016: 301-313</p>

Week 10	Apr 8 (W)	<p>Doing Biblical Theology in a postmodern, pluralistic, and glocal contexts</p> <p>Key Figures: Walter Brueggemann; John Goldingay, David Brown</p> <p><b># Blackboard Reflection 5:</b> How to explain the existence of different or contradictory theologies in the Bible?</p> <p><b>* Student Presentation 6:</b> Brueggemann 1997 (Polyphony and Cacophony)</p>	<p>Brueggemann 1997: 61-89 Lemche: 351-364 Barr: 541-562, 586-607 Perdue 2005 (chapter sampling)</p> <p><u>Recommended:</u> Gerstenberger 2005a &amp; 2005b Nelson; Goldingay Brueggemann 1997: 117-144, 317-332, 407-412, 567-577, 707-750</p>
Week 12	Apr 15 (W)	<p>Social Locations and Personal Experience</p> <p><b># Blackboard Reflection 6:</b> Where Do I Enter and What Do I Bring?</p> <p><b>* Student Presentation 7:</b> Perdue 2005: chs.3-9 (Doing Biblical Theology from the Margin)</p> <p><b>* Student Presentation 8:</b> Kwok (Reading the Bible in a Non-Biblical World)</p>	<p>Brueggemann 1997: 98-114 Brueggemann 2015</p> <p><u>Recommended:</u> O'Connor Kwok</p>

#### Contact Details for Teacher:

Lecturer: Sonia Wong (王珏)	Office: KKB 324
Tel: 39435150	Email: sonia.wong@cuhk.edu.hk
Office Hour: By Appointment	

#### Academic Honesty and Plagiarism:

Attention is drawn to University policy and regulations on honesty in academic work, and to the disciplinary guidelines and procedures applicable to breaches of such policy and regulations. Details may be found at <http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academichonesty/>.

With each assignment, students will be required to submit a signed declaration that they are aware of these policies, regulations, guidelines and procedures. For group projects, all students of the same group should be asked to sign the declaration.

For assignments in the form of a computer-generated document that is principally text-based and submitted via VeriGuide, the statement, in the form of a receipt, will be issued by the system upon students' uploading of the soft copy of the assignment. Assignments without the receipt will not be graded by teachers. Only the final version of the assignment should be submitted via VeriGuide.

The submission of a piece of work, or a part of a piece of work, for more than one purpose (e.g. to satisfy the requirements in two different courses) without declaration to this effect shall be regarded as having committed undeclared multiple submission. It is common and acceptable to reuse a turn of phrase or a sentence or two from one's own work; but wholesale reuse is problematic. In any case, agreement from the course teacher(s) concerned should be obtained prior to the submission of the piece of work.

**Term Paper Grading Rubric:**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Poor/Inadequate (D / F)</b>	<b>Fair (C)</b>	<b>Good (B)</b>	<b>Excellent (A)</b>
<b>Introduction/ Thesis Weight 15.00%</b>	<b>0.00 to 30.00 %</b> *weak or no introduction of topic. **paper's purpose is unclear/thesis is weak or missing.	<b>31.00 to 60.00 %</b> *basic introduction that states topic but lacks interest. **thesis is somewhat clear and arguable.	<b>61.00 to 80.00 %</b> *proficient introduction that is interesting and states topic. **thesis is clear and arguable statement of position.	<b>81.00 to 100.00 %</b> *exceptional introduction that grabs interest of reader and states topic. **thesis is exceptionally clear, arguable, well developed, and a definitive statement.
<b>Quality of Information/ Evidence Weight 20.00%</b>	<b>0.00 to 30.00 %</b> *information has little or nothing to do with the thesis. **information has weak or no connection to the thesis.	<b>31.00 to 60.00 %</b> *information relates to the main topic, few details and/or examples are given. **shows a limited variety of sources.	<b>61.00 to 80.00 %</b> *information relates to the main topic. **paper is well researched in detail and from a variety of sources.	<b>81.00 to 100.00 %</b> *paper is exceptionally researched, extremely detailed, and historically accurate. **information clearly relates to the thesis.
<b>Support of Thesis/Analyses Weight 35.00%</b>	<b>0.00 to 30.00 %</b> *limited or no connections made between evidence and thesis. **lack of analysis.	<b>31.00 to 60.00 %</b> *some connections made between evidence and thesis. **some analysis.	<b>61.00 to 80.00 %</b> *consistent connections made between evidence and thesis. **good analysis.	<b>81.00 to 100.00 %</b> *exceptionally critical, relevant and consistent connections made between evidence and thesis. **excellent analysis.
<b>Conclusion Weight 15.00%</b>	<b>0.00 to 30.00 %</b> *lack of summary of topic.	<b>31.00 to 60.00 %</b> *basic summary of topic with some final concluding ideas. **introduces no new information.	<b>61.00 to 80.00 %</b> *good summary of topic with clear concluding ideas. **introduces no new information.	<b>81.00 to 100.00 %</b> *excellent summary of topic with concluding ideas that impact reader. **introduces no new information.
<b>Organization/ Development of Thesis Weight 10.00%</b>	<b>0.00 to 30.00 %</b> *lacks development of ideas with weak or no transitions between and within paragraphs.	<b>31.00 to 60.00 %</b> *somewhat clear and logical development with basic transitions between and within paragraphs.	<b>61.00 to 80.00 %</b> *clear and logical order that supports thesis with good transitions between and within paragraphs.	<b>81.00 to 100.00 %</b> *exceptionally clear, logical, mature, and thorough development of thesis with excellent transitions between and within paragraphs.
<b>Citation/ Bibliography Format Weight 5.00%</b>	<b>0.00 to 30.00 %</b> *lack of academic format/numerous errors.	<b>31.00 to 60.00 %</b> *frequent errors in academic format.	<b>61.00 to 80.00 %</b> *conforms to academic rules for formatting and citation of sources with minor exceptions.	<b>81.00 to 100.00 %</b> *conforms to academic rules for formatting and citation of sources are perfect.

## Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools in Teaching, Learning and Assessment:

### Approach 3 – Use only with explicit acknowledgement

Students may use some AI tools in some class activities and assignments on the condition that they make explicit acknowledgement and proper citations of the input from AI tools.

### Acknowledging support from AI tools

Students are required to acknowledge all functional uses of a generative AI tool and cite it when they paraphrase, quote, or incorporate into their own work any content (whether it is text, image, data, or other format) that was created by it.

i. An example of acknowledgement

'I acknowledge the use of (name of AI tool – e.g. ChatGPT (<https://chat.openai.com/>)) to (specify the support, e.g. plan my essay, generate some ideas for the content, ask for examples of data collection instruments, get the dates of historical events, etc.).

ii. An example of citation

OpenAI. (2023). ChatGPT (Mar 20 version). <https://chat.openai.com/chat>

(Students are reminded that due to the rapid developments of generative AI tools, some citation formats may be updated regularly.)

iii. An example of including texts generated by an AI tool in their work

"The following text was generated by an AI tool / language model (ChatGPT):"

[Insert the text generated by ChatGPT here.]

iv. An example of including texts generated by an AI tool and the prompts that were used to elicit the text from the AI tool

"[The prompt], as generated by an AI language model (ChatGPT):"

[Insert the text generated by ChatGPT in response to the prompt.]

Students are reminded to learn and use the AI tools responsibly and ethically and be aware of the limitations.

Students are reminded to clarify with the course teacher and obtain permission if necessary when in doubt.