

## STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE-BASED PLAGIARISM IN ACADEMIC WRITING

**Anastasya, Budi Mulyono, Mukhamad Murdiono**

*Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia*  
[anastasya.2024@student.uny.ac.id](mailto:anastasya.2024@student.uny.ac.id)

### Article History

*Received: 24 November 2025, Accepted: 01 February 2026, Published 10 February 2025*

### Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengukur dan mendeskripsikan tingkat persepsi mahasiswa terhadap plagiarisme berbasis kecerdasan buatan dalam penulisan akademik yang ditinjau dari tiga indikator, yaitu kognitif, afektif, dan konatif. Penelitian tentang plagiarisme berbasis kecerdasan buatan masih didominasi oleh konteks negara maju dan berfokus pada aspek moral serta kebijakan integritas akademik, sementara persepsi mahasiswa di negara berkembang masih terbatas, terutama dalam mengeksplorasi bagaimana mahasiswa memahami, menilai, serta merasionalisasi penggunaan kecerdasan buatan dalam praktik penulisan ilmiah sehari-hari. Pendekatan yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah kuantitatif deskriptif dengan jenis *cross-sectional survey*, dengan sampel mahasiswa Universitas Negeri Manado, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Hukum. Pengumpulan data dilakukan menggunakan angket, dan analisis data meliputi statistik deskriptif (mean, standar deviasi, serta kategori persepsi). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa persepsi mahasiswa terhadap plagiarisme berbasis kecerdasan buatan berada pada kategori sedang hingga tinggi. Indikator kognitif dengan hasil kategori sedang, indikator afektif dengan hasil kategori tinggi, dan indikator konatif dengan kategori sedang. Hal ini mengindikasikan munculnya kesadaran baru di kalangan mahasiswa tentang pentingnya kejujuran akademik, namun sekaligus memperlihatkan dilema etis yang belum terselesaikan ketika efisiensi digital seperti penggunaan kecerdasan buatan bertentangan dengan tuntutan orisinalitas.

**Kata Kunci:** Kecerdasan Buatan; Penulisan Akademik; Persepsi Mahasiswa; Plagiarisme

### Abstract

*This study aims to measure and describe the level of students' perception of artificial intelligence-based plagiarism in academic writing which is reviewed from three indicators, namely cognitive, affective, and conative. Research on artificial intelligence-based plagiarism is still dominated by the context of developed countries and focuses on moral aspects and academic integrity policies, while the perception of students in developing countries is still limited, especially in exploring how students understand, assess, and rationalize the use of artificial intelligence in daily scientific writing practices. The approach used in this study is quantitative descriptive with a type of cross-sectional survey, with a sample of students from Manado State University, Faculty of Social Sciences and Law. Data collection was carried out using questionnaires, and data analysis included descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, and perception categories). The results of the study show that students' perception of artificial intelligence-based plagiarism is in the medium to high category. Cognitive indicators with medium category results, affective indicators with high category results, and conative indicators with moderate categories. This indicates a new awareness among students about the importance of academic honesty, but at the same time shows unresolved ethical dilemmas when digital efficiencies such as the use of artificial intelligence conflict with the demands of originality.*

**Keywords:** Academic Writing; Artificial Intelligence; Plagiarism; Students' Perception

### To cite this article:

Anastasya, Mulyono, B., & Murdiono, M. (2026). Students' Perception Of Artificial Intelligence-Based Plagiarism In Academic Writing. *JKTP: Jurnal Kajian Teknologi Pendidikan*, 9(1), 114–123. doi: [10.17977/um038v9i12026p114-123](https://doi.org/10.17977/um038v9i12026p114-123)

## INTRODUCTION

In the twenty-first century, digital technology has been increasingly utilized in higher education, particularly by university students. Students make use of the internet to access academic journals, employ reference management software, and interact through social media. Nevertheless, plagiarism remains a serious issue in universities, both in Indonesia and globally. Plagiarism does not only involve copying the work of others, but also includes paraphrasing without proper sources, unauthorized collaboration, and the submission of falsified assignments. Many perceive plagiarism as arising from weak student morality or inadequate institutional supervision (Sozon et al., 2024). In Indonesia, academic pressure, publication demands, and time constraints may further increase this risk. Therefore, the impact of emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI) makes it essential to first understand the actual forms of plagiarism occurring among students.

Students now have increasing access to artificial intelligence-based tools, such as text generation systems, automatic paraphrasing tools, and content creation services. In this study, AI-based plagiarism is defined as the use of generative technologies, such as ChatGPT, GrammarlyGO, and Copilot, to generate, modify, or improve academic texts without adequate attribution or personal reflection, thereby obscuring authorship and the originality of ideas (The & Latifah, 2025). These tools assist in the academic writing process; however, many institutions still conceptualize plagiarism solely as the direct copying of others' work. The use of AI has blurred the boundary between "writing independently" and "writing with tool assistance." Consequently, students' perceptions of what constitutes plagiarism may shift, particularly when universities have not established clear regulations regarding the use of AI in written assignments (Elkhatat, 2023; Elkhatat et al., 2023). In this context, students face not only traditional plagiarism but also a new risk in the form of "AI plagiarism," namely the unauthorized use of AI in academic work. If not addressed wisely, this phenomenon may threaten academic reputation and the integrity of student work.

Many higher education institutions are not yet fully prepared to address the implications of AI use in academic writing. Institutional policies and plagiarism detection systems continue to focus on traditional forms, such as direct copying, and have not adequately anticipated the role of AI in generating or modifying text (Bradley, 2025; TEQSA, 2024). For example, many students consider the use of AI as a "writing assistant" rather than an act of plagiarism. However, this perception may differ from that of lecturers or institutions. As a result, ambiguity arises regarding when the use of artificial intelligence constitutes a violation, when it is permissible, and the extent to which students understand its ethical boundaries. Therefore, studies that address plagiarism solely from a traditional perspective without considering artificial intelligence risk fail to explain the new phenomena currently emerging in academic practice.

Previous studies indicate a shift in the landscape of academic integrity with the integration of artificial intelligence into higher education. Chan (2025) introduced the term "AI-giarism" to describe academic misconduct occurring when students use AI to generate work without proper attribution, while also highlighting students' confusion in distinguishing between ethical and unethical uses of AI. Meanwhile, Baek Clare (2024) examined how perceptions and use of generative technologies such as ChatGPT are influenced by demographic variables, access to technology, and institutional policies, and warned of the potential for academic inequality and declining originality. A more comprehensive approach was offered by Sozon et al. (2024) through a systematic review identifying individual, social, institutional, and technological factors as drivers of academic misconduct, including AI misuse. Collectively, these studies provide a strong conceptual foundation for understanding the dynamics of academic ethics in the era of artificial

intelligence, although their primary focus remains on normative reflection and macro-level policy considerations.

Although international research on AI-based plagiarism has developed rapidly, empirical studies examining student perceptions in developing countries, including Indonesia, remain limited. Existing literature tends to emphasize moral issues, policy design, and academic integrity frameworks, but has not comprehensively explored how students understand, evaluate, and rationalize the use of artificial intelligence in everyday academic writing practices. Differences in academic culture, social norms, and levels of digital literacy may significantly influence perceptions of AI-based plagiarism. This study seeks to address this gap through an empirical approach that examines Indonesian students' perceptions of artificial intelligence use in academic contexts. Conceptually, this research expands the definition of plagiarism by proposing the concept of AI-based plagiarism within a local framework and adopts principles of academic integrity—such as honesty, trust, respect, responsibility, and courage—as analytical foundations for understanding ethical dynamics in the digital era. Based on this background, the study aims to measure and describe the level of students' perceptions of AI-based plagiarism in academic writing, encompassing cognitive, affective, and conative aspects. The research also examines the integration of artificial intelligence in learning and students' interactions with such technology, assessing students' perceptions and ethical behavior in relation to assessment and evaluation aspects.

## METHOD

The study employed a descriptive quantitative approach using a cross-sectional survey design, which is used to measure the extent to which a variable of interest occurs within a specific population. In this study, the level of students' perceptions of artificial intelligence-based plagiarism in academic writing was measured. The cross-sectional survey was conducted by formulating research questions, identifying research variables, determining research subjects, conducting measurements, and analyzing the data (Ayu Sofya et al., 2024). This study solely describes the level of students' perceptions of plagiarism; therefore, the data analysis technique used descriptive statistics, including the mean, standard deviation, and perception categories, with the assistance of SPSS 29.

The population of this study consisted of undergraduate students at Manado State University, particularly from the Faculty of Social Sciences and Law, totaling 1,641 students. The research sample was obtained using probability sampling, with the aim that each student had an equal opportunity to be selected as a respondent, thereby ensuring that the sample was representative and minimizing bias. From this population, 240 respondents were obtained using the Slovin formula with a margin of error ( $e$ ) of 10%, all of whom met the criteria and participated in completing the research questionnaire. The respondents consisted of students from various academic levels, ranging from the first to the eighth semester. The instrument used was a questionnaire employing a Likert scale (1–4) containing both positive and negative statements. For positive statements, the response categories consisted of “Strongly Agree” (score 4), “Agree” (score 3), “Disagree” (score 2), and “Strongly Disagree” (score 1). Before questionnaire distribution, validity and reliability testing was conducted using SPSS 29. The validity test was conducted on 240 respondents. If the calculated  $r$  value ( $r_{\text{count}}$ ) exceeded the  $r_{\text{table}}$  value of 0.127 for  $df = 240 - 2 = 238$  and  $\alpha = 0.05$ , the item or statement was considered valid. This study employed perception indicators based on the tripartite model of attitude proposed by Rosenberg and Hovland (1960), which explains that an individual's perception of an object consists of three main components: cognitive, affective, and conative.

## RESULT

Based on the results of the validity test conducted on the 15 statement items used to measure students' perceptions, all items (P1–P15) were found to be valid. The reliability test showed that the

Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for this study was 0.804, which is greater than 0.6, indicating that the instrument met the criteria for high reliability. Subsequently, the questionnaire data were analyzed using descriptive statistics by calculating the mean, standard deviation, and perception category for each indicator of students' perceptions. To provide a more meaningful interpretation of the mean values, perception category intervals were established based on the 1–4 Likert scale.

**Table 1. Perception Interval**

Indicator	Category	Value Interval	Mean Interval	Description
<b>Cognitive</b>	Very Low	5,00 - 8,74	1,00-1,74	Very Low Perception
	Low	8,75 - 12,49	1,75- 2,49	Low Perception
	Medium	12,50 - 16,24	2,50 – 3,24	Medium Perception
	High	16,25 - 20,00	3,25 – 4,00	High Perception
<b>Affective</b>	Sangat Low	6,00 - 9,49	1,00-1,74	Very Low Perception
	Low	9,50 - 12,99	1,75- 2,49	Low Perception
	Medium	13,00 - 16,49	2,50 – 3,24	Medium Perception
	High	16,50- 20,00	3,25 – 4,00	High Perception
<b>Conative</b>	Sangat Low	5,00 - 8,74	1,00-1,74	Very Low Perception
	low	8,75 - 12,49	1,75- 2,49	Low Perception
	Medium	12,50 - 16,24	2,50 – 3,24	Medium Perception
	High	16,25- 20,00	3,25 – 4,00	High Perception

Based on the interpretation criteria in Table 1, perception refers to the tripartite model of attitude theory, which consists of cognitive, affective, and conative components. The cognitive component is related to an individual's knowledge of the perceived object. The affective component reflects emotional reactions or feelings toward the object. The conative component describes an individual's tendency to act or behavioral intention toward the object. Based on this theory, students' perceptions of artificial intelligence–based plagiarism were measured through three main indicators: cognitive, affective, and conative. Based on these calculations, score interpretation categories were established for each indicator, namely the cognitive indicator with a score range of 5–20 and an interval width of 3.75, the affective indicator with a score range of 6–20 and an interval width of 3.50, and the conative indicator with a score range of 5–20 and an interval width of 3.75.

This study involved 240 undergraduate students from Universitas Negeri Manado, specifically from the Faculty of Social Sciences and Law. The distribution of respondents came from various fields of study, including Pancasila and Civic Education, Law, Public Administration, and History Education. With these characteristics, the data obtained reflect heterogeneous and generally representative student perceptions. Students' perceptions of artificial intelligence–based plagiarism may vary depending on their understanding of academic ethics and the use of artificial intelligence (AI). To obtain a clearer overview, the collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation for each perception indicator. This analysis aimed to measure and describe the level of students' perceptions of plagiarism in academic writing.

The cognitive indicator measures students' attitudes toward academic honesty and trust within the academic context, including awareness of the importance of completing assignments using one's own thinking, maintaining the originality of academic work, and understanding the impact of plagiarism. This indicator consists of five statements (P01–P05).

Based on Table 2, the results of the descriptive statistical analysis show that the average score for each statement ranges from 2.65 to 3.50. The highest average score is found in item P02 (Mean = 3.50; Sdt Deviation = 0.67). Meanwhile, the lowest average score is found in P05 (Mean = 2.65;

Std Deviation = 1.18). The total cognitive indicator score shows an average of 16.01 with a Std Deviation of 2.49.

**Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Cognitive Indicators**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
<b>P01</b>	240	1.00	4.00	3.3333	.70067
<b>P02</b>	240	1.00	4.00	3.5000	.67222
<b>P03</b>	240	1.00	4.00	3.3625	.75839
<b>P04</b>	240	1.00	4.00	3.1583	.80787
<b>P05</b>	240	1.00	4.00	2.6542	1.18973
<b>Total</b>	240	5.00	20.00	16.0083	2.48509
<b>Valid N (listwise)</b>	240				

This second affective indicator measures students' attitudes regarding respect for academic integrity (Respect) and moral courage (Courage) to reject dishonest behavior, including artificial intelligence-based plagiarism. This indicator consists of five statements (P06–P10) that assess students' awareness of personal plagiarism and their courage to reject academic dishonesty, despite social pressure.

**Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Affective Indicators**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
<b>P06</b>	240	1.00	4.00	3.3875	.63034
<b>P07</b>	240	1.00	4.00	3.6458	.61670
<b>P08</b>	240	1.00	4.00	3.4250	.72795
<b>P09</b>	240	1.00	4.00	3.3708	.82329
<b>P10</b>	240	1.00	4.00	2.6833	1.09761
<b>Total</b>	240	6.00	20.00	16.5083	2.25190
<b>Valid N (listwise)</b>	240				

Based on Table 3, the descriptive statistical analysis shows that the mean scores for each statement range from 2.68 to 3.65. The highest mean value is found in item P07 (Mean = 3.65; Std. Deviation = 0.62). Meanwhile, the lowest mean value is observed in item P10 (Mean = 2.68; Std. Deviation = 1.10). Overall, the total score for the affective indicator shows a mean of 16.51 with a standard deviation of 2.25.

The conative indicator measures students' responsibility in using artificial intelligence ethically and avoiding plagiarism. Five statements (P11–P15) assess students' awareness of rejecting the copying of artificial intelligence outputs without proper attribution, consistently citing references, ensuring that the use of artificial intelligence complies with given instructions, using artificial intelligence as a supportive tool, and perceptions related to prioritizing task completion speed over maintaining academic integrity.

**Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Conative Indicators**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
<b>P11</b>	240	1.00	4.00	3.2583	.80787
<b>P12</b>	240	1.00	4.00	3.2750	.77040
<b>P13</b>	240	1.00	4.00	3.3792	.70413
<b>P14</b>	240	1.00	4.00	3.4292	.67469
<b>P15</b>	240	1.00	4.00	2.8625	1.01136
<b>Total</b>	240	5.00	20.00	16.2042	2.62192
<b>Valid N (listwise)</b>	240				

Based on Table 4, descriptive statistical analysis shows that the average score for each statement ranges from 2.86 to 3.43. The highest average score is found in item P14 (Mean = 3.43; Std. Deviation = 0.67). Meanwhile, the lowest average score is found in item P15 (Mean = 2.86; Std. Deviation = 1.01). Overall, the total score of the conative indicator shows an average of 16.20 with a Std. Deviation of 2.62.

## DISCUSSION

Perception is a cognitive and evaluative process through which students interpret values of academic integrity, assess, and assign meaning to objects, events, or phenomena based on their experiences, values, and social environments (Campbell & Waddington, 2024; Sagge, 2024; Stone, 2023). This understanding of perception forms the basis for students to distinguish between academically ethical behavior and conduct that deviates from scholarly ethics, one example of such deviation being plagiarism. Plagiarism, as defined by Sozon et al. (2024), refers to the act of using another person's ideas, words, or work and claiming them as one's own without providing proper attribution. Plagiarism is not merely a technical violation of writing rules but also reflects ethical and cognitive failure in understanding the meaning of originality and academic responsibility (Kumar et al., 2023). Perkins et al. (2020) further highlight that plagiarism often occurs not because of an intention to deceive, but due to low levels of awareness and perception among students regarding the values of academic honesty. Insufficient understanding of citation practices, paraphrasing, and ownership of scholarly ideas weakens commitment to academic integrity.

Based on the results of the descriptive analysis, students' perceptions of the cognitive indicator are categorized as moderate. Positive statements (P01–P04) show mean values ranging from 3.14 to 3.49, indicating that students generally recognize the importance of honesty and originality in academic work. In contrast, the negative statement (P05) has a lower mean value (2.64), suggesting that some students still inadequately assess the impact of plagiarism that goes undetected by lecturers. Relatively small standard deviations for P01–P04 (0.70–0.83) indicate consistent perceptions among students, whereas P05 shows higher variability (1.20), reflecting significant differences in respondents' views. The overall analysis shows that the cognitive indicator has a total mean score of 16.0083. Since this indicator consists of five items, the average score per item is  $16.0083/5 = 3.20$ . Based on the category intervals of the 1–4 Likert scale, a value of 3.20 falls into the moderate category. Overall, the cognitive indicator reflects students' awareness of the importance of academic honesty and trust through originality of work, although a small proportion of students still perceive undetected plagiarism as less harmful.

The cognitive indicator, categorized as moderate (mean = 3.20), encompasses academic honesty and academic trust in relation to originality of work. From Fishman's (2014) perspective on academic integrity, honesty and trust are core components. Honesty represents the essence of all academic activities, not limited to plagiarism or data falsification, but reflecting an intellectual commitment to seeking truth openly and sincerely. Trust, in turn, serves as a social foundation among students and between students and lecturers, fostering collaboration, idea sharing, and intellectual dialogue without suspicion or fear of misuse. The mean value of 3.20 indicates that students' understanding of academic honesty and trust has been established but has not yet been fully internalized as a strong cognitive awareness. In line with these findings, educational approaches are viewed positively because they can foster independence and deepen understanding of academic integrity. Some students who have been involved in or are familiar with integrity violations perceive such processes as helping them reflect more deeply on integrity values and contributing positively to their personal development (Brickhill et al., 2025). Other findings indicate that the use of AI has positive impacts on creativity, quality, and the diversity of students' scholarly outputs (Sinaga et al., 2025).

Findings from Reinhardt et al. (2023) show that the honesty–humility dimension has a significant negative correlation with cheating behavior in higher education. Students with higher levels of honesty and humility tend to exhibit intrinsic learning goal orientations and are less likely to engage in academic misconduct. Students perceive honesty and trust as two main pillars in

building a culture of academic integrity in higher education. Students at Australian universities view honesty not merely as compliance with anti-plagiarism rules, but as a personal value that shapes reputation and trust within the academic community (Campbell & Waddington, 2024). The tendency of the results in this study to fall within the moderate category indicates a gap between conceptual understanding and the application of integrity values in academic practice. Students recognize the importance of honesty and trust, yet have not fully linked these values to moral responsibility for the originality of scholarly work.

Based on descriptive analysis, students' perceptions of the affective indicator are categorized as moderate to high. Positive statements (P06–P09) show mean values ranging from 3.37 to 3.65, indicating that students generally possess positive feelings and emotional commitment toward the importance of academic honesty. They tend to feel discomfort when using artificial intelligence unethically in academic writing. Conversely, the negative statement (P10) has a lower mean value (2.68), indicating that some students have not fully rejected or do not yet have firm emotional resistance to AI-based plagiarism. Standard deviations for items P06–P09 are relatively small (0.63–0.82), indicating consistency in respondents' perceptions of moral values and honesty in writing. However, the higher standard deviation for P10 (1.09) reflects greater variation in students' views regarding permissive attitudes toward AI-assisted plagiarism. Overall, the affective indicator has an average total score of 16.5083, yielding an average item score of  $16.5083/5 = 3.30$ . Based on the Likert scale interval, a value of 3.30 falls into the high category. Overall, the affective indicator suggests that students possess positive emotional attitudes toward respecting academic integrity and show courage in rejecting AI-based plagiarism, although a small proportion still exhibit ambivalence in certain situations.

From Fishman's perspective, academic integrity also encompasses respect and moral courage. Respect serves as a moral foundation ensuring that academic activities are conducted through honesty, collaboration, and appreciation of individual contributions. Moral courage represents the inner strength that transforms integrity values from discourse into concrete action, encompassing personal determination, commitment, and emotional readiness to uphold ethical standards (Fishman, 2014). The high affective indicator scores indicate that students demonstrate emotional engagement with academic integrity, particularly in terms of respect and moral courage. Research by Raman and Ramlogan (2020) shows that the implementation of honor codes and creative pedagogical strategies can foster emotional appreciation of academic integrity values. Strengthening affective values through reflective and participatory learning experiences can deepen students' emotional commitment to academic honesty.

Despite the high affective indicator, high scores do not necessarily guarantee consistent ethical behavior. Chala (2021) found that positive attitudes toward academic integrity do not always translate into consistent ethical actions. Research conducted at universities in Ethiopia revealed that although most students regarded cheating as a serious offense, many still engaged in academic misconduct. This aligns with findings from Hasri et al. (2022), which demonstrated a gap between attitudes and actual behavior, showing that students may judge dishonest behavior as serious while still participating in it. Therefore, positive attitudes alone do not ensure consistent ethical conduct; a gap remains between perception and actual behavior, indicating that strengthening affective values must be accompanied by practical education, supportive policies, and an academic environment conducive to consistently realizing integrity.

Based on descriptive analysis, students' perceptions of the conative indicator are categorized as moderate to high. Positive statements (P11–P14) show mean values ranging from 3.26 to 3.43, indicating that students generally exhibit positive behavioral tendencies to apply honesty and

academic responsibility in writing practices, including when using artificial intelligence. This reflects awareness of acting in accordance with integrity values not only at the levels of knowledge and attitude, but also in concrete actions. Conversely, the negative statement (P15) has a lower mean value (2.86), indicating that a small proportion of students still demonstrate permissive behavioral tendencies toward unethical AI use, such as copying outputs without modification or attribution. Standard deviations for items P11–P14 are relatively small (0.67–0.81), indicating consistent perceptions among respondents regarding honest behavior. However, the higher standard deviation for P15 (1.01) suggests greater variation in students' views regarding ethical boundaries in AI use for academic writing. Overall, the conative indicator has an average total score of 16.2042, yielding an average item score of  $16.2042/5 = 3.24$ . Based on the Likert scale interval, a value of 3.24 falls into the moderate category. Overall, the conative indicator reflects that students tend to possess intentions and behaviors aligned with academic responsibility, although a small proportion still display ambiguity in applying these principles when using artificial intelligence.

Fishman (2014) emphasizes that academic integrity encompasses not only cognitive and affective dimensions but also responsibility, representing the conative dimension of integrity. This dimension measures the extent to which students apply ethical values in practice, including personal accountability, upholding shared standards, modeling ethical behavior, and taking action when encountering violations. Students' attitudes toward integrity do not always strongly correlate with actual behavior, indicating that responsibility remains a challenge (Mol & van den Hoven, 2022). Brickhill et al. (2025) demonstrate that holistic approaches combining mandatory integrity modules, reflective pedagogy, and embedded curricula enhance students' independence in ethical action, strengthening their capacity to uphold standards, serve as role models, and take responsibility for academic behavior.

Students' personal responsibility, rather than institutional policy alone, is a key factor in ethical AI use. Students with strong ethical convictions are more likely to avoid unethical behavior, highlighting that modern academic integrity depends on individual moral awareness and accountability when confronting new technologies (Latifah & Hery, 2025; Lund et al., 2025). Positive attitudes toward tools such as ChatGPT are accompanied by awareness of potential misuse, underscoring the importance of personal responsibility and academic integrity in AI utilization. Individual moral awareness, alongside institutional policies, plays a decisive role in shaping ethical behavior, consistent with theories asserting that academic integrity relies on accountability and ethical management of technological innovation (Fajt & Schiller, 2025; Badiaturochmah et al., 2021). The moderate score of 3.24 indicates that academic integrity, particularly in terms of responsibility, demands personal accountability, enforcement of standards, and concrete ethical actions. Students' moral awareness, beyond mere compliance with policy, becomes a determining factor in ethical behavior, including in the use of artificial intelligence, affirming that modern academic integrity fundamentally depends on personal responsibility.

## CONCLUSION

This study shows that students' perceptions of artificial intelligence–based plagiarism in academic writing fall within the moderate to high category, with the cognitive, affective, and conative dimensions respectively reflecting awareness, emotional attitudes, and behavioral tendencies toward academic integrity. These findings affirm the emergence of new awareness among students regarding the importance of academic honesty, while simultaneously indicating tensions with the principle of academic originality as the foundation of scholarly integrity. Specifically, the results of this study are beneficial for higher education institutions in designing policies and academic ethics literacy programs that are more adaptive to technological developments, including the use of

artificial intelligence. However, this study is limited to the scope of a single university; therefore, the generalization of the findings should be approached with caution. For further development, future studies may expand the sample across institutions, examine demographic variables and academic culture, and assess the effectiveness of institutional policies in regulating the responsible use of artificial intelligence. Thus, this study provides an empirical foundation for strengthening academic integrity in the digital era.

## REFERENCES

- Sofya, A., Novita, N. C., Afgani, M. W., & Isnaini, M. (2024). Metode Survey: Explanatory Survey dan Cross Sectional dalam Penelitian Kuantitatif. *Edu Society: Jurnal Pendidikan, Ilmu Sosial Dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 4(3), 1696-1708. <https://jurnal.permapendis-sumut.org/index.php/edusociety>
- Badiaturochmah, D., Praherdhiono, H., & Sulthoni, S. (2021). Hubungan antara self-efficacy dengan hasil plagiasi karya tulis mahasiswa. *JKTP: Jurnal Kajian Teknologi Pendidikan*, 4(1), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um038v4i12021p013>
- Baek Clare, T. T. dan M. W. (2024). “ChatGPT seems too good to be true”: College students’ use and perceptions of generative AI. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7(April), 100294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100294>
- Bradley, S. (2025). *Moving Beyond Plagiarism and AI Detection: Academic Integrity in 2025-2026*. Packback Fearlessly Corious. <https://packback.co/resources/blog/moving-beyond-plagiarism-and-ai-detection-academic-integrity-in-2025/>
- Bretag, T., Mahmud, S., Wallace, M., Walker, R., James, C., Green, M., East, J., McGowan, U., & Patridge, L. (2011). Core elements of exemplary academic integrity policy in Australian higher education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.21913/ijeai.v7i2.759>
- Brickhill, M., Andrews, G., & Nieuwoudt, J. (2025). Developing student agency towards academic integrity through an educative approach: exploring students’ experiences and perspectives. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 23(3), 951–975. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-024-09567-y>
- Campbell, C., & Waddington, L. (2024). Academic integrity strategies: student insights. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 22(1), 33–50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-024-09510-1>
- Chala, W. D. (2021). Perceived seriousness of academic cheating behaviors among undergraduate students: an Ethiopian experience. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 17(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-00069-z>
- Chan, C. K. Y. (2025). Students’ Perceptions of “AI-giarism”: Investigating changes in understandings of academic misconduct. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30, 8087–8108. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13151-7>
- Elkhatat, A. M. (2023). Evaluating the authenticity of ChatGPT responses: a study on text-matching capabilities. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00137-0>
- Elkhatat, A. M., Elsaïd, K., & Almeer, S. (2023). Evaluating the efficacy of AI content detection tools in differentiating between human and AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00140-5>
- Fajt, B., & Schiller, E. (2025). ChatGPT in academia: university students’ attitudes towards the use of ChatGPT and plagiarism. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 23(3), 1363–1382. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09603-5>
- Fishman, T. (2014). Academic integrity. *In South African Journal of Science* (Vol. 115, Issues 11–12). <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2019/7439>

- Hasri, A., Supar, R., Azman, N. D. N., Sharip, H., & Yamin, L. S. M. (2022, September). Students' attitudes and behavior towards academic dishonesty during online learning. In *Proceedings* (Vol. 82, No. 1, p. 36). MDPI. <https://doi.org/10.3390/proceedings2022082036>
- Kumar, V., Verma, A., & Aggarwal, S. P. (2023). Reviewing academic integrity: assessing the influence of corrective measures on adverse attitudes and plagiaristic behavior. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 21(3), 497–518. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-022-09467-z>
- Latifah, & Hery, Y. T. (2025). Pengembangan Integritas Akademik Mahasiswa Melalui Praktik Belajar Studi Kasus. *JKTP: Jurnal Kajian Teknologi Pendidikan*, 8(1), 35–47. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um038v8i12025p035>
- Lund, B., Mannuru, N. R., Teel, Z. A., Lee, T. H., Ortega, N. J., Simmons, S., & Ward, E. (2025). Student perceptions of AI-Assisted writing and academic integrity: ethical concerns, academic misconduct, and use of generative AI in higher education. *AI in Education*, 1(1), 2. <https://doi.org/10.3390/aieduc1010002>
- Mol, H., & van den Hoven, M. (2022). Is there a relationship between student attitudes and behavior regarding integrity issues? *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 18(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-022-00100-5>
- Perkins, M., Gezgin, U. B., & Roe, J. (2020). Reducing plagiarism through academic misconduct education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 16(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-00052-8>
- Raman, V., & Ramlogan, S. (2020). Academic integrity and the implementation of the honour code in the clinical training of undergraduate dental students. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 16(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-020-00058-2>
- Reinhardt, N., Trnka, L. M., & Reinhard, M. A. (2023). The correlation of honesty-humility and learning goals with academic cheating. *Social Psychology of Education*, 26(1), 211–226. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-022-09742-2>
- Rosenberg, M. J., & Hovland, C. I. (1960). *Attitude Organization and Change: An Analysis of Consistency Among Attitude Components*. CT: Yale University Press.
- Sagge, R. G. (2024). Exploring students' perceptions of academic integrity in the digital classroom through Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). *Indian Journal Of Science And Technology*, 17(46), 4907–4920. <https://doi.org/10.17485/ijst/v17i46.2384>
- Sinaga, A. I., Nasution, A. F., & Albina, M. (2025). The effect of artificial intelligence use on creativity in writing scientific works. *JKTP: Jurnal Kajian Teknologi Pendidikan*, 8(3), 226–234.
- Sozon, M., Mohammad Alkharabsheh, O. H., Fong, P. W., & Chuan, S. B. (2024). Cheating and plagiarism in higher education institutions (HEIs): A literature review. *F1000Research*, 13, 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.147140.2>
- Stone, A. (2023). Student perceptions of academic integrity: a qualitative study of understanding, consequences, and impact. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 21(3), 357–375. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-022-09461-5>
- TEQSA. (2024). *The evolving risk to academic integrity posed by generative artificial intelligence: Options for immediate action*. August, 1–8. <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/guides-resources/resources/corporate-publications/evolving-risk-academic-integrity-posed-generative-artificial-intelligence-options-immediate-action>
- The, H. Y., & Latifah. (2025). Developing students' academic integrity through case study learning practices. *JKTP: Jurnal Kajian Teknologi Pendidikan*, 8(1), 034–045. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um038v8i12025p034>