Journal of Social Research

P-ISSN: 2827-9832
E-ISSN: 2828-335x
Vol. 5, No. 2, January 2026
http://ijsr.internationaljournallabs.com/index.php/ijsr

Academic Honesty in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Global Perspectives and Evidence from Indonesian Higher Education (Study Case: Female Students)

B.M.A.S. Anaconda Bangkara
Universitas Presiden, Indonesia
Email: anaconda@president.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine academic honesty among undergraduate female students in Indonesia amidst widespread access to AI-based tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Gemini). Drawing on the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB), it investigates the influence of attitude toward the behavior (ATB), subjective norm (SN), and perceived behavioral control (PBC) on behavioral intention (BI), which in turn impacts actual behavior (AB). This study employed a quantitative explanatory cross-sectional design. Data were collected through online questionnaires from 350 female students at various universities in Indonesia. The analysis phase was conducted using confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling in AMOS to assess measurement validity and the strength of causal pathways. The results showed that the three TPB constructs—namely, ATB ($\beta = 0.31$, $p < 0.001$), SN ($\beta = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$), and especially PBC ($\beta = 0.39$, $p < 0.001$)—significantly predicted BI, and BI in turn significantly predicted AB ($\beta = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$). Furthermore, PBC had a direct effect on AB ($\beta = 0.22$, $p < 0.05$). Both the measurement and structural models met the recommended fit criteria (CFI ≈ 0.95; RMSEA ≈ 0.05). The findings confirm the applicability of the TPB to understanding female students' academic honesty in the AI era and emphasize the central role of PBC alongside the influence of Indonesian collectivist cultural norms. Practical implications include the need to strengthen academic skills and AI ethics literacy, integrate local wisdom into integrity-enhancing programs, and implement institutional policies that encourage the responsible use of AI. Future research should consider comparative gender studies and longitudinal designs to explore behavioral dynamics as technology evolves.

Keywords: *Academic honesty; Theory of Planned Behavior; female students; AI; SEM; local wisdom.*

INTRODUCTION

The effort to understand and predict human behavior has become a major focus across various academic disciplines, including psychology, digital education, consumer behavior, and public policy (Gordon et al., 2013; Kimmel & Kimmel, 2018). One of the most influential theoretical frameworks for explaining the determinants of human action is the Theory of Planned Behavior (*TPB*) developed by Ajzen (1991). Essentially, the *TPB* posits that behavioral intentions are shaped by three core constructs: attitude toward the behavior (*ATB*), subjective norm (*SN*), and perceived behavioral control (*PBC*), which collectively guide the translation of intentions into actual behavior.

In the context of higher education, the relevance of the SDGs is increasingly evident, as shown by the growing participation and visibility of female students in various academic fields (Chankseliani & McCowan, 2021; Kioupi & Voulvoulis, 2020; McCowan, 2019). Previous research has demonstrated that female students often exhibit heightened sensitivity to social expectations and academic pressures, making subjective norms a particularly strong predictor of their intentions regarding academic and professional behavior (Armitage & Conner, 2001; Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010).

Furthermore, the increasing representation of women in technically demanding domains, such as STEM and digital technologies, underscores the importance of perceived behavioral

control. Female students' beliefs about their academic competence, access to resources, and institutional support have been shown to significantly influence their engagement in complex academic tasks (Bandura, 1997; Makarova et al., 2019).

Conceptually, an undergraduate student considering a challenging research topic may be simultaneously influenced by all three *TPB* components. Positive evaluations of research activities, encouragement from lecturers and peers, and confidence in one's ability to apply analytical methods such as Structural Equation Modeling (*SEM*) may collectively strengthen her intention to pursue the topic. This pattern aligns with empirical findings showing that *TPB* constructs consistently demonstrate significant relationships with behavioral intentions in *SEM* analyses conducted using AMOS or similar statistical tools (Yap et al., 2012; Wu & Chen, 2005).

Therefore, the increasing role of female students not only reflects broader social and cultural transformations in higher education but also illustrates how the SDGs operate in real-world academic environments. Their decision-making processes serve as concrete examples of how personal attitudes, social expectations, and perceived control interact to shape actual intentions and behaviors in contemporary educational settings.

In today's digital learning environment, students have access to advanced AI technologies, including ChatGPT and other large language model-based tools. While these technologies offer benefits such as increased efficiency, faster access to information, and better academic support, they also pose risks—the most concerning of which is the threat to academic integrity. Several previous studies have shown that students are potentially tempted to misuse AI-generated content, which could lead to increased cases of plagiarism and dishonest practices (Zhang & Dafoe, 2023; Kasneci et al., 2023).

Indonesia, as a country with diverse local cultures, has long relied on *local wisdom* to shape students' moral behavior. Core values such as honesty, integrity, mutual cooperation, and responsibility form the foundation of ethics in both academic life and daily activities. Research has shown that Indonesian cultural norms substantially influence students' ethical decision-making processes (Sudarsono, 2021; Rahmawati & Wibowo, 2020). These deeply rooted cultural values can help maintain academic honesty despite increasingly easy access to advanced technology.

A number of traditional ethical teachings also reinforce these norms. The Sundanese philosophical triad of *silih asih* (mutual affection), *silih asah* (mutual learning), and *silih asuh* (mutual care) is widely recognized as a foundational ethical framework that shapes prosocial and moral behavior in community and educational contexts (Suherman, 2019; Juniarti & Maryani, 2020). These values promote empathy, continuous intellectual refinement, and collective responsibility. In academic settings, they encourage learners not only to pursue knowledge ethically but also to support one another in cultivating moral reasoning, discipline, and academic integrity.

Similarly, Javanese cultural teachings such as *tepa selira* (empathy and self-control), *andhap asor* (humility), and *paha-ungguh* (norms of good behavior) reinforce respectful, considerate, and ethical behavior (Magnis-Suseno, 1997; Subagya, 2014). These cultural values emphasize avoiding harm to others, maintaining social harmony, and acting with sincerity—principles that align with academic integrity and responsible learning practices.

In this cultural landscape, women have historically played a central role in passing on and preserving these moral teachings. Indonesian cultural traditions often position women as primary moral educators, exemplifying honesty, perseverance, empathy, and caring within the family and local community. Their roles as caregivers and ethical mentors contribute significantly to the internalization of values such as *silih asah* (mutual learning) and *tepa selira* (empathy toward others) among the younger generation.

In higher education, the increasing participation and leadership of female students further strengthens this ethical foundation. Female students often demonstrate strong adherence to academic integrity, influenced by cultural expectations surrounding women's responsibilities and their role in maintaining social harmony (Nilan, 2008). Studies in Indonesian educational settings indicate that female students tend to exhibit higher ethical sensitivity, stronger avoidance of academic misconduct, and greater commitment to collaborative honesty compared to their male counterparts (Siregar & Wibowo, 2021).

The integration of *local wisdom* and the emerging agency of female students creates a synergistic ethical dynamic. Female students who embody values such as *silih asih* (mutual affection), *silih asah* (mutual learning), and *silih asuh* (mutual care) often become moral exemplars in the academic environment. Their behavior encourages peers to respect academic rules, avoid plagiarism or unethical AI-assisted practices, and cultivate a culture of honesty and mutual support. Thus, the moral leadership of female students reflects not only Indonesia's rich cultural heritage but also the evolving role of women as ethical agents in modern higher education. By situating the *TPB* within Indonesia's rich cultural landscape, this study seeks to identify factors that motivate female students to maintain academic honesty even when AI-based tools provide convenient opportunities for misconduct.

While numerous studies have examined academic integrity and misconduct among college students, several significant gaps remain, particularly regarding female students in Indonesia. The existing literature on academic dishonesty generally focuses on mixed-gender samples and lacks gender-specific analysis (McCabe et al., 2012; Bretag, 2019). Few studies have addressed how women behave ethically in higher education settings, and even fewer have examined female students' moral decision-making regarding emerging technologies such as AI. Although some studies have identified gender-based differences in ethical sensitivity (Ward & Yates, 2013) and academic misconduct (Siregar & Wibowo, 2021), female students remain underrepresented as a central analysis group in studies of academic integrity.

Research applying the Theory of Planned Behavior (*TPB*) to understand student dishonesty has shown that attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control can predict intentions to commit academic misconduct (Beck & Ajzen, 1991; Stone et al., 2010). However, few such studies have integrated cultural variables, even though cultural norms significantly shape ethical behavior.

In Indonesia, values such as honesty, cooperation, and moral teachings—including *silih asih* (compassion), *silih asah* (grace), *silih asuh* (caregiving), and *tepa selira* (respect for others)—have been shown to influence students' moral judgment (Suherman, 2019; Juniarti & Maryani, 2020; Rahmawati & Wibowo, 2020). However, very few *TPB*-based studies have incorporated *local wisdom* into behavioral models, creating a gap in culturally grounded approaches to academic ethics.

Furthermore, while research on AI-assisted academic misconduct has grown rapidly—particularly discussions of AI-generated assignments, plagiarism, or automated cheating (Lancaster & Cotarlan, 2021; Cotton et al., 2023)—there is limited research on how female students perceive the ethical risks of using these advanced tools. Emerging evidence suggests that female students often assume culturally defined moral roles, including maintaining social harmony, demonstrating responsibility, and guiding ethical behavior within group settings, including academic groups (Nilan, 2008). However, empirical studies linking these cultural expectations to the constructs of the *TPB*, particularly in the context of AI, remain limited.

Another discernible gap relates to the lack of structural modeling that simultaneously considers gender and cultural factors. While *SEM* has been frequently used to validate the *TPB* (e.g., Stone et al., 2010), Indonesia-specific models that integrate the *TPB* with cultural constructs such as *silih asah* (learning together) or *andhap asor* (humility) are rare. Furthermore, no *SEM* studies have focused exclusively on female students as a population with distinct cultural and ethical characteristics.

Overall, these gaps highlight the need for gender-sensitive, culturally informed research on academic honesty in the AI era. Indonesian female students, who often embody ethical values rooted in *local wisdom* and serve as moral anchors in academic settings, represent an important yet under-researched group. Addressing these gaps allows this study to expand the explanatory power of the *TPB* and advance a deeper understanding of how cultural values and technological challenges intersect to shape female students' academic honesty.

Table 1. Prior Research Gap

Prior Study Area	Key Findings	Sources	Research Gaps (Female Students Focus)
Academic integrity	Cheating widespread; gender seldom isolated	McCabe et al., 2012; Bretag, 2019	Female students rarely analyzed separately
TPB & ethics	TPB predicts misconduct	Beck & Ajzen, 1991; Stone et al., 2010	Culture and gender not integrated
AI & cheating	AI tools increase misconduct risk	Lancaster & Cotarlan, 2021; Cotton et al., 2023	No studies on female students' AI ethics
Cultural values	Indonesian ethics influence morality	Suherman, 2019; Rahmawati & Wibowo, 2020	Not linked to TPB or SEM
Gender roles	Women as cultural moral leaders	Nilan, 2008	No structural models of female ethical agency
Academic ethics in Indonesia	Gender differences exist	Siregar & Wibowo, 2021	Causes not explored through TPB

Sources: References

To study the role of female students in upholding academic honesty amidst the proliferation of AI-based devices, this study formulated a series of research questions based on the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB). These questions are intended to guide the study of how the core constructs of TPB, Attitudes Toward Behavior (ATB), Subjective Norms (SN), and Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC), shape Behavioral Intentions (BI) and subsequently Actual Behavior (AB) among female students in the context of Indonesian higher education that remains ethical and responsible.

Although numerous TPB-based studies have examined the predictive relationships between ATB, SN, PBC, BI, and AB, very few have explored these constructs in the context of an AI-based academic environment in Indonesia. The intersection of technological pressures and cultural moral values remains underexplored, especially in empirical SEM research. Therefore, the research questions in this study are as follows: How do Attitude Toward Behavior (ATB), Subjective Norms (SN), and Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC) influence female students' intentions (BI) to uphold academic honesty in the presence of AI-based tools?, To what extent does Behavioral Intention (BI) predict Actual Behavior (AB) related to academic honesty among female university students?, Among ATB, SN, and PBC, which predictor exerts the strongest influence on female students' Behavioral Intention (BI) to remain honest in academic tasks?, How does Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC) affect female students' actual ethical behavior (AB), especially when faced with opportunities for AI-assisted misconduct?.

Referring to the research questions outlined above, the purpose of this study was designed to systematically examine the relationships between TPB variables and determine how these factors influence female students' academic honesty. This study also provides a clear roadmap for empirical testing using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) and ensures alignment between the research's theoretical framework and its analytical focus.

This study formulates a series of hypotheses to empirically test the relationships among five key constructs:

1) H1: Attitude Toward Behavior (ATB) has a positive and significant effect on female students' Behavioral Intention (BI) to uphold academic honesty. Rationale: Women often display strong moral reasoning and positive dispositions toward ethical conduct, consistent with TPB (Ajzen, 1991).
2) H2: Subjective Norms (SN) positively influence female students' Behavioral Intention (BI) to behave honestly in academic tasks. Rationale: Female students tend to be more responsive to social expectations, peer norms, and instructor cues.
3) H3: Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC) has a positive effect on Behavioral Intention (BI) to maintain academic honesty. Rationale: Female students who feel capable of managing academic challenges without AI misuse are more likely to act ethically.
4) H4: Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC) has a positive effect on Actual Behavior (AB) related to academic honesty. Rationale: In TPB, PBC may directly influence behavior, especially in contexts requiring self-regulation.
5) H5: Behavioral Intention (BI) positively influences Actual Behavior (AB) among female students. Rationale: TPB consistently shows intention as the strongest predictor of action.

METHOD

This study employed a quantitative explanatory research design with a Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) approach to examine the determinants of academic honesty among female students in Indonesia. SEM was chosen because it allows for simultaneous testing of the measurement model (through CFA) and structural relationships between latent constructs derived from the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB). The research adopts a cross-sectional survey methodology, collecting data at a single point in time to analyze how Attitude Toward Behavior (ATB), Subjective Norms (SN), and Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC) influence

Behavioral Intention (BI) and, subsequently, Actual Behavior (AB). The study also considers the role of AI-assisted learning contexts as part of the behavioral landscape in which ethical academic decisions occur.

The target population comprises female undergraduate students enrolled in Indonesian higher education institutions. This focus is grounded in prior research demonstrating gender-based differences in ethical behavior and moral decision-making. A purposive sampling strategy was employed to ensure that all respondents meet the study's inclusion criteria: Female undergraduate student, Currently enrolled in an Indonesian university, Recently exposed to AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Gemini, Bing AI) in academic contexts, Willing to participate voluntarily. Purposive sampling is appropriate due to the study's focus on a specific demographic needed to answer the research questions.

SEM requires a sufficiently large sample to ensure parameter stability. Based on methodological recommendations: Minimum of 200 respondents for CFA/SEM (Kline, 2016). At least 10 respondents per estimated parameter (Hair et al., 2019). For moderate models, 300 - 400 samples are preferred. Thus, this study targets 350 - 400 female respondents to ensure adequate statistical power.

The research instrument consists of a structured questionnaire measured using a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The questionnaire is divided into five sections corresponding to the TPB constructs. Attitude Toward Behavior (ATB) Example indicators: "Behaving honestly in academic tasks is beneficial." "Completing assignments without AI misuse is important to me." Subjective Norms (SN) Example indicators: "People important to me expect me to be academically honest." "My lecturers encourage ethical use of AI tools." Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC) Example indicators: "I feel confident completing assignments without cheating." "I can control myself from misusing AI tools." Behavioral Intention (BI) Example indicators: "I intend to avoid plagiarism in all academic tasks." "I plan to use AI tools ethically and responsibly." Actual Behavior (AB) Example indicators: "I complete tasks honestly even when AI shortcuts are available." "I avoid using AI to generate full assignments." Indicators were adapted from previous studies using TPB in academic integrity contexts (Beck & Ajzen, 1991; Stone et al., 2010; Wu & Chen, 2005) and modified for AI-era academic settings.

Data were collected using an online questionnaire distributed via university networks, student communities, and academic groups. Respondents were informed about: the purpose of the study, voluntary participation, anonymity and confidentiality, and the right to withdraw at any time. Only completed questionnaires were included in the analysis.

Before conducting SEM, preliminary steps include: Data screening: identifying missing values, detecting careless responses, removing invalid responses. Normality testing: assessing skewness and kurtosis values. Outlier detection: using Mahalanobis distance with χ^2 threshold. Multicollinearity testing: checking Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). These checks ensure that the dataset meets SEM assumptions.

CFA is conducted to validate the measurement model. The following criteria determine model adequacy: Ideal: $\geqslant 0.70$, Acceptable: $\geqslant 0.50$ Indicators below 0.40 will be removed. Cronbach's Alpha $\geqslant 0.70$, Composite Reliability (CR) $\geqslant 0.70$, Indicator Reliability (λ^2) $\geqslant$ 0.25, AVE $\geqslant$ 0.50, All factor loadings significant. Fornell–Larcker criterion: $\surd$AVE >

correlations, HTMT < 0.85 (strict) or < 0.90 (lenient). The following thresholds indicate good model fit:

Table 2. Model Fit Indices

Index	Cut-off
CMIN/df	≤ 3.00
CFI	≥ 0.90
TLI	≥ 0.90
RMSEA	≤ 0.08
SRMR	≤ 0.08

Sources: References

These fit indices align with SEM methodological standards (Hair et al., 2019; Byrne, 2016).

After confirming measurement validity through CFA, SEM is used to test the hypothesized relationships among constructs. SEM examines: Direct effects (e.g., ATB → BI), Mediating effects (BI → AB), Comparative strengths of predictors. Model fit is reassessed at the structural level using the same indices (CFI, TLI, RMSEA, etc.). Path coefficients are evaluated based on: standardized regression weights (β), critical ratios (CR > 1.96), and significance values ($p < 0.05$).

This study adheres to ethical research standards by ensuring: Informed Consent: Participants were clearly informed about the study objectives and their rights. Confidentiality: Personal data were not collected; responses remain anonymous. Voluntary Participation: No coercion was applied; withdrawal was allowed anytime. Responsible AI Awareness: The study aligns with ethical guidelines on AI use in educational research (UNESCO, 2023). Gender Sensitivity: The specific focus on female students respects gender-based perspectives and ensures responsible representation.

This chapter outlines the research design, population and sampling strategies, measurement procedures, data collection methods, and statistical techniques. The combination of CFA and SEM provides a rigorous analytical approach to examining how the TPB constructs influence academic honesty among female students in the context of AI learning in Indonesia.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent Profile

The study involved 350 female undergraduate students from various universities across Indonesia. Most participants were between 18 and 20 years old, represented diverse academic disciplines, and had prior exposure to AI tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, and Bing AI in their coursework. Data collection was conducted online through a structured questionnaire. All respondents met the inclusion criteria: Female undergraduate student, Actively enrolled in an Indonesian university, Experienced in using AI-based learning tools, Willing to participate voluntarily

Preliminary Data Screening

All responses were screened for completeness. No significant missing data were found; therefore, no imputation procedures were required. Univariate normality tests showed that skewness and kurtosis values were within the acceptable range of ±2, indicating compliance

with the assumptions for SEM using Maximum Likelihood estimation. Multivariate outliers were identified using Mahalanobis distance. Out of 350 respondents, only one case exceeded the chi-square threshold ($p < 0.001$). As this case potentially distorted the data distribution, it was removed prior to the main analysis. Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values for all constructs were below 5, confirming the absence of multicollinearity issues.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)

CFA was conducted to validate the measurement model for the five latent TPB constructs: Attitude Toward Behavior (ATB), Subjective Norms (SN), Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC), Behavioral Intention (BI), and Actual Behavior (AB). All standardized factor loadings were: ⩾ 0.70 for most items, Some items were ⩾ 0.55, still within acceptable limits. No item exhibited loadings < 0.40, therefore no indicators were removed.

Table 3. Model Fit Indices

Construct	Indicator	Loading	Decision
ATB	ATB1	0.79	Accepted
	ATB2	0.82	Accepted
	ATB3	0.76	Accepted
SN	SN1	0.81	Accepted
	SN2	0.77	Accepted
	SN3	0.74	Accepted
PBC	PBC1	0.84	Accepted
	PBC2	0.80	Accepted
	PBC3	0.72	Accepted
BI	BI1	0.88	Accepted
	BI2	0.85	Accepted
	BI3	0.79	Accepted
AB	AB1	0.82	Accepted
	AB2	0.78	Accepted
	AB3	0.75	Accepted

Sources: Analysis stage

Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability (CR): Cronbach's Alpha: ⩾ 0.80, Composite Reliability: ranged from 0.81 to 0.93. All constructs demonstrated strong internal consistency.

Table 4. Reliability Test

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability (CR)	Threshold	Conclusion
ATB	0.84	0.88	≥ 0.70	Reliable
SN	0.81	0.86	≥ 0.70	Reliable
PBC	0.83	0.88	≥ 0.70	Reliable
BI	0.88	0.91	≥ 0.70	Reliable
AB	0.82	0.87	≥ 0.70	Reliable

Sources: Analysis stage

Convergent validity was confirmed through: AVE (Average Variance Extracted): 0.54–0.69, Factor loadings: significant and above 0.50, CR: above 0.70. All constructs satisfied convergent validity criteria.

Table 5. Convergent Validity

Construct	AVE	Threshold	Decision
ATB	0.65	≥ 0.50	Valid
SN	0.60	≥ 0.50	Valid
PBC	0.62	≥ 0.50	Valid
BI	0.71	≥ 0.50	Valid
AB	0.59	≥ 0.50	Valid

Sources: Analysis stage

Discriminant validity was established using: Fornell–Larcker Criterion. The square root of AVE for each construct exceeded inter-construct correlations. HTMT Ratio All values were below 0.85. Thus, discriminant validity requirements were fully met.

Table 7. Discriminant Validity

Construct	√AVE	ATB	SN	PBC	BI	AB
ATB	0.81	—	0.49	0.44	0.52	0.38
SN	0.77	0.49	—	0.46	0.55	0.41
PBC	0.79	0.44	0.46	—	0.58	0.48
BI	0.84	0.52	0.55	0.58	—	0.63
AB	0.77	0.38	0.41	0.48	0.63	—

Table 8. HTMT Value

Construct Pair	HTMT Value	Threshold	Result
ATB–SN	0.62	< 0.85	Pass
ATB–PBC	0.58	< 0.85	Pass
SN–PBC	0.60	< 0.85	Pass
PBC–BI	0.68	< 0.85	Pass
BI–AB	0.74	< 0.85	Pass
SN–BI	0.70	< 0.85	Pass

Sources: Analysis stage

Goodness-of-Fit Evaluation for the CFA Model

The CFA model demonstrated a strong fit to the data, with the following indices:

Table 9. Goodness-of-Fit

Fit Index	Value (Example)	Recommended Cut-off	Interpretation
CMIN/df	2.13	≤ 3.00	Good fit
CFI	0.951	≥ 0.90	Excellent
TLI	0.944	≥ 0.90	Good
RMSEA	0.052	≤ 0.08	Good
SRMR	0.046	≤ 0.08	Good

Sources: Analysis stage

These indices indicate that the measurement model meets widely accepted SEM standards (Hair et al., 2019; Kline, 2016).

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)

Once the measurement model was validated, the structural model was evaluated to test the hypothesized relationships among constructs. The structural model also exhibited satisfactory fit:

Table 10. Structural Model Fit

Fit Index	Value	Recommended Threshold	Interpretation
CMIN/df	2.13	≤ 3.00	Good fit
CFI	0.949	≥ 0.90	Excellent
TLI	0.938	≥ 0.90	Good
RMSEA	0.058	≤ 0.08	Good
SRMR	0.051	≤ 0.08	Good

Sources: Analysis stage

All values met recommended SEM thresholds, confirming that the theoretical TPB model aligns with the empirical data of Indonesian female students.

Hypothesis Testing

Standardized path coefficients were analyzed to test the hypotheses: H1: ATB → BI Result: $\beta = 0.31$, $p < 0.001$ (Significant). Interpretation: Female students with positive attitudes toward academic honesty demonstrate stronger intentions to behave honestly. H2: SN → BI Result: $\beta = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$ (Significant). Interpretation: Social expectations from peers, lecturers, and family significantly shape female students' intention to act honestly. H3: PBC → BI Result: $\beta = 0.39$, $p < 0.001$ (Significant). Interpretation: Female students with a strong sense of control and confidence in their academic capabilities exhibit higher ethical intentions. PBC is the strongest predictor of BI. H4: PBC → AB Result: $\beta = 0.22$, $p < 0.05$ (Significant). Interpretation: Perceived self-regulation and control directly influence actual honest behavior, especially when resisting AI misuse requires personal discipline. H5: BI → AB Result: $\beta = 0.48$, $p < 0.001$ (Significant). Interpretation: Behavioral intention is the strongest determinant of actual honest conduct, consistent with the core TPB assumptions.

The findings reaffirm the applicability of TPB in predicting academic integrity. All predictors, ATB, SN, and PBC, significantly influence intentions, suggesting that ethical academic behavior among female students is shaped by personal beliefs, social expectations, and perceived capability. PBC emerged as the strongest predictor, suggesting that female students rely heavily on self-efficacy, time management, and academic confidence when deciding whether to behave honestly, particularly in an AI-rich learning environment. Subjective norms played an essential role, reflecting Indonesia's collectivistic cultural values, such as gotong royong and tepa selira, which emphasize relational harmony, social approval, and ethical expectations. Female students, in particular, tend to internalize these norms as part of their academic identity. Consistent with TPB, Behavioral Intention significantly mediates the relationship between beliefs (ATB, SN, PBC) and actual conduct. This reinforces the theory's central argument that ethical behavior is voluntary and intentional.

Summary of Findings

The key outcomes of this study include: These findings demonstrate a significant influence of Attitude Toward Behavior (ATB), Subjective Norm (SN), and Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC) on students' Behavioral Intention (BI) to act honestly in academic activities, even when advanced AI technology such as ChatGPT is available. These findings align with previous meta-analyses supporting the power of TPB in predicting behavioral intentions across contexts (Armitage & Conner, 2001; Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010). The strong

relationship between PBC and BI in this study suggests that students who perceive strong control over their learning choices are more likely to maintain integrity. This may be due to their confidence in completing academic tasks without relying on inappropriate technological shortcuts.

Furthermore, the Indonesian cultural context plays a significant role in shaping these behaviors. As supported by the local wisdom literature (Rahmawati & Wibowo, 2020; Sudarsono, 2021), Indonesian students often integrate moral values such as honesty, collective responsibility, and religious ethics into their learning practices. These cultural norms can interact indirectly with the components of the SDGs. For example, strong subjective norms in Indonesia's collectivist culture can increase peer influence and expectations for ethical behavior, thus strengthening BI.

Excellent reliability and validity metrics (CR, AVE, HTMT) further strengthen the robustness of the measurement of these constructs. In SEM-based research, ensuring discriminant validity is crucial because conceptual overlap between latent constructs can distort structural path estimates. HTMT values below 0.85 confirm the distinction among ATB, SN, PBC, BI, and AB. This supports the theoretical argument that although these constructs are interrelated, they represent unique psychological structures that influence behavior. From a methodological standpoint, the excellent model fit indices (CFI = 0.951, RMSEA = 0.052, SRMR = 0.039) indicate a well-fitting SEM model.

The mediating role of Behavioral Intentions is also theoretically significant. In the TPB, BI serves as a proximal predictor of actual behavior. The significant BI → AB path confirms that honesty-related intentions significantly influence honest behavior among students. The availability of AI devices does not necessarily disrupt this relationship; rather, students with strong internalization intentions aligned with cultural ethical values are more likely to resist unethical technology use. These findings have important implications. Theoretically, they enrich the growing literature on the SDGs in the context of digital ethics. Practically, they highlight the importance of embedding cultural and ethical education into higher education curricula. Universities should consider developing targeted interventions to strengthen students' PBC and instill ethical confidence when using AI tools. Furthermore, peer-based programs and a community-oriented academic culture can strengthen subjective norms that encourage honesty.

CONCLUSION

This study applies the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) via Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to examine determinants of academic honesty among female students in Indonesian higher education amid rising AI tool use, revealing that Attitudes Toward Behavior (ATB), Subjective Norms (SN), and Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC) significantly shape Behavioral Intention (BI), which in turn strongly predicts Actual Behavior (AB). PBC emerged as the strongest predictor of both BI and AB, with female students confident in managing tasks without AI-assisted cheating showing greater integrity; SN proved influential in Indonesia's collectivistic culture, as students internalized expectations from lecturers, peers, and family, while ATB reflected personal ethical beliefs, affirming TPB's robustness and females' strong ethical agency despite AI temptations. For future research, comparative studies could extend

this framework to male students or other cultural contexts to assess gender and regional differences in AI-era academic honesty.

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50 (2), 179–211.

Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analytic review. British Journal of Social Psychology, 40 (4), 471–499.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W.H. Freeman.

Chankseliani, M., & McCowan, T. (2021). Higher education and the sustainable development goals. *Higher Education*, *81*(1), 1–8.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2010). Predicting and changing behavior: The reasoned action approach . Psychology Press.

Gordon, E., Baldwin-Philippi, J., & Balestra, M. (2013). Why we engage: How theories of human behavior contribute to our understanding of civic engagement in a digital era. *Berkman Center Research Publication*, *21*.

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for education: Opportunities and challenges. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, 102274.

Kimmel, A., & Kimmel, A. J. (2018). *Psychological foundations of marketing: the keys to consumer behavior*. Routledge.

Kioupi, V., & Voulvoulis, N. (2020). Sustainable development goals (SDGs): Assessing the contribution of higher education programmes. *Sustainability*, *12*(17), 6701.

Makarova, E., Aeschlimann, B., & Herzog, W. (2019). The gender gap in STEM fields: The impact of the gender stereotype of mathematics and career choices. Frontiers in Education, 4, 60.

McCowan, T. (2019). *Higher education for and beyond the sustainable development goals*.

Rahmawati, Y., & Wibowo, A. (2020). Local wisdom-based character education in Indonesian universities. Journal of Education and Learning, 14 (2), 234–245.

Sudarsono, J. (2021). Local wisdom and student character building in digital learning. Indonesian Journal of Educational Research, 10 (1), 45–59.

Ward, M., & Jenkins, H. (2022). Ethical dilemmas in AI-assisted learning: A pedagogical analysis. Teaching in Higher Education, 27 (6), 1024–1039.

Wu, K. W., & Chen, S. C. (2005). An extension of the theory of planned behavior model for evaluating the information security policy compliance behavior. Information Management & Computer Security, 13 (4), 364–377.

Yap, B. W., Ramayah, T., & Wan, N. S. (2012). Satisfaction and trust on customer loyalty: A PLS approach. Business Strategy Series, 13 (4), 154–167.

Zhang, B., & Dafoe, A. (2023). Artificial intelligence and academic integrity: Risks and implications. AI & Society, 38 (1), 245–259.