BAB V
KESIMPULAN

5.1 Kesimpulan

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui hubungan antara penggunaan *generative AI* dengan d*ecision fatigue*, g*eneral self-efficacy*, dan c*ognitive overload* pada mahasiswa di Indonesia. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa *generative AI usage* memiliki hubungan positif yang signifikan dengan ketiga variabel tersebut, sehingga seluruh hipotesis penelitian diterima. Hubungan antara *generative AI usage* dengan *general self-efficacy* tergolong rendah, sedangkan hubungan dengan *decision fatigue* dan *cognitive overload* tergolong sangat rendah. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa penggunaan *generative AI* berkaitan dengan aspek psikologis dan kognitif pada mahasiswa di Indonesia.

5.2 Saran

Berdasarkan hasil penelitian dan keterbatasan yang ditemui selama proses penelitian, penulis memberikan beberapa saran yang diharapkan dapat menjadi pertimbangan bagi penelitian selanjutnya, yaitu sebagai berikut.

1. Penelitian selanjutnya disarankan menggunakan jumlah responden yang lebih besar dengan karakteristik yang lebih beragam, baik dari segi perguruan tinggi, program studi, maupun wilayah, sehingga hasil penelitian dapat memberikan gambaran yang lebih representatif terhadap populasi.
2. Penelitian selanjutnya dapat menambahkan variabel lain yang diduga berhubungan dengan penggunaan *generative AI*, seperti *AI literacy*, kemampuan berpikir kritis, *technology readiness*, performa akademik, atau variabel psikologis lainnya, sehingga dapat memberikan pemahaman yang lebih komprehensif mengenai dampak penggunaan *generative AI*.
3. Penelitian selanjutnya disarankan menggunakan pendekatan *mixed methods* atau menambahkan wawancara kepada responden agar hasil analisis kuantitatif dapat dijelaskan secara lebih mendalam berdasarkan pengalaman pengguna *generative AI*.

4. Penelitian selanjutnya dapat menggunakan desain penelitian *longitudinal* untuk mengamati perubahan hubungan antara penggunaan *generative AI* dengan *decision fatigue, general self-efficacy*, dan *cognitive overload* dalam jangka waktu tertentu.
5. Penelitian selanjutnya juga dapat memperluas objek penelitian, tidak hanya pada mahasiswa, tetapi juga pada kelompok pengguna *generative AI* lainnya, seperti pelajar, dosen, maupun pekerja profesional.

REFERENSI

[1] C. K. Y. Chan and K. K. W. Lee, "The AI generation gap: Are Gen Z students more interested in adopting generative AI such as ChatGPT in teaching and learning than their Gen X and millennial generation teachers?," *Smart Learning Environments*, vol. 10, no. 1, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1186/s40561-023-00269-3.

[2] R. Sahabuddin *et al.*, "Dampak Penggunaan AI dalam Meningkatkan Efisiensi Belajar Mahasiswa: Studi tentang Ketergantungan dan Kemampuan Kritis," vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 421–430, 2025, doi: 10.61722/jrme.v2i3.4530.

[3] T. Kingchang, P. Chatwattana, and P. Wannapiroon, "Artificial Intelligence Chatbot Platform: AI Chatbot Platform for Educational Recommendations in Higher Education," *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 34–41, 2024, doi: 10.18178/ijiet.2024.14.1.2021.

[4] E. Kasneci *et al.*, "ChatGPT for Good? On Opportunities and Challenges of Large Language Models for Education," 2023. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274.

[5] Chegg, "Global Student Survey," 2025.

[6] I. Dergaa *et al.*, "From tools to threats: a reflection on the impact of artificial-intelligence chatbots on cognitive health," *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 15, 2024, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1259845.

[7] D. H. Chang, M. P. C. Lin, S. Hajian, and Q. Q. Wang, "Educational Design Principles of Using AI Chatbot That Supports Self-Regulated Learning in Education: Goal Setting, Feedback, and Personalization," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, vol. 15, no. 17, Sep. 2023, doi: 10.3390/su151712921.

[8] N. Xu, F. Wang, B. Zhou, B. Li, C. Xiao, and M. Chen, "Cognitive Overload: Jailbreaking Large Language Models with Overloaded Logical Thinking," 2024.

[9] Shalu, N. Verma, K. Dev, A. B. Bhardwaj, and K. Kumar, "The Cognitive Cost of AI: How AI Anxiety and Attitudes Influence Decision Fatigue in Daily Technology Use," *Ann. Neurosci.*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 73–84, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.1177/09727531251359872.

[10] S. Zhang, X. Zhao, T. Zhou, and J. H. Kim, "Do you have AI dependency? The roles of academic self-efficacy, academic stress, and performance expectations on problematic AI usage behavior," *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 21, no. 1, May 2024, doi: 10.1186/s41239-024-00467-0.

[11] N. Oikarinen *et al.*, "Low eating self-efficacy is associated with unfavorable eating behavior tendencies among individuals with overweight and obesity," *Sci. Rep.*, vol. 13, no. 1, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1038/s41598-023-34513-0.

[12] A. Luszczynska, U. Scholz, and R. Schwarzer, "The General Self-Efficacy Scale: Multicultural Validation Studies," 2005.

[13] X. Liu and Z. Ye, "The forgotten middle: How moderate self-efficacy amplifies the threat of AI through job insecurity," *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 16, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1734254.

[14] X. Liu, X. Ji, and Y. Zhang, "Trajectories of college students' general self-efficacy, the related predictors, and depression: A piecewise growth mixture modeling approach," *Heliyon*, vol. 9, no. 5, May 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e15750.

[15] A. Bandura, *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1997.

[16] S. M. F. A. Khan and S. Suhluli, “Generative AI and Cognitive Challenges in Research: Balancing Cognitive Load, Fatigue, and Human Resilience,” *Technologies (Basel).*, vol. 13, no. 11, Nov. 2025, doi: 10.3390/technologies13110486.

[17] A. P. Aristawidya and M. R. Ramadhana, “The Effects of Trust and Cognitive Load on Human-Generative AI Communication in Higher Education: Evidence from Indonesian Undergraduate Students,” *INJECT (Interdisciplinary Journal of Communication)*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 119–146, Feb. 2026, doi: 10.18326/inject.v11i1.6235.

[18] L. Labadze, M. Grigolia, and L. Machaidze, “Role of AI chatbots in education: systematic literature review,” Dec. 01, 2023, *Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH*. doi: 10.1186/s41239-023-00426-1.

[19] A. Gregorac, B. Brünner, and M. Ebner, “Chatbots in Education: A Systematic Rapid Literature Review,” 2025, doi: 10.3217/0nqa4-6xh12.

[20] A. Tlili *et al.*, “What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education,” *Smart Learning Environments*, vol. 10, no. 1, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x.

[21] M. Maier, D. Powell, P. Murchie, and J. L. Allan, “Systematic review of the effects of decision fatigue in healthcare professionals on medical decision-making,” 2025, *Routledge*. doi: 10.1080/17437199.2025.2513916.

[22] K. D. Vohs, R. F. Baumeister, B. J. Schmeichel, J. M. Twenge, N. M. Nelson, and D. M. Tice, “Making Choices Impairs Subsequent Self-Control: A Limited-Resource Account of Decision Making, Self-Regulation, and Active Initiative,” *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 94, no. 5, pp. 883–898, May 2008, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.94.5.883.

[23] J. Sweller, “Cognitive Load During Problem Solving: Effects on Learning,” *Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 257–285, Apr. 1988, doi: 10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4.

[24] F. Paas, A. Renkl, and J. Sweller, “Cognitive load theory and instructional design: Recent developments,” in *Educational Psychologist*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc., 2003, pp. 1–4. doi: 10.1207/S15326985EP3801_1.

[25] A. Darejeh, N. Marcus, G. Mohammadi, and J. Sweller, “A critical analysis of cognitive load measurement methods for evaluating the usability of different types of interfaces: guidelines and framework for Human-Computer Interaction,” Feb. 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2402.11820.

[26] J. P. P. Miranda, E. B. Parreño, and J. G. Rivera, “Defining AI Fatigue in Academic Contexts: Dimensions, Indicators, and a Stage-Based Model Using Grounded Theory,” *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 91–107, May 2026, doi: 10.26803/ijlter.25.5.5.

[27] A. Bandura, “Self-efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change,” 1977, doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191.

[28] R. Schwarzer, M. Jerusalem, J. Weinman, and S. Wright, “Generalized *Self-Efficacy* Scale,” 1995, [Online]. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304930542_Generalized_*Self-Efficacy*_Scale

[29] D. Thüs, S. Malone, and R. Brünken, “Exploring *generative AI* in higher education: a RAG system to enhance student engagement with scientific literature,” *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 15, 2024, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1474892.

[30] W. C. Morales-García, L. Z. Sairitupa-Sanchez, S. B. Morales-García, and M. Morales-García, “Adaptation and psychometric properties of a brief version of the general self-efficacy scale for use with artificial intelligence (GSE-6AI) among university students,” *Front. Educ. (Lausanne).*, vol. 9, 2024, doi: 10.3389/feduc.2024.1293437.

[31] G. A. Pignatiello, R. J. Martin, and R. L. Hickman, “Decision fatigue: A conceptual analysis,” Jan. 01, 2020, *SAGE Publications Ltd*. doi: 10.1177/1359105318763510.

[32] M. Gerlich, “AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking,” *Societies*, vol. 15, no. 1, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.3390/soc15010006.

[33] R. L. Hickman, G. A. Pignatiello, and S. Tahir, “Evaluation of the Decisional Fatigue Scale Among Surrogate Decision Makers of the Critically Ill,” *West. J. Nurs. Res.*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 191–208, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.1177/0193945917723828.

[34] R. Schwarzer and M. Jerusalem, “Indonesia Adaptation of the General Self-Efficacy Scale.” Accessed: Jul. 06, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~health/indonese.htm

[35] M. Klepsch, F. Schmitz, and T. Seufert, “Development and validation of two instruments measuring intrinsic, extraneous, and germane cognitive load,” *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 8, no. NOV, Nov. 2017, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01997.

[36] M. A. Bujang, E. D. Omar, D. H. P. Foo, and Y. K. Hon, “Sample size determination for conducting a pilot study to assess reliability of a questionnaire,” Feb. 01, 2024, *Korean Academy of Conservative Dentistry*. doi: 10.5395/rde.2024.49.e3.

[37] S. K. Lwanga and S. Lemeshow, “Sample Size Determination in Health Studies: A Practical Manual,” 1991.

[38] R. F. Baumeister, E. A. Sparks, T. F. Stillman, and K. D. Vohs, “Free will in consumer behavior: Self-control, ego depletion, and choice,” *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 4–13, Jan. 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.jcps.2007.10.002.

LAMPIRAN

1. Hasil Uji *Harman's Single-Factor Test*

Total Variance Explained

Factor	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.178	22.432	22.432	6.608	20.651	20.651
2	4.067	12.709	35.140			
3	2.273	7.103	42.243			
4	1.554	4.857	47.100			
5	1.177	3.678	50.778			
6	.987	3.083	53.861			
7	.950	2.969	56.830			
8	.921	2.879	59.709			
9	.866	2.707	62.416			
10	.830	2.594	65.010			
11	.790	2.467	67.477			
12	.768	2.400	69.877			
13	.727	2.272	72.149			
14	.723	2.259	74.408			
15	.675	2.109	76.518			
16	.645	2.015	78.533			
17	.626	1.957	80.490			
18	.613	1.916	82.406			
19	.583	1.821	84.226			
20	.559	1.746	85.972			
21	.527	1.646	87.619			
22	.480	1.500	89.118			
23	.456	1.426	90.544			
24	.424	1.325	91.869			
25	.413	1.291	93.160			
26	.376	1.176	94.335			
27	.347	1.084	95.419			
28	.335	1.047	96.466			
29	.303	.946	97.412			
30	.284	.886	98.298			
31	.278	.870	99.168			
32	.266	.832	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.