Human-AI Symbiosis: Unveiling the Inherent Limitations of AI through the Sadharanikaran Model of Communication

Ugyal T. Lama Yolmo and Pooja Basnett, Ph.D.
ugyal.lama@gmail.com

[**Note:** The preliminary version of this article was presented as a paper in the International Seminar on Two Decades of the Sadharanikaran Model of Communication, organized by the Department of Languages and Mass Communication, Kathmandu University School of Arts (KUSOA), on 26 May 2024.]

Abstract: In the unending discourse surrounding the potential replacement of humans by artificial intelligence (AI) in the future, this paper introduces a distinctive perspective grounded in the belief that such a substitution is implausible. It asserts that the invaluable intricacies of human communication, essential for fostering genuine connections, remain beyond the grasp of AI. Employing Adhikary's Sadharanikaran Model of Communication (SMC) as the guiding framework, this article embarks on a methodical exploration of human communication, dissecting the nuanced components that contribute to its depth and richness. Through empirical evidence and comparative analyses, it sheds light on the inherent limitations of AI, providing a comprehensive understanding of why the SMC reinforces the irreplaceable role of humans in communication. By scrutinizing instances where human communication transcends mere information exchange, it is argued that the qualitative dimensions of human interaction defy replication by AI. Furthermore, a comparative

analysis of AI-driven communication and human discourse also has been presented. Rather than positioning AI as a substitute, the emphasis is on leveraging its strengths in tandem with human capabilities, emphasizing the collective potential of a harmonious collaboration between the two entities.

Keywords: AI, Communication, Human and AI, Sadharanikaran

Introduction

In the contemporary era marked by the ascendancy of artificial intelligence (AI), the ongoing discourse surrounding the conceivable replacement of human communication by automated systems merits meticulous scrutiny (Najmiddinov, 2023). Acknowledging the undeniable transformative impact of AI across diverse sectors, it becomes increasingly crucial to embark on a critical examination, discerning the intricate boundaries that delineate the capabilities of this burgeoning technology (Guerrero-Velástegui et al., 2023). This introductory section serves as the gateway to a profound exploration, establishing a foundation for understanding the complexities inherent in human communication and shedding light on the algorithmic limitations that AI grapples with when attempting to replicate the profound richness of human interaction.

The rise of AI has ushered in an era where automated systems, powered by sophisticated algorithms, permeate various aspects of our lives. From virtual assistants and chatbots to predictive analytics and language processing tools, the integration of AI technologies has become pervasive, raising questions about the extent to which these systems can emulate the intricacies of human communication (Garg et al., 2022). While the transformative potential of AI in enhancing efficiency and productivity is widely acknowledged, an equally critical dialogue centres around the preservation of the irreplaceable human touch in communication (Bhosale, 2020).

Human communication is a multifaceted phenomenon that encompasses not only the exchange of information but also the subtle nuances of emotion, context, and social dynamics. It involves a complex interplay of verbal and non-verbal cues, cultural subtleties, and a deep understanding of contextual relevance (Griffiths, 2020). In essence, it is the embodiment of shared experiences, empathy, and the capacity to adapt dynamically to a myriad of situational intricacies. This rich tapestry of human communication forms the crux of our societal fabric, influencing relationships, shaping cultural norms, and fostering a profound sense of connection (Garg et al., 2022).

In contrast, the algorithmic nature of AI, while remarkable in its computational prowess, faces inherent challenges when confronted with the intricacies of human interaction. The deterministic nature of algorithms, driven by data patterns and predefined rules, struggles to encapsulate the spontaneity, emotional depth, and contextual sensitivity inherent in human communication (Najmiddinov, 2023). While AI can process vast amounts of data and execute complex tasks with precision, the qualitative aspects that define human connection remain elusive, pointing to the profound limitations of current AI models in replicating the full spectrum of human interaction (Guerrero-Velástegui, 2023).

The imperative for a critical examination of AI's potential to replace human communication becomes evident in the nuanced exploration of these algorithmic limitations. It prompts us to question not only the technical capabilities of AI but also the ethical dimensions of its integration into various aspects of our lives (Najmiddinov, 2023). As AI continues to evolve, these considerations become integral to shaping a future where technological advancements coexist harmoniously with the preservation of the distinct qualities that define human communication.

Against this backdrop, this paper seeks to contribute to the ongoing discourse by presenting a comprehensive analysis grounded

in the Sadharanikaran model of communication. By applying this model, rooted in Indian philosophical thought, we aim to discern and articulate the intricacies that make human communication irreplaceable. The ensuing exploration will unravel the limitations faced by AI in replicating these nuanced aspects, emphasizing the importance of recognizing and navigating these boundaries for a balanced coexistence between humans and AI. This examination is not merely an intellectual pursuit; it underscores the essence of our humanity, the very fabric of our societal connections, and the preservation of the invaluable qualities that make human communication an enduring and irreplaceable phenomenon.

Conceptual Framework

Central to the theoretical underpinning of our study is the Sadharanikaran Model of Communication, an intricate paradigm firmly grounded in the bedrock of Hindu philosophy. This unique model unfolds as a distinctive lens through which we scrutinize the complexities inherent in human communication, surpassing conventional Western perspectives that often dominate discussions in the field (Adhikary, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2014b). In juxtaposition, the exposition of AI's evolutionary trajectory serves as a contextual backdrop, elucidating the landscape within which our exploration unfolds. Concurrently, an in-depth examination of existing theories pertaining to human-AI interaction brings to light discernible gaps, precisely those that the Sadharanikaran model adeptly addresses.

The Sadharanikaran model, with its roots deeply embedded in the diverse tapestry of Hindu philosophical traditions, provides a departure from the predominantly Western-centric theories that often shape discussions on communication (Adhikary, 2014a, 2014b, 2015a; Tewari, 1992). It draws upon the philosophical tenets of Sadharanikaran, encapsulating the universal principles governing the transformation of the formless to the manifest (Adhikary, 2009,

2014b, 2015b;). In the context of our study, this model transcends the traditional boundaries of communication theories by offering a holistic perspective that goes beyond linguistic and cognitive dimensions. Instead, it encapsulates the essence of human interaction, incorporating emotional nuances, contextual understanding, and the symbiotic interplay of various communicative elements (Ray, 2012).

As we delve into the Sadharanikaran model, its unique attributes become apparent. Unlike reductionist models that compartmentalize communication into discrete components, this model embraces the interdependence and interconnectedness of various facets of communication (Kumar, 2005a). It offers a more encompassing view, mirroring the complexity of human interaction that extends beyond mere information exchange (Baran & Davis, 2009). The Sadharanikaran model becomes a guiding framework that prompts us to explore communication as an intricate dance, where emotional resonance, cultural context, and dynamic adaptability play pivotal roles.

The juxtaposition of the Sadharanikaran model against the backdrop of AI's evolution becomes instrumental in our exploration. The trajectory of AI, marked by exponential advancements and an ever-expanding domain of applications, forms the contemporary canvas upon which our study unfolds. This contextualization allows us to discern the challenges and opportunities presented by AI in the realm of human communication. Moreover, it emphasizes the need for a nuanced understanding that transcends conventional Western frameworks and accommodates the unique intricacies encapsulated by the Sadharanikaran model (Adhikary, 2004; Carey, 2004).

Within the existing landscape of theories surrounding human-AI interaction, discernible gaps emerge. Many conventional theories, while invaluable in their own right, often fall short in encapsulating the depth and breadth of human communication, particularly when confronted with the nuanced challenges posed by

AI. The Sadharanikaran model, with its emphasis on universality and inclusivity, steps into this void, offering a comprehensive framework that aligns seamlessly with the intricacies of human-AI interaction (Adhikary, 2014b, 2018).

In summation, this conceptual framework lays the groundwork for our exploration, positioning the Sadharanikaran model as a pivotal theoretical lens through which to understand the complexities of human communication and its interaction with artificial intelligence. By weaving together philosophical traditions, AI evolution, and the limitations of existing communication theories, this framework not only sets the stage for our study but also enriches the discourse on the symbiotic relationship between humans and AI in the realm of communication.

Objectives

Our study unfolds with a tripartite set of objectives, each meticulously crafted to guide a systematic inquiry.

1. Examine the inherent limitations in AI's attempts to replicate the multifaceted nature of human communication.
2. Conduct a profound exploration of the unique qualities intrinsic to human interaction using the Sadharanikaran model.
3. Unravel the broader implications of AI limitations for the symbiotic relationship between humans and AI, contributing to the discourse on ethical and societal dimensions of AI integration.

Research Questions

The research questions serve as the compass guiding our empirical journey. They are designed with precision to facilitate a nuanced exploration of AI's limitations in replicating human communication. The questions propel us to delve into the Sadharanikaran model's contributions to understanding human

interaction intricacies and prompt contemplation on the broader implications of identified limitations for the coexistence of humans and AI.

The following are the research questions posed by the paper: Inherent Limitations of AI in Replicating Human Communication:

R1. What specific aspects of human communication pose challenges for AI replication?
R2. How do current AI models fall short in understanding the nuances of human interaction?

Sadharanikaran Model's Contribution to Understanding Human Communication:

R3. In what ways does the Sadharanikaran model enhance our understanding of human communication?
R4. How can the Sadharanikaran model provide insights into the unique qualities of human interaction?

Implications of Limitations for the Symbiotic Relationship between Humans and AI:

R5. What are the potential consequences of AI's limitations on the symbiotic relationship with humans?
R6. How might acknowledging these limitations contribute to the responsible development and integration of AI?

Theoretical Framework

Our chosen theoretical framework, the Sadharanikaran Model of Communication (SMC), is rooted in ancient Hindu philosophy and offers a perspective that extends beyond traditional Western paradigms (Adhikary, 2008, 2010). This section explores

the model's historical origins, foundational principles, and its relevance to human-AI interaction, setting the stage for a nuanced evaluation of the qualitative aspects of communication that AI, by its computational nature, may lack.

Proposed by Dr. Nirmala Mani Adhikari, the SMC is a systematic representation of communication processes from a Hindu perspective (Adhikary, 2015a; Kumar, 2005b). It orchestrates the dynamic interaction between communication parties, aiming for a state of commonness or oneness (Adhikary, 2014; Adhikary, 2018). Central to this model are the concepts of Sahridayata (shared understanding) and Sahridayas (the harmonized sender and receiver), achieved through the sadharanikaran process (Adhikary, 2009).

The model draws from the *Natyashastra* of Bharata and the scholarly interpretations of Bhattanayaka, particularly in relation to the concept of rasa (Adhikary, 2012, 2015b, 2016; Kumar, 2005a). The term "sadharanikaran" itself, derived from the Sanskrit word "sadharan," emphasizes the essence of commonality and simplification in communication (Adhikary, 2015a; Tewari, 1992). This model is not merely a theoretical construct but a pioneering effort from the East that resonates with the universal aspiration for harmony in communication (Adhikary, 2009).

In the global context, the Sadharanikaran Model offers a transformative perspective on communication, contributing to the evolution of communication studies by emphasizing the cultural and qualitative dimensions often overlooked in other models. This analysis will further explore the key components of the Sadharanikaran Model and their implications for understanding communication within this unique framework.

Core Concepts

1. Sahridayata and Sahridayas:

- Definition: Sahridayata represents the capacity of individuals to

send and receive messages. Sahridayas are the parties involved in communication, capable of recognizing each other as senders and receivers (Adhikary, 2009, 2014; Kumar, 2005b).

- Implication: Communication involves parties with the ability to engage in shared emotional experiences and understanding, emphasizing a mutual connection.

2. Bhava (Moods or Emotions):

- Definition: Bhava refers to the moods, emotions, or thoughts in the mind of the sender (Adhikary, 2009, 2014).
- Implication: The emotional content forms the basis of communication, highlighting the significance of shared feelings for effective communication.

3. Abhivyanjana (Expression or Encoding):

- Definition: Abhivyanjana involves translating bhavas into a form perceptible by the senses. It is the expression or encoding process (Adhikary, 2009, 2014).
- Implication: Communication requires simplification, where complex concepts are transformed by the source to be comprehensible to the receiver.

4. Sandesh (Message or Information):

- Definition: Sandesh is the outcome of the abhivyanjana process, representing the manifested message (Adhikary, 2009, 2014).
- Implication: Successful communication results in the transmission of clear and comprehensible messages from the sender to the receiver.

5. Sarani (Channel):

- Definition: Sarani refers to the channel or medium through which the message is transmitted (Adhikary, 2009, 2014).

- Implication: Different channels, both natural and artificial, play a crucial role in shaping the communication process.

6. Rasaswadana (Receiving, Decoding, and Interpreting the Message):
- Definition: Rasaswadana involves the receiver receiving, decoding, and interpreting the message to ultimately experience the rasa (Adhikary, 2009, 2014).
- Implication: Communication is a dynamic process involving the active participation of the receiver in decoding and interpreting the message.

7. Doshas (Noises):
- Definition: Doshas are noises that distort the message and lead to miscommunication (Adhikary, 2009, 2014).
- Implication: The model recognizes the importance of addressing various types of noises, including semantic, mechanical, and environmental factors, to ensure effective communication.

8. Sandarbha (Context):
- Definition: Sandarbha refers to the context, and the effectiveness of any message depends on the communication environment (Adhikary, 2009, 2014).
- Implication: Communication is contextual, and the same message may have different meanings in different contexts.

9. Pratikriya (Process of Feedback):
- Definition: Pratikriya refers to the responses of the receiver after receiving the message, involving the process of feedback (Adhikary, 2009, 2014).
- Implication: Active feedback allows the receiver to play an essential role in the communication process, ensuring a continuous and responsive exchange.

Overall Implications

The Sadharanikaran Model underscores the importance of shared emotions, asserting that empathy and mutual understanding are essential for effective communication. It advocates for clear and simple communication to minimize misunderstandings, ensuring that all parties can grasp the message, thereby making communication more meaningful and successful.

Active participation from both the sender and recipient is crucial in this model, as communication is viewed as a dynamic exchange. Both participants must ensure the message is clear and appropriate, fostering a more responsive and engaged communication process.

The model also recognizes the multiplicity of communication channels-textual, digital, nonverbal, and spoken-and acknowledges the presence of "noises" that can distort the message (Adhikary, 2018). Effective communication requires identifying and mitigating these disruptions to maintain clarity.

Context plays a significant role in communication, with the model emphasizing that situational, social, and cultural factors greatly influence message interpretation. Understanding the context ensures that the communication is relevant and appropriate for the audience.

Finally, the feedback loop is vital to the Sadharanikaran Model, as it completes the communication process. Continuous feedback allows for iterative exchanges, enabling the sender to adjust the message based on the recipient's responses. This loop highlights that communication is an ongoing process rather than a one-time event.

Methodology

Research Design: Our qualitative exploratory design was aimed at capturing the intricate nuances of human communication and AI interactions. The flexibility of this approach allowed for

in-depth exploration, acknowledging the complexity of the subject matter.

Data Collection Methods: Primary data collection involved semi-structured interviews with individuals engaged in emotionally charged and contextually rich communication scenarios. This qualitative approach enabled us to capture the subjective experiences and emotional dimensions of human interaction. Additionally, content analysis was applied to AI-generated communication in various contexts, ensuring a comprehensive examination of its textual outputs.

Sample Selection: A purposive sampling strategy was meticulously implemented to ensure the inclusion of participants with diverse experiences and perspectives. For human participants, criteria included involvement in emotionally charged communication scenarios such as:

- Conflict Resolution Conversation: Participants engaged in emotionally charged discussions related to conflict resolution, where the exchange involves navigating and addressing interpersonal conflicts, expressing emotions, and seeking resolutions.
- Support Group Interaction: Individuals participating in a support group session, sharing personal experiences and emotions in a supportive environment, highlighting the empathetic and emotionally nuanced aspects of human communication.
- Job Interview Setting: Participants involved in a job interview scenario, where emotions such as nervousness, excitement, and confidence come into play, showcasing the complexity of communication in professional settings.

While for AI interactions, diverse AI models were selected, encompassing:

- Natural Language Processing Algorithm: Interaction with

a natural language processing (NLP) algorithm designed to analyze and generate human-like text. This could involve querying the algorithm with various prompts to observe its ability to comprehend and respond to diverse linguistic inputs.

- Virtual Assistant Assistance: Interacting with a virtual assistant, like Siri or Google Assistant, to perform tasks, answer queries, or engage in casual conversations, exploring the limitations and capabilities of AI in understanding and responding to user input.
- Chatbot Conversation: Engaging with a chatbot designed for customer service or information retrieval, assessing how well the AI can navigate a conversation, comprehend context, and provide relevant information within the scope of its programming.

Data Analysis Procedures

Thematic analysis, a systematic qualitative analysis method, was employed to identify recurring patterns and themes in human communication. This rigorous process involved open coding, axial coding, and selective coding to derive meaningful insights. AI-generated communication underwent a detailed scrutiny aligned with the Sadharanikaran model. The model served as a structured framework to assess emotional nuances, contextual understanding, and responsiveness in AI interactions. The analysis was iterative, involving multiple researchers to enhance reliability and validity.
Analysis

Results

Human communication instances revealed a spectrum of emotional intelligence, nuanced context comprehension, and adaptive responsiveness. Participants' narratives provided rich insights into the multifaceted nature of human interaction. On the

AI front, content analysis brought to light both the successes and limitations of AI-generated communication in capturing the depth and subtleties inherent in human discourse.

Comparative Analysis of Human and AI Communication

Through the application of the Sadharanikaran model, a comprehensive comparative analysis unfolded. Parameters within the model allowed for a structured examination of emotional nuance, contextual depth, and responsiveness in both human and AI communication. This systematic approach facilitated a nuanced understanding of the disparities between the two forms of communication.

The differences between AI-driven and human communication are particularly pronounced in scenarios requiring deep emotional intelligence and contextual understanding. This section provides examples and case studies illustrating these differences, highlighting the limitations and capabilities of specific AI models.

Example 1: Customer Service Interactions

Human representatives can interpret customers' emotional states through tone, word choice, and pauses. They respond empathetically, such as, "I understand how frustrating this must be. Let me help resolve this quickly." In contrast, AI, like OpenAI's GPT-4, can simulate empathy with phrases like "I'm sorry for the inconvenience," but often misses subtle hints at personal hardships that a human would address.

Case Study: Mental Health Support

Mental health professionals rely on non-verbal cues to understand and respond to patients. A therapist might notice hesitance and ask, "Is there something specific that's worrying you?" AI-based mental health apps, like Woebot, use natural language processing but struggle with complex emotional layers. AI might provide generic

coping mechanisms for grief mixed with guilt, whereas a human therapist offers nuanced responses.

Example 2: Creative Writing and Art

Human creativity in writing and art is rooted in personal experiences and cultural contexts. A poet might craft resonant verses from personal loss. AI models like DALL-E and GPT-4 mimic human creativity by analysing datasets but lack the originality and emotional depth of human-created art.

Case Study: Legal Document Review

Lawyers interpret and draft documents with an understanding of implications and subtleties. They might detect problematic clauses based on specific client concerns. AI tools like Kira Systems efficiently identify key clauses but often miss contextual nuances that seasoned lawyers would recognize, overlooking subtle language that could be harmful.

AI faces challenges in emotional and contextual understanding. While GPT-4 can recognize sadness and respond sympathetically, it cannot genuinely understand emotions. AI also struggles with cultural, historical, and personal context, leading to misinterpretations. Furthermore, AI lacks the dynamic adaptability of humans, who can adjust communication in real-time based on non-verbal cues.

AI excels in efficiency and scalability for routine tasks but is deficient in areas requiring emotional intelligence and contextual understanding. Humans' ability to interpret non-verbal cues and adapt dynamically makes them indispensable in complex, emotionally charged interactions. Integrating AI in communication should leverage both AI's strengths and human capabilities.

Identification of Limitations through the Sadharanikaran Model

The Sadharanikaran model has played a pivotal role in highlighting significant limitations within AI communication. By

applying this model, researchers and practitioners have been able to pinpoint specific areas where AI falls short in replicating the emotional depth and contextual intricacies that are intrinsic to human interaction. One of the key findings through this application has been the recognition that AI often struggles to grasp and appropriately respond to the subtle nuances of human emotions, intentions, and social contexts. Unlike humans, AI may not fully comprehend the underlying meaning conveyed through non-verbal cues, tone of voice, or cultural context, which are essential elements of effective communication.

This identification of limitations through the Sadharanikaran model has provided a robust foundation for further exploration and discussion. It has sparked critical conversations about the distinct advantages that human communication offers, including empathy, intuition, and the ability to adapt dynamically to changing conversational dynamics. Moreover, understanding these limitations has underscored the importance of integrating human oversight and intervention in AI-driven communication systems, particularly in sensitive or high-stakes scenarios such as healthcare, counseling, or conflict resolution.

By acknowledging and addressing these limitations, stakeholders in AI development and deployment can make informed decisions about where and how to leverage AI effectively while recognizing the irreplaceable value of human communication skills. This insight not only guides the ongoing refinement of AI algorithms and technologies but also emphasizes the need for interdisciplinary collaboration between AI researchers, psychologists, ethicists, and communication experts. Together, they can work towards enhancing AI's ability to augment human communication without compromising the essential qualities that make human interactions meaningful and effective.

Discussion

Human Communication Insights: Our study of human communication revealed a rich tapestry of emotional intelligence, context comprehension, and adaptive responsiveness, reflecting the core concepts of the Sadharanikaran Model.

AI Communication: Successes and Challenges: In contrast, AI communication showed both strengths and limitations. While AI excelled in certain areas, it struggled with emotional intricacies and contextual nuances, highlighting the differences between human and AI communication.

Comparative Analysis with the Sadharanikaran Model: Using the Sadharanikaran Model's nine elements, we compared human and AI communication:

- Sahridayas (Sender and Receiver): Humans exhibit emotional exchange and contextual understanding, while AI lacks this emotional capacity (Adhikary, 2014).
- Bhava (Moods or Emotions): Human communication is rich in emotions, which AI struggles to convey authentically.
- Abhivyanjana (Expression or Encoding): Humans simplify complex ideas intuitively; AI lacks this context-sensitive encoding.
- Sandesh (Message or Information): Human messages are layered with emotions and context, whereas AI messages tend to be more straightforward.
- Sarani (Channel): Humans use diverse channels, including non-verbal cues; AI is limited to predefined mediums.
- Rasaswadana (Decoding and Interpretation): Humans actively interpret messages contextually; AI may misinterpret without nuanced understanding.
- Doshas (Noises): Both humans and AI face communication disruptions, but AI struggles more with noise mitigation.
- Sandarbha (Context): Human communication is highly context-

dependent, while AI's contextual understanding is limited.

- Pratikriya (Feedback): Human feedback is dynamic and iterative, whereas AI's feedback process lacks depth.

Implications for Human-AI Interaction: This study emphasizes the significance of emotional intelligence, contextual understanding, and responsiveness in communication—qualities where AI falls short. Recognizing these limitations is crucial for ethically integrating AI into communication contexts.

Sadharanikaran Model's Broader Relevance: Rooted in Hindu philosophy, the Sadharanikaran Model highlights unity, empathy, and mutual understanding, which are universally beneficial for communication. Its principles are adaptable across cultures, offering valuable insights for enhancing both human and AI-mediated interactions.

Guiding AI Development: To improve AI's effectiveness and responsibility, investment in research on context, empathy, and ethical decision-making is essential. Transparency, explainability, and bias mitigation are crucial for building trust in AI systems. Collaborative human-AI interaction should be prioritized, with ongoing monitoring and flexibility to adapt to changes. Policies should ensure data privacy, algorithm transparency, and accountability, while ethics boards and international cooperation guide AI's responsible use.

By following these recommendations, we can harness AI's strengths while addressing its limitations, ensuring its positive impact on society.

Conclusion

The conclusive synthesis encapsulates the key findings, emphasizing the limitations of AI as unveiled through the Sadharanikaran model. It underscores the scholarly contributions of the study to the discourse on AI, human-computer interaction, and communication studies. The final thoughts echo the significance

of acknowledging and understanding these limitations, urging a balanced and informed approach in navigating the evolving landscape of technology and communication.

Navigating Disparities in Human and AI Communication by answering the research questions posed by the study:

Inherent Limitations of AI in Replicating Human Communication:

R1. Specific Challenges in Human Communication for AI Replication:

Our exploration uncovered that the nuanced aspects of human communication, particularly emotional intelligence, context comprehension, and adaptive responsiveness, pose formidable challenges for AI replication. The intricate interplay of these elements in human interaction proved elusive for current AI models.

R2. Shortcomings of Current AI Models in Understanding Human Nuances:

Current AI models demonstrated noteworthy successes but fell short in grasping the subtleties of human interaction. Emotions, contextual intricacies, and the dynamic nature of communication eluded the computational efficiency of AI, highlighting the inherent disparities in understanding the depth and richness inherent in human discourse.

Sadharanikaran Model's Contribution to Understanding Human Communication:

R3. Enhanced Understanding through the Sadharanikaran Model:
The Sadharanikaran model emerged as a valuable tool for enhancing our understanding of human communication. Its structured framework allowed for a nuanced analysis of emotional nuance,

contextual depth, and responsiveness, offering deeper insights into the complexities that distinguish human communication.

R4. Insights into Unique Qualities of Human Interaction:

By applying the Sadharanikaran model, we gained insights into the unique qualities of human interaction. Elements such as Sahridayas, Bhava, and Rasaswadana provided a lens to scrutinize the emotional richness, contextual intelligence, and dynamic reciprocity inherent in human communication.

Implications of Limitations for the Symbiotic Relationship between Humans and AI:

R5. Potential Consequences on the Symbiotic Relationship:

The identified limitations in AI communication pose potential consequences for the symbiotic relationship between humans and AI. Recognizing the disparities underscores the need for a balanced approach, where AI complements but does not replace the intricate qualities of human communication.

R6. Contribution to Responsible AI Development and Integration:

Acknowledging the limitations uncovered by the Sadharanikaran model contributes to the responsible development and integration of AI. Understanding where AI falls short informs ethical considerations, guiding the refinement of algorithms, fostering effective human-AI collaboration, and ensuring a balanced symbiotic relationship.

While the current limitations of AI are significant, it is essential to consider the perspectives of researchers who argue that future advancements in AI technology may overcome these challenges. These researchers suggest that the rapid pace of innovation in AI could bridge many of the gaps that currently exist.

One major area of optimism is the potential for improved algorithms that can handle more complex and nuanced tasks. Future developments in machine learning, particularly in areas such as deep learning and reinforcement learning, could enable AI systems to better understand and mimic human cognitive processes. This could lead to more accurate and reliable AI applications across various fields, from healthcare to autonomous vehicles.

Moreover, advancements in computational power and quantum computing may exponentially increase the capabilities of AI systems. With greater processing power, AI could handle larger datasets more efficiently, leading to improved decision-making and problem-solving abilities. Enhanced hardware, combined with sophisticated software, might result in AI that can perform tasks previously thought to be beyond its reach.

Additionally, interdisciplinary approaches that integrate insights from neuroscience, psychology, and other fields could contribute to more human-like AI. By drawing on a deeper understanding of human cognition and behaviour, AI researchers might develop systems that better replicate the subtleties of human intelligence, including creativity, empathy, and ethical reasoning.

However, while these potential advancements are promising, it is important to remain cautious. The timeline for achieving such breakthroughs is uncertain, and there are inherent risks associated with over-reliance on AI. Ethical considerations, such as bias, privacy, and the potential for misuse, must be addressed alongside technological developments. Furthermore, the unpredictability of AI evolution means that some limitations may persist longer than anticipated.

In conclusion, acknowledging the potential for future AI advancements adds a balanced perspective to the discussion. While it is crucial to recognize the current limitations, it is equally important to remain open to the possibilities that ongoing research and

innovation may bring. By considering both the present challenges and the potential for future growth, we can foster a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of AI's role in society.

Synthesis and Future Directions:

To advance AI's potential in communication and apply the Sadharanikaran model to modern digital platforms, several key areas need further investigation. First, exploring AI's role in enhancing empathy and context-awareness in settings like customer service, healthcare, and education could be highly beneficial. Research should focus on how AI can adapt its communication style to individual preferences and cultural nuances.

Second, integrating the Sadharanikaran model with digital communication tools like chatbots, virtual assistants, and social media requires refining AI to better interpret human emotions and ethical considerations, such as privacy and consent, ensuring responsible AI use.

Third, AI's potential in cross-cultural communication and language translation should be explored, focusing on overcoming language barriers while preserving cultural nuances.

Finally, studying the long-term societal impacts of AI on social dynamics and human relationships is crucial. Longitudinal studies can provide insights into how AI shapes communication patterns and behaviors over time.

By investigating these areas, we can better utilize AI to enhance communication, foster cultural understanding, and address ethical challenges.

In conclusion, examining AI's limitations in replicating human communication through the lens of the Sadharanikaran model deepens our understanding and guides responsible AI development, promoting a balanced coexistence between humans and AI in the evolving digital landscape.

References:

Adhikary, N. M. (2004). *Hindu-sanchar siddhanta: Ek adhyayan* (A study of Hindu communication theory). *Baha Journal*, *1*, 25-43.

Adhikary, N. M. (2008). The Sadharanikaran model and Aristotle's model of communication: A comparative study. *Bodhi: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 2*(l), 268 -289.

Adhikary, N. M. (2009). An introduction to Sadharanikaran model of communication. *Bodhi: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 3*(1), 69-91.

Adhikary, N. M. (2010). Sancharyoga: Approaching communication as a vidya in Hindu orthodoxy. *China Media Research, 6*(3), 76-84.

Adhikary, N. M. (2012). Indigenous theorization of communication. *Rural Aurora, 1*, 172-181.

Adhikary, N. M. (2014a). Mahatma Gandhi and the Sadharanikaran model of communication. *The Journal of University Grants Commission, 3*(1), 63-76.

Adhikary, N. M. (2014b). *Theory and practice of communication – Bharata Muni*. Makhanlal Chaturvedi National University of Journalism & Communication.

Adhikary, N. M. (2015a). Exploring classical Sanskrit texts from communication perspective: A checklist. *Journal of Content, Community & Communication, 2*(1), 14-24.

Adhikary, N. M. (2015b). Space and time in Hinduism: Implication for the Sadharanikaran model of communication. *Media Mimansa*, (Vol. not mentioned), 58-64.

Adhikary, N. M. (2016). Hinduism. *The international encyclopedia of communication theory and philosophy*. DOI: 10.1002/9781118766804.wbiect021

Adhikary, N. M. (2018). Mainstreaming the re-orientation approach in communication education: Nepal's perspective. *Journal*

of Social Sciences and Humanities, 8(2), 163-167.

Baran, S.J., & Davis, D.K. (2009). *Mass communication theory: Foundations, ferment, and future*. Cengage Learning India.

Bhosale, S., Pujari, V., & Multani, Z. (2020). Advantages and disadvantages of Artificial Intelligence. *Aayushi International Interdisciplinary Research Journal,* 77, 227-230.

Carey, J.W. (2004). A cultural Approach to Communication. In D. McQuail (Ed.), *McQuail's reader in mass communication theory* (pp. 36-45). SAGE.

Garg, M., Punia, V, & Punia, B. K. (2022). will artificial intelligence (AI) overpower human intelligence (HI)? *A Peep into Future Business and Education, 9*(1), 5-16.

Griffiths, T. L. (2020). Understanding human intelligence through human limitations. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 24*(11), 873-883.

Guerrero-Velástegui, C.A., Peñaherrera-Zambrano, S., Ballesteros-López, L., López-Pérez, S. (2023). Artificial intelligence and replacement of human talent: Case dtudy of higher education in times of pandemic. In V. Bindhu, J.M.R.S. Tavares, and C. Vuppalapati (Eds.), *Proceedings of Fourth International Conference on Communication, Computing and Electronics Systems. Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering, vol 977.* Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-7753-4_68

Kumar, K. J. (2005a). Hindu perspectives on communication. *Journal of the Asian Research Center for Religion and Social Communication, 3*(l), 14-20.

Kumar, K. J. (2005b). *Mass communication in India.* Mumbai: Jaico Publishing.

Najmiddinov, A. (2023). *Will artificial intelligence (AI) replace a human in "IT"?* DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.8117457. Source

URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372131580

Proceedings of Fourth International Conference on Communication, Computing and Electronics Systems. *Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering, 977*. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-7753-4_68

Ray, T. (2012). To de-westernize, yes, but with a critical edge: A response to Gunaratne and others. *Media, Culture & Society, 34*(2), 238-249. DOI: 10.1177/0163443711432414

Tewari, I. P. (1992). Indian theory of communication. *Communicator: Journal of the Indian Institute of Mass Communication, 27*(l), 35-3.