

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This chapter serves the true clarity of understanding the development of artificial intelligence as a form of human companionship thence generating make-believe relationships with human beings, as it will serve conclusion and theoretical implications based on the research findings.

5.1. Conclusion

AI companionship doesn't develop immediately when a user interacts with AI. True, AI can serve human answers, but a make-believe relationship happens through repeated interaction. It can evolve from gradual development that started off as a functional interaction or how the usage of AI started off by using it as a tool for practical everyday use in users' life/ and through that development, things arise as well that influenced users to create comfort, not only repeated interaction, but also perceived usefulness, its responsiveness, the availability that users tend to start opening up their personal problems towards AI that creates a sense of emotional comfort later, then rant to AI mostly about everything. Through that intensity, people gain interpretations of the AI that they use, and create social cues like serving pronouns for this human-made machine. Nevertheless, users tend to maintain the awareness that the companionship is constructed with an artificial entity, and somehow tend to determine a meaning, without actually forgetting on how maintaining human-to-human relationship are more important than just relying on AI as the only interaction.

5.2. Research Implications

5.2.1. Theoretical Implication

AI begins having a meaning of companionship by its users when they no longer interact with practical purposes and begin having a form of familiarity, comfort and meaning of a relationship through their repeated interactions. And instead of forming the relationship immediately, the meaning-making has a process through continuous communication in which interactions gradually become more comfortable. Companionship isn't determined by the capability of AI towards its users, but also how users use, interpret, and put on some meaning-making in the interaction. Connecting it with Human agency in social cognitive theory by Bandura, the findings shows how users were determined by its purposes on using AI actively, making them not passive recipients, making AI companionship doesn't depend on the capabilities of technology but also on users' decision on using AI continuously, repeatedly, until an emotional meaning-making process happen that leads to interpretation of AI towards their lives. In relation to Knapp's Relational Development Model, the interaction was observed between users and the AI. There's familiarity, disclosure, and continuous interaction. There aren't any same patterns as human-to-human relationship because AI does not independently participate in the relationship that the users would interpret, but mostly because of

how users initiate things with the AI, personalize, maintain communication, and end things with how they interpret their interactions with AI. Furthermore, in HMC perspective, there is a deeper understanding on how a human-made machinery can be both instrumental and relational roles in communications while also not possess human emotions but still engaging with users' emotional rants. Users realizes with what they communicate, it is not a human being but a machine, and the awareness makes the boundary between human beings and a machine comprehensible yet is now considered negotiable in this era instead of considering it as a discrimination for the users that uses AI.

From here, it is understandable that AI could emerge from impersonal purposes at first before developing into personal forms of communication. Personal interaction with AI also does not necessarily replace interaction with human beings. However, both forms of interaction and communication could coexist in this era of technology, depending on what the users' need, what the users' situations are, and what the users' choose to communicate with.

5.2.2. Social Implication

The interaction and the relationship that happens between human beings and AI is now considered as a social phenomenon. From the result, users that interacts with AI have awareness that the connection created is different between human and human

relationship and it does not mean that AI can replace the quality of human beings in communicating. AI may provide immediate responses and be non-judgemental, but a machine does not have emotions the same way as human beings despite the comfort that AI provides.

5.2.3. Practical Implication

This research is more careful and its purpose is to find the understanding of AI use in everyday life instead of rejecting or discriminating personal interactions with AI, especially how in this era, using AI as a place to rant is now considered a digital culture. It is now understandable through the findings that the awareness of using AI as a companionship can coexist with recognizing every part of advantages and disadvantages of the users themselves or the AI itself.

For AI users, it is essential to decrease an excessive use on AI that may lead to relying on AI a lot, when AI itself can have errors. Not only that, but to emphasize it with Human Agency theory by Albert Bandura, dependency on AI excessively could lead to a loss of human agency, meaning that users can become less active in their own critical thinking and decision making, making them have a lack of firm stances and their own behavior. AI tends to respond based on what users want, provide in the prompts, and through the knowledge or memories it has based on the users' previous

interactions. From here, detaching with reality can be dangerous, reliance on AI may become problematic when it becomes excessive, making users forget human nature that humans are naturally social human beings, interactions and relationships with other human beings is still needed.

For future practitioners and researchers, AI companionship can be developed through continuous interactions, there should be an examination of the stages, the boundaries that is continuously built and the attachment levels in the relationship of human beings with a human-made machine. The findings may serve a reference for more of AI and human being relationship concerns of researches.