CHAPTER «ECONOMIC SCIENCES»

DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES BASED ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE SYSTEM OF REBUILDING COMMUNICATION AND DIALOGUE

Piotr Zięba[1]
Paulina Kolisnichenko[2]

Abstract. The work explores the role of digital technologies based on artificial intelligence in the system of restoring communication and dialogue at the enterprise in conditions of prolonged instability, crises and transformations of the organizational environment. It is shown that communication is considered not as a technical transfer of information, but as a process of forming common meanings, trust and agreed decisions between management, employees and external stakeholders. Dialogue is interpreted as a special form of communication, which involves active listening, recognition of different positions and joint development of decisions, rather than one-sided information. The key areas of restoring communication at the enterprise are revealed, including value-based rethinking of relationships, improvement of organizational communication channels, development of communicative competencies, introduction of partnership formats of employee participation in decision-making. It is shown that digital technologies based on artificial intelligence enhance the effectiveness of each of these areas, but cannot replace them. The dual nature of such systems is emphasized, which are capable of both supporting reflective and honest dialogue and enhancing manipulative or formal communication

---

[1] mgr,
WSHIU Academy of Applied Sciences, Poland
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-6432-4120
[2] PhD in Economics,
Vice Rector for International Cooperation,
WSHIU Academy of Applied Sciences, Poland
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6730-1236

in the absence of ethical constraints and transparent rules for data use. The aim of the work is to theoretically substantiate the directions of restoring communication and dialogue in the enterprise with the involvement of artificial intelligence-based systems, as well as to compare the impact of these systems in the period before 2022 and after the rapid spread of dialog services. In the period before 2022, artificial intelligence-based systems were used mainly as tools for analytics, monitoring and classification of appeals and responses, which made it possible to identify areas of tension, gaps in understanding and the accumulation of mistrust earlier. After 2022, they began to be integrated directly into everyday communication channels, becoming constantly available assistants in preparing messages, explaining decisions, summarizing discussions and supporting inclusivity.

1. Introduction

Digital technologies based on artificial intelligence in modern society have ceased to be just tools for automating individual operations and are increasingly becoming an environment in which human communications are formed, supported and restored. In a world where societies are experiencing deep traumas from wars, large-scale crises, economic instability, growing distrust of institutions and constant information noise, traditional channels of dialogue are overloaded or blocked. On the one hand, digital platforms increase polarization, create information bubbles, and contribute to the spread of hate speech. On the other hand, it is the new generation of digital technologies based on artificial intelligence that opens up fundamentally new opportunities for the reconstruction of dialogue, for the creation of safe spaces for communication, for the involvement of people who were previously excluded from public discussions due to linguistic, cultural, physical or psychological barriers. The relevance of the topic is enhanced by the fact that without the restoration of high-quality communication, it is impossible to achieve either social consensus, sustainable development, or effective conflict management. The particular importance of digital technologies based on artificial intelligence in the system of restoration of communication and dialogue is determined by their ability to work with very large data sets about human behavior, moods, and reactions. Algorithms for analyzing texts, images, audio, and video can reveal patterns in how

tension is formed in communities, which topics are the most sensitive, and which words and phrases most often provoke aggression. This makes it possible not only to respond to existing conflicts, but also to prevent their escalation through preventive moderation of discussions, adaptation of communication strategies, and construction of more empathetic messages. At the same time, such technologies can support facilitators, mediators, psychologists, managers, and community leaders by offering them analytical prompts, scenarios, and models of possible compromises. This takes the restoration of dialogue to a qualitatively different level, combining human ethical responsibility and the computing power of digital solutions. Equally significant is the potential of digital technologies based on artificial intelligence to overcome barriers between different social, cultural and professional groups. Modern automatic translation tools, intelligent subtitling systems, voice assistants, adaptive interfaces and personalized learning platforms allow people with different levels of education, different languages of communication, with disabilities or traumatic experiences to enter the space of dialogue more safely. If participation in public discussions previously required significant resources, specialized knowledge and physical presence, now digital technologies based on artificial intelligence can reduce this inequality, creating conditions for more inclusive participation. This is especially important in societies experiencing the consequences of conflict, where a significant part of citizens feels despair, distrust and alienation, and therefore needs supportive, context-sensitive channels of communication.

The relevance of researching digital technologies based on artificial intelligence in the system of restoring communication and dialogue is also related to the need to develop new ethical, legal and institutional frameworks for their application. Any technology affects the balance of power between communication participants. Algorithms can both mitigate conflicts and intensify manipulation, censorship, and distortion of facts. When it comes to restoring dialogue between vulnerable groups, between citizens and government institutions, and between different political camps, it is especially important to be aware of the risks of algorithmic bias, opacity of decision-making, and the collection and use of personal data. This makes the topic not only technological, but also humanitarian, legal, and philosophical. New models of co-regulation are needed, in which digital

solutions specialists, lawyers, sociologists, psychologists, media experts and representatives of civil society together determine how to use digital technologies based on artificial intelligence so that they truly contribute to dialogue, and not replace it with imitation.

An important component of relevance is also the fact that digital technologies based on artificial intelligence fundamentally change the forms of dialogue themselves. Along with the traditional exchange of views between people, hybrid formats of interaction are emerging, where part of the communication load is taken on by intelligent chatbots, decision-making support systems, virtual moderators, interactive educational platforms. They can explain complex decisions of government bodies in understandable language, help citizens formulate their requests and complaints, collect collective opinions, visualize options for the development of situations, and identify points of agreement. Such a transformation requires understanding, as the role of a person in the communication process is changing, new expectations arise regarding transparency, responsibility, and trust in digital tools. Without deep scientific and practical analysis, these changes can lead to disappointment, to a loss of faith in the possibilities of dialogue, if society does not understand how such systems work and for what purpose they are used. Thus, the relevance of the topic is due to the fact that digital technologies based on artificial intelligence create the foundation for long-term strategies of social cohesion, reconciliation and post-conflict recovery. They allow for the preservation and structured analysis of the collective experience of social trauma, the formation of inclusive narratives that recognize different voices and stories, and the support of educational and cultural programs aimed at the development of empathy and critical thinking. Through public sentiment analysis systems, digital participation platforms, and interactive forms of public consultations, it is possible to build a more honest and open dialogue between citizens, communities, and institutions. In this context, digital technologies based on artificial intelligence cease to be a purely technical innovation and become a key component of the infrastructure of a democratic society, where the restoration of communication and dialogue becomes not a one-time action, but a constant process of maintaining mutual understanding and trust. That is why the study of their role, possibilities and limitations is not only a scientific task, but also a social need.

2. Directions for restoring communication
and dialogue at the enterprise

Communication in an enterprise is not just the transfer of information from one person to another. Its essence lies in creating a common field of understanding, in the formation of agreed meanings shared by managers, employees, partners and clients. Any management process begins with how people formulate their expectations, tasks, limitations, vision of the future, and this is always connected with communication. If information only circulates in documents, emails or oral instructions, but is not transformed into a meaning understandable to everyone, then formally communication exists, but in fact the enterprise loses coherence of actions. That is why the essence of communication in an enterprise should be considered as a constant process of harmonizing interests, expectations and resources between all participants, and not only as a technical transmission of messages. The quality of such interaction determines the atmosphere of trust, the level of motivation of personnel and the readiness of the team to jointly respond to external challenges. Dialogue in an enterprise is a special form of communication, in which the main thing is not only the spoken word, but the ability to listen, clarify and co-create solutions [1-3]. A modern enterprise, especially in conditions of rapid change, cannot function effectively without dialogue, in which employees have the opportunity not only to carry out orders, but also to ask questions, express doubts, share ideas, warn about risks. The dialogical model of communication creates a space where joint decisions are formed, and not simply instructions are imposed, where mistakes become an occasion for learning, and not for finding the guilty, where each participant feels their own subjectivity (Table 1).

Communication and dialogue in the enterprise always have a multidimensional nature. They include formal channels associated with official orders, regulations, meeting minutes, and informal ones, which manifest themselves in conversations between colleagues, in interaction in corridors, chat rooms, and during breaks. The essence of effective communication lies in the ability of management to realize and take into account both of these planes. If management messages contradict the real experience of employees, then trust is destroyed, and informal communication begins to compensate for the lack of openness through rumors, speculation, and emotional reactions.

Table 1

Essential foundations of communication and dialogue in the enterprise

Key aspect	Extended explanation
Shared meaning and common understanding	Communication in the enterprise is not only the transfer of information from one person to another but the creation of shared meaning that guides coordinated action. Messages become effective only when employees understand not just the literal content but also the intention, priorities and context behind them. When leaders explain decisions together with their reasons, limitations and expected outcomes, employees can align their own tasks and expectations with organisational goals. Without this shared understanding, communication may formally exist in the form of emails, meetings and reports, yet the organisation functions as a set of disconnected individuals rather than an integrated system
Dialogue as mutual influence instead of one way transmission	Dialogue in the enterprise implies that all parties have the right and practical possibility to influence the final decision. It assumes active listening, clarification of assumptions, and readiness to revise initial positions. When managers speak only in a top down mode, communication quickly turns into a monologue that does not take into account operational knowledge and experience of front line staff. Dialogue changes this pattern because it invites questions, doubts and alternative proposals. As a result, solutions are based on a more complete view of reality and employees feel co authorship and responsibility for implementation
Trust, psychological safety and respect	Trust is the invisible infrastructure that supports every communication process inside the enterprise. Employees are ready to speak openly only when they are confident that sincere questions or criticism will not lead to punishment or hidden sanctions. Psychological safety encourages people to admit mistakes, share early warning signs of problems and propose non standard ideas. Respectful dialogue does not deny differences in hierarchy or expertise but prevents them from turning into humiliation or exclusion. Where trust is weak, formal channels may still function but most important information circulates in informal networks, which makes management blind to real risks and conflicts
Connection between communication and organisational culture	Every interaction inside the enterprise reinforces or changes elements of organisational culture. Regular open dialogue, transparent explanations of decisions and honest discussion of difficulties form a culture of cooperation and responsibility. In contrast, avoidance of difficult topics, manipulation with information and symbolic consultations without real influence create a culture of fear and cynicism. Thus communication cannot be considered a neutral technical process. It always carries cultural messages about what is allowed, what is valued and what is ignored. Understanding this connection helps leadership use communication consciously as a tool for long term cultural development rather than only for short term coordination of tasks.

Source: formred by the authors

When official discourse is consistent with the everyday experience of the team, then dialogue between management levels becomes a resource for development, rather than a source of tension. In this case, it is communication that becomes the environment where corporate culture, norms of mutual respect, a sense of fairness, and transparency of decisions are formed. The essence of dialogue in an enterprise is especially clearly manifested in conditions of change, conflict, or crisis. When new strategies, technologies, and structures are introduced, each employee perceives these processes through his or her own fears, hopes, and expectations. If communication is limited to a dry message about the fact of changes, resistance arises, rumors intensify, and hidden conflicts appear [4-7]. Dialogue in such a situation means the willingness of management to explain the reasons and logic of decisions, listen to staff reactions, admit mistakes, and adjust steps taking into account the practical experience of employees. In this sense, dialogue serves as a tool for transforming individual anxiety into a collective discussion, where ways to mitigate the negative consequences of changes are jointly sought, responsibility is distributed, and a sense of joint participation in decision-making is formed. It is such a dialogue that reduces polarization, prevents destructive conflicts, and increases the adaptability of the organization (Table 2).

It is necessary to emphasize that the essence of communication and dialogue in the enterprise is directly related to issues of power, influence and responsibility. Who has the right to speak, who determines the agenda of meetings, who formulates terms and goals, and who only listens, is not just a technical detail, but a mirror of the internal structure of the organization. If a culture of fear operates in the enterprise, where employees are afraid to express a different opinion, then any official declarations about open dialogue remain empty. If managers demonstrate a willingness to self-reflect, recognize the possibility of their own mistakes, encourage questions and suggestions, then communication turns into a shared space of responsibility. In such an environment, dialogue does not deny leadership, but fills it with new content, when the manager acts not only as a source of instructions, but also as a moderator of meanings, a facilitator of mutual understanding, a partner in finding solutions. It is worth noting that a modern enterprise exists in a complex information field, where internal communication constantly intersects with external communication.

Development of the system of communication
and dialogue in the enterprise

Key aspect	Extended explanation
Designing clear communication architecture	The system of communication in the enterprise requires an intentional architecture that defines who communicates with whom, about what and in which format. This includes regular meetings, channels for urgent information, procedures for feedback and escalation of problems. When the architecture is explicit and simple, employees know where to go with questions or ideas and managers understand their responsibility to respond within a reasonable time. Such clarity reduces rumours and duplication of messages and supports faster and more consistent decision making across departments
Integrating formal and informal channels	Effective communication systems do not rely only on formal structures such as official meetings, emails and protocols. They also recognise the importance of informal interactions where employees share experiences, concerns and innovative suggestions. Management can support healthy informal communication by creating spaces for cross departmental contact, encouraging communities of practice and being present in everyday conversations instead of staying isolated. When formal and informal channels support each other, important signals about problems or opportunities reach decision makers earlier and dialogue becomes more natural and continuous
Building participation and feedback mechanisms	For dialogue to be real, employees must have practical opportunities to influence decisions that affect their work. This means surveys with visible follow up actions, suggestion schemes, working groups with mixed representation and open sessions where management discusses strategic choices with staff. Feedback must move in both directions. Leaders explain what has been done with received proposals and why some of them were accepted or rejected. Over time such mechanisms transform communication from ritual information campaigns into a shared process of reflection and co creation of policy and strategy
Continuous evaluation and improvement of communication practices	A system of communication and dialogue is never finished. It needs regular evaluation using qualitative and quantitative methods such as interviews, focus groups, internal audits and analysis of conflicts or project failures. The aim is not to punish individuals but to detect recurring bottlenecks, misunderstood messages and structural barriers. Based on these insights the enterprise can adjust formats of meetings, revise internal regulations, improve training in communication skills and update digital tools. When evaluation becomes routine, communication is treated as a strategic organisational resource that requires the same careful management and investment as finances, technology or human capital

Source: formred by the authors

Employees are both carriers of corporate meanings and active participants in social networks, professional communities, and public discussions. This means that the essence of communication and dialogue in an enterprise can no longer be limited to internal channels. The way an organization explains its values, attitude to socially significant events, and ethical business standards directly affects the level of trust not only of customers but also of its own employees. When the words and actions of an enterprise coincide, dialogue with employees and external stakeholders reinforces each other, forming a holistic image of a responsible entity. If a gap arises between internal messages and external image, trust is destroyed, which makes real dialogue impossible. Therefore, a deep understanding of the essence of communication and dialogue becomes the basis for further understanding of how digital tools and technologies based on artificial intelligence can support, rather than replace, live human communication in modern organizations [8-11].

The directions for restoring communication and dialogue at the enterprise are primarily related to rethinking the organization's value principles. After periods of conflict, crises, and drastic changes in structure or leadership, employees often lose a sense of justice, transparency, and mutual respect. Therefore, the first strategic direction is to form a new common foundation on which dialogue can be built. This involves honestly admitting mistakes, calling things by their proper names, and openly talking about what exactly was lost in terms of trust and mutual understanding. Management should not only declare the values of openness, mutual respect, and partnership, but also demonstrate them in specific personnel decisions, in the incentive system, and in the style of daily communication. Restoring communication begins when employees see that their doubts, fears, and questions are legitimate topics for discussion, not a reason for punishment. Without such a value foundation, any programs to improve communication channels or introduce new tools remain superficial and do not produce a long-term effect. In many enterprises, conflicts and misunderstandings are exacerbated due to the fact that information is lost between management levels, distorted during transmission, arrives late or does not reach those to whom it concerns [12-15]. Restoring communication means reviewing internal regulations, document routes, and forms of meetings and conferences. It is important to create a clear system where each employee knows where

to turn with a proposal, complaint, or question, and managers are obliged to provide feedback within clear deadlines. It is necessary to eliminate excessive barriers between departments, reduce the number of unnecessary levels of approval, and introduce formats for coordinating decisions that are understandable to everyone. The transparency of the enterprise's plans and priorities plays a special role. If strategic goals are known only to a narrow circle of people, this creates a feeling of alienation and suspicion, which makes any dialogue superficial. Therefore, the direction of structural communication renewal involves a transition from the principle of secrecy to the principle of explanation.

At the same time, in many organizations, conflicts develop not because the parties have incompatible interests, but because they do not know how to constructively talk about their needs, formulate requests and comments, discuss problems without mutual accusations. Restoring dialogue requires systematic investments in training employees in the skills of active listening, non-violent communication, conducting difficult conversations, and mediation. This can be internal training, mentoring, working in groups where real situations are simulated. It is important to gradually abandon the culture in which criticism is perceived as a personal attack, and mistakes are tried to be hidden. Instead, an environment should be formed in which constructive feedback is the norm and supported by management. When employees see that their suggestions are not just listened to, but are actually taken into account in decisions, they begin to perceive dialogue as a tool of influence, and not as a formal procedure. It is this direction that moves communication from the plane of formal messages to the plane of joint learning and security development.

3. The impact of artificial intelligence-based systems on the restoration of communication and dialogue

Thus, in the period up to 2022, artificial intelligence-based systems had not yet been massively integrated into the everyday lives of most people, but they were already significantly influencing the understanding of how communication and dialogue could be restored in various social and organizational contexts. In the initial stages, these systems were mostly considered as tools to support work with information. They analyzed large amounts of text, identified recurring themes, classified messages, and

helped filter content by keywords and emotional coloring. Although the direct participation of such systems in live communication was limited, it was then that the understanding was formed that artificial intelligence-based technologies could not only automate routine tasks, but also work subtly with the context of human statements. This created the prerequisites for their future use in the processes of restoring dialogue after conflicts, crises, or long periods of mistrust, primarily due to a better vision of the moods and needs of different groups. Within enterprises, by 2022, artificial intelligence-based systems were used mainly in the field of analytics, customer relationship management, automated user support, and handling of requests. However, even in this, at first glance, utilitarian format, they influenced the restoration of communication. Intelligent modules for analyzing requests helped to identify typical reasons for customer and employee dissatisfaction, highlight recurring conflict situations, and identify topics for which explanations were lacking. This allowed enterprise management to build more targeted information campaigns, adjust the tone of official messages, and change the formats of internal meetings. Some organizations experimented with chatbots that answered typical employee questions about procedures, payments, and schedules, which reduced frustration associated with the feeling of information closure. Although these solutions did not replace a live dialogue between managers and staff, they partially relieved the tension associated with uncertainty, and therefore created a more favorable background for further face-to-face conversations. At the level of external communication of enterprises and other organizations, artificial intelligence-based systems by 2022 manifested themselves through the analysis of social networks, media content and user feedback. Technologies for analyzing sentiment in publications, comments and messages made it possible to see which company decisions were perceived as unfair, which campaigns aroused indignation, and which, on the contrary, were supported and trusted. This made it possible to take a different approach to resuming dialogue with customers, communities, and professional communities. Managers were able to respond not only to individual complaints, but also to deep trends in public perception, conduct targeted awareness campaigns, and build more transparent communication channels. In some cases, the results of such analysis became the basis for public apologies by companies, revisions of controversial decisions, and

the involvement of independent experts in discussing complex situations. In other words, AI-based systems acted as a kind of early warning tool for the destruction of trust and helped companies move from a defensive position to a real dialogue with their environment. An important area of influence of AI-based systems in the period up to 2022 was their use in research and pilot projects aimed directly at supporting dialogue and conflict mediation. In different countries, experiments were carried out with online platforms for public discussions, where algorithms analyzed the arguments of participants, grouped similar positions, highlighted points of agreement and key differences. Such solutions helped to structure very large discussions, making them more accessible for comprehension by participants who could not read all the messages. In the context of enterprises, similar approaches began to be used to collect ideas for reforming internal processes, preparing strategic changes, and agreeing on new rules of interaction. And although the technological limitations of the time did not allow for complete avoidance of simplifications, the very fact of using AI-based systems as tools for structuring collective dialogue created a new understanding of the possibilities of combining digital solutions and live communication. People have seen that algorithms can help them see where they actually agree, even when from the outside the discussion appears polarized (Table 3).

After 2022, when AI-based systems went beyond narrowly professional applications and began to be widely used as dialogue services available to a wide audience, the essence of their impact on communication and dialogue has changed dramatically. If earlier they worked mainly in the background as analytical modules, now AI-based systems have become direct participants in the communication process, addressed as naturally as a colleague or consultant. In enterprises, this meant the emergence of constantly available assistants capable of helping an employee formulate a letter to management, prepare arguments for a meeting, and find softer formulations in a conflict situation. At the same time, managers began to use such systems to prepare appeals to personnel, explain complex changes, and adapt the same information to different groups of employees. All this has radically lowered the barrier to entry into formal dialogue, as an employee no longer needs to overcome the fear of writing or the lack of time to carefully edit texts; he can use a digital assistant as a draft mirror of his thoughts, and only then bring the message to a personally acceptable form.

Systems have begun to be integrated directly into teamwork platforms, instant messengers, and corporate portals.

Table 3

**Features of restoring communication and dialogue
in the enterprise before 2022**

Aspect	Characteristic features	Role of technology based on artificial intelligence
Focus of restoration initiatives	Restoration of communication and dialogue before 2022 was centred mainly on leadership behaviour, organisational culture and redesign of formal channels such as meetings in person, internal newsletters and structured workshops. Dialogue was understood primarily as a sequential process of negotiations that required physical presence and specially organised sessions. Managers concentrated on soft skills training, conflict resolution seminars and the introduction of new procedures for information flow. The emphasis was on human mediation and on the gradual rebuilding of trust through repeated face to face contacts, rather than on continuous digital support.	Technology based on artificial intelligence was used in a rather limited and indirect way. Analytical modules processed employee surveys, open comments and customer complaints in order to detect recurring problems and sentiments. These tools helped communication specialists identify topics that required clarification or public reaction. However, the results of such analysis usually stayed within a narrow group of experts and rarely influenced the everyday language or structure of conversations between managers and staff
Tools and communication formats	Typical restoration programmes relied on classical communication formats such as town hall meetings, strategy presentations, focused group discussions and small workshops with professional facilitators. Information moved mostly through linear channels from leadership to employees, with limited opportunities for real time feedback. Digital platforms such as email, basic intranet portals and static knowledge bases supported logistics and documentation but did not significantly change the nature of interaction	Systems based on artificial intelligence were embedded mainly in analytical and support functions, for example in customer relationship management systems or service desks. They were rarely visible to ordinary employees as communication partners. There were first experiments with chatbots that answered frequently asked questions, but their language was highly scripted and inflexible.

Source: formred by the authors

Modern tools for automatic translation, speech recognition, subtitle generation, text-to-speech conversion and vice versa have made it possible to bring into the dialogue those people who previously remained on the sidelines of the internal life of the enterprise due to language, physical or psychological barriers. Employees who are not confident in the language of business communication have been able to prepare messages with the support of the system, and people with hearing or vision impairments have received additional channels of access to information.. This increases the chances that problematic topics will be voiced at all, and not remain hidden. At the same time, there is a growing need for transparent rules for processing such sensitive data, as without clear confidentiality guarantees, trust in new communication channels can quickly collapse (Table 4).

In the period after the rapid development of systems based on artificial intelligence, their dual nature was especially clearly manifested in the context of the restoration of communication and dialogue. On the one hand, they expanded the possibilities for analyzing communication processes, made dialogue more accessible, personalized, inclusive, helped to structure conflict discussions and find points of potential agreement in them. On the other hand, the risks of replacing real dialogue with the appearance of active communication have increased, when flows of beautifully designed messages are not accompanied by real changes in management practices, and excessive automation of responses devalues the unique human voice. This has posed a new level of task for enterprises and society in general, namely, to learn how to use systems based on artificial intelligence not as a replacement for human interaction, but as a tool to support it. The answer to this challenge is the development of a culture of conscious use of digital tools, increasing the level of critical thinking, and forming new competencies of dialogical interaction, in which people and technologies act as partners. In such a perspective, the restoration of communication and dialogue after 2022 is unimaginable without systems based on artificial intelligence, however, the decisive factor in effectiveness remains not the presence of technology itself, but the value orientations and ability of organizations to responsibly integrate it into live human communication.

Table 4

Features of restoring communication and dialogue
in the enterprise after 2022

Aspect	Characteristic features	Role of technology based on artificial intelligence
Focus of restoration initiatives	After 2022 restoration of communication and dialogue increasingly combines traditional human centred practices with constant digital assistance. Dialogue is no longer tied only to formal meetings or physical presence. It unfolds in hybrid environments that include synchronous and asynchronous channels, written and spoken interactions, and continuous feedback loops. Leaders use structured conversations, open question sessions and collaborative digital spaces to address fears, discuss change and co create solutions with employees. Restoration is seen as an ongoing process rather than a one time intervention, with emphasis on transparency, mutual learning and psychological safety.	Systems based on artificial intelligence become integrated directly into the daily communication environment. They support employees and managers in drafting letters, adjusting tone in sensitive messages, and translating complex strategic decisions into accessible language for different audiences. During and after meetings they summarise discussions, highlight unresolved issues and identify patterns across multiple conversations. These capabilities make it easier to keep all participants informed, to avoid repetition of misunderstandings and to include colleagues who could not attend in real time. Technology based on artificial intelligence thus transforms restoration from isolated events into a continuous, data informed practice.
Tools and communication formats	Organisations adopt a rich mix of formats such as virtual town halls, moderated digital forums, collaborative documents in real time and persistent chat channels around key topics. Employees are encouraged to participate from different locations and time zones, which reduces the dependence on strict schedules and physical presence. Dialogue is documented automatically and becomes searchable, which allows participants to revisit arguments and track how decisions evolved over time. Inclusion of diverse voices becomes more realistic, since individuals can contribute in written form, through voice, or via anonymous channels when they address very sensitive issues.	Technology based on artificial intelligence underpins almost all these formats. Real time transcription, automatic captioning and instant translation open the door for participants with different language skills and physical abilities. Intelligent agents moderate large scale discussions by clustering similar arguments, detecting emerging conflicts and proposing questions that help clarify positions. In feedback platforms systems based on artificial intelligence group comments into themes and highlight examples that illustrate broader concerns. In this way technology based on artificial intelligence functions as a facilitator that structures large volumes of input and makes them manageable for human decision makers.

Source: formred by the authors

4. Conclusions

Summarizing the previous considerations, we can say that communication and dialogue in the enterprise cease to be only auxiliary management tools and turn into a key condition for the survival and development of the organization in conditions of prolonged instability, social upheavals and high uncertainty. Not only the moral state of the team, but also competitiveness, the ability to innovate, the quality of decisions made depend on whether the enterprise is able to restore trust, restart destroyed communication channels, admit mistakes and openly discuss painful topics. Digital technologies based on artificial intelligence in this logic no longer look like just a technical novelty. They become part of the infrastructure of dialogue, a new environment in which corporate meanings are formed, interests are coordinated, conflicts are discussed. That is why the issue of their implementation and use cannot be considered separately from the values of the organization, its culture of mutual respect, transparency and readiness for responsibility towards employees and society. In retrospect, it is clear that the period up to 2022 played the role of a preparatory phase, when systems based on artificial intelligence learned to work with the content of human messages, the moods of communities, and patterns of conflict situations. They were used mainly as tools for analytics, monitoring, and classification of appeals and responses, that is, they were, as it were, behind the scenes of visible dialogue. It was then that it was realized that digital solutions are capable of signaling early on the accumulation of tension, the growth of distrust, and the separation of formal communication from the real experience of people. After the rapid development of technologies based on artificial intelligence, these previous developments became the foundation for integrating systems into the very fabric of everyday communication. They began to act as interlocutors, editors, facilitators, and assistants in the formulation of thoughts and structured discussion. In such a situation, enterprises have a historic chance to combine the human capacity for empathy, moral assessment and creativity with the computational capabilities of digital tools that help to see a holistic picture of communication processes. At the same time, the restoration of communication and dialogue in the enterprise cannot be reduced to the technical update of communication channels or the introduction of new platforms. Its essence lies in a comprehensive transformation that includes rethinking values, simplifying and clarifying

organizational structures, developing communication competencies, and forming new formats for employee participation in decision-making. In this complex, digital technologies based on artificial intelligence act as a multiplier of the changes already initiated. They allow you to more quickly identify weaknesses in communication, more precisely adjust information flows, support inclusivity, and open additional spaces for the expressions of those who previously had no voice. At the same time, it is human decisions that determine whether this power will be used to strengthen dialogue or, conversely, to increase control, hide information, and construct a convenient but distorted picture of reality. Reconstructed communication is a living process of human interaction, and systems based on artificial intelligence can only strengthen or weaken this process, but cannot replace its content.

The dual nature of the impact of technologies based on artificial intelligence is of particular importance. On the one hand, they open up large-scale opportunities for supporting reflective, evidence-based and context-sensitive dialogue. Thanks to them, the company can see the mood of the team not in the form of isolated signals, but as a systemic picture, can experiment with different formats for explaining decisions, can build individual trajectories of information and training for different groups of employees. On the other hand, the same systems can serve as a means of manipulative communication, creating the appearance of dialogue without real influence of employees on decisions, increasing the asymmetry of power over information. Threats are associated with algorithm bias, with the opacity of data processing, with the risk of leakage of confidential information, with dependence on external technology providers. All this requires not only technical but also ethical maturity from enterprises, the ability to set their own standards for the responsible use of AI-based systems, to develop digital literacy, to teach employees to critically perceive automated prompts, and for managers not to shift their managerial and moral responsibility to technology. In general, it can be argued that digital technologies based on artificial intelligence have already become an integral part of the modern system for restoring communication and dialogue, but their real effect depends on what strategic goals the organization sets for itself. If the main goal is to reduce costs, external gloss and the visibility of active interaction, then even the most modern systems will turn into tools for superficial communication and increase distrust. If the enterprise is

focused on long-term team cohesion, honest discussion of complex topics, and partnerships with employees, customers and society, then technologies based on artificial intelligence can become powerful allies. They will help us to better see people behind the numbers, to more quickly notice gaps in understanding, to more clearly formulate common goals and the path to achieving them. It is in this context of values that a true renewal of communication and dialogue is possible, where digital tools do not replace human speech and responsibility, but rather support them, making mutual understanding more resilient to crises and changes.

References:

1. Skliarenko, N.V., Kolosnichenko, M.V., Didukh, A.S., Kolosnichenko, O.V., Remenieva, T.V. (2022). Living visual communication design toward to sustainable development: Conceptual framework and ecological strategies. *International Journal of Design & Nature and Ecodynamics*, 17(6): 875-882

2. Navickas, V., & Malakauskaitė, A. (2007). The pecularities of formation and development of event marketing strategies. *Business: Theory and Practice*, *8*(3), 146-152.

3. Dzemyda, I. (2014). Electronic marketing for the development of international tourism. *Business: Theory and Practice*, *15*(2), 191-197.

4. Mustanir, A., Yasin, A. (2018). Community participation in transect on development planning. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi Publik*, 8(2): 137-146.

5. Octavianti, M., Mulyana, S., Sugiana, D., El Karimah, K., Koswara, A. (2021). The role of opinion leaders in participatory development communication of former migrant workers. *Bricolage: Jurnal Magister Ilmu Komunikasi*, 7(1): 31-40.

6. Zerfass, A., Verčič, D., Nothhaft, H., Werder, K.P. (2018). Strategic communication: defining the field and its contribution to research and practice. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 12(4): 487-505.

7. Van Ruler, B. (2018). Communication theory: An underrated pillar on which strategic communication rests. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 12(4): 367-381

8. Zhovnirchyk, Y., Chernov, S., Larina, N., Lukashuk, M., Antonova, L. (2023). Strategic planning for the sustainable development of territorial communities. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning*, 18(17): 2097-2105.

9. Fortunato, J.A., Gigliotti, R.A., Ruben, B.D. (2017). Racial incidents at the University of Missouri: The value of leadership communication and stakeholder relationships. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 54(2): 199-209.

10. Peleckis, K., Peleckienė, V., & Mažeikienė, A. (2012). Business negotiations and business meetings: communication in the bargaining process. *Business: Theory and Practice*, *13*(2), 176-185

11. Melkote, S., Steeves, H.L. (2015). Place and role of development communication in directed social change: A review of the field. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses,* 10(3): 385-402.

12. Yuan, H.F., Huang, L., Si, G.L., Lv, Y., Nie, T., Liu, C.X. (2022). Time-frequency analysis and type identification of high-density communication countermeasure electronic signals. *Traitement du Signal*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 723-729

13. Blažienė, I., & Gruževskis, B. (2010). Socially responsible restructuring: Employees' security dimension in Lithuania. *Business: Theory and Practice*, *11*(4), 302-313.

14. Kozlenko, M., Vialkova, V. (2020). Software defined demodulation of multiple frequency shift keying with dense neural network for weak signal communications. In 2020 IEEE 15th International Conference on Advanced Trends in Radioelectronics, Telecommunications and Computer Engineering (TCSET), Lviv-Slavske, Ukraine, pp. 590-595.

15. Alazzam, F.A.F., Shakhatreh, H.J.M., Gharaibeh, Z.I.Y., Didiuk, I., Sylkin, O. (2023). Developing an information model for E-Commerce platforms: A study on modern socio-economic systems in the context of global digitalization and legal compliance. *Ingénierie des Systèmes d'Information*, Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 969-974.