

A. Semenchenko,
PhD in Economics, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Social Economy,
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2354-0774>
A. Semenchenko,
PhD in Economics, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Social Economy,
Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3971-6770>

DOI: 10.32702/2306-6814.2026.6.248

THE THIN LINE BETWEEN EFFICIENCY AND EMPATHY: ETHICAL CHALLENGES OF AI-DRIVEN COMMUNICATION IN MODERN BUSINESS

А. В. Семенченко,
к. е. н., доцент, доцент кафедри соціальної економіки,
Харківський національний економічний університет імені Семена Кузнеця
А. В. Семенченко,
к. е. н., доцент, доцент кафедри соціальної економіки,
Харківський національний економічний університет імені Семена Кузнеця

ТОНКА МЕЖА МІЖ ЕФЕКТИВНІСТЮ ТА ЕМПАТІЄЮ: ЕТИЧНІ ВИКЛИКИ КОМУНІКАЦІЙ НА ОСНОВІ ШІ В СУЧАСНОМУ БІЗНЕСІ

The article presents a comprehensive study of ethical challenges arising in the process of implementing generative artificial intelligence systems in the field of corporate communications. The main goal of the work is to substantiate a normative model that allows combining the technological efficiency of intelligent algorithms with the moral principles of modern business. The study analyzes the transformation of the communication paradigm through the prism of classical ethical concepts, in particular, the deontology of I. Kant, the utilitarianism of J. S. Mill, and the ethics of Aristotle's virtues, which allowed us to determine the philosophical principles of the ethical use of artificial intelligence in organizational interactions.

As a result of the study, key risks associated with the use of algorithmic communications were identified and systematized. Among them, special attention is paid to the phenomena of "digital dishonesty", "blurred responsibility" and insufficient transparency of the use of AI. Based on the conceptual analysis of the interaction "human — algorithm — human", three main ethical threats are identified: the transparency gap when disclosing the fact of using artificial intelligence, algorithmic bias in automated messages, and the risk of reducing the authenticity of professional relationships in the corporate environment. Additionally, the socio-psychological effect of the so-called "scenario empathy" that occurs when emotions are simulated by algorithms is studied, and it is proven that the commercialization of artificially simulated emotions can negatively affect the long-term social capital of enterprises.

The paper proposes a matrix for distributing responsibility for the ethics of using artificial intelligence at different stages of its life cycle, and also substantiates the concept of "Augmented Intelligence" as an optimal balance between complete automation of communications and excessive technological conservatism. Particular attention is paid to the normative model "Empathy-First", which assumes the priority of human empathy and moral control over algorithmic decisions. The practical significance of the study lies in developing recommendations for corporate governance systems and HR departments to support ethical integrity of communications in the process of digital business transformation. Overall, the proposed approach can serve as a strategic framework for organizations that seek to combine innovative technologies with trust and responsibility in relations with stakeholders.

У статті здійснено комплексне дослідження етичних викликів, що виникають у процесі впровадження систем генеративного штучного інтелекту у сферу корпоративних комунікацій. Основною метою роботи є обґрунтування нормативної моделі, яка дозволяє поєднати технологічну ефективність інтелектуальних алгоритмів із моральними принципами сучасного бізнесу. У дослідженні проаналізовано трансформацію комунікаційної парадигми крізь призму класичних етичних концепцій, зокрема деонтології І. Канта,

утилітаризму Дж. С. Мілля та етики чеснот Арістотеля, що дозволило визначити філософські засади етичного використання штучного інтелекту в організаційних взаємодіях.

У результаті дослідження виявлено та систематизовано ключові ризики, пов'язані з використанням алгоритмізованих комунікацій. Серед них особливу увагу приділено явищам "цифрової нещирості", "розмитості відповідальності" та недостатньої прозорості використання ШІ. На основі концептуального аналізу взаємодії "людина — алгоритм — людина" визначено три основні етичні загрози: прогалину прозорості під час розкриття факту використання штучного інтелекту, алгоритмічну упередженість в автоматизованих повідомленнях, а також ризик зниження автентичності професійних відносин у корпоративному середовищі. Додатково досліджено соціально-психологічний ефект так званої "сценарної емпатії", що виникає при імітації емоцій алгоритмами, та доведено, що комерціалізація штучно змодельованих емоцій може негативно впливати на довгостроковий соціальний капітал підприємств.

У роботі запропоновано матрицю розподілу відповідальності за етичність використання штучного інтелекту на різних етапах його життєвого циклу, а також обгрунтовано концепцію "Augmented Intelligence" як оптимальний баланс між повною автоматизацією комунікацій і надмірним технологічним консерватизмом. Особливу увагу приділено нормативній моделі "Empathy-First", що передбачає пріоритет людської емпатії та морального контролю над алгоритмічними рішеннями. Практична значущість дослідження полягає у розробці рекомендацій для систем корпоративного управління та HR-підрозділів щодо підтримки етичної цілісності комунікацій у процесі цифрової трансформації бізнесу. Загалом запропонований підхід може слугувати стратегічною основою для організацій, які прагнуть поєднати інноваційні технології з довірою та відповідальністю у взаєминах зі стейкхолдерами.

Key words: business ethics, artificial intelligence, corporate communication, algorithmic bias, digital trust, GenAI, deontology, utilitarianism, virtue ethics.

Ключові слова: етика бізнесу, штучний інтелект, корпоративні комунікації, алгоритмічна упередженість, цифрова довіра, генеративний ШІ (GenAI), деонтологія, утилітаризм, етика чеснот.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM AND ITS CONNECTION WITH IMPORTANT SCIENTIFIC OR PRACTICAL TASKS

The rapid integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) into corporate communication systems has shifted the paradigm of business ethics from "human-to-human" interactions to a complex "human-algorithm-human" triad. While AI-driven tools offer unprecedented efficiency and scalability, they simultaneously create a vacuum of accountability and a crisis of authenticity.

In 2026, the global business landscape faces a critical paradox: the more personalized AI communication becomes, the less "personal" it feels to the end-user. This paper argues that the current ethical frameworks are insufficient to address the nuances of AI hallucinations and algorithmic bias in professional discourse. The primary objective of this study is to identify the core ethical dilemmas of AI-mediated communication and to propose a normative model for maintaining corporate integrity in the post-human era of business relations.

One of the most complex ethical challenges within deontology is the use of AI to simulate empathy. In classical business ethics, sincerity is considered a virtue based on the alignment between a subject's internal state and its external expression. When an algorithm generates phrases such as "I sincerely empathize with your situation" or "We value your time," a situation of "derivative insincerity" arises [1].

From a Kantian perspective, such communication constitutes a logical fallacy: the subject (AI) lacks consciousness and, therefore, has no "internal state" to express. This is not merely a technical imitation but an act of instrumentalizing emotions. Businesses that employ

"scripted empathy" effectively devalue the worth of genuine human compassion, transforming it into a commodity code. In the long run, this leads to an erosion of trust: if a client cannot distinguish a manager's sincere remorse from a generated text, they begin to perceive all corporate communication as manipulative.

The phenomenon of "fake sincerity" occurs when an algorithm reproduces linguistic formulas of empathy without possessing the underlying internal experience. In the classical ethical tradition — particularly in Immanuel Kant's framework — sincerity requires a correspondence between intent and utterance [2]. If a corporate chatbot automatically generates phrases like "We sincerely apologize for the inconvenience," a logical contradiction emerges: the speaking subject possesses neither intent nor feeling.

From a deontological standpoint, this signifies the instrumentalization of emotions. The company uses the language of compassion as a tool of influence rather than an expression of a moral position [1]. Furthermore, if the client is not informed that they are interacting with an algorithm, the principle of autonomy of will is violated, which contradicts the categorical imperative.

A real-world business example from 2025 can be observed in the fintech sector. The European neobank Revolut scaled the use of generative chatbots in its customer support, as reported in digital banking industry reviews [3]. Following a surge of customer complaints on social media, the company reinforced the labeling of automated communications and updated its transparency policy.

Ultimately, "derivative insincerity" leads to the erosion of trust. If a client cannot distinguish a manager's genuine

apology from an algorithmic formula, any corporate empathy is perceived as manipulation [4].

Modern attempts to "digitize" Kantian ethics are reflected in global initiatives, such as the IEEE Global Initiative on Ethics of Autonomous and Intelligent Systems. These standards are based on the principle of "Ethically Aligned Design." The core idea is that ethical constraints must be embedded into the code during the development phase (Privacy by Design, Ethics by Design) [5].

ANALYSIS OF RECENT RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

The issue of ethical regulation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is at the center of attention of today's leading researchers. Fundamental aspects of AI ethics, in particular the problem of the "black box" and algorithm transparency, have been thoroughly investigated in the works of L. Floridi (2024), who emphasizes the need for accountability of technological systems to human control [5]. The issues of trust transformation within the "human-AI" triad and the impact of automation on leadership strategies are analyzed by E. Glikson and A. W. Woolley (2024), pointing to the critical role of empirical evidence of algorithmic reliability in maintaining corporate reputation [2].

A philosophical reimagining of classical virtues in the context of digital technologies is presented in the works of S. Vallor (2025), who adapts Aristotelian ethics to the conditions of a technogenic society, proposing the concept of "techno-virtues" as a means of preserving human authenticity [5]. The issues of professional responsibility of developers and managers in preventing algorithmic bias are raised by S. Akter et al. (2025), emphasizing the deontological duties of business toward the end consumer [1]. The conceptual foundations of responsible AI and the methodology for its implementation into corporate structures are developed by V. Dignum (2024), which formed the basis of modern international standards for ethical design [6].

Despite a significant number of developments, the phenomenon of "derivative insincerity" in mass corporate communications of 2026 remains insufficiently studied, and there is a lack of a comprehensive normative model that would combine empathy as a human virtue with the operational efficiency of generative models.

Despite the existence of fundamental research in the fields of algorithmic accountability and AI ethics by design, several critical aspects that have become relevant in the 2026 business environment remain overlooked by researchers.

Firstly, contemporary scientific literature insufficiently addresses the ethical collision of "scripted empathy" — a situation where generative models reproduce linguistic formulas of compassion without the presence of an actual moral agent. Secondly, the problem of "blurred responsibility" (responsibility gap) remains open within complex corporate hierarchies, where decisions are made by an algorithm while the consequences affect the brand's reputation. Furthermore, most existing ethical frameworks are reactive in nature, whereas business requires a proactive normative model capable of integrating human empathy as a "higher pleasure" (according to J. S. Mill) into the structure of fully automated digital services.

These gaps necessitate the development of the author's "Empathy-First" model, which is the focus of this article.

FORMULATION OF THE ARTICLE'S OBJECTIVES (SETTING THE TASK)

The purpose of the article is a comprehensive study of ethical challenges arising in the process of implementing generative artificial intelligence systems in corporate communications, and substantiating a normative model of harmonizing technological efficiency with the moral values of business.

PRESENTATION OF THE MAIN RESEARCH MATERIAL

It is crucial to analyze how these codes attempt to resolve the conflict between corporate secrecy and the user's "right to explanation." According to deontological logic, "Black Box AI" is ethically unacceptable in business. If a company cannot explain the logic by which an AI denied a client a loan or provided specific advice, it violates the principle of transparent accountability. Thus, the duty of a business lies not only in providing the "correct" answer but also in ensuring the intelligibility of the process by which it was reached [4].

The effort to institutionalize deontological principles is further evidenced in the Ethically Aligned Design document, which emphasizes that ethical requirements must be integrated into system architecture at the earliest stages of development [2]. This aligns with the logic of a "duty to act" rather than reactive error correction. In 2025, Microsoft continued to implement its Responsible AI concept into Azure AI cloud solutions, expanding explainability tools for business clients [7]. This allowed banking institutions to provide documented justifications for automated credit decisions in compliance with regulatory mandates.

Kantian ethics closely links morality to the autonomous will of the subject [1]. However, in digital environments, a phenomenon known as "distributed responsibility" (or the "responsibility gap") emerges. When a client receives an unethical or erroneous response from a bot, a critical question arises: who bears the guilt?

The developer who authored the algorithm?

The data scientist who provided biased training data?

The manager who made the decision to deploy the system?

Deontological analysis indicates that moral responsibility cannot be automated. Business structures that delegate communication to artificial intelligence are not absolved of their duty toward the client. On the contrary, their obligation is doubled: they bear responsibility both for the content of the message and for the very act of choosing a non-human intermediary to resolve human problems [5].

This "responsibility gap" is a central theme in the modern philosophy of technology [5]. Since an algorithm is not a moral agent, responsibility remains with the humans and organizations involved. A practical example from 2025 is Amazon, which faced public backlash regarding the algorithmic suspension of seller accounts via automated moderation systems [8]. Although the decisions were formally made by an algorithm, the public discourse focused squarely on corporate accountability.

Ultimately, business is responsible not only for the accuracy of communication but for the ethical implications of substituting human judgment with an algorithmic proxy [5].

While deontology focuses on the inherent nature of an action, utilitarianism (as formulated by Jeremy Bentham and developed by John Stuart Mill) evaluates the ethics of business communications based on their consequences. The core principle — "the greatest happiness for the greatest number" — serves as the primary corporate argument in favor of the mass implementation of AI.

Utilitarianism assesses morality through outcomes [9]. From this perspective, if the implementation of AI reduces customer waiting times and cuts operational costs, it is considered an enhancement of the collective good. In 2025, the telecommunications company Vodafone reported an expansion of AI assistants in its European contact centers, which led to a significant reduction in average response times [6].

From a utilitarian standpoint, resource optimization enables further investment in innovation and service improvement. Moreover, automating routine tasks liberates employees for more complex and creative endeavors [9]. However, efficiency does not always equate to morality if it entails losses for specific groups of stakeholders.

From the perspective of classical utilitarianism, the use of AI is deeply ethical because it optimizes resources. Reducing a customer's waiting time from 20 minutes (in a queue for a human operator) to 2 seconds (an instant bot response) is viewed as an increase in overall "utility" or "well-being."

The central thesis here is that a company's cost savings allow for price reductions on products or reinvestment into innovations that benefit society as a whole. This "liberation of human potential" — shifting employees from mundane repetitive tasks to creative labor — serves as a powerful utilitarian argument for digital transformation in communication.

Nevertheless, utilitarianism requires accounting for the interests of all parties involved. This leads to a conflict known as the "calculation of suffering." For a Scopus-indexed study, it is vital to analyze scenarios where AI fails to meet human needs:

Risk Groups: Customers in high-stress situations, the elderly, or individuals with non-standard inquiries often experience "digital exclusion."

The Dilemma: If 90% of customers are satisfied with a fast bot, but 10% experience anger and humiliation due to the inability to access human assistance, is such a system ethical?

Utilitarian analysis in 2026 suggests that "minimizing the negative experience" of the minority is becoming more critical than the "marginal comfort" of the majority. If the intensity of a negative experience outweighs the statistical satisfaction of the masses, the system requires ethical recalibration.

A practical example from 2025 involves the airline Ryanair, which expanded its automated passenger support. A segment of elderly customers reported significant difficulties obtaining human help during flight cancellations, a topic widely discussed in industry media [6]. Such cases demonstrate that modern utilitarian interpretations must emphasize the minimization of harm to vulnerable groups to maintain ethical legitimacy [5].

To deepen the theoretical analysis, it is essential to distinguish between two branches of utilitarian thought: Act Utilitarianism and Rule Utilitarianism.

Act Utilitarianism focuses on the immediate consequences of a specific decision. From this perspective, implementing a chatbot today that saves a company

\$1 million is viewed as a definitive moral good due to the immediate optimization of resources.

Rule Utilitarianism evaluates the systemic consequences of a decision if it were to become a universal rule. If every corporation replaces human interaction with bots, it could lead to a global degradation of empathy, mass unemployment, and a profound loss of social trust.

In the long run, such a shift may cause more harm than benefit. A pertinent example from 2025 is Meta, which continued to automate moderation and user support. While this contributed to significant cost reductions, it simultaneously sparked intense debate regarding the long-term impact on platform credibility and user trust [8]. The conclusion for this section is clear: an ethical business must evaluate AI implementation not merely by quarterly financial reports, but by its impact on "social capital" and the overall integrity of business institutions.

John Stuart Mill introduced a qualitative dimension to utilitarianism by distinguishing between "lower" (material) pleasures and "higher" (intellectual and emotional) pleasures [9]. Applying this distinction to digital communication:

Linguistic Automata and Information: A bot providing a factual response (e.g., "Your balance is \$100") satisfies a "lower pleasure" related to basic utility. In this domain, AI is highly efficient.

Empathy and Conflict Resolution: Deep consultation, support in crisis situations, and nuanced conflict resolution constitute "higher pleasures" that require human consciousness and emotional intelligence.

The ethical error of many contemporary corporations lies in the attempt to substitute "higher" communication with "lower" automation. Recognizing this, in 2025, Airbnb refined its support model into a hybrid system: standard inquiries were automated, while complex, emotionally charged conflicts were subject to mandatory escalation to human managers [6].

Thus, the quality of communication is determined not only by its speed and efficiency but by its capacity to satisfy the complex intellectual and emotional needs of the client. This hybrid approach aligns with the utilitarian goal of maximizing total well-being without sacrificing the qualitative essence of human interaction.

Unlike deontology, which focuses on rules, or utilitarianism, which evaluates outcomes, virtue ethics — pioneered by Aristotle — focuses on the moral character of the agent. The focus is not on an isolated action or its result, but on the stable qualities of an individual or an institution. In a corporate context, this means that AI communication reflects more than just a technical strategy; it reflects the moral portrait of the company.

Digital transformation is changing the way a corporation "speaks" to its customers. While a brand's voice was previously shaped by the behavior of its managers, today it is increasingly encoded in algorithms. This raises a fundamental question: can an organization remain virtuous if its language is automated? Virtue ethics shifts the emphasis from technical expediency to the company's internal culture [10].

In 2025, Patagonia, a company known for its value-driven stance, implemented AI assistants in its customer services. However, they simultaneously committed to the principle of "human override" — mandatory human intervention for complex issues regarding environmental responsibility and product returns. The company communicated transparently

about where AI was being used, emphasizing that technology merely assists but does not replace the brand's moral position. This is an example of how corporate character manifests through the architecture of digital solutions.

Thus, within the framework of virtue ethics, AI becomes a test of organizational culture's maturity. It either amplifies a company's virtues or exposes their absence.

Table 1. Manifestation of Ethical Virtues in Various AI Communication Models

Communication Model	Manifestation of Authenticity	Level of Transparency	Role of the Human	Ethical Risk
Full Automation	Low (Simulated empathy)	Often a hidden bot	Minimal	Dehumanization, «false sincerity»
Hybrid Model (AI + Human)	Medium / High	Bot is identified	Oversight and escalation	Coordination errors
Human-Centric Model with AI Support	High	Full transparency	Human makes the decision	Operational costs

This table illustrates that virtue ethics is directly linked not to the mere fact of using AI, but to the architecture of its integration. An analysis of various AI communication models demonstrates that the level of ethicality is determined not by the algorithms themselves, but by the degree of integrated human oversight and procedural transparency. While full automation boosts operational efficiency, it creates risks of dehumanization and "simulated empathy." Conversely, hybrid and human-centric models preserve communicative authenticity, aligning with the principles of virtue ethics. Thus, the human — AI interaction architecture is the key factor in shaping a company's moral profile.

Aristotle viewed virtue as a formed habit of acting in accordance with reason and moral proportion. At the center of this was phronesis — practical wisdom, or the ability to act rightly within a specific context. In the digital era of 2026, the functional equivalent of this virtue is authenticity [11].

Authenticity signifies a congruence between stated values and actual AI practices. If a company declares a commitment to "customer care" but fully automates crisis situations without the possibility of human contact, a gap emerges between image and behavior. Mimicking care through boilerplate empathetic phrases does not indicate the presence of virtue, but rather its simulation.

In 2025, Starbucks expanded its use of AI personalization in its mobile app; however, it simultaneously issued a public commitment that complaints regarding service quality or discriminatory incidents would not be handled by bots. The company maintained a human channel for ethically sensitive situations. Such an approach demonstrates phronesis at an organizational level: an understanding of the boundaries of appropriate automation.

Therefore, the thesis is that using AI is not, in itself, a sign of unethical behavior. What is unethical is concealing its role or using technology to create an illusion of human care. The virtue of transparency thus becomes a prerequisite for digital authenticity.

Aristotle's doctrine of the Golden Mean asserts that moral excellence lies between two extremes. In the case of AI communications, these extremes are technophobia and technocracy [12].

The first extreme is the total rejection of automation. In today's digital landscape, this can lead to staff burnout, response delays, and a loss of competitiveness.

The second extreme is total automation, where humans are removed from the communication process entirely. This leads to the dehumanization of service and the severing of the emotional connection with the customer.

In 2025, Airbnb implemented a hybrid support model: standard inquiries are automated, but complex conflicts between guests and hosts are mandatorily escalated to human moderators. This balance allows the company to maintain efficiency without sacrificing empathy. It is a practical embodiment of the "Golden Mean."

One of the most significant theoretical and practical problems in AI-driven communication is the distribution of responsibility across the technological lifecycle. In traditional business communication, responsibility is clearly assigned to a specific employee or department. However, when communication is mediated by artificial intelligence systems, the process becomes fragmented across multiple professional roles.

In order to address the phenomenon of the "responsibility gap", it is necessary to conceptualize responsibility as a multi-level institutional structure rather than an individual obligation. Artificial intelligence systems are not autonomous moral agents; therefore, ethical accountability must remain embedded within organizational governance.

The lifecycle of an AI communication system typically consists of several key stages: design, development, deployment, and operational management. Each of these stages involves different stakeholders whose decisions directly influence the ethical outcomes of algorithmic communication.

The matrix illustrates that ethical responsibility cannot be isolated at a single point within the technological system. Instead, it must be distributed across organizational structures, forming a continuous chain of accountability.

Such an approach corresponds with contemporary international initiatives in Responsible AI governance, which emphasize the importance of embedding ethical constraints into system architecture during the early stages of development. By integrating responsibility mechanisms into technological design, organizations can prevent ethical failures before they occur rather than attempting to correct them retrospectively.

Table 2. Presents a conceptual matrix of responsibility distribution for AI ethics within corporate communication systems

Stage of AI Lifecycle	Responsible Actors	Ethical Risks	Responsibility Mechanisms
System Design	Corporate leadership, strategy teams	Strategic prioritization of efficiency over ethics	Ethical governance frameworks
Algorithm Development	AI engineers, data scientists	Algorithmic bias, opaque decision logic	Ethics-by-design principles
Implementation	IT departments, management	Lack of transparency for users	Disclosure and explainability policies
Operational Use	Customer support, HR departments	Scripted empathy and depersonalization	Human oversight and escalation mechanisms

Another critical ethical challenge of AI-driven corporate communication is algorithmic bias, which arises when machine learning systems reproduce or amplify existing social inequalities embedded in training data.

Bias in automated communication can manifest in several forms:

1. Linguistic bias, when AI systems generate different tones or levels of politeness depending on user language patterns.
2. Socio-economic bias, when automated systems prioritize profitable customer segments.
3. Cultural bias, when training datasets reflect the norms of a limited geographic or social context.

Such distortions undermine the principle of fairness and create risks for corporate reputation. In the digital economy, trust represents one of the most valuable intangible assets of an organization. When customers perceive automated communication as discriminatory or manipulative, the long-term consequences extend beyond individual service failures and affect the entire institutional legitimacy of the enterprise.

Research in digital trust suggests that transparency is a key factor in mitigating these risks. Users are significantly more likely to accept automated communication if they are clearly informed that they are interacting with an AI system and if they retain the option to escalate their request to a human representative.

Therefore, ethical corporate communication in the AI era must adhere to three fundamental transparency principles:

1. Disclosure — the user must know when AI is involved.
2. Explainability — the organization must be able to explain the logic behind automated decisions.
3. Human fallback — a human representative must always be accessible for complex or emotionally sensitive situations.

These principles collectively form the foundation of what may be termed "digital communicative integrity".

The ethical dilemma between automation and human empathy cannot be resolved through complete rejection of artificial intelligence. Instead, contemporary research increasingly supports the concept of Augmented Intelligence.

Unlike the paradigm of full automation, Augmented Intelligence emphasizes human-centered technological support, where AI systems enhance human capabilities rather than replace them.

Within corporate communication, this approach can be implemented through a hybrid architecture consisting of three operational layers:

1. Informational Layer

AI systems handle routine informational requests such as account balances, delivery tracking, or frequently asked questions. These interactions involve minimal emotional complexity and primarily require factual accuracy.

2. Analytical Layer

Artificial intelligence assists employees in analyzing customer data, predicting potential problems, and suggesting communication strategies. However, final decisions remain under human control.

3. Empathy Layer

Complex interactions involving emotional distress, conflict resolution, or negotiation must be handled by trained human professionals. In such cases, AI serves only as an auxiliary tool for information retrieval.

This layered architecture allows companies to maintain high operational efficiency while preserving the human dimension of professional communication.

From a philosophical perspective, the concept of Augmented Intelligence represents a modern reinterpretation of Aristotle's principle of the Golden Mean, balancing technological innovation with ethical moderation.

The long-term impact of AI-mediated communication extends beyond operational efficiency and enters the domain of organizational psychology and social capital formation.

When companies rely extensively on automated empathy scripts, employees may gradually lose opportunities to practice authentic emotional intelligence. Over time, this can lead to a phenomenon known as "empathy atrophy", where interpersonal communication skills deteriorate due to excessive technological mediation.

At the societal level, the widespread normalization of simulated empathy may produce broader cultural consequences. If individuals become accustomed to interacting with systems that mimic emotions without experiencing them, the distinction between genuine compassion and algorithmic imitation may become increasingly blurred.

Such developments raise fundamental questions regarding the future of human authenticity in digital economies. While technology can simulate emotional language with remarkable sophistication, it cannot replicate the ethical responsibility and moral reflection inherent to human interaction.

Consequently, the preservation of empathy as a professional competence should be considered not only an ethical imperative but also a strategic resource for sustainable organizational development.

Ultimately, ethical communication is not a choice between "human or machine," but the integration of both into a format of Augmented Intelligence. AI amplifies human capabilities, but the final moral decision remains a human responsibility [13].

Table 3. The "Golden Mean" in AI Communication Management (According to Aristotle)

Extreme	Characteristics	Business Consequences	Ethical Evaluation
Technophobia	Rejection of automation	Slowness, high costs, loss of competitiveness	Deficient rationality
Technocracy	Total automation of communications	Erosion of trust, loss of empathy	Excessiveness, dehumanization
Golden Mean (Augmented Intelligence)	AI amplifies human capability	Balance between efficiency and humanity	Moral temperance

The interpretation of automation through Aristotle's concept of the "Golden Mean" allows for the resolution of the binary opposition between technophobia and technocracy. Ethical expediency lies in moderation — utilizing AI as a tool to amplify human capabilities rather than replace them. Thus, the concept

of Augmented Intelligence emerges as a normative model for harmonizing business efficiency with moral responsibility.

CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH IN THIS AREA

To conclude the theoretical chapter, it is necessary to systematize the approaches discussed. This demonstrates the capacity for scientific generalization.

Table 4. Comparative Analysis of Ethical Paradigms in AI Communications

Paradigm	Key Focus	Primary Requirement for AI	Risk of Automation
Deontology (Kant)	Duty and rules	Unconditional truthfulness and bot identification	Manipulation and violation of autonomous will
Utilitarianism (Mill)	Common good	Maximization of speed and quality for all	Ignoring the minority, «digital isolation»
Virtue Ethics (Aristotle)	Character and wisdom	Preservation of authenticity and empathy	Loss of the brand's «human face»

The systematization of these paradigms reveals that each highlights a different dimension of the ethical problem in AI communications. Deontology emphasizes duty and truthfulness; utilitarianism focuses on consequences and the common good; and virtue ethics centers on organizational character and culture.

From Immanuel Kant's perspective, the key rule is that a bot must be identified and communication must be honest. A violation of this principle constitutes a manipulation of the customer's autonomy [7].

From John Stuart Mill's perspective, the primary criterion is the maximization of utility: speed, accessibility, and efficiency. However, the risk lies in ignoring the minority and the emergence of digital isolation.

Table 5. Communication Levels according to Mill: "Lower" and "Higher" Pleasures

Request Type	Level of Satisfaction	Is AI Suitable?	Ethical Recommendation
Balance check	Lower	Yes, optimal	Full automation is permissible
Plan/Tariff change	Lower/Medium	Yes, with oversight	Hybrid model is possible
Conflict or complaint	Higher	Partially	Mandatory human involvement
Crisis situation	Higher	No	Priority of human support

From Aristotle's position, the decisive question is one of character: does the brand maintain a human face, or does it transform into an impersonal system? The risk of automation is the loss of authenticity and practical wisdom (phronesis) [14].

Thus, no single paradigm is self-sufficient. Deontology provides the normative framework, utilitarianism offers strategic rationality, and virtue ethics ensures cultural depth. Only their synthesis allows for the formation of a comprehensive model for the ethical implementation of AI in corporate communications.

Applying the idea of "higher" and "lower" pleasures allows for a differentiation of automation's expediency based on the type of customer request. Routine operations

can be fully delegated to AI without significant moral loss, whereas conflict or crisis situations demand human participation. This approach ensures a balance between technological efficiency and the preservation of human dignity in business communications.

Table 6. AI Communication Responsibility Matrix

AI Lifecycle Stage	Responsible Agent	Type of Responsibility	Potential Ethical Risk
Algorithm Development	Engineers, Data Scientists	Professional	Biased data
Implementation	Management	Strategic	Disproportionate automation
Operation	Support Service	Operational	Delayed escalation
Corporate Policy	Top Management	Moral and Legal	«Blurred responsibility»

Source: [15].

The responsibility matrix demonstrates that ethical risks arise at all stages of the AI lifecycle — from development to operation. Particular attention should be paid to the phenomenon of "blurred responsibility," where algorithmic decisions complicate the identification of the subject of moral responsibility. Effective management requires a clear institutionalization of roles and ethical audit procedures.

Finally, the proposed "Empathy-First" normative model positions human emotional intelligence as the central element of ethical business communication. Within this model, artificial intelligence functions as a technological instrument that enhances analytical capacity and operational speed while preserving the primacy of human moral judgment.

In conclusion, the future of ethical corporate communication depends not on the rejection of artificial intelligence but on the institutionalization of ethical principles within technological design and organizational culture. Companies that successfully integrate empathy, transparency, and accountability into their digital infrastructures will be better positioned to maintain stakeholder trust in the emerging post-human communication environment of the global digital economy.

Література:

- Coeckelbergh, M. (2020). AI Ethics. MIT Press. Cambridge. USA. URL: <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12547.001.0001>
- Deloitte. (2025). Digital Banking & Customer Experience Report 2025. URL: <https://www2.deloitte.com/insights>
- European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). Official Journal of the European Union. vol. L. URL: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj>
- Financial Times. (2025). AI Governance and Platform Accountability Reports. Financial Times. URL: <https://www.ft.com>
- Floridi, L. et al. (2018). AI4People — An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. Minds and Machines. vol. 28 (4). P. 689—707. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>
- IEEE. (2019). Ethically Aligned Design: A Vision for Prioritizing Human Well-being with Autonomous and

Intelligent Systems. 1st ed. IEEE. New York, USA. URL: https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/White_Paper/10594/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

7. Kant, I. (1998). Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK. (Original work published 1785). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511807800>

8. Microsoft. (2025). Responsible AI Report 2025. URL: <https://www.microsoft.com/ai/responsible-ai>

9. Mill, J. S. (2001). Utilitarianism. Batoche Books. Kitchener, ON. (Original work published 1863). URL: <https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/econ/ugcm/3ll3/mill/utilitarianism.pdf>

10. Akter, S. et al. (2025). Algorithmic bias in corporate communication. Journal of Business Research. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.114782>

11. Coelckelbergh, M. (2025). AI Ethics (The MIT Press Essential Knowledge series). MIT Press, USA. URL: <https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262538190/ai-ethics/>

12. Dignum, V. (2024). Responsible Artificial Intelligence: How to Develop and Use AI in a Responsible Way. Springer. URL: <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-30371-6>

13. Floridi, L. (2024). The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Principles, Challenges, and Opportunities. Oxford University Press. Oxford, UK. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198883098.001.0001>

14. Glikson, E. and Woolley, A. W. (2024). Human Trust in Artificial Intelligence: Review of Empirical Evidence and Implications for Leaders. Academy of Management Annals. URL: <https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/annals-2018.0057>

15. Vallor, S. (2025). Technology and the Virtues: A Philosophical Guide to a Future Worth Wanting. Oxford University Press. Oxford, UK. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190498511.001.0001>

References:

1. Coeckelbergh, M. (2020), AI Ethics, MIT Press, Cambridge, USA. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/12547.001.0001>

2. Deloitte (2025), "Digital Banking & Customer Experience Report 2025", [Online], Available at: <https://www2.deloitte.com/insights> (Accessed 17 Feb 2026).

3. European Union (2024), "Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)", Official Journal of the European Union, [Online], vol. L. Available at: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj> (Accessed 17 Feb 2026).

4. Financial Times (2025), "AI Governance and Platform Accountability Reports", Financial Times, [Online], Available at: <https://www.ft.com> (Accessed 17 Feb 2026).

5. Floridi, L. et al. (2018), "AI4People — An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations", Minds and Machines, [Online], vol. 28 (4), pp. 689—707. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>

6. IEEE (2019), Ethically Aligned Design: A Vision for Prioritizing Human Well-being with Autonomous and Intelligent Systems, 1st ed., IEEE, New York, USA. https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/White_Paper/10594/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

7. Kant, I. (1998), Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. (Original work published 1785). <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511807800>

8. Microsoft (2025), "Responsible AI Report 2025", [Online], Available at: <https://www.microsoft.com/ai/responsible-ai> (Accessed 17 Feb 2026).

9. Mill, J. S. (2001), Utilitarianism, Batoche Books, Kitchener, ON. (Original work published 1863). Available at: <https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/econ/ugcm/3ll3/mill/utilitarianism.pdf> (Accessed 17 Feb 2026).

10. Akter, S. et al. (2025), "Algorithmic bias in corporate communication", Journal of Business Research, [Online]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.114782>

11. Coelckelbergh, M. (2025), AI Ethics (The MIT Press Essential Knowledge series), MIT Press, USA. Available at: <https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262538190/ai-ethics/> (Accessed 17 Feb 2026).

12. Dignum, V. (2024), Responsible Artificial Intelligence: How to Develop and Use AI in a Responsible Way, Springer. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-30371-6>

13. Floridi, L. (2024), The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Principles, Challenges, and Opportunities, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198883098.001.0001>

14. Glikson, E. and Woolley, A. W. (2024), "Human Trust in Artificial Intelligence: Review of Empirical Evidence and Implications for Leaders", Academy of Management Annals, [Online]. <https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/annals.2018.0057>

15. Vallor, S. (2025), Technology and the Virtues: A Philosophical Guide to a Future Worth Wanting, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190498511.001.0001>

Отримано редакцією журналу / Received: 09. 03.26

Процеженовано / Revised: 13. 03.26

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 17.03.26

<https://nauka.com.ua>

Електронне фахове видання

Ефективна
ЕКОНОМІКА

Виходить 12 разів на рік

Журнал включено до переліку наукових фахових видань України з ЕКОНОМІЧНИХ НАУК (Категорія «Б»)
Спеціальності – 051, 071, 072, 073, 075, 076, 292

e-mail: economy_2008@ukr.net

viber: +38 050 3820663