

# Applying Artificial Intelligence in Business Communication: A Quantitative Study on the Impact of Microsoft Copilot on Employee Performance

Alexandra PUȚANU\*

National University of Science and Technology POLITEHNICA Bucharest, Romania,  
Doctoral School of Entrepreneurship, Engineering and Business Management

\*Corresponding author, alexandra\_putanu@yahoo.com

**Abstract.** *The rapid integration of artificial intelligence into organizational communication has raised new questions about employee performance and workplace dynamics. Recent studies show that intelligent digital tools can improve clarity, speed, and collaboration in professional environments. However, empirical research remains limited regarding the specific artificial intelligence systems used in everyday communication tasks. This paper examines this gap by analyzing employees' perceptions and experiences with Microsoft Copilot. The focus is on internal communication and perceived personal effectiveness. The study uses a quantitative design, based on an online questionnaire distributed to employees from different professional environments. The research explores four main aspects: familiarity with Copilot, frequency of use, perceived improvements in communication, and the link between attitudes toward artificial intelligence and adoption behavior. The results show that greater familiarity with the tool is associated with more frequent use. Regular use is also positively related to perceived improvements in communication. Employees who find Copilot useful for communication tend to report higher personal effectiveness. Positive attitudes toward AI also appear to support adoption. These results are relevant for organizations that plan to integrate AI into communication practices. Training, awareness, and clear usage protocols remain essential. The study contributes to the scientific literature by providing empirical evidence on the role of AI in workplace communication and by pointing to new research directions in organizational digital transformation.*

**Keywords:** intelligence in communication, Microsoft Copilot, employee performance, technology adoption, digital transformation, workplace efficiency, organisational communication.

## Introduction

Artificial intelligence has moved from a specialised technological resource to a practical component of organisational work. Its effects are particularly visible in communication-intensive tasks, where employees increasingly rely on AI-based tools to draft messages, summarise information, adjust tone, organise documents, and support decisions. The rapid development of generative AI and large language models has accelerated this transition, making AI less peripheral and more closely embedded in everyday workplace routines (Feuerriegel et al., 2024; Gupta et al., 2025). Microsoft Copilot is one of the tools that illustrates this shift. Integrated into familiar work environments, it is designed to assist employees in business communication, workflow coordination, and productivity-related activities (Bird et al., 2022; Harrington, 2025).

The use of AI in workplace communication brings clear opportunities, but also several risks. Previous studies show that AI-powered tools can improve clarity, reduce workload, and support creativity, especially in roles where communication is frequent and demanding (Jia et al., 2024; Ikram & Othman, 2025). Imran et al. (2021) and Gupta et al. (2025) suggests that AI can complement human skills by improving accuracy, efficiency, and knowledge sharing. At the same

time, employees may face technostress, privacy concerns, distrust, or discomfort with AI-generated content (Araujo et al., 2020; Brown et al., 2022; Illia et al., 2023). These mixed reactions show that AI adoption is not only a technical issue. It also depends on how employees experience the tool in daily communication.

Existing research has already examined several dimensions of AI adoption in business settings. Some studies focus on AI-supported communication behaviours (Hassan, 2024). Others analyse organisational readiness for AI (Jöhnk et al., 2021), changes in employee skills and roles (Morandini et al., 2023; Babashahi et al., 2024), or psychological responses to AI-enabled work processes (Chang et al., 2024; Hornung & Smolnik, 2022). There is also growing interest in user attitudes toward AI assistants such as ChatGPT or Copilot. Most of this work, however, looks at programming, education, or general content creation (Bird et al., 2022; Prather et al., 2023; Lau & Guo, 2023). Less is known about how generative AI affects employee performance through business communication.

This study addresses that gap. It examines the impact of Microsoft Copilot on employee performance in the context of organisational communication. The approach is quantitative, which separates it from earlier conceptual or qualitative work. Instead of analysing AI adoption in broad terms, the study focuses on communication-based performance outcomes. This allows a closer view of how AI may reshape written and interpersonal communication at work.

The originality of the study lies in three main directions: AI-mediated communication quality, perceived productivity gains, and employee attitudes toward Copilot as a communication partner. By measuring these dimensions quantitatively, the research adds empirical evidence to the literature on human–AI collaboration. The results have both theoretical and practical value. From a theoretical perspective, they extend technology acceptance and AI-augmented performance models by adding communication-specific variables (Awa & Ukoha, 2020; Na et al., 2022). From a practical perspective, they can support organisational policies on AI deployment, employee training, digital literacy, and ethical rules for AI-assisted communication (Bravo et al., 2021; Vanden Abeele et al., 2024).

Based on the reviewed literature, the study is guided by the following research questions:

RQ1. How does the use of Microsoft Copilot influence employees' business communication performance?

RQ2. Does AI-assisted communication improve overall employee productivity?

RQ3. What attitudes and behavioural intentions shape employees' willingness to integrate Copilot into daily communication tasks?

Through these questions, the study examines how Microsoft Copilot shapes communication outcomes and employee performance. It also offers insights that may support future organisational policies and further research.

## Literature review

### *Artificial intelligence adoption in organisational communication*

The rapid evolution of artificial intelligence (AI) in organisational contexts has generated extensive scholarly interest, particularly regarding its implications for communication, workflow efficiency, and employee performance.

Researchers have analysed how AI tools influence human behaviour, reshape professional roles, and support decision-making. These effects are often linked to productivity and broader organisational transformation (Imran et al., 2021; Feuerriegel et al., 2024).

The literature recognises that AI can support communication tasks and reduce cognitive load. Still, one issue remains less clear: how specific AI systems, such as Microsoft Copilot, affect communication-related performance in the workplace.

AI adoption in daily communication has been studied through several perspectives, including digital literacy, human–AI collaboration, and technology acceptance. Several authors argue that organisations increasingly use AI-mediated tools to support written communication, automate repetitive tasks, and help employees focus on more strategic work (Bravo et al., 2021; Ikram & Othman, 2025). This shift is part of the wider movement linked to Industry 4.0 and digital transformation. Communication systems now need to function in hybrid work settings, with larger information flows and faster response expectations (Kovaitė et al., 2020). Yet employees do not respond to AI in the same way. Their levels of trust, comfort, and willingness to use AI tools can vary significantly (Araujo et al., 2020; Illia et al., 2023).

A recurring theme in the literature is the psychological response to AI tools. Trust, perceived usefulness, and emotional reactions shape acceptance behaviours (Awa & Ukoha, 2020; Chang et al., 2024). AI may reduce workload and improve accuracy. But it can also create anxiety, technostress, and fear of replacement (Hornung & Smolnik, 2022). Employees therefore have to balance efficiency gains with concerns about autonomy, privacy, and ethical use. Researchers also warn about AI-generated content, especially in relation to authenticity, bias, and transparency (Brown et al., 2022; Illia et al., 2023). This suggests that AI acceptance in communication cannot be explained only through technical performance. Human factors and organisational culture matter just as much.

#### *Technology acceptance and the integration of Microsoft Copilot*

Researchers generally agree that AI can transform communication processes. Generative AI tools can help employees produce clearer messages, structure content, and write faster (Bird et al., 2022; Ross et al., 2023).

Some studies also show that AI can act as a cognitive partner. It may support creativity, problem-solving, and communication accuracy (Jia et al., 2024; Ikram & Othman, 2025). These findings are consistent with research on human–AI collaboration, where AI is seen as a complement to human skills rather than a replacement, especially in tasks that need context and nuanced interpretation (Gupta et al., 2025).

Still, the effects of AI on performance depend strongly on context. Organisational readiness, digital skills, and the nature of employees' tasks all influence outcomes (Jöhnk et al., 2021; Morandini et al., 2023). Employees with limited digital literacy may find it harder to integrate AI tools into their work, even when the tools are available (Bravo et al., 2021). AI-mediated communication also raises another concern: over-reliance. If employees depend too much on automated systems, critical thinking and active engagement with communication tasks may decline (George et al., 2024). The literature therefore presents a mixed picture. AI can improve communication-driven performance, but its impact is not automatic.

#### *AI-supported communication and employee performance*

Much of the literature on AI-assisted communication uses models such as the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) or the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). These models focus on perceived usefulness, ease of use, and behavioural intention (Awa & Ukoha, 2020; Na et al., 2022). They have been applied in different organisational contexts. However, research focused specifically on Microsoft Copilot is still limited.

Studies on AI-powered coding assistants, chatbots, and generative language models such as Copilot or ChatGPT offer useful insights. They discuss perceived efficiency, user trust, and collaboration with AI systems (Bird et al., 2022; Prather et al., 2023; Lau & Guo, 2023). Even so, many of these studies are centred on technical or educational contexts. Business communication receives less direct attention.

The current literature therefore leaves an important gap. AI tools are increasingly integrated into business communication ecosystems, but empirical studies that quantify the performance effects of Microsoft Copilot in professional environments remain scarce. Existing work often uses qualitative approaches, conceptual analyses, or broad studies of AI adoption. Communication behaviours are rarely isolated. This limits the understanding of how Copilot influences message clarity, task productivity, and employee attitudes toward AI-supported communication.

## Methodology

### *Research purpose and objectives*

The main purpose of this research is to examine how artificial intelligence tools, particularly Microsoft Copilot, shape internal communication and influence employees' professional performance in contemporary organisations. The study focuses on employee perceptions, the level of Copilot adoption, and the perceived benefits linked to its use in everyday work tasks.

In a context of fast digitalisation, AI is changing work processes and internal communication. Microsoft Copilot, as an AI assistant created for professional environments, plays a visible role in this shift. It can influence task execution, communication flows, and organisational culture. For this reason, understanding how employees perceive, adopt, and evaluate the tool is relevant from both theoretical and practical perspectives.

Accordingly, this research aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. To investigate the level of familiarity and usage of Microsoft Copilot among employees.
2. To evaluate employees' perceptions regarding the impact of Copilot on internal organisational communication.
3. To analyse how Copilot influences employees' efficiency and individual performance.
4. To identify employees' attitudes toward AI adoption and the organisational changes brought about by such technologies.

### *Research hypotheses*

As AI becomes more present in organisational processes, it is necessary to examine not only how often Copilot is used, but also how employees connect it with communication, efficiency, and workplace change. The study tests the following hypotheses:

H1. Higher levels of familiarity with Microsoft Copilot are associated with more frequent use of the tool.

H2. Frequent use of Copilot is positively associated with the perception that it improves internal communication.

H3. A positive perception of Copilot's usefulness in internal communication is correlated with higher perceived personal efficiency.

H4. Employees who hold a positive attitude towards AI are more likely to adopt and frequently use Microsoft Copilot.

### *Research method and instrument*

The study uses a quantitative research design. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire. This method was selected because it offers standardised and statistically analysable

data on employees' opinions, attitudes, and behaviours regarding AI tools, with a specific focus on Microsoft Copilot and internal communication.

The questionnaire was distributed online. This format allowed fast distribution, efficient data collection, participant comfort, anonymity, and lower social desirability bias. There are also limits. Online surveys may lead to superficial answers, self-selection bias, and limited control over the response environment. Even with these constraints, the method remains suitable for an exploratory study.

The questionnaire included five sections: sociodemographic and professional data; familiarity and use of Microsoft Copilot; perceived impact on internal communication; perceived personal efficiency and trust in AI; attitudes toward AI adoption and motivation for future use.

The instrument combined closed-ended questions, single and multiple-choice items, Likert scales, and selected open-ended questions. This structure allowed both statistical analysis and more nuanced responses.

#### *Research variables*

To test the hypotheses, the study uses dependent and independent variables.

The dependent variable refers to employees' perceived personal efficiency when using Microsoft Copilot. It is measured through indicators such as perceived performance improvement, time savings, motivation, and task effectiveness.

The independent variables include familiarity with Microsoft Copilot, frequency of use, perceived communication improvement, attitudes toward AI, and personal motivation to adopt AI technologies.

#### *Research design*

The study follows a cross-sectional quantitative design. Data were collected at one point in time, without manipulating the variables. This design makes it possible to assess current perceptions, usage patterns, and attitudes toward AI tools in organisational communication.

The research is exploratory and descriptive. Its purpose is to build an empirical basis for understanding how AI adoption, especially Microsoft Copilot, affects communication processes and individual performance.

#### *Research sample*

The sample consists of 200 voluntary participants, forming a convenience sample collected between 12-16 May 2025. Participants were professionally active individuals from various sectors where internal communication and digital technologies are relevant.

The sample is not statistically representative. Still, it offers useful insights into employees' experiences with AI tools. Convenience sampling is appropriate for exploratory research, especially when the goal is to identify emerging trends and behavioural patterns.

The respondents had diverse sociodemographic profiles. This diversity allowed comparative analyses across subgroups.

#### *Data collection procedure*

The questionnaire was created in Google Forms. This allowed efficient structuring, filtering, and data export. It was distributed through social networks, including Facebook and LinkedIn, as well as collaborative communication tools such as WhatsApp. This helped reach a wide range of professionally active users.

The data were processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26. The analysis included descriptive statistics, correlations, and hypothesis testing.

## Results and discussions

This section presents the empirical results of the study. The analysis shows how employees perceive and use Microsoft Copilot in internal organisational communication. The findings are based on questionnaire responses and focus on familiarity with the tool, usage patterns, perceived communication improvements, and effects on personal efficiency.

The results also show how these dimensions appear across different socio-demographic groups. This helps clarify how much AI-assisted communication has entered daily work practices. The analysis also supports the validation of the research hypotheses and objectives.

The socio-demographic profile shows that most respondents are female, representing 54.5% of the sample. The largest age group is 25–34 years, with 59.5% of respondents. More than 74% hold higher education degrees, either bachelor's or master's. The main fields of activity are IT/Technology, with 33.5%, and Marketing/Communication, with 31.5%. Most participants are specialists or consultants, representing 65.5%. Almost half have worked in their organisation for 3-5 years, with 48.0%. Remote work is the most common arrangement, reported by 43.0% of respondents (Table 1).

**Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents**

| Variable              | Categories                         | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Gender                | Female                             | 109       | 54.5    | 54.5          | 54.5               |
|                       | Male                               | 91        | 45.5    | 45.5          | 100.0              |
| Age                   | 25–34 years                        | 119       | 59.5    | 59.5          | 59.5               |
|                       | 35–44 years                        | 58        | 29.0    | 29.0          | 88.5               |
|                       | 45–54 years                        | 6         | 3.0     | 3.0           | 91.5               |
|                       | Over 55 years                      | 1         | 0.5     | 0.5           | 92.0               |
|                       | Under 25 years                     | 16        | 8.0     | 8.0           | 100.0              |
| Educational level     | Doctoral studies                   | 16        | 8.0     | 8.0           | 8.0                |
|                       | High school                        | 11        | 5.5     | 5.5           | 13.5               |
|                       | Post-secondary / vocational school | 24        | 12.0    | 12.0          | 25.5               |
|                       | Higher education – bachelor's      | 77        | 38.5    | 38.5          | 64.0               |
|                       | Higher education – master's        | 72        | 36.0    | 36.0          | 100.0              |
| Field of activity     | Administrative / Secretariat       | 11        | 5.5     | 5.5           | 5.5                |
|                       | Finance / Accounting               | 23        | 11.5    | 11.5          | 17.0               |
|                       | IT / Technology                    | 67        | 33.5    | 33.5          | 50.5               |
|                       | Marketing / Communication          | 63        | 31.5    | 31.5          | 82.0               |
|                       | Production / Operations            | 7         | 3.5     | 3.5           | 85.5               |
|                       | Human Resources                    | 14        | 7.0     | 7.0           | 92.5               |
|                       | Sales                              | 15        | 7.5     | 7.5           | 100.0              |
| Position held         | Executive employee                 | 17        | 8.5     | 8.5           | 8.5                |
|                       | Director / Executive               | 5         | 2.5     | 2.5           | 11.0               |
|                       | Department head / Manager          | 47        | 23.5    | 23.5          | 34.5               |
|                       | Specialist / Consultant            | 131       | 65.5    | 65.5          | 100.0              |
| Organisational tenure | 1–3 years                          | 75        | 37.5    | 37.5          | 37.5               |
|                       | 3–5 years                          | 96        | 48.0    | 48.0          | 85.5               |
|                       | 5–10 years                         | 16        | 8.0     | 8.0           | 93.5               |
|                       | Over 10 years                      | 5         | 2.5     | 2.5           | 96.0               |
|                       | Under 1 year                       | 8         | 4.0     | 4.0           | 100.0              |
| Work arrangement      | Hybrid                             | 65        | 32.5    | 32.5          | 32.5               |
|                       | On-site                            | 49        | 24.5    | 24.5          | 57.0               |
|                       | Remote                             | 86        | 43.0    | 43.0          | 100.0              |

Source: data processed using SPSS v.26.

H1. Higher levels of familiarity with Microsoft Copilot are associated with more frequent use of the tool.

The Spearman rank-order correlation indicates a statistically significant positive association between employees' familiarity with Microsoft Copilot and the frequency with which they use the tool ( $r_s = 0.88$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This moderate-to-strong correlation suggests that higher levels of familiarity are linked to more frequent engagement with Copilot in professional tasks. The finding supports hypothesis H1, confirming that users who feel more knowledgeable about the tool are also more likely to integrate it consistently into their daily workflows. This relationship highlights the importance of training and exposure in promoting sustained AI adoption within organisations. (Table 2).

**Table 2. Spearman correlation between familiarity with Microsoft Copilot and frequency of use**

| Variable                           | Spearman's rho | Sig. (2-tailed) | N   |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----|
| Familiarity with Microsoft Copilot | 1              | —               | 200 |
| Frequency of Copilot use           | 0.88           | 0.000           | 200 |

Source: data processed using SPSS v.26.

H2. Frequent use of Copilot is positively associated with the perception that it improves internal communication.

The Spearman correlation analysis revealed a statistically significant positive association between the frequency of Copilot use and employees' perception that the tool improves internal communication ( $r_s = 0.87$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This indicates that respondents who use Copilot more frequently are more likely to perceive it as contributing beneficially to communication processes within their teams. The moderate strength of the correlation suggests a meaningful, consistent relationship, supporting hypothesis H2 and highlighting that regular interaction with AI tools may enhance users' awareness of their communicative value (Table 3).

**Table 3. Spearman correlation between frequency of Copilot use and perceived improvement of internal communication**

| Variable                                        | Spearman's rho | Sig. (2-tailed) | N   |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----|
| Frequency of Copilot use                        | 1              | —               | 200 |
| Perceived improvement of internal communication | 0.87           | 0.000           | 200 |

Source: data processed using SPSS v.26.

H3. A positive perception of Copilot's usefulness in internal communication is correlated with higher perceived personal efficiency.

The correlation analysis indicates a statistically significant positive relationship between the perceived usefulness of Copilot in internal communication and employees' perceived personal efficiency ( $r = 0.920$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This confirms hypothesis H3, suggesting that employees who consider Copilot helpful in facilitating communication are more likely to report increased efficiency in their daily tasks (Table 4).

**Table 4. Correlations between perceived usefulness of Copilot in internal communication and perceived personal efficiency**

| Variable                                                  | Pearson Correlation | Sig. (2-tailed) | N   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----|
| Perceived usefulness of Copilot in internal communication | 1                   | —               | 200 |
| Perceived personal efficiency                             | 0.920               | 0.000           | 200 |

Source: data processed using SPSS v.26.

H4. Employees who hold a positive attitude towards AI are more likely to adopt and frequently use Microsoft Copilot.

The Spearman rank-order correlation shows a statistically significant positive association between employees' attitudes towards artificial intelligence and their frequency of Copilot use ( $r_s = 0.89$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This indicates that individuals who hold a more positive attitude towards AI are more likely to adopt and use Copilot regularly in their professional activities. The moderate strength of the correlation supports hypothesis H4 and suggests that attitudinal factors represent an important driver of AI adoption behaviours in organisational contexts. These findings reinforce the relevance of fostering positive perceptions of AI to encourage broader and more consistent integration of AI-assisted tools.

**Table 5. Spearman correlation between attitude towards AI and frequency of copilot use**

| Variable                     | Spearman's rho | Sig. (2-tailed) | N   |
|------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----|
| Positive attitude towards AI | 1              | —               | 200 |
| Frequency of Copilot use     | 0.89           | 0.000           | 200 |

Source: data processed using SPSS v.26.

The empirical findings are consistent with previous research on AI adoption, workplace digitalisation, and communication-enhancing technologies. The high level of familiarity and exposure to Microsoft Copilot among respondents reflects earlier findings showing that employees in digitally mature environments tend to adopt AI tools faster. This is especially visible in sectors such as IT and communication (Bravo et al., 2021; Kovaitė et al., 2020). The structure of the sample also matters. Most respondents are young and highly educated, which supports research showing that younger professionals often display stronger digital literacy and greater openness toward AI-based tools (Araujo et al., 2020).

The confirmation of H1 is in line with technology adoption frameworks such as TAM and UTAUT. These models argue that awareness, perceived competence, and perceived usefulness influence behavioural intention and actual use (Awa & Ukoha, 2020). Research on human–AI collaboration reaches a similar conclusion. Familiarity lowers uncertainty and makes employees more willing to include AI in daily work routines (Illia et al., 2023). The present study follows the same pattern.

H2 shows that frequent Copilot use is associated with better perceived internal communication. This supports earlier findings that AI tools can improve message clarity, reduce cognitive workload, and support more efficient information flow (Imran et al., 2021; Feuerriegel et al., 2024). In practical terms, employees may use Copilot to draft emails, summarise information, organise messages, or adjust tone. These functions are especially useful in remote and hybrid work settings, where written communication carries much of the daily workload (Kovaitė et al., 2020).

The result for H3 also fits the literature. Employees who perceive Copilot as useful for communication report higher personal efficiency. Chang et al. (2024) and Hornung and Smolnik (2022) note that AI systems can improve productivity by automating repetitive tasks and allowing employees to focus on more complex activities. The finding also confirms that trust and perceived utility are central to the benefits of AI tools, as discussed by Brown et al. (2022) and Illia et al. (2023).

H4 adds another relevant point. A positive attitude toward AI is linked to more frequent Copilot use. This corresponds with studies showing that emotional responses, trust, and openness to change influence technology acceptance (Araujo et al., 2020; Chang et al., 2024). The result also

supports earlier concerns about technostress. If employees feel anxious or sceptical about AI, adoption may remain limited, even when the tool is available (Hornung & Smolnik, 2022).

Overall, the findings show that Microsoft Copilot has a positive perceived influence on business communication performance. Respondents associate the tool with clearer messages, less time spent on communication tasks, and more coherent written output. Employees who use Copilot more frequently also report stronger improvements in internal communication. This suggests that AI-assisted tools can support communication efficiency and effectiveness.

The results also show that AI-assisted communication through Copilot is linked to higher perceived personal efficiency. Employees report time savings, better task management, and improved accuracy. The strong positive correlation between communication-related usefulness and efficiency indicates that productivity gains may come from better communication workflows.

Employees' willingness to adopt Copilot is shaped by several factors. Positive attitudes toward AI, perceived usefulness, trust in AI-generated outputs, and confidence in data security all matter. Employees who see AI as useful and feel comfortable working with AI tools are more likely to use Copilot regularly. Clear organisational guidelines and training can also increase openness to daily use.

Taken together, the results confirm and extend the existing literature. Microsoft Copilot, although still relatively under-studied, follows adoption and impact patterns found in earlier research on AI-driven communication technologies. This study therefore adds empirical evidence on Copilot's role in organisational communication. It also supports the need for policies focused on training, ethical use, and AI literacy.

## Conclusion

This study examined how Microsoft Copilot supports internal organisational communication and employee performance. The results offer empirical insight into the adoption and perceived value of AI-assisted tools in contemporary workplaces.

The quantitative findings show that familiarity with Copilot strongly predicts frequency of use. Employees who know the tool better tend to use it more often. Regular use is also associated with stronger perceptions of communication efficiency. This suggests that Copilot can support daily communication tasks, especially when employees understand how to use it in concrete work situations.

The results also show that employees who perceive Copilot as useful for internal communication report higher personal efficiency. This points to the role of AI in simplifying routine tasks and improving information flows. At the same time, attitudes toward AI influence adoption. Employees with more positive attitudes are more likely to use Copilot frequently. Technological readiness and employee perceptions therefore remain central in AI integration.

The study contributes to the literature by focusing specifically on Microsoft Copilot in a professional communication context. It extends research on AI-enabled communication, digital collaboration, and human–AI interaction. The findings show that Copilot's perceived usefulness is linked not only to better communication outcomes, but also to higher personal efficiency. These results support theoretical expectations regarding perceived utility, trust, and emotional disposition in technology adoption.

The practical implications are also clear. Organisations that plan to use AI tools should not rely only on technical implementation. Employees need targeted training, clear protocols, and transparent information about data security. These measures can strengthen trust and encourage more consistent use of AI-driven communication systems.

The study has several limitations. The sample is based on convenience sampling, which limits the generalisability of the findings. The cross-sectional design captures perceptions at a single point in time, so causal relationships cannot be established. The research also relies on self-reported data. Responses may therefore be influenced by subjective bias, social desirability, or different levels of experience with AI tools.

Future research could address these limits through longitudinal designs, larger probabilistic samples, and objective performance indicators. Further studies could also compare Copilot with other AI systems. Another useful direction would be to examine how organisational culture, leadership support, and digital literacy shape AI adoption.

In conclusion, the study shows that AI already plays a visible role in workplace communication and employee performance. Microsoft Copilot appears to support clearer communication, higher perceived efficiency, and stronger digital work practices when employees are familiar with the tool and hold positive attitudes toward AI. These findings provide a useful basis for future research and for organisations seeking responsible and effective AI integration.

## References

- Araujo, T., Helberger, N., Kruikemeier, S., & De Vreese, C. H. (2020). In AI we trust? Perceptions about automated decision-making by artificial intelligence. *AI & Society*, 35(3), 611–623.
- Awa, H. A. R. T., & Ukoha, K. A. L. U. (2020). Studying enterprise systems' acceptance using integrated unified theory of acceptance and use of technology (UTAUT). *Journal of Sustainability Science and Management*, 15(5), 98–126.
- Babashahi, L., Barbosa, C. E., Lima, Y., Lyra, A., Salazar, H., Argôlo, M., ... & Souza, J. M. D. (2024). AI in the workplace: A systematic review of skill transformation in the industry. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(6), 127.
- Bird, C., Ford, D., Zimmermann, T., Forsgren, N., Kalliamvakou, E., Lowdermilk, T., & Gazit, I. (2022). Taking Flight with Copilot: Early insights and opportunities of AI-powered pair-programming tools. *Queue*, 20(6), 35–57.
- Bravo, M. C. M., Chalezquer, C. S., & Serrano-Puche, J. (2021). Meta-framework of digital literacy: A comparative analysis of 21st-century skills frameworks. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, (79), 76–109.
- Brown, H., Lee, K., Mireshghallah, F., Shokri, R., & Tramèr, F. (2022). What does it mean for a language model to preserve privacy? *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 2280–2292.
- Chang, P. C., Zhang, W., Cai, Q., & Guo, H. (2024). Does AI-driven technostress promote or hinder employees' artificial intelligence adoption intention? A moderated mediation model of affective reactions and technical self-efficacy. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, 413–427.
- Feuerriegel, S., Hartmann, J., Janiesch, C., & Zschech, P. (2024). Generative AI. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 66(1), 111–126.
- Gupta, S. T., Joshi, P., Kaur, A., & Kumar, P. (2025). Digital tools and technologies: Enabling knowledge sharing and collaborative business culture. In *Knowledge sharing and fostering collaborative business culture* (pp. 297–328). IGI Global.
- Harrington, K. (2025). *Revolutionizing workplace productivity: How Microsoft Copilot transforms O365 Online*.

- Hassan, A. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence on organizational communication. In *Artificial Intelligence and Economic Sustainability in the Era of Industrial Revolution 5.0* (pp. 793–807). Springer.
- Hornung, O., & Smolnik, S. (2022). AI invading the workplace: Negative emotions towards the organizational use of personal virtual assistants. *Electronic Markets*, 32(1), 123–138.
- Ikram, I., & Othman, B. (2025). Human-AI collaboration: Enhancing creativity and productivity in the digital age. *Baltic Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 2(1), 1–6.
- Illia, L., Colleoni, E., & Zyglidopoulos, S. (2023). Ethical implications of text generation in the age of artificial intelligence. *Business Ethics, the Environment & Responsibility*, 32(1), 201–210.
- Imran, F., Shahzad, K., Butt, A., & Kantola, J. (2021). Digital transformation of industrial organizations: Toward an integrated framework. *Journal of Change Management*, 21(4), 451–479.
- Jia, N., Luo, X., Fang, Z., & Liao, C. (2024). When and how artificial intelligence augments employee creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 67(1), 5–32.
- Jöhnk, J., Weißert, M., & Wyrski, K. (2021). Ready or not, AI comes—An interview study of organizational AI readiness factors. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 63(1), 5–20.
- Kovaitė, K., Šumakaris, P., & Stankevičienė, J. (2020). Digital communication channels in Industry 4.0 implementation: The role of internal communication. *Management: Journal of Contemporary Management Issues*, 25(1), 171–191.
- Lau, S., & Guo, P. (2023). From “ban it till we understand it” to “resistance is futile”: How university programming instructors plan to adapt as more students use AI code generation and explanation tools such as ChatGPT and GitHub Copilot. *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research*, 106–121.
- Morandini, S., Fraboni, F., De Angelis, M., Puzzo, G., Giusino, D., & Pietrantonio, L. (2023). The impact of artificial intelligence on workers’ skills: Upskilling and reskilling in organisations. *Informing Science*, 26, 39–68.
- Na, S., Heo, S., Han, S., Shin, Y., & Roh, Y. (2022). Acceptance model of artificial intelligence-based technologies in construction firms: Applying TAM in combination with the TOE framework. *Buildings*, 12(2), 90.
- Prather, J., Reeves, B. N., Denny, P., Becker, B. A., Leinonen, J., Luxton-Reilly, A., & Santos, E. A. (2023). “It’s weird that it knows what I want”: Usability and interactions with Copilot for novice programmers. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 31(1), 1–31.
- Ross, S. I., Martinez, F., Houde, S., Muller, M., & Weisz, J. D. (2023). The programmer’s assistant: Conversational interaction with a large language model for software development. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, pp. 491–514.
- Vanden Abeele, M. M., Vandebosch, H., Koster, E. H., De Leyn, T., Van Gaeveeren, K., de Segovia Vicente, D., ... & Baillien, E. (2024). Why, how, when, and for whom does digital disconnection work? A process-based framework of digital disconnection. *Communication Theory*, 34(1), 3–17.