

TOWARDS ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE: DETERMINANTS OF EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION IN ORGANIZATIONS – AN EXAMPLE FROM THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

Agnieszka WALCZAK-SKAŁECKA^{1*}, Kamil SKAŁECKI², Jagoda CYC³

¹ Lublin University of Technology; a.skalecka@pollub.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-1386-2158

² Lublin University of Technology; k.skalecki@pollub.pl, ORCID: 0009-0007-5585-095X

³ Lublin University of Technology; j.cyc@pollub.pl

* Correspondence author

Purpose: The study aimed to identify and analyze factors that, according to the surveyed employees, shape the effectiveness of communication within their organization.

Design/methodology/approach: The study's data were collected using a dual approach, combining a diagnostic survey and in-depth interviews. A total of 41 employees from a telecommunications company participated in the research. The study was conducted from May to June 2025.

Findings: Employees are not only aware of the importance of communication for understanding their tasks and achieving organizational goals but also recognize areas in need of improvement and potential solutions. At the same time, they demonstrate openness and a development-oriented mindset, which may serve as a foundation for building organizational resilience through enhanced communication effectiveness.

Research limitations/implications: The study was conducted on a small sample, which limits the generalizability of the findings.

Practical implications: The article may serve as an inspiration for managers, who can directly influence the issues identified by employees as important, such as fostering a friendly climate and open attitudes, promoting direct contact, clarifying the division of roles, reducing time pressure, and developing and implementing clear communication procedures.

Originality/value: The article focuses on the underestimated importance of effective communication as a key factor shaping organizational resilience. The study provides a detailed analysis of the determinants of communication effectiveness in the specific context of a selected telecommunications company, which is important because the significance of these factors may vary considerably depending on the organization.

Keywords: effective communication, organizational resilience, communication barriers, managerial attitude.

Category of the paper: Research Paper.

1. Introduction

Organizational resilience is becoming an increasingly significant component of contemporary management discourse. Undoubtedly, this is a consequence of recurring disruptions, which tend to originate from unexpected domains and sources. Whether an organization survives and the extent to which it can cope more effectively with subsequent crises depends on its capacity to master the process of developing organizational resilience (McCarthy et al., 2017; Miceli et al., 2021; Napier et al., 2024; Pradana, Ekowati, 2024; Su, Junge, 2023). Among the factors shaping organizational resilience, communication deserves particular attention. On the one hand, it is the most common and pervasive element of all human activity; on the other, its importance is still often underestimated within organizations (Dahlman, Heide, 2020; Ruck, Welch, 2012). There is also evidence suggesting that communication constitutes one of the most critical factors reinforcing organizational resilience (Bui et al., 2019).

The study presented here concentrates on identifying and analyzing the factors that determine communication effectiveness within a selected telecommunications enterprise. The potential number of determinants influencing effective communication at the team and organizational levels is considerable. Consequently, it is the specific organizational context that ultimately shapes the relative significance of these factors in relation to the development of communication effectiveness and organizational resilience.

2. Organizational resilience in relation to communication effectiveness

Contemporary conceptualizations of resilience emphasize its critical role in managing risk and uncertainty. The prevailing perspective in the literature frames resilience as a multidimensional capability of a system to anticipate and mitigate threats while responding effectively to change. In the first case, the organization identifies risks and flexibly adjusts its process structures; in the second, it promptly restores functionality following a crisis and systematically develops adaptive competencies (Bhamra et al., 2011; Burnard, Bhamra, 2011; Ortiz-de-Mandojana, Bansal, 2016). Another essential attribute of resilience lies in the development of solutions that do not give rise to persistent, regressive behavioral patterns (Alliger et al., 2015; Bowers et al., 2017; Chapman et al., 2020). Analyzing organizational resilience through the lens of a dynamic process, encompassing practices across all organizational levels, such as fostering team cohesion, strengthening trust and solidarity, sharing leadership, and promoting open communication (Brykman, King, 2021; Mitchell et al., 2025; Morgan et al., 2015; Pavez et al., 2021; Varajão et al., 2023), appears to constitute the

foundation for cultivating the competencies necessary for resilience development. Attempting to capture the essence of organizational resilience also requires examining the dimension of individual resilience, as well as the dynamics occurring between individuals and organizational units (Hartwig et al., 2020; Stoverink et al., 2020). What happens within teams between individuals is invariably mediated by communication processes.

Team communication plays a critical role in supporting organizational resilience, enabling teams to adapt, respond effectively to challenges, and maintain performance under dynamic and demanding conditions. When an unexpected event arises during the execution of a complex task, team members must rapidly establish effective communication. This is essential for developing a shared understanding of the altered situation and for appropriately adjusting action strategies (Blanchard et al., 2023). Intensive communication by leaders supports teams in reducing stress, accelerating knowledge flow, and stimulating innovation. Collective creativity, in turn, proves critical for functioning effectively in an uncertain business environment (Wang et al., 2024). Teams' experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic accelerated organizational evolution, orienting it toward greater employee autonomy, mutual trust, and responsibility. The degree of team integration, as well as the role of intermediaries within communication networks assumed by certain employees, facilitated processes of coping with crises (Maurer et al., 2022). Communication serves as a central link within the system, enabling the sharing of critical information, which facilitates the interpretation of events, the establishment of order, and the definition of actions. The process of information exchange constitutes a fundamental mechanism for ascribing meaning to organizational activities. As a result, both efficiency and adaptability are enhanced. From a systems perspective, communication functions as a core integrative element through which goals, processes, schedules, outcomes, and the overall direction of the organization are understood (Home, Orr, 1997). A meta-analysis examining the role of communication in the coping and effectiveness of diverse teams demonstrated that communication is a critical intra-organizational process in developing organizational resilience (Bui et al., 2019). Communication functions as a core mechanism for building resilience through narrative processes, sharing experiences, the cultivation of collective identity, and sensemaking (Buzzanell, 2018). Narratives bind communities and teams together, enabling them to construct shared realities that appear inaccessible to groups unable to co-create collective stories (Brach, Wasilewski, 2024). These reinforcing practices, together with communication oriented toward crisis management (Kim, 2021) constitute a significant contribution to the development of organizational resilience.

Not all communication processes can, however, be considered effective. The effectiveness of intra-organizational communication is influenced by multiple factors, including the clarity and precision of the message (Bambacas, Patrickson, 2008; Bang et al., 2010; Pandey, Garnett, 2006; Park, Choi, 2020), responsibility, conciseness, and honesty in communication (Marques, 2010), the level of personal engagement in the process, manifested, for example, through active listening practices, emotional intelligence, and empathy (Clark et al., 2019; Fuller et al., 2021;

Hendon et al., 2017; Kiran Gupta, 2025; Muss et al., 2025), general cognitive openness, the ability to adapt communication style to the situation and the audience (Brown et al., 2019; Hicks, 2020; Oliveira et al., 2022), competence in providing and receiving feedback, as well as organizational structure (Chew et al., 2024; Maurer et al., 2023; Yazici, 2002), organizational culture (Brown, Starkey, 1994; Gochhayat et al., 2017; Men, Yue, 2019; Yue et al., 2021), and communication technologies (Chew et al., 2024; Yazici, 2002). In the context of a specific organization, it is therefore necessary to analyze the key factors shaping communication effectiveness within that particular team, at that specific time, and in that unique context. Only such an analysis can provide insights into what requires development, what needs to be fundamentally changed, and what should be maintained, enabling the organization to move systematically toward the cultivation of organizational resilience.

3. Research methodology

The subject of the study was a telecommunications company operating for 15 years. The enterprise specializes in providing high-speed fiber-optic internet, wireless internet services, and a wide range of television and telephony offerings. Its customer base includes individual clients, businesses, and public institutions. The company employs 47 people across two branches.

The following research question was formulated: What determinants shape communication effectiveness in the studied organization? The research aims to identify, based on employees' perceptions, the factors influencing communication effectiveness within their organization and to analyze these factors.

Effective communication is a complex process, and several factors that may influence its ultimate course appear difficult to predict. Among the main categories of these factors are the adaptation of messages to the informational needs of recipients, which is the responsibility of the sender; the allocation of communication roles, including the particular role of management in this process; the integrity of communication processes and organizational culture, which shapes interpersonal relationships and provides the often implicit backdrop for communication; and, finally, processes for monitoring communication effectiveness and its continuous improvement (Olsztyńska, 2002). The nature of the organization's activities also plays a significant role. The emphasis on communication effectiveness differs between virtual teams and on-site production environments, where direct, face-to-face interaction remains particularly important (Battiston et al., 2020). The first hypothesis was formulated as follows:

- H1.** According to employees' perceptions, the key factors of effective communication in the studied organization are a friendly team atmosphere, direct contact within the branch, and a clear task division.

Face-to-face communication and electronic channels, including email, are the most frequently used forms of communication within organizations (Kaneko, 2025; Lee, 2022; Major, Spalek, 2017). On this basis, the second hypothesis was formulated:

H2. The most frequently utilized communication channels in the studied organization are face-to-face communication and email.

Due to its complexity and the diversity of influencing factors, the communication process faces numerous challenges and barriers. Among these are organizational issues (Greer et al., 2018), cultural differences, individual-level factors (Dierdorff, Fisher, 2022; Vishnubhotla, Mendes, 2024), psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999), and information overload, which has taken on new significance in contemporary contexts (Eppler, Mengis, 2004). On this basis, the following hypothesis was formulated:

H3. The most frequently encountered communication barriers among employees in the studied organization are the diverse attitudes and individual communication competencies of those involved in the communication process.

The data were collected using a dual approach. First, the diagnostic survey method was employed, utilizing a questionnaire technique. The research instrument was a proprietary survey questionnaire, with items focusing on the assessment of communication effectiveness within the organization, the channels and tools used for communication in the studied organization, and the barriers encountered by respondents in this area. A five-point Likert scale was applied. The questionnaire also included demographic items and one open-ended question, designed to provide respondents with an opportunity to share their reflections on potential improvements to communication. Paper-based questionnaires were distributed within the organization, and data were collected between May and June 2025. Second, the interview method was employed, specifically the technique of in-depth individual interviews (IDI). The research tool applied was an interview guide. The interviews were semi-structured, which made it possible to compare results while at the same time maintaining the flexibility of responses and the opportunity to explore issues in more depth where it was considered relevant. The interviews were conducted in June 2025. The decision to employ two research methods, a questionnaire survey and in-depth individual interviews, was motivated by the intention to obtain the most comprehensive and multifaceted picture of the research problem.

A total of 31 employees participated in the questionnaire survey, including 27 women and 4 men. The respondents represented the following job positions: Assistant/Support Staff, Specialist, and Coordinator. In addition, 10 in-depth interviews were conducted, involving 3 men and 7 women.

4. Results

4.1. Quantitative data analysis

The overall assessment of communication (Table 1) does not appear to be at a satisfactory level (overall mean score – 3.16). At the same time, employees recognize the existence of a communication channel they perceive as effective; however, the responses in this regard were not consistent ($M = 4.06$; $SD = 1.26$). The lowest-rated aspect was access to key information regarding changes within the company ($M = 2.81$; $SD = 1.11$). This result may suggest that employees often do not receive information in a clear and timely manner.

Table 1.
Overall evaluation of organizational communication

Item	M	SD
Information about significant changes within the company (e.g., reorganizations, project modifications) reaches me in a clear and timely manner.	2.81	1.11
I have easy access to documents, procedures, or updates necessary for my work.	3.65	1.25
My supervisor regularly provides me with feedback regarding my work and the team's objectives.	3.48	1.39
There is an effective communication channel within the company that allows me to connect with other employees.	4.06	1.26
I am informed about decisions that directly pertain to my position or team.	3.23	1.43

Source: own elaboration.

The remaining elements assessed as part of the overall characterization of communication in the studied organization received average ratings, with mean scores ranging from 3.23 to 3.65. The similar standard deviations indicate a variability in how communication practices are perceived within the organization.

Interdepartmental communication received even lower ratings (Table 2). Respondents indicated that communication pathways that could facilitate problem-solving between departments are difficult to consider well-established ($M = 2.94$; $SD = 1.31$). Moreover, departments exchange key information to a less than satisfactory degree ($M = 3.03$; $SD = 1.22$). Among the elements assessed at this stage, the highest rating was given to the statement regarding the efficiency of conflict resolution between departments ($M = 3.45$; $SD = 1.29$). It is therefore possible that, despite the absence of established formal communication pathways, employees take the initiative to resolve conflict situations on their own. Such scenarios often occur in young or small organizations, where operational activities are prioritized over the creation of formal procedural guidelines. The assessment of interdepartmental collaboration is not consistent among the surveyed employees.

Table 2.*Evaluation of communication between departments*

Item	M	SD
Collaboration between departments takes place without unnecessary delays.	3.16	1.34
Departments transparently exchange key information.	3.03	1.22
Inter-team communication is well-organized and yields tangible results.	3.29	1.10
Established communication pathways exist for resolving interdepartmental issues.	2.94	1.31
Interdepartmental conflicts are resolved promptly and do not escalate.	3.45	1.29

Source: own elaboration.

Respondent employees were also asked to assess the impact of communication on work effectiveness within the organization (Table 3). The highest rating was given to the statement that clear and regular communication enhances individual work effectiveness, with employees showing greater consistency in their assessments compared to previous items ($M = 4.52$; $SD = 0.85$). Almost equally important, according to employees, was the speed of information flow ($M = 4.48$; $SD = 0.85$). Respondents also indicated that a lack of transparent communication can reduce work efficiency, although the variability in responses was somewhat higher in this case ($M = 4.16$; $SD = 1.29$). The lower mean rating of the positive impact of regular meetings on work pace and quality ($M = 3.84$; $SD = 1.21$), may result from both their frequency and perceived relevance.

Table 3.*Employees' assessment of the impact of communication on work effectiveness in the organization*

Item	M	SD
Clear and regular communication enhances my work effectiveness.	4.52	0.85
A fast flow of information within the company helps me perform my tasks more effectively.	4.48	0.85
A lack of transparent communication reduces my work efficiency.	4.16	1.29
Regular team meetings positively influence the pace and quality of my work.	3.84	1.21
Effective communication with supervisors motivates me to work more efficiently.	4.03	1.27

Source: own elaboration.

Employees of the studied organization use multiple communication channels in their daily work (Table 4). According to employees, the most frequently used communication channels are the company phone ($M = 4.45$; $SD = 1.06$) and email ($M = 4.26$; $SD = 0.99$). Both of these channels were also rated highly in terms of effectiveness - the company phone ($M = 4.23$; $SD = 1.36$) and email ($M = 4.35$; $SD = 0.87$). The slightly higher rating of email in this category, coupled with its lower standard deviation, may indicate that the ability to refer back to previous communications provided by this channel, which is clearly not afforded by phone conversations, is particularly important given the nature of the work performed by the respondents.

Table 4.*Employees' assessment of the frequency and effectiveness of communication channel use*

Communication channel	Frequency of use		Effectiveness	
	M	SD	M	SD
Email	4.26	0.99	4.35	0.87
Company phone	4.45	1.06	4.23	1.36
Corporate messenger	3.97	1.22	4.29	1.03
Face-to-face meetings	3.84	1.29	4.16	1.26

Source: own elaboration.

Although employees use the corporate messenger less frequently than the phone or email, they rate its effectiveness almost equally high. Face-to-face meetings are conducted somewhat less frequently ($M = 3.84$; $SD = 1.29$), and their perceived effectiveness is slightly lower as well ($M = 4.16$; $SD = 1.26$).

In addition to communication channels, respondents assessed the quality of the information they received in the context of their tasks (Table 5). Respondents reported the greatest difficulties in receiving information about project changes with sufficient lead time ($M = 2.65$; $SD = 1.45$). Although responses were highly variable in this regard, a similar pattern was observed in the assessment of the regularity of feedback on work performance ($M = 3.16$; $SD = 1.57$). Reactive communication behaviors on the part of managers received the highest rating ($M = 3.90$; $SD = 1.22$). Slightly lower ratings were given to the clarity of expectation-setting ($M = 3.68$; $SD = 1.28$), communication and updating of task priorities ($M = 3.61$; $SD = 1.26$).

Table 5.*Employees' assessment of the quality of information received related to task performance*

Item	M	SD
I receive clear and precise guidelines regarding expectations for my work.	3.68	1.28
Task priorities are clearly defined and regularly updated.	3.61	1.26
I regularly receive constructive feedback on my work.	3.16	1.57
I can count on a prompt response when I approach my supervisor with a question.	3.90	1.22
I am informed about project changes with sufficient lead time.	2.65	1.45

Source: own elaboration.

According to the respondents, effective communication is one of the key factors influencing the achievement of organizational goals (Table 6). Almost all items received scores above 4.5. The most important aspect, from the respondents' perspective, was the clarity of communication, which helps reduce the risk of errors during project execution ($M = 4.87$; $SD = 0.43$). Respondents were consistent in their views. According to them, effective communication helps to better understand the company's goals and facilitates the identification and resolution of problems ($M = 4.77$; $SD = 0.42$). Slightly lower ratings were assigned to regular updates on work progress in relation to maintaining focus on specific objectives ($M = 4.45$; $SD = 0.81$).

Table 6.

Employees' assessment of the importance of effective communication for achieving organizational goals

Item	M	SD
Clear communication reduces the risk of errors in project execution.	4.87	0.43
Effective communication helps me better understand the company's goals.	4.77	0.42
Efficient communication enables us to identify and resolve problems more quickly.	4.77	0.42
Open communication increases my engagement in achieving the company's objectives.	4.65	0.66
Regular updates on work progress help me maintain focus on specific goals.	4.45	0.81

Source: own elaboration.

Among the main barriers hindering effective communication (Table 7), respondents identified fatigue ($M = 3.06$; $SD = 1.39$), time pressure ($M = 2.84$; $SD = 1.28$), and differences in temperament ($M = 2.74$; $SD = 1.39$). In all cases, responses varied among the participants. Considering the level of ratings for the individual items, it can be concluded that communication barriers in the studied organization do not occur to a significant extent.

Table 7.

Employees' assessment of the intensity of communication barriers

Item	M	SD
Criticism	2.16	1.24
Name-calling	1.29	0.74
Premature judgment	2.29	1.31
Praise combined with evaluation	1.55	0.85
Dictating	1.84	0.93
Threatening	1.03	0.18
Moralizing	1.39	0.71
Asking too many or inappropriate questions	2.00	1.26
Unjustified advising	1.71	0.90
Distracting attention	1.48	0.68
Illogical reasoning	1.74	0.96
Ironic reassurance	1.42	0.67
Information distortion	2.16	1.29
Excessively large, rapid, or voluminous information	2.06	1.26
Unclear subject matter	1.97	1.14
Incomprehensible language	1.65	0.95
Negative attitude	2.03	1.2
Shyness	1.52	0.89
Lack of interest in the issue	2.29	1.13
Excessive emotional involvement	2.55	1.23
Lack of substantive preparation	2.29	1.24
Lack of concentration	1.94	0.99
Monotony of speech	1.61	0.71
Differences in temperament	2.74	1.39
Fatigue	3.06	1.39
Noise	1.90	1.16
Inappropriate meeting location	1.71	1.10
Too few/too many participants in the discussion	1.65	0.84
Time pressure	2.84	1.28
Poor room arrangement	1.23	0.50
Telecommunications network failure	1.90	1.16

Source: own elaboration.

4.2. Qualitative data analysis

Interviewees assessed the quality of communication in the organization as average [“Honestly, I would say it’s average, although recently one of our IT specialists has been trying to improve it”, PM6], good [“Communication between offices or between employees is, I think, at a good level”, PK3] or very good [“You could say it’s very good, (...). Basically, I don’t see any problems”, PK8].

According to the interviewees, the factors shaping communication effectiveness in the studied organization are:

- individual attitudes and competencies,
- the communication climate established by supervisors (“A closer relationship and a more relaxed atmosphere greatly facilitate the communication process” [PK2], “If a supervisor talks normally with their employees, then employees are open with them” [PM10]),
- organizational structure and division of responsibilities,
- communication methods and tools, with the greatest expectations placed on face-to-face meetings (“Meetings would help a lot, or some kind of accountability for what was done and what wasn’t, and why? More frequent conversations” [PK3], “Regular team meetings would help a lot. Everyone could report on their progress so others would know how things are going” [PK4], “I think it would be good to simply have a group meeting and discuss everything we are currently working on, what is a priority, and what needs to be done” [PK8]),
- fast, ongoing, and complete information flow,
- availability of key personnel involved in specific communication processes.

Among the major communication challenges identified by the respondents were:

- inadequate top-down information management between employees and supervisors, such as insufficient communication from supervisors, lack of time for detailed task discussions or duplication of tasks (unjustified delegation to two employees), absence of established communication procedures and pathways, and lack of personal culture in communication,
- insufficient flow and access to information, e.g., failure to communicate the completion of a given stage of work, poorly chosen communication channels, or incomplete information,
- challenges related to communication tools and their effective use, such as low user competence, underutilization or inadequate use of communication tools, and lack of employee readiness to adopt digital communication solutions,
- lack of clarity in roles, responsibilities, and task coordination,
- interpersonal and personality-related factors,

- time pressure and workload, e.g., lack of time and availability of key individuals, insufficient time for training, or excessive number of tasks within a short timeframe,
- conflicts and misunderstandings arising from missing, incomplete, or poorly executed tasks and insufficient information sharing.

Table 8 presents exemplifications of the above categories in excerpts from the collected data.

Table 8.

Communication challenges in the examined enterprise based on the conducted interviews

Challenge	Exemplification in collected data
Inadequate top-down information management in employee - supervisor relations	„There is a lack of communication between, let’s say, the boss and the employees directly reporting to him. I think there is a lot that could be improved here. (...) I am very dependent on my supervisor’s decisions. (...) and here what is really missing is time on his part to just sit down and thoroughly discuss a given issue, how it should be handled” [PK2]. „If they create chaos or are unable to communicate information properly, it later translates into individual departments, which then cannot reach an understanding or encounter problems” [PK3]. „Very often, while carrying out a task, I find out that, for example, my boss is already continuing this task, even though he assigned it to me, and when I call someone, I discover that he is already working on it” [PK4]. „If a supervisor is unpleasant or unsympathetic towards someone, no one will come to him with a problem or expect a solution, because they will be afraid of being shouted at. So the very form of conversation, kindness towards the other person, has in my opinion a fundamental impact” [PM10].
Insufficient flow and access to information	„However, there are certain difficulties, especially when someone does not pass on to others the information about the stage at which they finished their part of the task” [PK4]. „Information does not reach where it should; you tell someone, but the information is not retained, and later accusations arise like: ‘I told you that,’ ‘No, I didn’t hear it’” [PM10].
Challenges related to communication tools and their effective use	„One of our IT specialists in the company is trying to improve this by implementing program [x], but I don’t think everyone is fully able to use it yet” [PM6]. „It works well for smaller projects, but for larger ones, there’s so much that if we were to start using it, I think a separate person would be needed just to manage this platform and coordinate the tasks, deadlines, and so on” [PK7].
Lack of clarity in roles, responsibilities, an task coordination	„One person receives the same task, or no one receives it” [PK3]. „Overall, we have a problem with delegating the appropriate tasks to people; in my opinion, the scope of responsibilities is not properly defined, which disrupts communication from the very beginning because sometimes it’s unclear who should be told what. Information reaches different people, not necessarily those it should, and I believe that the lack of clearly defined responsibilities can affect communication problems, as it is unclear where a given message should go” [PM10].
Interpersonal and personality-related factors	„If someone is introverted, they may not necessarily report problems at work or might be afraid to speak up. On the other hand, if someone has a difficult personality and cannot get along with others, it also affects efficiency, because interpersonal problems and conflicts arise, which in turn impact work” [PK3]. „I believe this is a direct personality trait and has a direct impact on communication. Not everyone will want to participate in a conversation. Some prefer to remain passive, so there is a group of people, even in our organization, who simply acknowledge information without engaging. Not everyone wants to discuss a given topic” [PM10].
Time pressure and workload	„If I don’t have time, and they are still learning or facing new situations, problems can arise because there simply isn’t enough time to train everything” [PK3]. „If someone responds nervously because they already have too many tasks, it definitely has a negative impact and makes everything more difficult” [PK4]. „In every company, there is pressure and stress imposed from above, whether through deadlines or from management insisting that something must be completed” [PM6]. „A major factor is the high workload and lack of time to simply meet, so that everyone could meet at the same time and discuss things” [PK7].

Cont. table 8.

Conflicts and misunderstandings	„Everyone is different; one person is so busy and didn't pass something on to another, which confused work" [PK1]. „I think there are sometimes misunderstandings, for example, when there are no clear divisions. It has happened that several people were working on the same task at the same time, wasting time and causing unnecessary conflicts" [PK2]. „Sometimes misunderstandings can occur because someone didn't do something, and someone else was waiting for it, or it wasn't communicated on time" [PK3].
---------------------------------	--

Source: own elaboration.

5. Discussion

The research aimed to assess the factors shaping communication effectiveness in the studied organization from the employees' perspective. The hypothesis concerning the key factors of effective communication in the studied company, assuming that they include a friendly atmosphere in the group, direct contact, and a clear division of tasks, was confirmed by the collected data. Respondents highlighted kindness, warmth, and closeness of relationships as elements that not only are noticed but also, in their opinion, facilitate smooth and uninterrupted communication. „A closer relationship and a more relaxed atmosphere greatly facilitate the communication process" [PK2], „If a supervisor communicates normally with their employees, then the employees are open to them" [PM10]. In evaluating individual attitudes, openness also emerged as a factor promoting the development of a friendly atmosphere. These elements are consistent with existing literature, which emphasizes the role of emotional intelligence and empathy in organizational communication processes (Clark et al., 2019; Fuller et al., 2021; Hendon et al., 2017; Kiran Gupta, 2025; Muss et al., 2025), as well as organizational culture (Brown, Starkey, 1994; Gochhayat et al., 2017; Men, Yue, 2019; Yue et al., 2021) and the leader's communication style (Brown et al., 2019; Hicks, 2020). The obtained results are consistent with previous findings, indicating that kind and open attitudes contribute to more effective communication within the organization.

Both quantitative and qualitative data highlight direct contact as the form of communication that enhances work efficiency and provides employees with a clear understanding of their task: "Regular team meetings positively affect the pace and quality of my work" ($M = 3.84$; $SD = 1.21$). These findings are supported by the literature (Battiston et al., 2020). Moreover, direct contact is one of the elements that facilitates the development of trust, team cohesion, and open communication, all of which are crucial for building organizational resilience (Brykman, King, 2021; Mitchell et al., 2025; Morgan et al., 2015; Pavez et al., 2021; Varajão et al., 2023).

Interestingly, the *Resource model of team resilience capacity* (Brykman, King, 2021) suggests that the link between a team's learning capacity and its resilience runs in the direction of learning. The primary trigger in this process is *Voice Climate*, which provides employees

with the space to express their opinions and share their challenges. The effect of such an organizational climate can be reinforced by the leader's attitude and behavior, specifically their *Leader's Learning Goal Orientation*. A leader who actively promotes learning as a goal enables fuller use of the organizational climate by building *Team Resilience Capacity*. These links are visible in the collected material, although it is difficult to assess their direction.

In contrast, the division of roles emerges from the collected data as somewhat unclear in places, requiring clarification and hindering daily work. Therefore, the gaps noted by respondents can be regarded as an indication of the significance of this factor in enhancing or diminishing communication effectiveness. The importance of clarity in messaging and the clear assignment of tasks for communication effectiveness has been emphasized by numerous authors (Bambacas, Patrickson, 2008; Bang et al., 2010; Pandey, Garnett, 2006; Park, Choi, 2020), as well as the division of roles within the organizational structure (Chew et al., 2024; Maurer et al., 2023; Yazici, 2002).

The second hypothesis assumed that the most frequently used communication channels in the studied organization are direct communication and email. This hypothesis was partially confirmed. Email is indeed one of the most frequently used communication channels, with a mean usage frequency of $M = 4.26$. However, the company phone is used even more frequently than email, achieving the highest mean usage frequency of $M = 4.45$. Direct meetings are practiced slightly less often than the company phone, email, or corporate messenger, with a mean usage frequency of $M = 3.84$. These findings are partially supported by the literature, which identifies email and face-to-face meetings as the most common communication channels in organizations (Kaneko, 2025; Lee, 2022; Major, Spalek, 2017). The high frequency of company phone usage in this case may be related to the nature and dynamism of the business activities. It is also worth noting that telecommunication technologies are highlighted by researchers as important for communication effectiveness (Chew et al., 2024; Yazici, 2002).

The third hypothesis, concerning the most frequently occurring communication barriers and assuming that they are employees' attitudes and individual communication competencies, was not fully confirmed. Interpersonal factors are indeed significant and can constitute a barrier to communication; however, other factors were reported as occurring more frequently: „fatigue” ($M = 3.06$; $SD = 1.39$) and „time pressure” ($M = 2.84$; $SD = 1.28$). In third place were „differences in temperament” ($M = 2.74$; $SD = 1.39$), which relate to individual traits. These issues were also raised in the interview data, although no conclusions can be drawn regarding their greater significance relative to the other reported barriers. The literature indicates that individual traits and competencies can strongly influence communication effectiveness (Dierdorff, Fisher, 2022; Vishnubhotla, Mendes, 2024), which is consistent with the findings of this study. Researchers also indicate that information overload (Eppler, Mengis, 2004) and organizational factors (Greer et al., 2018), which are a frequent cause of time pressure during tasks, significantly affect communication processes within organizations. It is worth

noting here that communication within an organization can help build its resilience when it is symmetrical and gives both a sense of being heard and elicits a response from the supervisor (Kim, 2021). However, it is difficult to build such an environment without constantly working to remove communication barriers.

A primary limitation of the present study is the small sample size, which prevents the generalization of the findings to a larger population. Given the complex and multi-layered nature of communication within organizations, particularly from the perspective of building organizational resilience, it is important to examine organizations within their specific contexts, as these contexts may strongly influence the relative importance of different determinants of communication effectiveness. Other teams with a high degree of diversity among their members include, for example, teams working according to the Design Thinking methodology. These teams deliberately manage diversity and are therefore potentially an interesting field for observing the methods used to strengthen team resilience.

The practical implications of the present study focus primarily on actions that team managers can undertake. Measures such as fostering a friendly climate, promoting open attitudes and direct, task-oriented contact, as well as clarifying the division of roles, coordinating tasks, and developing clear communication procedures that can lead to a reduction in time pressure and employee fatigue, can be an effective recipe for improving communication efficiency in the organization and, as a result, also have a positive impact on strengthening its resilience.

6. Conclusion

Employees recognize the importance of effective communication for their personal ability to perform tasks efficiently, reduce the risk of errors, and understand organizational goals. The organization faces practical challenges in communication, particularly regarding role clarity and the management of employee workload. Addressing these issues through fostering a friendly climate, promoting direct contact, clarifying task distribution, and reducing time pressure and fatigue will be crucial for enhancing communication effectiveness and, consequently, for building and maintaining organizational resilience. Openness to discussion and the expressed willingness to develop organizational communication provide a fertile ground for active participation in strengthening organizational resilience, an outcome that may be difficult to achieve without effective communication.

References

1. Alliger, G.M., Cerasoli, C.P., Tannenbaum, S.I., Vessey, W.B. (2015). Team resilience. How teams flourish under pressure. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44(3), 176-184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2015.05.003>
2. Bambacas, M., Patrickson, M. (2008). Interpersonal communication skills that enhance organisational commitment. *Journal of Communication Management*, 12(1), 51-72. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13632540810854235>
3. Bang, H., Fuglesang, S.L., Ovesen, M.R., Eilertsen, D.E. (2010). Effectiveness in top management group meetings: The role of goal clarity, focused communication, and learning behavior. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 51(3), 253-261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2009.00769.x>
4. Battiston, D., Blanes I Vidal, J., Kirchmaier, T. (2020). Face-to-Face Communication in Organisations. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2934290>
5. Bhamra, R., Dani, S., Burnard, K. (2011). Resilience: The concept, a literature review and future directions. *International Journal of Production Research*, 49(18), 5375-5393. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2011.563826>
6. Blanchard, M.D., Kleitman, S., Aidman, E. (2023). Are two naïve and distributed heads better than one? Factors influencing the performance of teams in a challenging real-time task. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1042710. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1042710>
7. Bowers, C., Kreutzer, C., Cannon-Bowers, J., Lamb, J. (2017). Team Resilience as a Second-Order Emergent State: A Theoretical Model and Research Directions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1360. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01360>
8. Brach, B., Wasilewski, J. (2024). *Organizacja to opowieść*. Newsline.
9. Brown, A.D., Starkey, K. (1994). The Effect of Organizational Culture on Communication and Information. *Journal of Management Studies*, 31(6), 807-828. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1994.tb00640.x>
10. Brown, O., Paz-Aparicio, C., Revilla, A.J. (2019). Leader's communication style, LMX and organizational commitment: A study of employee perceptions in Peru. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 40(2), 230-258. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-03-2018-0129>
11. Brykman, K. M., King, D.D. (2021). A Resource Model of Team Resilience Capacity and Learning. *Group & Organization Management*, 46(4), 737-772. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10596011211018008>
12. Bui, H., Chau, V.S., Degl'Innocenti, M., Leone, L., Vicentini, F. (2019). The Resilient Organisation: A Meta- Analysis of the Effect of Communication on Team Diversity and Team Performance. *Applied Psychology*, 68(4), 621-657. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12203>

13. Burnard, K., Bhamra, R. (2011). Organisational resilience: Development of a conceptual framework for organisational responses. *International Journal of Production Research*, 49(18), 5581-5599. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2011.563827>
14. Buzzanell, P.M. (2018). Organizing resilience as adaptive-transformational tensions. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 46(1), 14-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2018.1426711>
15. Chapman, M.T., Lines, R.L.J., Crane, M., Ducker, K.J., Ntoumanis, N., Peeling, P., Parker, S.K., Quested, E., Temby, P., Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C., Gucciardi, D.F. (2020). Team resilience: A scoping review of conceptual and empirical work. *Work & Stress*, 34(1), 57-81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2018.1529064>
16. Chew, X., Alharbi, R., Khaw, K.W., Alnoor, A. (2024). How information technology influences organizational communication: The mediating role of organizational structure. *PSU Research Review*, 8(3), 633-647. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PRR-08-2021-0041>
17. Clark, M.A., Robertson, M.M., Young, S. (2019). "I feel your pain": A critical review of organizational research on empathy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(2), 166-192. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2348>
18. Dahlman, S., Heide, M. (2020). *Strategic Internal Communication: A Practitioner's Guide to Implementing Cutting-Edge Methods for Improved Workplace Culture*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003005728>
19. Dierdorff, E.C., Fisher, D.M. (2022). Problematic personalities in teams: Implications for performance trajectories and resilience to unexpected change. *Personnel Psychology*, 75(3), 589-617. <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12481>
20. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>
21. Eppler, M.J., Mengis, J. (2004). The Concept of Information Overload: A Review of Literature from Organization Science, Accounting, Marketing, MIS, and Related Disciplines. *The Information Society*, 20(5), 325-344. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972240490507974>
22. Fuller, M., Kamans, E., Van Vuuren, M., Wolfensberger, M., De Jong, M.D.T. (2021). Conceptualizing Empathy Competence: A Professional Communication Perspective. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 35(3), 333-368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10506519211001125>
23. Gochhayat, J., Giri, V.N., Suar, D. (2017). Influence of Organizational Culture on Organizational Effectiveness: The Mediating Role of Organizational Communication. *Global Business Review*, 18(3), 691-702. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150917692185>
24. Greer, L.L., de Jong, B.A., Schouten, M.E., Dannals, J.E. (2018). Why and when hierarchy impacts team effectiveness: A meta-analytic integration. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(6), 591-613. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000291>

25. Hartwig, A., Clarke, S., Johnson, S., Willis, S. (2020). Workplace team resilience: A systematic review and conceptual development. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 10(3-4), 169-200. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386620919476>
26. Hendon, M., Powell, L., Wimmer, H. (2017). Emotional intelligence and communication levels in information technology professionals. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 71, 165-171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.01.048>
27. Hicks, J.M. (2020). Leader Communication Styles and Organizational Health. *The Health Care Manager*, 39(4), 175-180. <https://doi.org/10.1097/HCM.0000000000000305>
28. Home, J.F., Orr, J.E. (1997). Assessing behaviors that create resilient organizations. *Employment Relations Today*, 24(4), 29-39. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ert.3910240405>
29. Kaneko, A. (2025). Team Communication in the Workplace: Interplay of Communication Channels and Performance. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 88(2), 223-248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23294906231190584>
30. Kim, Y. (2021). Building organizational resilience through strategic internal communication and organization–employee relationships. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 49(5), 589-608. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2021.1910856>
31. Kiran Gupta, S.K. (2025). Emotional Intelligence and Its Effect on Team Dynamics: A Systematic Review. *European Economic Letters (EEL)*, 15(1), 2726-2744. <https://doi.org/10.52783/eel.v15i1.2700>
32. Lee, Y. (2022). Dynamics of Symmetrical Communication Within Organizations: The Impacts of Channel Usage of CEO, Managers, and Peers. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 59(1), 3-21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2329488418803661>
33. Major, P., Spałek, S. (2017). Omówienie tradycyjnych i współczesnych metod komunikacji w zespołach projektowych. In: R. Knosala (Ed.), *Innowacje w zarządzaniu i inżynierii produkcji: Vol. I* (pp. 200-211). Oficyna Wydawnicza Polskiego Towarzystwa Zarządzania Produkcją.
34. Marques, J.F. (2010). Enhancing the quality of organizational communication: A presentation of reflection- based criteria. *Journal of Communication Management*, 14(1), 47-58. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13632541011017807>
35. Maurer, M., Bach, N., Oertel, S. (2022). Forced to go virtual. Working-from-home arrangements and their effect on team communication during COVID-19 lockdown. *German Journal of Human Resource Management: Zeitschrift Für Personalforschung*, 36(3), 238-269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23970022221083698>
36. Maurer, M., Bach, N., Oertel, S. (2023). Changes in formal structure towards self-managing organization and their effects on the intra-organizational communication network. *Journal of Organization Design*, 12(3), 83-98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41469-023-00143-z>

37. McCarthy, I.P., Collard, M., Johnson, M. (2017). Adaptive organizational resilience: An evolutionary perspective. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 28, 33-40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.07.005>
38. Men, L.R., Yue, C.A. (2019). Creating a positive emotional culture: Effect of internal communication and impact on employee supportive behaviors. *Public Relations Review*, 45(3), 101764. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2019.03.001>
39. Miceli, A., Hagen, B., Riccardi, M.P., Sotti, F., Settembre-Blundo, D. (2021). Thriving, Not Just Surviving in Changing Times: How Sustainability, Agility and Digitalization Intertwine with Organizational Resilience. *Sustainability*, 13(4), 2052. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042052>
40. Mitchell, R., Von Stieglitz, S., Gu, J., Boyle, B., Ocampo, A.C.G. (2025). Tackling adversity with open minds: Team personality composition facilitates shared leadership and team resilience. *Applied Psychology*, 74(1), e12568. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12568>
41. Morgan, P.B.C., Fletcher, D., Sarkar, M. (2015). Understanding team resilience in the world's best athletes: A case study of a rugby union World Cup winning team. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 16, 91-100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.08.007>
42. Muss, C., Tüxen, D., Fürstenau, B. (2025). Empathy in leadership: A systematic literature review on the effects of empathetic leaders in organizations. *Management Review Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-024-00472-7>
43. Napier, E., Liu, S.Y.H., Liu, J. (2024). Adaptive strength: Unveiling a multilevel dynamic process model for organizational resilience. *Journal of Business Research*, 171, 114334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114334>
44. Oliveira, N., Argyres, N., Lumineau, F. (2022). The role of communication style in adaptation to interorganizational project disruptions. *Journal of Operations Management*, 68(4), 353-384. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joom.1183>
45. Olsztyńska, A. (2002). Komunikacja wewnętrzna w przedsiębiorstwie. In: H. Mruk (Ed.), *Komunikowanie się w biznesie*. Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej.
46. Ortiz-de-Mandojana, N., Bansal, P. (2016). The long-term benefits of organizational resilience through sustainable business practices. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37(8), 1615-1631. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2410>
47. Pandey, S.K., Garnett, J.L. (2006). Exploring Public Sector Communication Performance: Testing a Model and Drawing Implications. *Public Administration Review*, 66(1), 37-51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00554.x>
48. Park, S., Choi, S. (2020). Performance Feedback, Goal Clarity, and Public Employees' Performance in Public Organizations. *Sustainability*, 12(7), 3011. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12073011>
49. Pavez, I., Gómez, H., Lauhié, L., González, V.A. (2021). Project team resilience: The effect of group potency and interpersonal trust. *International Journal of Project Management*, 39(6), 697-708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2021.06.004>

50. Pradana, D.W., Ekowati, D. (2024). Future organizational resilience capability structure: A systematic review, trend and future research directions. *Management Research Review*, 47(10), 1586-1605. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-08-2023-0538>
51. Ruck, K., Welch, M. (2012). Valuing internal communication; management and employee perspectives. *Public Relations Review*, 38(2), 294-302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.12.016>
52. Stoverink, A.C., Kirkman, B.L., Mistry, S., Rosen, B. (2020). Bouncing Back Together: Toward a Theoretical Model of Work Team Resilience. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(2), 395-422. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2017.0005>
53. Su, W., Junge, S. (2023). Unlocking the recipe for organizational resilience: A review and future research directions. *European Management Journal*, 41(6), 1086-1105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2023.03.002>
54. Varajão, J., Fernandes, G., Amaral, A. (2023). Linking information systems team resilience to project management success. *Project Leadership and Society*, 4, 100094. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plas.2023.100094>
55. Vishnubhotla, S.D., Mendes, E. (2024). Exploring the relation between personality traits and agile team climate: Aggregating results from a twice replicated study in a telecom company. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 210, 111937. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2023.111937>
56. Wang, L., Chen, X.-P., Yin, J. (2024). Leading via virtual communication: A longitudinal field experiment on work team creativity in an extreme context. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 41(1), 195-231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-022-09846-5>
57. Yazici, H.J. (2002). The role of communication in organizational change: An empirical investigation. *Information & Management*, 39(7), 539-552. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7206\(01\)00110-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7206(01)00110-0)
58. Yue, C.A., Men, L.R., Ferguson, M.A. (2021). Examining the Effects of Internal Communication and Emotional Culture on Employees' Organizational Identification. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 58(2), 169-195. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2329488420914066>