World Journal of Research in Education
educationworldjournal.com
Online ISSN: 3107-961X
Received: 28-09-2026, Accepted: 28-10-2026, Published: 12-11-2026
Volume 2, Issue 4, 2026, Page No. 28-31

Effective communication and employee performance in Nigeria's telecommunications industry: The roles of job satisfaction and work engagement

Nwankwo Ifeoma Lucy[1], Onyeledo Ijeoma Peace[2], Onodugo Chinwe Felicia[3*]
[1] School of General Studies, College of Health Sciences, 135 Ezamgbo, Ebonyi State, Nigeria
[2] Department of Human Resource Management, Charisma University, Montana State, USA
[3] Department of Forensic Accounting and Audit, Charisma University, Montana State, USA
Corresponding Author: Onodugo Chinwe Felicia

Abstract
Purpose: This study examines the association between effective organisational communication and self-reported employee performance in Nigeria's telecommunications industry, considering job satisfaction and work engagement as potential parallel mediators. Design/methodology: The supplied study summary describes a cross-sectional questionnaire survey of 186 employees from four telecommunications operators in Lagos and Port Harcourt. Six communication dimensions, job satisfaction, work engagement and three performance domains were assessed. Descriptive statistics, correlations and regression-based mediation estimates were supplied for editorial review. Findings: Reported mean communication was 3.86 (SD = 0.56), and mean performance was 3.48 (SD = 0.53). Feedback (M = 3.95) was the highest-rated communication dimension; upward communication (M = 3.71) was the lowest-rated. The reported bivariate communication–performance association was r = .61. A reported multiple regression accounted for 47.4% of performance variance. However, reported total, direct and indirect mediation estimates do not reconcile arithmetically, so no definitive mediated proportion is asserted. **Originality/value:** The paper proposes an integrated, multidimensional communication framework for telecommunications workplaces, with attention to satisfaction and engagement. Limitations: Findings are provisional pending dataset verification; cross-sectional self-report data cannot identify causal effects.

Keywords: Organisational communication, employee performance, job satisfaction, work engagement, telecommunications, Nigeria

Introduction

Reliable communication is central to the daily work of telecommunications companies. Customer service, sales and technical teams often need to exchange information quickly to resolve faults, escalate complaints and keep customers informed. When messages are delayed, unclear or incomplete, even routine service issues can become difficult to manage. Against this operational background, the relationship between internal communication and employee performance deserves closer attention in Nigeria's telecommunications sector.

Communication within an organisation takes several forms. Downward communication helps managers explain priorities and expectations, while upward communication gives employees opportunities to raise concerns and suggest improvements. Horizontal communication connects colleagues and departments whose work depends on one another. Beyond the direction in which information travels, employees also judge whether messages are clear, whether discussion is open and whether feedback arrives in time to be useful.

This study examines how employees' perceptions of communication relate to their self-reported performance. It also considers whether job satisfaction and work engagement may help account for that relationship. By examining six aspects of communication across multiple telecommunications operators, the study offers a more detailed picture of workplace communication in the Nigerian setting. Because the evidence is cross-sectional, the findings are interpreted as associations rather than proof of cause and effect.

1. Research objectives and hypotheses

The objectives are to (a) describe communication and performance levels; (b) estimate the association between overall communication and performance; (c) evaluate the unique associations of six communication dimensions with performance; and (d) estimate indirect associations through job satisfaction and work engagement. H1: Overall communication is positively associated with employee performance. H2: Communication dimensions differ in their adjusted associations with performance. H3: Communication is positively associated with satisfaction and engagement. H4–H5: Indirect associations through satisfaction and engagement are positive. H2 and H3–H5 require additional model outputs for complete assessment.

Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

1. Communication and employee performance

Research on communication satisfaction has long shown that employees distinguish between the quality of information they receive, the channels through which it is shared and the broader communication climate (Downs & Hazen, 1977) [2]. Employee performance is similarly broader than completing assigned tasks: it includes the ways employees support colleagues and adapt to changing work demands. The Individual Work Performance Questionnaire provides one established approach to assessing these behaviours (Koopmans *et al*., 2014) [4].

2. Theoretical explanation

Several theoretical perspectives help explain why communication may matter at work. Shannon and Weaver's

(1949) [6] model draws attention to how information can be distorted or interrupted in transmission. Social exchange theory suggests that employees who experience respectful and responsive communication may be more willing to contribute positively to their organisation (Blau, 1964). Affective Events Theory further suggests that everyday workplace interactions can shape employees' feelings and responses over time (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) [7]. These perspectives offer plausible explanations, although the present design cannot test causal sequences.

3. Parallel intermediary framework

The proposed model places organisational communication alongside two possible intermediary experiences: job satisfaction and work engagement. It examines whether communication is associated with performance directly and whether additional associations appear through each intermediary. The two pathways are considered in parallel. Such a model can describe statistical patterns, but with measurements collected at one point in time it cannot establish which experience occurred first.

Methods

1. Design, setting and participants

The supplied research account describes a cross-sectional survey of 186 employees in Lagos and Port Harcourt from MTN (n = 78), Airtel (n = 57), Globacom (n = 32) and 9mobile (n = 19). Respondents reportedly worked in customer care (n = 65), sales (n = 56), technical units (n = 46) and HR/administration (n = 19). The described collection period was September 2025, with 186 usable responses among 210 questionnaires distributed (88.6%). Recruitment records, organisational permissions and respondent-level data were not supplied for independent confirmation.

The original claim that Yamane's formula yields n = 186 from N = 1,240 at 5% precision is incorrect: n = 1,240/ [1 + 1,240(0.05) ^ 2] = 302.44, conventionally rounded upward to 303. Accordingly, the achieved sample of 186 is treated as an observed sample rather than a formula-justified 5% precision sample. The asserted accessible population of 1,240 and any random-sampling procedure must be substantiated before publication.

2. Measures

The described questionnaire used six communication dimensions—downward, upward, horizontal, clarity, openness and feedback—with three items per dimension, rated on five-point scales. Job satisfaction was measured with six adapted items, work engagement with six items, and performance with nine items spanning task, contextual and adaptive domains. These are author-described adaptations informed by the CSQ, MSQ, UWES and IWPQ traditions; the exact item sets, scoring rules, factor structure and permissions should be appended and validated. In particular, a six-item engagement measure must not be labelled UWES-3.

3. Statistical analysis

The proposed analyses comprise descriptive statistics, internal-consistency estimates, Pearson correlations, ordinary least squares regression and a parallel-mediator model with 5,000 bootstrap resamples (PROCESS Model 4). Coefficients are described as unstandardised only where the original account implies this; all coefficient types must be confirmed from software output. Missing-data procedures, distributional diagnostics, collinearity checks and confidence intervals require verification. Reported coefficients are reproduced below as provisional values, not independently recalculated results.

4. Ethics and transparency

The supplied account states that participation was voluntary and anonymous. The manuscript cannot yet specify a verified ethics committee, approval number or formal exemption. The final submission should report the actual approval/exemption, consent process, recruitment permissions, data security and data availability statement. No fabricated approval details are inserted.

Results

1. Participant characteristics

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Operator	MTN	78	41.9
	Airtel	57	30.6
	Globacom	32	17.2
	9mobile	19	10.2
Department	Customer care	65	34.9
	Sales	56	30.1
	Technical	46	24.7
	HR/admin	19	10.2

Note: Percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding. All figures are transcribed from the supplied study summary.

2. Descriptive results

Variable	Mean	SD
Downward communication	3.89	0.64
Upward communication	3.71	0.68
Horizontal communication	3.88	0.65
Communication clarity	3.92	0.60
Communication openness	3.86	0.62
Feedback	3.95	0.61
Overall communication	3.86	0.56

Job satisfaction	3.30	0.66
Work engagement	3.17	0.61
Task performance	3.52	0.58
Contextual performance	3.46	0.60
Adaptive performance	3.47	0.59
Overall performance	3.48	0.53

Among the six communication dimensions, feedback received the highest average rating, whereas upward communication received the lowest. This difference describes employees' reported experiences; it does not establish that feedback is the strongest predictor of performance. The summary also reports Cronbach's alpha values of .941 for the overall communication measure and .854 for performance. These reliability estimates should be checked against the original item-level data before publication.

3. Correlations and regression

The supplied summary indicates positive correlations between communication and job satisfaction (r = .52), work engagement (r = .40) and performance (r = .61). Job satisfaction (r = .51) and engagement (r = .45) were also positively correlated with performance. These figures suggest that employees reporting better communication also tended to report more favourable work experiences and performance. The original output is needed to confirm exact significance levels and confidence intervals.

Reported model	Coefficient(s)	R^2	Verification status
Satisfaction ~ communication	b = 0.611	0.269	Provisional
Performance ~ communication	b = 0.587	0.376	Provisional; check against r and SDs
Performance ~ communication + satisfaction + engagement	bCOM = 0.368; bSAT = 0.209; bENG = 0.209	0.474	Overall F approximately consistent; coefficients unverified

The reported third regression model explains 47.4% of the variation in self-reported performance within the analysed sample. This is a measure of statistical fit, not evidence that communication caused 47.4% of employee performance.

4. Indirect associations: unresolved numerical inconsistency

Path or effect	Reported estimate	Reported bootstrap 95% CI
Communication → satisfaction → performance	0.128	[0.064, 0.205]
Communication → engagement → performance	0.083	[0.034, 0.145]
Combined indirect effect	0.211	[0.134, 0.301]
Direct effect	0.368	[0.242, 0.494]
Total effect	0.587	[0.477, 0.697]

An important discrepancy remains in the mediation figures. The reported direct effect of 0.368 and combined indirect effect of 0.211 sum to 0.579, whereas the stated total effect is 0.587. In an ordinary least squares parallel-mediation analysis using the same sample and measurement scale, these components should agree apart from rounding. The difference must be resolved from the original statistical output before the indirect effects or mediation percentages can be treated as definitive.

5. Hypothesis appraisal

The available figures are broadly consistent with H1, which anticipates a positive association between overall communication and performance. H2 cannot yet be assessed because the adjusted effects of the six separate communication dimensions were not supplied. Although satisfaction and engagement show positive reported associations, the proposed mediation hypotheses require verified, internally consistent estimates before firm conclusions can be drawn.

Discussion

Taken together, the findings suggest that employees who view communication within their organisations more positively also tend to rate their own performance more highly. This pattern is consistent with the practical importance of clear instructions, timely feedback and access to relevant information. However, other explanations remain possible. Employees who perform well may perceive communication more favourably, while leadership practices, organisational culture and common-method measurement may influence both sets of responses.

Upward communication stood out as the lowest-rated dimension. This may be worth exploring because employees need opportunities to report operational problems and share ideas with supervisors. Nevertheless, the study did not directly assess power distance or psychological safety. It would therefore be premature to attribute the lower rating to either factor without additional evidence.

The relationships involving job satisfaction and work engagement also fit with the idea that employees' workplace experiences may connect communication to performance. Yet the cross-sectional data do not establish a temporal pathway. Future analysis should compare alternative models, account for relevant employee and organisational characteristics and, where possible, collect information at different points in time.

For managers, the findings point to practical areas for review rather than proven interventions. Regular feedback discussions, accessible channels for upward communication and clearer procedures for handing work between departments may be useful starting points. Any changes should be piloted and evaluated against operational indicators, such as response times, resolution quality and customer service outcomes, before claims about their effectiveness or financial return are made.

Conclusion

This study offers preliminary evidence that favourable perceptions of organisational communication are associated

with stronger self-reported employee performance among 186 telecommunications employees in Lagos and Port Harcourt. Feedback was rated most positively, while upward communication received the lowest average rating. The reported models also suggest positive relationships involving job satisfaction and work engagement, although inconsistencies in the mediation estimates prevent a definitive interpretation of the indirect pathways. Verification of the original data and statistical outputs is essential before journal submission.

Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations should guide interpretation. The study relies on cross-sectional, apparently self-reported measures, making causal inference inappropriate and leaving room for common-method bias. The sampling frame has not been verified, the participating employees were drawn from only two cities, and the adapted scales lack documented construct-validation results in the supplied materials. Original statistical outputs were also unavailable for independent verification. Future research would benefit from broader sampling, validated instruments, longitudinal measurement and objective indicators of work performance.

Declarations

Ethics approval: [Insert verified committee name, reference number and approval/exemption date]. Informed consent: [Confirm actual consent procedure]. Funding: [Disclose actual funding or state none if true]. Conflicts of interest: [Author declaration required]. Data availability: [State actual repository/access conditions; raw dataset not provided for this draft]. Author contributions: [Complete before submission].

References

1. Blau PM. Exchange and Power in Social Life. Wiley,1964.
2. Downs CW, Hazen MD. A factor analytic study of communication satisfaction. The Journal of Business Communication,1977:14(3):63–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/002194367701400306
3. Hayes AF. Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach (3rd ed.). Guilford Press,2022.
4. Koopmans L, Bernaards CM, Hildebrandt VH, de Vet HCW, van der Beek AJ. Construct validity of the individual work performance questionnaire. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine,2014:56(3):331–337. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000113
5. Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Lee JY, Podsakoff NP. Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. Journal of Applied Psychology,2003:88(5):879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
6. Shannon CE, Weaver W. The Mathematical Theory of Communication. University of Illinois Press,1949.
7. Weiss HM, Cropanzano R. Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. Research in Organizational Behavior,1996:18:1–74.
8. Editorial note: Contemporary empirical references from the thesis summary were excluded because their bibliographic identities have not been authenticated. A targeted, verified literature review should be added before journal submission.