Previous research suggests that during an organizational crisis social networks increase in heterogeneity, while the variability or entropy of the actual communication in the network decreases. In this study we investigate empirically what changes in communication might contribute to the decrease of entropy of the exchanged information. We focus on two dimensions of changes in communicative behavior, and derive and test two hypotheses: First, we hypothesize that in the light of a crisis people are trying to finger point to sources of rumors and failures, to attribute accountability for the crisis to others, and to establish the belief that responsibility is not allocated with themselves, without casting specific blame. One indicator for this behavior is the increased usage of anaphora; pronouns that refer back to another social entity. Our methodological contribution here is anaphora resolution, which identifies who refers to whom without repeating names. We use this information to update the weights of nodes and edges of valued network data, and analyze the impact of this enhancement on network analytic measures computed on the graph. Secondly, we hypothesize that the intra-organizational discourse drifts towards polarized opinions, and that people try to establish an identity by contrasting points of view and taking a stand on their beliefs. An indicator for this communication style is the increased occurrence of antonyms within and across messages from individuals.