
THE ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION CLIMATE AT THE ONE DOOR INTEGRATED SERVICE AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT (DPM-PTSP) CITY OF MAKASSAR

Muh Ramlan Febriansyah^{1*}

A. Alimuddin Unde²

Arianto³

^{1,2,3}Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Hasanuddin University

e-mail: ramlanfebriansyah.23@gmail.com

*Correspondence: ramlanfebriansyah.23@gmail.com

Submitted: 27 January 2022, **Revised:** 06 February 2022, **Accepted:** 20 February 2022

Abstract. This study aims to determine the organizational communication climate at the Office of Investment and One Stop Services (DPM-PTSP) Makassar City. This study involved 40 employees who performed public services for the last 3 months at the Makassar City Investment and One Stop Integrated Service (DPM-PTSP) office. This study uses a quantitative approach with data collection techniques using a questionnaire made using a Likerts scale. Data were analyzed using SPSS and MS Excel. The results showed that the organizational communication climate showed results with an average value of 112 which indicated the organizational communication climate at the Makassar City DPM-PTSP office was categorized as Good Enough.

Keywords: organizational; communication climate; public service.

INTRODUCTION

Communication is important for the sustainability of an organization because a successful organization must be seen from the side of good communication. individual and organizational goals ([Farndale, Pai, Sparrow, & Scullion, 2014](#)); ([Dickmann & Doherty, 2010](#)); ([Ayers, 2015](#)), respond to and implement organizational changes, coordinate organizational activities and play a role in managing all relevant organizational actions. Communication in the organization can occur vertically ([Evelina, 2016](#)), which can occur between superiors to subordinates and subordinates to superiors, and horizontally which can occur between colleagues who are in equal positions.

Employees in an organization can exchange information through formal communication networks and informal communication ([Sosa, Gargiulo, & Rowles, 2015](#)). In conveying information, you can use communication channels such as e-mail, letters, telephone, and discussion forums ([Berjón, Beato, Mateos, & Feroso, 2015](#)). Communication skills are very important in terms of sharing knowledge among colleagues.

According to ([Kaewkitipong, Chen, & Ractham, 2016](#)) *knowledge sharing* is the stage of dissemination and provision of *knowledge* at the right time for employees who need it. This description is in line with the results of research conducted by ([Koenig, Takayama, & Matarić, 2010](#)) overall *knowledge sharing* has a positive relationship with the communication dimension.

Organizational communication has an

important role in increasing *knowledge sharing*, because through organizational communication, officials can share knowledge with colleagues in the organization. An organization requires the ability to manage and develop *knowledge* possessed in order to improve the quality of human resources in an organization. *Knowledge management* can ultimately be the right support for organizations to improve the competitiveness of public services in competing between organizations engaged in the same field.

Organizational communication is a dynamic process and involves complex communication techniques ([Poutanen, Siira, & Aula, 2016](#)); ([Mutuku & Mathooko, 2014](#)), networks and channels. It not only involves upward and downward communication, but managers and employees communicate with each other in various ways at different levels ([Ali & Haider, 2012](#)). Likewise within the scope of government agencies, organizational communication becomes important in order to increase its capacity as a public servant. For example, in exchanging information or communication regarding policies, ideas or ideas and decisions between the government and those who are governed or citizens ([Díaz-Cayeros, Magaloni, & Ruiz-Euler, 2014](#)).

The government is essentially a public servant who then has an extension in the form of a public organization to realize its functions as a service provider. for the public interest. The presence of public organizations is very necessary for government administrators in a country. Experience and observations of the long history of bureaucracy show that public

services have not been maximized because they are influenced by the pathological height of the bureaucracy so that they have not been able to meet people's expectations.

The unsatisfactory quality of public services has always been a public complaint until now. Whereas in essence public services are designed and organized to facilitate meeting the needs of the community.

One of the factors that greatly influence the performance of government officials is the organization as a forum where the apparatus carries out their duties. The size, structure and model of the organization will describe the hierarchy, duties of authority and responsibilities of the apparatus in carrying out their duties, thus requiring effective organizational communication in providing services. The importance of the existence of a communication climate makes Kopelman, Brief and Guzzo make a hypothesis which states that changes in the organizational communication climate may in the future affect performance (Pace & Faules, 2006).

In an organization or institution there are usually people who work together to achieve organizational goals. Every organization, especially an office organization, of course requires a variety of information, has a purpose, meets the structure, fulfills performance needs, develops duties and responsibilities, and can achieve the expected performance results. In creating a maximum cooperative relationship within an organization, it is necessary to have communication between them which is called organizational

communication ([Anghel Blidaru & Anghel Blidaru, 2015](#)).

Ideally, the One-Stop Integrated Service and Investment Service (DPM-PTSP) is one of the local government apparatus in Makassar City that implements a one-stop integrated service system. DPM-PTSP as an agency specifically tasked with providing services regarding licensing that directly intersect with the community, can basically be said to be a new breakthrough or innovation in local government management which is expected to be able to provide quality public services in accordance with the demands and expectations of the community.

The PTSP concept was created in order to improve services to the community and shorten the service process in order to realize fast, easy, cheap, transparent, certainty, and affordable services. With the PTSP, licensing applicants no longer need to take care of various letters and documents at different offices with different office locations. The PTSP concept is different from the one-roof concept where all permit services are located within one roof and the process is handled by each counter, while PTSP all types of management are carried out through one counter.

In the implementation of licensing at the DPM-PTSP office, there are several types of permits that are held including Building Construction Permits, Disturbance Permits (HO), Alcoholic Drinks Vendor Permits, Route Permits, Fisheries Business Permits, Construction Services Business Permits, Trading Business Permits, Industrial

Business Permits , Company Registration Certificate, Industry Registration Certificate, Tourism Business Registration Certificate, Private Training Institute Operation Permit, Health Permit, Environmental Permit, Warehouse Registration Certificate, Permit to Employ Foreign Workers, Advertising Permit.

At the DPM-PTSP Office which is engaged in public services, it is necessary to carry out the IKM (Community Satisfaction Index) in accordance with the Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services that every public service agency is obliged to evaluate and improve the implementation of public services. Therefore, a survey on community satisfaction was carried out called the IKM (Community Satisfaction Index).

If you look at the interval values carried out by DPM-PTSP in the IKM survey (Community Satisfaction Index) it shows a change in the categorization of the interval value and the results of the satisfaction index survey have changed significantly between 2017 and 2019.

The satisfaction survey data below still uses interval calculations with seven categories, namely A, A-, B, B-, C, D, and E with each interval of twenty values from 0 to 100. Meanwhile, survey data in 2018 and 2019 used interval calculations. with four categorizations, namely A, B, C, and D with different interval values, the interval distance from A, B, and C is 11.69 while the interval value from category C to D is 39.99 which is far adrift from other intervals. (Final Report of Community Satisfaction Index ([Darwis, Haning, & Indar, 2020](#)))

Interval value data on the service time

dimension in 2017 with an interval value of 80.4 which is in category B, then in 2018 it shows an interval value of 3.04 which is in category C and in 2019 the first semester occupies an interval value of 3.535 which category value A. (Final Report of Community Satisfaction Index ([Darwis et al., 2020](#))).

However, if viewed based on the final report of the 2017 to 2019 community satisfaction index survey, the first semester of the Makassar City DPM-PTSP shows that the level of community satisfaction on the service time dimension shows the lowest value of other indicators, namely service requirements, service procedures, fees or tariffs, product specifications. services, implementing competencies, implementing behavior, facilities and infrastructure, complaints, suggestions and input (the service notice became the 10th dimension until the survey in 2017). The low value of the service time dimension has continued for the last three years. (Final Report of the Community Satisfaction Index ([Darwis et al., 2020](#))).

The data that the researchers obtained from the 2019 IKM results report at the DPM-PTSP office is that the administrative completion period for the various permits above takes 12 days. However, from the results of the researcher's observations, it was found that there was a discrepancy between the data listed in the 2019 IKM results report at the DPM-PTSP office and community statements. An example of a case found by researchers is the Building Permit (IMB). In fact, from the results of the interview, the permit for IMB processing took more than 12 days without any clarification from the officer.

Therefore, the researcher wants to know the value of the service time dimension which is consistently low in three years in terms of organizational communication climate in the organizational structure of DPM-PTSP Makassar City.

METHODS

The type of research that will be used in this research is descriptive quantitative with a survey approach, where the researcher focuses on disclosing how the organizational communication climate is. The location of this research is in the Office of Investment and One Stop Services (DPM-PTSP) Makassar City. In this study, the instrument used was a questionnaire (*questionnaires*) measurement Likerts scale to ordinal find out how the Organizational Communication Climate was, then the alternative answers were chosen, namely Very Good, Good, Fairly Good, Less Good and Not Good. Positive statements are given a score for SB = 5, B=4, CB=3, KB = 2 and TB = 1. While negative statements are given a score for SB = 1, B=2, CB=3, KB = 4 and TB = 5.

This study focuses on employees of the Building Permit (IMB) service and the community who use the services of the Building Permit (IMB) at the Makassar City DPM-PTSP office. In this study, the total population for employees is 40 employees with different educational classifications for the last 3 months. In this study, the Organizational Communication Climate was measured through several indicators, namely:

1. Trust, the hard effort made by employees to develop and maintain relationships with all personnel related to communication in the organization which is supported by statements and actions.
2. Joint decision-making, all employees must be involved in communicating and have the opportunity to consult on issues and be involved in the decision-making process.
3. Honesty, a work atmosphere created by direct communication within the organization.
4. Openness to downward communication, all employees have the right to obtain all information that can support them in improving their performance (except the information is for confidential purposes for organizational security)
5. Listening to upward communication, employees at every level in the organization are obliged to listen to various suggestions or problem reports raised from every level in the organization.
6. Attention to high-performance goals, every employee has the motivation to improve performance and productivity in the organization.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Organizational Communication Climate in DPM-PTSP Makassar

In Organizational Communication Climate, there are several categories of indicators that are described. In determining the value of these categories

the researcher performs calculations for each indicator, then the description of the data presented is the highest value and the lowest value, namely to get the ideal value of Mean (M_i) and the ideal standard deviation (SD_i) are obtained based on the following formula:

- a. Ideal mean (M_i) = (highest score + lowest score)
- b. Ideal standard deviation (SD_i) = $1/6$ (highest score-lowest score)

After knowing the value of the Mean According to Suharsimi Arikunto (2012:299), according to Suharsimi Arikunto (2012:299),

- a. The high group, all respondents who have a score of as much as an average score plus 1 (+1) standard deviation ($X \geq M_i + 1 SD_i$)
- b. Medium group, all respondents who have a score between an average score of minus 1 standard deviation and an average score of plus 1 standard deviation between ($M_i - 1SD_i$) $X < (M_i + SD_i)$
- c. Less group, all respondents who have a score lower than the average score minus 1 standard deviation ($X < M_i - 1 SD_i$)

In this study, the categorization for each variables are described as follows:

Table 1. Category Organizational Communication Climate

No.	Category	Formula
1	Good	$X \geq M_i + 1 SD_i$
2	Fairly Good	$(M_i - 1SD_i) < X < (M_i + SD_i)$
3	Not Good	$X < M_i - 1 SD_i$

Categorization is made based on the needs of this research to find out how the organizational communication climate in the DPM office -PTSP Makassar. Based on the above formula, the scale value in this study was determined after knowing the results of the scores from the questionnaire that had been responded to by the participants, namely 40 employees.

Organizational Communication Climate Variable (X) was measured through a questionnaire consisting of 30 statements with a Likert Scale consisting of 5 alternative answers. Where the score is 5 for the highest score and 1 for the lowest

score, the 30 questions consist of 6 indicators containing 5 questions for each indicator. From the results of the calculation using the formula above, it was found that the scale value for each indicator of the variable x (Organizational Communication Climate) was as follows:

a) Trust

From the answers to the questionnaire consisting of 5 statements from 40 respondents, the highest score was 25 and the lowest score was 8 After calculating, $M_i = 17$ and $SD_i = 3$, then the value scale of the confidence indicator is as follows:

Table 2. Trust Value Scale

No	Formula	Scale	F	%	Category
1	$X \geq Mi + 1SDi$	$X \geq 19$	26	65	Good
2	$Mi + 1SDi > X > Mi - 1SDi$	$19 > X > 15$	9	22.5	Fairly Good
3	$X < Mi - 1SDi$	$X < 15$	5	12.5	Not Good
Average Score					17

results of the confidence value scale in table 4.14 found that the average value was 17 which indicates that the Trust Indicator is Fairly Good at the Makassar DPM-PTSP office, which means that the leadership has enough trust in every employee in providing services and the relationships that each employee builds to increase trust in defenders. work quite well, then the trust that employees build to work together in solving problems is quite good, then the leadership's trust in the

ability of employees to complete the work is quite good, lastly about the trust of colleagues in carrying out tasks is also quite good.

b) Joint Decision Making

For the Decision Making indicator, it is also measured through 5 statement items that get answers from 40 respondents, with the highest score of 25 and the lowest score being 10. After calculating, $Mi = 18$ and $SDi = 3$, then the value scale of the indicator Decision Making is as follows:

Table 3. Value Scale of Joint Decision Making

No.	Formula	Scale	F	%	Category
1	$X \geq Mi + 1SDi$	$X \geq 21$	17	42.5	Good
2	$Mi + 1SDi > X > Mi - 1SDi$	$21 > X \geq 15$	17	42.5	Fairly Good
3	$X < Mi - 1SDi$	$X < 15$	6	15	Not Good
Average Score					18

results of the decision-making value scale in table 4.15 found that the average value is 18 which indicates that the Decision Making indicator is Good Enough at the Makassar DPM-PTSP office, which means that the involvement and participation of employees in decision making is quite

good where employees have the opportunity to provide opinions in every decision-making.

c) Honesty

Then, the Honesty Indicator for the highest score is 25 and the lowest score is 8. After calculating, $Mi = 17$ and $SDi = 3$, then the value scale of the Honesty

indicator is as follows:

Table 4. Honesty Value Scale

No.	Formula	Scale	F	%	Category
1	$X \geq Mi + 1SDi$	$X \geq 20$	26	65	Good
2	$Mi + 1SDi > X > Mi - 1SDi$	$20 > X > 14$	11	27.5	Good enough
3	$X < Mi - 1SDi$	$X < 14$	3	7.5	Not Good
Average Score					17

results of the honesty value scale in table 4.16 found that the average value is 17 which indicates that the Honesty indicator is Fairly Good at the Makassar DPM-PTSP office, which means that the employee's candor in delivering actual information about the work results to the leadership is sufficient. good and vice versa, the seriousness of the organization sees that employee

honesty is very important in order to improve its performance quite well.

d) Openness to Downward

Communication Indicators of downward communication get the highest score of 25 and the lowest score of 11, so $Mi = 18$ and $SDi = 2$ then the scale value is obtained as follows:

Table 5. Scale Value of Openness to Downward Communication

No.	Formula	Scale	F	%	Category
1	$X \geq Mi + 1SDi$	$X \geq 20$	22	55	Good
2	$Mi + 1SDi > X > Mi - 1SDi$	$20 > X > 16$	10	25	Fairly Good
3	$X < Mi - 1SDi$	$X < 16$	8	20	Not Good
Average Value					18

results of the communication openness value scale in table 4.17 found that the average value for the Downward Communication indicator was 18 which was included in the Good Enough category at the Makassar DPM-PTSP office, which means that attention of the leadership pays attention to the problem of honest employee work reports. and open quite well and the attention of the leadership in providing instructions and directions in the

implementation of tasks is quite good, namely in accordance with the main tasks of the subordinates.

e) Upward communication

As for the Upward Communication indicator, of the 40 respondents the highest score was 25 and the lowest score was 8. After calculating, $Mi = 17$ and $SDi = 3$, then the value scale of the Upward Communication indicator is as follows

Table 6. Scale Value of Listening in Upward Communication

No	Formula	Scale	F	%	Category
1	$X \geq Mi + 1SDi$	$X \geq 20$	26	65	Good
2	$Mi + 1SDi > X > Mi - 1SDi$	$20 > X > 14$	11	27.5	Good enough
3	$X < Mi - 1SDi$	$X < 14$	3	7.5	Not Good
Average Score					17

results of the upward communication score scale in table 4.18 found that the average value was 17 which indicated that Upward Communication was Good Enough at the Makassar DPM-PTSP office, which showed the leadership's attention in trying to listen to employee complaints was quite good.

f) Attention to the high-performing goal

For the High-Performing indicator, from the results of the responses from 40 respondents it was found that the highest score was 25 and the lowest value was 9. Then the value of $Mi = 17$ and $SDi = 3$, then the scale of values of the High-Performing indicator was as follows:

Table 7. The Attention Score Scale for High-Performing Goals

No.	Formula	Scale	F	%	Category
1	$X \geq Mi + 1SDi$	$X \geq 20$	18	45	Good
2	$Mi + 1SDi > X > Mi - 1SDi$	$20 > X > 14$	17	42.5	Fairly Good
3	$X < Mi - 1SDi$	$X < 14$	5	12.5	Not Good
Average Score					17

results of the score scale for high goals in table 4.19 found that the average value is 17 which indicates that the High Performance indicator is Fairly Good in the Makassar DPM-PTSP office, which means that employees are responsible for the work done, without the need for reviewing the decisions that have been taken and the teamwork formed to create satisfactory services

for the community which is quite good.

While overall of the 30 statement items containing the 6 indicators which have received responses from 40 respondents, the highest score was 150 and the lowest score was 74. Then the Mi value = 112 and $SDi = 13$, then the value scale of the Organizational Communication Climate Variable are as follows:

Table 8. Value Scale of Organizational Communication Climate at the Makassar DPM-PTSP office

.	Formula	Scale	F	%	Category
1	$X \geq M_i + 1SD_i$	$X \geq 125$	14	35	Good
2	$M_i + 1SD_i > X > M_i - 1SD_i$	$125 > X > 99$	14	35	Fairly Good
3	$X < M_i - 1SD_i$	$X < 99$	12	30	Not Good
Average Score				112	

Results of the scale in table 4.20 found that the organizational communication climate in the Makassar DPM-PTSP office is 14 (45%) Good, 14 (42.5%) Fairly Good and 12 (12.5%) Not Good . Then, the average value obtained is 112 which can be concluded that the overall organizational communication climate at DPM-PTSP Makassar is Good Enough, which means that employees create an attitude of mutual trust in providing services, be honest in their work, build good communication between employees and between employees. leadership, and quite high performance where employees carry out their duties professionally.

DISCUSSION

Makassar City Investment and One Stop Integrated Services Agency.

The either by looking at the results of data analysis, showing the ability of IMB employees to provide services by looking at several indicators. The communication climate can also be the basis for assessing the quality of the relationship between employees or employees and their superiors in a company. According to (Suripto, 2017) state that there are at least six major indicators in assessing the

organizational communication climate where these indicators can describe the internal and external conditions of an organization within it. The following are 6 indicators for measuring how the organizational communication climate variable in DPM-PTSP Makassar:

1. Trust
2. Decision making
3. Honesty
4. Communication downwards
5. Communication upward
6. High performance

On the indicator of trust, the data shows that the level of trust between employees at the DPM-PTSP Makassar office gets an average value ie 17 of the total highest score is 25, which means that the trust built between employees can be said to be quite good. Which means that the leadership has sufficient trust in employees so that employees can build cooperation in solving problems to improve relationships at work.

Then in terms of making decisions related to whether employees at DPM-PTSP Makassar have the opportunity to communicate and be involved in decision-making discussions on problems or solutions, namely from the results of data analysis, researchers found an average value of 18 from the highest value of 25 which indicates that the activity good

decision making. Because every employee is involved in decision-making and participation in providing opinions on relevant policies in the organization to improve work abilities.

For honesty, the average score is 17 from the highest score of 25, which means that honesty between employees in the DPM-PTSP office environment is quite good. Honesty is the attitude of the employee's candor not only with colleagues but also with superiors and vice versa how superiors are honest with subordinates about various matters related to services at the Makassar DPM-PTSP office.

Furthermore, downward communication related to messages sent from superiors or leaders to subordinates at DPM-PTSP Makassar got an average score of 18 out of 25 highest scores. This indicates that the communication from the leadership to the subordinates is quite good where the leadership is sufficient to listen to employee complaints, the leader is quite attentive in listening to the complaints of his subordinates, besides that the leadership is quite open in hearing the obstacles faced by his subordinates, then the relationship between superiors and subordinates is going quite well. If there is a problem related to service delivery, the leadership simply tries to solve the problem, plus the leader responds to his employees who excel.

Likewise, upward communication at DPM-PTSP Makassar got an average score of 17 from the highest score of 25 which indicates that communication from subordinates to superiors is quite good,

which means obedience and loyalty to the direction of the leadership is quite good.

The average value of being committed to high performance is 17 out of the highest score of 25. This value indicates that the attitude to commit to high performance is quite good at the Makassar DPM-PTSP office where the responsibility for the work done and the researcher found that the IMB officers who are in the scope of DPM-PTSP Makassar city in completing their work quite in accordance with the directions or SOPs that apply to the office and the value of the communication climate built in it shows good enough with an average number of 112 from the highest score of 130.

CONCLUSIONS

Organizational communication climate in the DPM office -PTSP Makassar city is categorized as quite good because it is influenced by several indicators, namely in terms of trust not only built between employees and employees but also between employees and superiors, then in terms of making employee decisions, for example, regarding making organizational policies that are relevant to the position and Opportunities are also given to employees to provide opinions on every organizational policy, then honesty is also very important in providing public services at the Makassar DPM-PTSP office, as for the openness to downward communication where superiors always try to listen to employee complaints, and related to hearing in upward communication how the leadership responds to each employee's complaint,

and also attention to high goals where the leadership is quite trying to solve service problems faced by employees.

REFERENCES

- Ali, Akbar, & Haider, Jahanzaid. (2012). Impact of internal organizational communications on employee job satisfaction-Case of some Pakistani Banks. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Management and Business Studies*, 1(10), 38–44.
- Anghel Blidaru, Diana Marcela, & Anghel Blidaru, Gabriel Robert. (2015). Organizational Communication Forms and Causes for Disruption of Organizational Communication and their Improvement. *Valahian Journal of Economic Studies*, 6(1).
- Ayers, Rebecca S. (2015). Aligning individual and organizational performance: Goal alignment in federal government agency performance appraisal programs. *Public Personnel Management*, 4(2), 169–191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026015575178>
- Berjón, Roberto, Beato, M^a Encarnación, Mateos, Montserrat, & Feroso, Ana M^a. (2015). SCHOM. A tool for communication and collaborative e-learning. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 5(1), 1163–1171.
- Darwis, Darwis, Haning, Mohamad Thahir, & Indar, Nur Indrayati Nur. (2020). Restrukturisasi Organisasi dan Kualitas Pelayanan di Dinas Penanaman Modal Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu Kota Makassar. *Kolaborasi: Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 6(3), 365–380.
- Díaz-Cayeros, Alberto, Magaloni, Beatriz, & Ruiz-Euler, Alexander. (2014). Traditional governance, citizen engagement, and local public goods: evidence from Mexico. *World Development*, 5(3), 80–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.01.008>
- Dickmann, Michael, & Doherty, Noeleen. (2010). Exploring organizational and individual career goals, interactions, and outcomes of developmental international assignments. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 5(4), 313–324. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.20353>
- Evelina, L. W. (2016). Vertical communication based on local wisdom: A study of world class university. *Pertanika Journal Social Sciences & Humanities*, 24(5), 59–70.
- Farndale, Elaine, Pai, Avinash, Sparrow, Paul, & Scullion, Hugh. (2014). Balancing individual and organizational goals in global talent management: A mutual-benefits perspective. *Journal of World Business*, 4(2), 204–214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2013.11.004>
- Kaewkitipong, Laddawan, Chen, Charlie C., & Ractham, Peter. (2016). A community-based approach to sharing knowledge before, during, and after crisis events: A case study from Thailand. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 5(4), 653–666. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.07.063>
- Koenig, Nathan, Takayama, Leila, & Matarić, Maja. (2010). Communication and knowledge sharing in human–robot interaction and learning from demonstration. *Neural Networks*, 2(8),
-

1104–1112.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2010.06.005>

Mutuku, Claire Katungu, & Mathooko, P. (2014). Effects of organizational communication on employee motivation: A case study of Nokia Siemens Networks Kenya. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Project Planning Management*, 1(3), 28–62.

Poutanen, Petro, Siira, Kalle, & Aula, Pekka. (2016). Complexity and organizational communication: A quest for common ground. *Human Resource Development Review*, 5(2), 182–207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484316639713>

Sosa, Manuel E., Gargiulo, Martin, & Rowles, Craig. (2015). Can informal communication networks disrupt coordination in new product development projects? *Organization Science*, 2(4), 1059–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2015.0974>

Suripto, Teguh. (2017). Strategi Meningkatkan Kinerja Perusahaan Melalui Budaya Organisasi Yang Islami. *JESI (Jurnal Ekonomi Syariah Indonesia)*, 6(2), 144–153. [http://dx.doi.org/10.21927/jesi.2016.6\(2\).%25p](http://dx.doi.org/10.21927/jesi.2016.6(2).%25p)



© 2022 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).
