

**ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION OF THE KUPANG CITY  
REGIONAL INFLATION CONTROL TEAM IN MAINTAINING  
INFLATION STABILITY**  
(ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN INFLATION CONTROL DECISION  
MAKING AT THE KUPANG CITY TPID HIGH LEVEL MEETING FORUM)

Windi Putri E. Fanggi<sup>1\*</sup>, Iriana Bakti<sup>2</sup>, Trie Damayanti<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Faculty of Magister Communication Science, Universitas Padjadjaran, Jatinangor, Indonesia

[putrielisabeth99@email.com](mailto:putrielisabeth99@email.com)

[irianabaktipr@gmail.com](mailto:irianabaktipr@gmail.com)

[trie.damayanti@unpad.ac.id](mailto:trie.damayanti@unpad.ac.id)

(\*) Corresponding Author

[putrielisabeth99@email.com](mailto:putrielisabeth99@email.com)

**ARTICLE HISTORY**

**Received** : 20-11-2025

**Revised** : 07-12-2025

**Accepted** : 25-01-2026

**KEYWORDS**

Organizational  
Communication;  
Regional Inflation  
Control; Social Network  
Analysis; Interagency  
Collaboration; Public  
Policy Networks

**ABSTRACT**

Effective regional inflation control requires not only structural coordination but also well-functioning organizational communication across agencies. This study analyzes organizational communication dynamics within the Regional Inflation Control Team (TPID) of Kupang City by comparing communication patterns during the policy formulation and policy implementation phases. Using a Social Network Analysis (SNA) approach within a structuralism paradigm, data were collected through in-depth interviews, observations of TPID meetings, and analysis of official documents. The findings identify two distinct communication models: a hierarchical and centralized communication pattern during the policy formulation phase (Model A), and a horizontal, collaborative communication pattern during the policy implementation phase (Model B). These results indicate that organizational communication within TPID is dynamic and context-dependent, adjusting to different policy functions. This study contributes to organizational communication and public policy studies by highlighting communication as a key operational mechanism in cross-agency coordination for regional inflation control.

*This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA license.*



**INTRODUCTION**

Inflation remains a critical macroeconomic challenge, particularly in decentralized governance systems where regional economic conditions vary significantly. While national monetary policy provides a general framework for

price stability, short-term inflationary pressures are often shaped by regional factors such as food supply, distribution systems, and local market dynamics. In developing economies, inflation is especially sensitive to disruptions in food supply chains, positioning subnational governance as a key arena for inflation control.

In Indonesia, inflation control has evolved from a centralized policy domain into a multi-level governance responsibility involving national institutions, regional governments, and sectoral agencies. This shift became more pronounced following recurring supply shocks and price volatility in essential food commodities, which exposed the limitations of centralized interventions in addressing region-specific inflation dynamics. As a result, coordination mechanisms at the regional level have been institutionalized to support inflation control efforts.

One of the most prominent mechanisms is the Regional Inflation Control Team (Tim Pengendalian Inflasi Daerah, TPID), a formal inter-agency coordination forum established at provincial and municipal levels. TPID brings together regional governments, Bank Indonesia, Statistics Indonesia (BPS), BULOG, and technical agencies responsible for trade, agriculture, food security, and transportation. Rather than operating as a single hierarchical organization, TPID functions as a cross-institutional policy network aimed at aligning information, coordinating interventions, and stabilizing regional prices.

Existing studies on TPID and inflation control in Indonesia have predominantly focused on economic outcomes, policy instruments, and institutional arrangements, such as price stabilization measures, supply-side interventions, and fiscal coordination. While these studies provide valuable insights into policy effectiveness, they largely overlook the internal communication processes that enable coordination among TPID members. Consequently, little is known about how interaction patterns, information flows, and communicative roles shape decision-making and policy execution within TPID.

From an organizational communication perspective, this gap is significant. Communication does not merely transmit information but constitutes organizational processes by shaping authority, coordination, and collective action—especially within cross-institutional settings. In policy networks like TPID, communication structures influence which actors become central, how decisions are legitimized, and how policy directives are translated into operational action. Understanding TPID therefore requires attention not only to formal mandates but also to how communication actually unfolds among participating institutions.

Moreover, TPID operates across distinct policy phases that demand different communicative functions. Policy formulation forums, such as High Level Meetings (HLM), emphasize information consolidation, strategic alignment, and decision legitimization. In contrast, policy implementation relies on continuous coordination, rapid information exchange, and collaborative problem-solving among technical agencies. These differences suggest that organizational communication within TPID is dynamic and context-dependent rather than uniform.

Positioned within this gap, this study examines organizational communication patterns within TPID Kupang City by comparing the policy formulation and policy implementation phases. Using Social Network Analysis (SNA), the study maps communication relationships among TPID actors to reveal structural differences in centralization, hierarchy, and collaboration across policy phases. Kupang City provides a relevant case due to its vulnerability to food supply disruptions and its active inter-agency coordination in responding to regional inflation pressures.

The novelty of this study lies in its integration of organizational communication theory and Social Network Analysis to analyze TPID as a communicative system rather than merely an administrative coordination forum. Unlike previous studies that emphasize economic indicators or institutional design, this article demonstrates how communication structures function as an operational mechanism in regional inflation governance and how these structures shift according to policy function. By foregrounding communication dynamics, the study contributes to organizational communication scholarship and offers a new perspective on the governance of regional inflation control.

## METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a quantitative research approach grounded in the structuralist paradigm, with Social Network Analysis (SNA) as the primary analytical framework. From a structuralist perspective, organizational communication within the Regional Inflation Control Team (TPID) is understood as a system of patterned relations among actors that produces organizational functions such as coordination, authority, and decision-making. Accordingly, the analysis focuses on relational structures rather than individual attributes.

The research examines the communication network of TPID Kupang City during a period of heightened inflation pressure in early 2025. TPID Kupang City was selected due to the intensity of inter-agency coordination undertaken to respond to inflationary dynamics during this period. TPID is conceptualized not as a bounded organization but as a network of institutional relations embedded within a broader regional governance system.

The unit of analysis consists of institutional actors and directed communication ties between them. Actors include the Mayor's Office, Bank Indonesia, Statistics Indonesia (BPS), sectoral government agencies (trade, agriculture, food security, transportation), and BULOG. Communication ties are defined as directed interactions related to inflation control, including information exchange, coordination, reporting, and policy-related communication.

Network data were collected through structured data elicitation to construct adjacency matrices. Communication ties were identified based on documented interactions, verified institutional reports, and systematic observation of coordination forums. Observational data from a TPID high-level coordination meeting held on March 11, 2025, were used to capture formal communication patterns during the policy formulation phase. Documentary sources—including meeting minutes, official TPID reports, and internal coordination records—were used to verify and complement network data.

Network analysis and visualization were conducted using Gephi software. The primary SNA indicators employed in this study include degree centrality, to measure actor prominence within the network, and directionality of communication flows, to distinguish between centralized and reciprocal interaction patterns. These indicators were used to examine network configuration, actor positioning, and structural shifts across policy phases.

The analysis produced two communication models reflecting different phases of policy governance. Model A represents communication during the policy formulation phase, characterized by a centralized and hierarchical structure. Model B represents communication during the policy implementation phase, characterized by a decentralized and horizontally connected structure.

To ensure data validity, this study applies source triangulation and method triangulation by cross-validating communication ties across documentary evidence, observational data, and actor verification. This procedure strengthens the reliability of network data and supports the robustness of the structural interpretations.

By emphasizing relational positions and network structures, this quantitative SNA approach enables a systematic examination of how organizational communication within TPID is reconfigured in response to the functional demands of policy formulation and implementation..

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Communication During Policy Formulation



Social Network Analysis shows that communication during formal TPID policy meetings is characterized by a centralized and hierarchical network structure. The Mayor of Kupang City occupies the most central position, indicating a dominant role in agenda setting and policy direction. Communication flows primarily originate from the Mayor and converge toward a collective forum representing all TPID members.

Bank Indonesia and Statistics Indonesia (BPS) also hold structurally significant positions. Bank Indonesia functions as the main source of inflation analysis and policy recommendations, while BPS provides statistical data supporting problem identification. Communication from both institutions is largely one-directional, directed toward the collective forum rather than toward individual technical agencies.

The collective forum node exhibits a high in-degree and no outgoing ties, indicating that information and directives converge at the forum level without subsequent horizontal redistribution. Direct communication among sectoral agencies such as trade, agriculture, food security, and logistics is minimal, resulting in limited horizontal interaction during this phase.

These findings indicate that communication during the policy formulation phase prioritizes authority consolidation, information standardization, and policy legitimization rather than operational coordination. The central position of political leadership reflects the role of formal authority in framing inflation as a strategic governance issue and aligning institutional perspectives across agencies.

The one-directional communication patterns of Bank Indonesia and BPS suggest that analytical and statistical inputs function as shared cognitive references for collective interpretation, not as objects of negotiation among technical actors. Meanwhile, the absence of outgoing communication from the collective forum highlights that policy meetings serve as arenas for convergence of meaning, not dialogic problem-solving.

From a structuralist perspective, this configuration reflects the institutional logic of agenda setting, where hierarchical communication supports coherence, reduces interpretive ambiguity, and produces a unified policy narrative. Rather than indicating communicative inefficiency, the centralized structure of Model A demonstrates how hierarchical communication operates as a functional governance mechanism during the policy formulation stage.

**Communication During Policy Implementation**



In contrast to the centralized structure observed in Model A, Model B illustrates a decentralized and horizontally connected communication network that emerges during the policy implementation phase. Social Network Analysis shows a significant redistribution of communicative centrality from political and analytical actors toward sectoral agencies directly involved in operational activities.

In this model, institutions such as the Trade Office, Food Security Office, Agriculture Office, and BULOG occupy central positions within the network. These actors are connected through multiple reciprocal communication ties, indicating frequent and sustained interaction. Unlike Model A, communication flows in Model B are multidirectional and dense, reflecting the practical demands of coordinating supply, managing distribution, monitoring prices, and responding to rapidly changing market conditions.

Communication during this phase is largely operational and problem-oriented. Interactions are facilitated through informal and semi-formal channels, including inter-agency messaging groups, direct coordination, and ad hoc consultations. These channels enable real-time information exchange and rapid adjustment of actions, which are essential for managing inflation-related interventions such as market operations and supply stabilization. The prominence of horizontal ties suggests that no single actor monopolizes authority; instead, coordination emerges through mutual dependence and functional necessity.

Bank Indonesia remains connected to the network in Model B, but its role shifts significantly compared to Model A. Rather than acting as a central authority or directive actor, Bank Indonesia assumes a monitoring and early-warning function, providing alerts, analytical updates, and strategic guidance when necessary. Structurally, this is reflected in fewer but strategically positioned communication ties, indicating selective intervention rather than continuous operational involvement. This pattern underscores the distinction between policy steering and policy execution within network governance arrangements.

The decentralization observed in Model B highlights that effective policy implementation relies less on hierarchical control and more on adaptive communication capacity among technical actors. The network's flexibility allows institutions to respond to situational demands without awaiting formal directives, thereby enhancing responsiveness and coordination efficiency. From a structuralist perspective, the prominence of sectoral agencies in this phase reflects a reconfiguration of communication roles driven by task requirements rather than formal authority.

Taken together, Model B demonstrates that communication during implementation functions as a coordination mechanism, enabling synchronization of actions across institutions with interdependent responsibilities. The

horizontal structure does not imply the absence of leadership, but rather a redistribution of communicative centrality that aligns with operational needs. This finding reinforces organizational communication scholarship that emphasizes the importance of flexible, network-based communication structures in complex policy implementation settings.

### **Functions of Communication in TPID**

The findings indicate that communication within the Regional Inflation Control Team (TPID) Kupang City performs multiple interrelated functions that enable cross-institutional governance to operate effectively. Communication does not merely serve as a channel for information transmission, but functions as a structural mechanism through which coordination, decision-making, and collective action are produced. These functions emerge contextually and are shaped by the phase of policy governance rather than by fixed organizational roles.

The most fundamental function of communication within TPID is information exchange. During the policy formulation phase, communication enables the consolidation of diverse forms of knowledge, including inflation analysis, statistical data, and sectoral reports, into a shared interpretive framework. Information flows are largely centralized and directed toward a collective forum, ensuring that all participating institutions develop a common understanding of inflation dynamics and policy priorities. During the implementation phase, information exchange becomes more distributed and reciprocal, supporting real-time updates on market conditions, supply availability, and operational constraints. In both phases, information exchange functions as the foundation upon which coordination and decision-making are built.

Beyond information exchange, communication also fulfills a coordination function that aligns institutional actions across organizational boundaries. In the formulation phase, coordination is achieved symbolically through the alignment of perspectives and policy narratives, rather than through direct operational interaction. This form of coordination minimizes interpretive divergence and prepares institutions for subsequent implementation. In contrast, during the implementation phase, coordination becomes operational and continuous, relying on horizontal communication among technical agencies. Communication enables synchronization of actions, rapid adjustment to field conditions, and resolution of interdependencies without reliance on formal hierarchical directives.

Communication further functions as a decision-making mechanism within TPID. Decisions are not produced solely through formal authority, but through communicative processes that integrate analysis, data, and institutional input. In policy meetings, communication supports decision legitimation by framing inflation as a shared governance problem and by embedding decisions within collectively accepted interpretations. During implementation, decision-making becomes decentralized and situational, as technical actors make context-specific adjustments guided by ongoing communication rather than formal policy revision. This illustrates that decision-making in TPID is communicatively constructed and distributed across phases.

Finally, communication serves a structural integration function, enabling TPID to operate as a coherent task group despite the absence of a unified organizational hierarchy. Through patterned communication relations, TPID maintains continuity between policy formulation and implementation, ensuring that strategic direction and operational execution remain connected. The ability of TPID to shift communication structures—from centralized to horizontal—demonstrates that communication is the key mechanism that binds institutions into a functioning governance network. In this sense, communication constitutes TPID as an operational entity, allowing cross-institutional collaboration to persist across changing policy demands.

### **CONCLUSION**

City by analyzing communication structures across policy formulation and implementation phases. Using a structuralist Social Network Analysis approach, the findings demonstrate that communication within TPID is not

uniform but dynamically reconfigured in response to governance demands. Two distinct communication structures emerge: a centralized and hierarchical configuration during policy formulation, and a decentralized, horizontal configuration during policy implementation. These structures are not contradictory; rather, they function complementarily to support different policy objectives within the same governance system.

The study contributes to organizational communication and network governance literature by showing that communication functions as a constitutive mechanism of governance rather than a supporting tool. Communication enables TPID to operate as a cross-institutional task group by facilitating shared interpretation, coordination, and decision-making across organizational boundaries. The ability of TPID to shift communication structures according to policy phases underscores the importance of structural flexibility in managing complex public policy issues such as regional inflation control.

From a broader perspective, this research highlights the analytical value of integrating qualitative inquiry with Social Network Analysis under a structuralist paradigm. By focusing on relational patterns rather than individual attributes, the study provides a nuanced understanding of how governance networks operate in practice. These findings suggest that effective inter-agency governance depends not on rigid institutional hierarchies, but on the capacity to reconfigure communication structures in line with functional demands. Future research may extend this approach by comparing communication networks across regions or policy domains to further refine theories of organizational communication in public governance.

## REFERENCES

- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2007). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543-571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>
- Bovee, C. L., & Thill, J. V. (2015). *Business communication today*. Pearson Higher Ed.
- Brennan, L. D. (1973). Book reviews : Communication in organizations: An annotated bibliography and sourcebook. Robert M. Carter. Detroit, gale research, 1972. 272 pages, \$14.50. *The ABCA Journal of Business Communication*, 10(2), 49-49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002194367301000205>
- Chu, H. (2015). Research methods in library and information science: A content analysis. *Library & Information Science Research*, 37(1), 36-41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2014.09.003>
- Clampitt, P. G. (2017). Communicating for managerial effectiveness: Challenges | Strategies | Solutions. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071800829>
- Creswell, J., Poth, C. N., & Rawlins, P. (2023). Mapping design trends and evolving directions using the sage handbook of mixed methods research design. *The Sage Handbook of Mixed Methods Research Design*, 527-537. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529682663.n50>
- Dewey, J. (1910). How we think. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10903-000>
- Effendy, O. U. (2008). *Dinamika Komunikasi*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2011). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011>
- Fajar Mahmud, S. (2020). Analisis Peranan tim Pengendalian Inflasi Daerah Terhadap Perekonomian Dumai. *JURNAL UNITEK*, 11(1), 51-60. <https://doi.org/10.52072/unitek.v11i1.22>
- Fetni, F., & Fait, T. F. (2024). Komunikasi organisasi pemerintah dalam meningkatkan kualitas pelayanan publik pada distrik sentani jayapura. *Journal Publicuho*, 7(2), 811-823. <https://doi.org/10.35817/publicuho.v7i2.437>
- GOLDHABER, G. M., PORTER, D. T., YATES, M. P., & LESNIAK, R. (1978). Organizational communication: 1978. *Human Communication Research*, 5(1), 76-96. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1978.tb00624.x>
- Gouran, D. S., & Hirokawa, R. Y. (1996). Functional theory and communication in decision-making and problem-solving groups: An expanded view. *Communication and Group Decision Making*, 55-80. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452243764.n3>

- Griffin, E., Griffin, E. A., Ledbetter, A., & Sparks, G. G. (2019). *A first look at communication theory*. Ingram.
- Guetterman, T. C. (2019). Basics of statistics for primary care research. *Family Medicine and Community Health*, 7(2), e000067. <https://doi.org/10.1136/fmch-2018-000067>
- Hamni, M. (2021). Tujuan sistem informasi manajemen dalam mengambil keputusan. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/84kfp>
- Hilal, A. A., Suryana, A., & Wahyudin, U. (2023). Peranan Iklim Komunikasi Organisasi Pada Organisasi Dan Perusahaan dalam Kondisi bonus Demografi. *Komunikologi: Jurnal Pengembangan Ilmu Komunikasi dan Sosial*, 7(1), 98. <https://doi.org/10.30829/komunikologi.v7i1.15550>
- Hirokawa, R. Y., & Poole, M. S. (1996). *Communication and group decision making*. SAGE.
- IKAYASARI, L., AKBAR, M., & SARI, E. (2019). The effect of organizational culture and communication in decision making by school principals. *International e-Journal of Educational Studies*, 4(7), 122-132. <https://doi.org/10.31458/iejes.615719>
- Kankam, P. K. (2019). The use of paradigms in information research. *Library & Information Science Research*, 41(2), 85-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2019.04.003>
- Kartini, Pratama, A. A., Hasibuan, D. A., Nasution K, R. S., Al Mujahid, N. S., & Shila, N. F. (2024). Teori Komunikasi Organisasi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 8(1), 3151-3158.
- Kivunja, C., & Kuyini, A. B. (2017). Understanding and applying research paradigms in educational contexts. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 6(5), 26. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n5p26>
- Kohler, J. W., Anatol K, W. E., & Applbaum, R. L. (1981). *Organizational Communication: Behavioral Perspective*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Littlejohn, S., & Foss, K. (2009). Encyclopedia of communication theory. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412959384>
- Muhammed Othman, W. (2025). The reflections of organizational communication on decision making: Kurdistan Institute of public administration (KIPA) as a case study. *Muthanna Journal of Administrative and Economic Sciences*, 15(1), 39-54. <https://doi.org/10.52113/6/2025-15-1/39-54>
- Musheke, M. M., & Phiri, J. (2021). The effects of effective communication on organizational performance based on the systems theory. *Open Journal of Business and Management*, 09(02), 659-671. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2021.92034>
- Muspawi, M., Melati, P. D., & Kinanthi, A. C. (2024). Memahami aliran informasi dalam organisasi. *NIVEDANA : Jurnal Komunikasi dan Bahasa*, 5(1), 70-79. <https://doi.org/10.53565/nivedana.v5i1.811>
- Mykkänen, M. (2017). Clarifying communication professionals' tasks in contributing to organizational decision making. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention*, 4(5), 3460-3468. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsshi/v4i5.01>
- Nandini, N., Kustiawan, W., Nasution, A. R., Harahap, F. S., Harahap, M. P., Berutu, N., & Nabila, V. (2024). Peran Komunikasi Dalam Peningkatan Kinerja Organisasi. *Journal of Citizen Research and Development*, 1(2), 138-143. <https://doi.org/10.57235/jcrd.v1i2.3161>
- Purba, B., Hasoloan, A., & Yasir, A. (2021). Komunikasi Organisasi dalam proses Pengambilan Keputusan Di UPT-PTPH Provinsi Sumatera Utara. *JURNAL SIMBOLIKA: Research and Learning in Communication Study*, 7(1), 84-95. <https://doi.org/10.31289/simbollika.v7i1.4444>
- Rahmawati, T. S., & Khoerunnisa, L. (2023). Kualitas Kepemimpinan dalam Menciptakan Iklim Komunikasi Organisasi untuk Meningkatkan Kinerja Pegawai. *Jurnal Komunikasi Profesional*, 6(6), 588-599. <https://doi.org/10.25139/jkp.v6i6.5211>
- Ramadhan, A. (2024). Pengaruh Pengambilan Keputusan, Inovasi Organisasi, Dan era digital Terhadap Strategi Pemasaran Bisnis. *Jurnal Siber Multi Disiplin*, 2(1), 45-53. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jsmd.v2i1.123>
- Refai, R., Patimah, S., Subandi, S., & Makbulloh, D. (2024). Meningkatkan efektivitas keputusan organisasi. *POACE: Jurnal Program Studi Adminitrasi Pendidikan*, 4(1), 85-96. <https://doi.org/10.24127/poace.v4i1.5084>
- Riang, Y. (2023). Dinamika Komunikasi Organisasi dalam Penerapan Inovasi MBKM di Universitas Katolik Widya Mandira Kupang. *Jurnal Komunikasi Nusantara*, 5(2), 218-225. <https://10.33366/jkn.v%vi%i.399>

- Riang, Y., Bataona, M. J., & Dhosa, D. D. (2024). Dinamika Komunikasi Organisasi dalam Proses Pengambilan Keputusan Implementasi E-Government di Pemerintahan Kota Kupang. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi UHO : Jurnal Penelitian Kajian IlmuKomunikasidan Informasi*, 9(1), 60-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.52423/jikuho.v9i1.16160DINAMIKA>
- Simon, H. A. (1950). Administrative behavior. *AJN, American Journal of Nursing*, 50(2), 46-47. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00000446-195002000-00071>
- Sinaga, K. M., Fita Lestari, A., Gilbert Sinaga, D., Fadila, Y., & Fatkhuri, F. (2025). Implikasi Komunikasi Organisasi dalam Pengambilan Keputusan: Studi Kasus Integrasi Polri Ke Dalam Kemendagri. *Journal Evidence Of Law*, 4(1), 179-187. <https://doi.org/10.59066/jel.v4i1.995>
- Sodikin, D. F. (2024). *Kepemimpinan Terdistribusi: Memperkuat Kolaborasi, Menyuburkan Inovasi*. Cendekia Press.
- Sugiat, M. A. (2020). Pengembangan sdm unggul berbasis collaborative strategic management. *SULTANIST: Jurnal Manajemen dan Keuangan*, 8(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.37403/sultanist.v8i1.175>
- Suryani, A. W., & Utami, H. (2020). Rigour in qualitative studies: Are we on track? *Jurnal Akuntansi dan Keuangan*, 22(2), 47-58. <https://doi.org/10.9744/jak.22.2.47-58>
- Susanta, H. S., Arief, E., & Sarmiati, S. (2020). Dinamika komunikasi orangtua dengan anak remaja Di Kota padang. *JIKE : Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi Efek*, 3(2), 145-153. <https://doi.org/10.32534/jike.v3i2.928>
- Wardani, S. (2023). Komunikasi Organisasi Sebagai Kunci Efektivitas Dan Produktivitas Dalam Lingkungan Ekonomi modern. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 3(2), 242-247. <https://doi.org/10.56145/ekonomibisnis.v3i2.151>
- Wayne Pace, R., & Faules, D. F. (2006). *Komunikasi Organisasi (Strategi Meningkatkan Kinerja Perusahaan)*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Wijaya, C., Duwiska, E. J., Khodijah, S., Hasian Dalimunthe, A. F., Ramadhani, M. R., Nurdalila, N., & Rambe, F. (2022). Peranan Komunikasi Organisasi bagi Kepemimpinan Organisasi Di MTs al-ikhlas Sidodadi Ramunia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 6(3), 13737-13747. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v6i3.4500>