Identification of Employee Behavior through Communication Audit to Evaluate Employee Effectiveness

by Lusia Permata Hartanti

Identification of Employee Behavior through Communication Audit to Evaluate Employee Effectiveness

Theresia Intan Putri Hartiana
Communication Science Department
Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University
Surabaya, Indonesia
theresiaintan@ukwms.ac.id

Lusia Permata Sari Hartanti
Industrial Engineering Department
Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University
Surabaya, Indonesia
lusia.hartanti@ukwms.ac.id

Ig. Jaka Mulyana
Industrial Engineering Department
Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University
Surabaya, Indonesia
jmulyono@ukwms.ac.id

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to measure the Higher Education Institution (HEI) effectiveness of internal communication among employees to obtain a better understanding of how employees should be communicated. Employee's interaction affects HEI outcomes such as customer satisfaction; HEI reputation, it is necessary to understand employee communication behavior. This study used communication audit method to measure the effectiveness of employee communication behavior. The results found that (a) in the matter of information needs for the needed or obtained while doing a work indicated ineffectiveness; (b) openness of information that should be told and finally told, was not effective in the matter of mistakes information about the job, telling the problems that were occurred in the work, complaints concerning employment or conditions of employment at this time, provide advice regarding the performance of the employer; (c) the follow-up effective information that should be able done and finally be done indicated effectiveness at all levels of structural; (d) The source of information that is often needed and often used was through WhatsApp Groups; (e) The accuracy of the information provided by the leaders was appropriate; (f). Relations that have occurred between employees and leaders were effective; (g). The employee felt satisfied with the work results.

Keywords:
Higher Education Institution, Employee Communication Behavior, Communication Audit, Effectiveness

1. Introduction

Education is a complex process that has an important role in increase human resources capabilities. Therefore, educational institutions need to pay attention to the quality of education provided. The quality of education is generated from an educational process that refers to determining standards which are influenced by internal and external factors to provide satisfaction to customers or stakeholders. Education as an organization must be managed in such a way that the activities of implementing educational programs can run effectively, efficiently, and productively without wasting time, energy, and costs; efficiency can also be interpreted as the ratio between output and input (Mulyadi, 2007). According to Hardjana (2019), efficiency and effectiveness are two sides of the

coin, efficiency also can be interpreted as 'doing things right' while effectiveness means 'doing the right thing '. According to Hidayat (1986), effectiveness is a measure tool to measure how far the targets are made including quality, quantity, and time that has been achieved. The bigger the target presentation that can be achieved, the higher the effectiveness will be.

Organizational communication is the process of sending and receiving information in a complex organization, including internal communication that occurs between employee within an organization including vertical communication from top to bottom (downward) as well as communication from the bottom up (upward) and horizontal communication among the employee of the same level of authority in an organization. Iordache-platis and Josan (2009) stated that communication is the process of transmitting a meaningful message between people, the act of communication takes place when the sender sends out the pieces of information when a source transmits signals via a channel to the receiver. Therefore, it is important to build and maintain an effective communication system in an organization.

Many studies explained that the sustainability of HEI is influenced by quality. Therefore, to achieve good quality in HEI must be oriented toward the increase in high-quality communication. Effective communication has an important role in achieving organizational effectiveness. Marks et al. (2001) explained that communication is a necessary component for coordination and team communication problems. An integrated communication process, needful in HEI, must be defined as a complete shape (Iordache-platis and Josan, 2009). Effective communication is successful in collaborating interpersonal relationships with the employees. Proper communication between employees increases trust in the HEI which leads to the success of business organizations

The widely used method of assessing communication in an organization is a communication audit. This method was popular in the 1950s, but this method grew quickly. International Communication Association (ICA) developed the organizational communication audit in 1971. A communication audit is often used to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of an organization's internal communication systems and to diagnose communication problems and create strategies for improvement. Organizational communication audit is used to monitor and evaluate media in general, messages, and the communication climate within the organization (Kriyantono, 2014). Mohammed and Bungin (2015) argued that communication audits are very important to be conducted in organizational efforts to bring change to internal organization. Through this action, it can be a tool to reduce the level of uncertainty that leads to unwanted rumors among members of the organization.

The need for this study emphasizes the communication that occurs in employees in HEI. Every employee is responsible for making the organization to be successful. The purpose of this study is to measure the HEI effectiveness of internal communication among employees to obtain a better understanding of how employees should be communicated.

2. Literature Review

Communication audit is an evaluation method that is developed by ICA based on scientific and professional standards to evaluate and research a problem that is carried out systematically, planned, regularly and methodologically, based on evidence, using predetermined standard criteria and the result of the audit will be shared to all parties of the organization (Hardjana, 2000). Seitel (2016) stated that the most effective communication audit starts with researchers who understand the research's object, understand the attitudes of the targeted public towards the organization, understand issues that are targeted by the public, and understand the relative strength of public and other publics. An audit that has been carried out by an organization will produce findings that are useful for organizational improvement (Hardjana,2019)

Communication audits are beneficial for the continuity and effectiveness of communication in the organization. Hardjana (2020) revealed the benefits of communication:

a. To know the excess or shortage of communication related to the topic, the sources and channels of communication.
b. To rate the quality of information and measure the quality of the relationships of the communication, specifically measure interpersonal trust, support, friendliness, and job satisfaction.
c. To know the active networks of informal communication operations and compare it with the formal communication.
d. To identify the source of information lacking and the information's filters by comparing them to their respective roles in the communications network.
e. To know the categories and examples of communication experiences and events that is positive or negative.
f. To describe patterns of communication on a personal level, group or organization related to the communication component, frequency and quality of interaction.

g. To give recommendations about the changes or improvement that needs to be conducted.

3. Methods

This study was conducted at an HEI in Surabaya, Indonesia. The instrument used in this study refers to the ICA Questionnaire that most of the section consists of two columns, firstly, actual level communication, and secondly, how communication should ideally be. The questions consist of eight themes regarding communication audits. The eight themes are:

Theme 1: Strengths and weaknesses in communication.
Theme 2: How do you feel about the amount of information you are receiving?
Theme 3: How do you feel about the amount of information you are receiving from the following sources?
Theme 4: How much information are you receiving through these channels?
Theme 5: How do you feel about the amount of information you are sending?
Theme 6: How do you feel about the action taken on the information you are sending?
Theme 7: How quickly do you get information from the following sources?
Theme 8: Working relationships

The questionnaire utilized in this study includes a total of 75 questions measured using 4-point scales.

A simple random sampling was used for this study. Questionnaires were distributed via electronic by the authors. This method was chosen because of the covid-19 pandemic conditions that are currently being faced. A sample of 162 employees was collected, but only 99 employees to process in this study. The rest cannot be processed because the given answer was not completed.

4. Results and Discussion

Demographic

The participants for this study were employees at HEI in Surabaya, Indonesia with approximately 600 employees. Employees vary in several demographic aspects including gender, age, and educational background. A sample of 99 employees was used for this study. Table 1 provides information about the gender of participants.

Table 1. Participants Based on Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	44	44.4 %
Female	55	55.6 %
Total	**99**	**100%**

The highest percentage of participants was between 41-50 years (42%). Table 2 indicates the various age of participants. Table 3 shows the majority of participants were lecturers with a cumulative frequency of 56 participants and 43 participants were administration staff.

Table 2. Participants Based on Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
20–30s	19	19.2%
31–40s	19	19.2%
41–50s	41	41.4%
> 50s	20	20.2%
Total	**99**	**100%**

Table 3. Participants based on Professional Job

Position	Frequency	Percentage
Lecturers	56	56.6%
Administration Staff	43	43.4%
Total	**99**	**100%**

Identification of Employee Communication Behavior

A general comparison about employee information needs is related to employee information needs, employee openness, information sources, communication channels, follow-up information, relationships within work units, satisfaction with work results, and accuracy of information. The summary statistic is presented in Table 4. Information regarding mistakes in doing work seemed ineffective because 62 people stated that they had little access to this information with a total mean of 2.28. There is a gap between information regarding promotions and career advancement with 64 people said they needed it, but the number obtained turned out to be 55 people who said they had little information. It was proved by the mean of 2.41 for the obtained information. Information regarding the problems being faced by Faculties/Bureaus/Institutions appears to be ineffective on the information obtained, with a mean of 2.42 while the information required is 2.52. Information about the problems being faced by the Study Program/Sub-division also seems ineffective because the mean for information needed is 2.56 but the information obtained is 2.45.

Table 4. Employee Information Needs

Type of Information		Amount of Information I needed				Mean	Category	Amount of information I got				Mean	Category
		Very little	Little	Much	Very much			Very little	Little	Much	Very much		
Tasks that must be performed on the job	F	1	12	69	17	3.03	Effective	2	19	71	7	2.83	Effective
	P	1%	12.1%	69.7%	17.2%			2%	19.2%	71.7%	7.1%		
Campus' rules and policies	F	3	8	76	12	2.98	Effective	4	24	68	3	2.70	Effective
	P	3%	8.1%	76.8%	12.1%			4%	24.2%	68.7%	3%		
Employee salaries and benefits	F	2	16	71	10	2.90	Effective	4	33	55	7	2.66	Effective
	P	2%	16.2%	71.7%	10.1%			4%	33.3%	55.6%	7.1%		
Use of technology in workplace	F	4	12	63	20	3	Effective	6	36	50	7	2.58	Effective
	P	4%	12.1%	63.6%	20.2%			6.1%	36.4%	50.5%	7.1%		
Mistakes while doing work	F	11	48	36	4	2.33	Ineffective	9	54	35	1	2.28	Ineffective
	P	11.1%	48.5%	36.4%	4%			9.1%	54.5%	35.4%	1%		
Assessment of work performed	F	6	16	71	6	2.77	Effective	4	39	52	4	2.56	Effective
	P	6.1%	16.2%	71.7%	6.1%			4%	39.4%	52.5%	4%		
How to solve problems at work	F	5	14	69	11	2.87	Effective	4	23	67	5	2.73	Effective
	P	5.1%	14.1%	69.7%	11.1%			4%	23.2%	67.7%	5.1%		
How to decide problems at work	F	5	14	71	9	2.85	Effective	3	26	67	3	2.70	Effective
	%	5.1%	14.1%	71.7%	9.1%			3%	26.3%	67.7%	3%		
Promotion and career advancement	F	7	28	55	9	2.66	Effective	7	48	40	4	2.4	Ineffective
	P	7.1%	28.3%	55.6%	9.1%			7.1%	48.5%	40.4%	4%		

Type of Information		Amount of Information I needed				Mean	Category	Amount of information I got				Mean	Category
		Very little	Little	Much	Very much			Very little	Little	Much	Very much		
Information regarding new policies in each study department/ division	F	2	22	68	7	2.81	Effective	5	35	56	3	2.58	Effective
	P	2%	22.2%	68.7%	7.1%			5.1%	35.4%	56.6%	3%		
Information about new policies in Faculties/Bureaus / Institutions	F	3	17	71	8	2.85	Effective	7	33	54	5	2.58	Effective
	P	3%	17.2%	71.7%	8.1%			7.1%	33.3%	54.5%	5.1%		
Impact of work carried out for Faculties/Bureau/ Institutions	F	3	23	65	8	2.78	Effective	5	35	58	1	2.55	Effective
	P	3%	23.2%	65.7%	8.1%			5.1%	35.4%	58.6%	1%		
Impact of work carried out for study department and division	F	2	17	69	11	2.90	Effective	4	33	58	4	2.62	Effective
	P	2%	17.2%	69.7%	11.1%			4%	33.3%	58.6%	4%		
Problems that were being faced by the Faculty/Bureau/ Institution	F	9	36	47	7	2.52	Effective	12	37	45	5	2.43	Ineffective
	P	9.1%	36.4%	47.5%	7.1%			12.1%	37.4%	45.5%	5.1%		
Problems that were being faced by the study department/division	F	6	38	49	6	2.53	Effective	9	39	48	3	2.45	Ineffective
	P	6.1%	38.4%	49.5%	6.1%			9.1%	39.4%	48.5%	3%		
Mean						2.79	Effective	Mean					Effective

F = frequency, P = percentage

In table 5 regarding the information shared by employees, it can be seen that the behavior of employees in delivering information is most eager to tell about their problems regarding the work, with the total number of 57 people (mean 2.72), but in the end, employees tell a little about the problems they face at work (mean 2.31). However, they wanted to tell the story behind the complaints made at work, but in the end, 72 people said little was told (mean 2.12). In addition, related to providing information on the performance of a superior, it seems ineffective to both of them, both in the information that wanted to be conveyed. Openness in telling about performance and the problems experienced while working are on a minimum state with a mean of 2,38 which was obtained through this research regarding the type of information.

Table 5. Information Told by Employees

Type of Information		Amount of information I should tell				Mean	Category	Amount of information I told				Mean	Category
		Very little	Little	Much	Very much			Very little	Little	Much	Very much		
The work I am currently doing	F	4	25	59	11	2.78	Effective	5	37	51	6	2.62	Effective
	P	4%	25.3%	59.6%	11.1%			5.1%	37.4%	51.5%	6.1%		
The work I should be doing	F	5	22	62	10	2.78	Effective	7	32	57	3	2.54	Effective
	P	5.1%	22.2%	62.6%	10.1%			7.1%	32.3%	57.6%	3%		
Work Problems	F	8	34	52	5	2.72	Effective	13	43	42	1	2.31	Ineffective
	P	8.1%	34.3%	52.5%	5.1%			13.1%	43.4%	42.4%	1%		
Tells about the problems in my work	F	10	39	46	4	2.44	Ineffective	10	48	40	1	2.32	Ineffective
	P	10.1%	39.4%	46.5%	4%			10.1%	48.5%	40.4%	1%		

Type of Information		Amount of information I should tell				Mean	Category	Amount of information I told				Mean	Category
		Very little	Little	Much	Very much			Very little	Little	Much	Very much		
Complaints regarding work or current working conditions	F	13	52	29	5	2.62	Effective	18	53	26	2	21.12	Ineffective
	P	13.1%	52.5%	29.3%	5.1%			18.2%	53.5%	26.3%	2%		
Giving advice regarding the performance of seniors	F	14	41	37	7	2.37	Ineffective	19	42	36	2	2.21	Ineffective
	P	14.1%	41.4%	37.4%	7.1%			19.2%	42.4%	36.4%	2%		
Technical working instructions	F	2	30	61	6	2.72	Effective	5	35	52	7	2.62	Effective
	P	2%	30.3%	61.6%	6.1%			5.1%	35.4%	52.5%	7.1%		
Mean						2.63	Effective					2.38	Ineffective

F = frequency, P = percentage

Regarding follow-up of the information, Table 6 shows the result was effective at all levels of position. Employees need to follow information and do it both to their superiors and to their subordinates. As many as 61 or 61.6% of participants admitted that they should need follow-up information to colleagues and as much as 1 or 1% of participants admitted that they should not really need follow-up information to colleagues. Meanwhile, 75 or 75.8% of participants admitted that in the end they often carry out the follow-up process to colleagues. As many as 61 or 61.6% of participants admitted that they need follow-up information to the Dean/Vice Dean/Director/Vice Director/Head of Bureau/Head of the Centre. The final result of 74 or 74.7% of participants admitted that they often carry out the follow-up process to the Dean/Vice Dean/Director/Vice Director/Head of Bureau/Head of the Centre.

Table 6. The Follow-up about Employee Information

Follow up to		The work I should do				Mean	Category	The work I did				Mean	Category
		Really Do Not Need Follow-up	Do Not Need Follow-up	Need Follow-up	Really Need Follow-up			Really Never Follow-up	Never Follow-up	Frequent Follow-up	Very often Follow-up		
Subordinate*	F	0	0%	17	18	3.51	Effective	0	0	25	10	3.29	Effective
	P	0%	0%	17.2%	18.2%			0%	0%	25.3%	10.1%		
Co-workers	F	1	3	61	34	3.30	Effective	2	4	75	18	3.11	Effective
	P	1%	3%	61.6%	34.4%			2%	4%	75.8%	18.2%		
Head of Study Program / Secretary of Study	F	0	5	57	37	3.32	Effective	3	6	79	11	2.99	Effective
	P	0%	5.1%	57.6%	37.4%			3%	6.1%	79.8%	11.1%		
Dean/Vice Dean/ Director/Vice Director/Head of Bureau/Head of Center	F	0	3	61	35	3.32	Effective	2	6	74	17	3.07	Effective
	P	0%	3%	61.6%	35.4%			2%	6.1%	74.7%	17.2%		
Leader of University	F	2	6	54	37	3.37	Effective	4	9	73	13	3	Effective
	P	2%	6.1%	54.5%	37.4%			4%	9.1%	73.7%	13.1%		
Mean							Effective						Effective

F = frequency, P = percentage

According to Table 7, it states that all information sources are effective. Employees get the information they need. As many as 62 or 62.6% of participants stated that they often needed information sources from the WA

Group, while 99 participants stated that they often received information sources from WhatsApp group. Meanwhile, for direct communication, 97 participants stated that they often needed information sources from colleagues from different units, while 99 participants stated that they often receive sources of information from colleagues from the same work unit.

Table 7. Sources of information needed by employees and finally accepted

Information Resources		The source of the information I needed				Mean	category	The source of the information I received				Mean	Category
		Really Do Not Need	No needed	Often needed	Very often needed			Really Do Not Receive	Do not receive	Often received	Very often received		
Subordinate*	F	0%	1	18	16	3.43	Effective	0	1	30	4	3.09	Effective
	P	0%	1%	18.2%	16.2%			0%	1%	30.3%	4%		
Colleagues in same work unit	F	1	1	69	28	3.25	Effective	2	2	75	20	3.14	Effective
	P	1%	1%	69.7%	28.3%			2%	2%	75.8%	20.2%		
Colleagues from different units	F	0%	11	78	10	3	Effective	0	16	77	6	2.90	Effective
	P	0%	11.1%	79.8%	10.1%			0%	16.2%	77.8%	6.1%		
Head of study program/Secretary of Study Program/Head of Subdivision	F	1	4	75	19	3.13	Effective	1	9	76	13	3.02	Effective
	P	1%	4%	75.8%	19.2%			1%	9.1%	76.8%	13.1%		
Dean/Vice Dean Director/Vice Director/Head of Bureau	F	1	3	74	21	3.16	Effective	1	9	72	17	3.06	Effective
	P	1%	3%	74.7%	21.2%			1%	9.1%	72.7%	17.2%		
Faculty/Bureau/Study Program Meetings	F	1	5	73	20	3.13	Effective	1	11	77	10	2.97	Effective
	P	1%	5.1%	73.7%	20.2%			1%	11.1%	77.8%	10.1%		
Internal Publications	F	2	18	72	7	2.85	Effective	5	30	58	6	2.66	Effective
	P	2%	18.2%	72.7%	7.1%			5.1%	30.3%	58.6%	6.1%		
Bulletin Board	F	2	18	72	7	2.85	Effective	4	22	66	7	2.76	Effective
	P	2%	18.2%	72.7%	7.1%			4%	22.2%	66.7%	7.1%		
E-mail	F	1	1	69	28	3.25	Effective	0	6	57	36	3.30	Effective
	P	1%	1%	69.7%	28.3%			0%	6.1%	57.6%	36.4%		
WA Groups	F	0%	2	62	35	3.32	Effective	0	0	52	47	3.47	Effective
	P	0%	2%	62.6%	35.4%			0%	0%	52.5%	47.5%		
		The source of information I needed				3..13	Effective	The source of information I received				3.033	Effective

F = frequency, P = percentage

In Table 8 regarding communication channels, it can be said effective. The data above can be said that the bulletin board is a communication channel that is rarely used because almost 50 participants stated that they never used a bulletin board as a communication channel, and 42 participants said that they never used memos or letters as

a communication channel. Participants prefer WA Group as a communication channel which is often used by 96 participants and used e-mail by 89 participants.

Table 8. Employee Communication Channels

Communication Channels		The communication channel I needed				Mean	Category	The communication channel I use frequently				Mean	Category
		Very much unneeded	Unneeded	Often Needed	Very often needed			Very much unused	Never used	Often used	Very often used		
Face-to-face between 2-4 people	F	0%	2	78	19	3.17	Effective	1	9	74	15	3.04	Effective
	P	0%	2%	78.8%	19.2%			1%	9.1%	74.7%	15.2%		
Official meeting/forum	F	0%	8	82	9	3.01	Effective	2	22	65	10	2.83	Effective
	P	0%	8.1%	82.8%	9.1%			2%	22.2%	657%	10.1%		
Telephone	F	1	10	75	13	2.94	Effective	1	31	50	17	2.83	Effective
	P	1%	10.1%	75.8%	13.1%			1%	31.3%	50.5%	17.2%		
Written letter or memo	F	1	10	82	6	2.92	Effective	4	38	39	8	2.31	Ineffective
	P	1%	10.1%	82.6	6.1%			4%	38.4%	49.5%	8.1%		
Bulletin board	F	1	23	70	5	2.78	Effective	8	42	45	4	2.33	Ineffective
	P	1%	24.2%	70.7%	5.1%			8.1%	42.4%	45.4%	4%		
E-mail	F	0%	2	69	28	3.26	Effective	2	8	52	37	3.25	Effective
	P	0%	2%	69.7%	28.3%			2%	8.1%	52.5%	37.4%		
WA Groups	F	0%	1	58	40	2.98	Effective	0	3	46	50	3.14	Effective
	P	0%	1%	58.6%	40.4%			0%	3%	46.5%	50.5%		
Mean		The communication channel I needed				2.99	Effective	The communication channel I use frequently				2.81	Effective

F = frequency, P = percentage

Table 9. The Accuracy of Information

Accuracy of Information		Very incorrect	Incorrect	Correct	Very correct	Mean	Category
Co-workers	F	0	11	82	6	2.99	Correct
	P	0%	11.1%	82.8%	6.1%		
Head of Study Program/Secretary of Study Program/Head of Subdivision	F	0	7	75	17	3.1	Correct
	P	0%	7.1%	75.8%	17.1%		
Dean/Vice Dean/Head of Bureau/Head of Centre/Head of Institution	F	1	4	72	22	3.5	Correct
	P	1%	4%	72.7%	22.2%		
Total Mean		Accuracy of Information				3.19	Correct

F = frequency, P = percentage

Table 9 states that the information always came in the right substance. As many as 82 or 82.8% of participants stated that their colleagues were the reason behind the accuracy of the right information. A total of 75 or 75.8% of participants stated the Head of Study Program/Secretary of Study Program/Head of Subdivision as the accuracy of the correct information. As many as 72 or 72.7% of participants show that the Dean/Vice Dean/Head of Bureau/Head of Centre/Head of Institution has correct information and 1 or 1% of the participants stated that it was very incorrect.

Table 10 related to relationships at work both to superiors, subordinates, and co-workers can be said to be good even though 17 participants said they disagreed with the leaders always giving praise for the work they did. While 8 participants stated that the work unit was open with differences of opinion. The other 98 participants stated that they can make friends easily with all colleagues and 86 participants stated that we can make friends easily with all colleagues.

Table 10. Relationship at Work

Type of Relation		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	Category
I trust my co-workers	F	0	1	78	20	3.19	Good
	P	0%	1%	78.8%	20.2%		
My co-workers are good discussion partners	F	0	2	78	19	3.17	Good
	P	0%	2%	78.8%	19.2%		
I can make friends easily with all my colleagues	F	0	1	78	20	3.19	Good
	P	0%	1%	78.8%	20.2%		
I can trust my leader	F	0	2	60	37	3.35	Good
	P	0%	2%	60.6%	37.4%		
My leader believed in me	F	0	2	74	23	3.21	Good
	P	0%	2%	74.7%	23.2%		
My leader listened to me	F	0	5	73	21	3.16	Good
	P	0%	5.1%	73.7%	21.2%		
I can state my arguments freely even there are differences of opinion with the leader	F	0	7	70	22	3.15	Good
	P	0%	7.1%	70.7%	22.2%		
I can tell the leader directly if something is not right	F	0	6	72	21	3.15	Good
	P	0%	6.1%	72.7%	21.2%		
The leader always gives praise for the work I have done	F	5	12	64	18	2.9	Good
	P	5.1%	12.1%	64.6%	18.2%		
The leader is friendly to everyone	F	0	5	64	30	3.25	Good
	P	0%	5.1%	64.6%	30.3%		
The leader understands the needs of the workers	F	1	6	72	20	3.12	Good
	P	1%	6.1%	72.7%	20.2%		
I feel comfortable with my leader	F	1	3	71	24	3.19	Good
	P	1%	3%	71.7%	24.2%		
I trust my leader	F	1	2	67	29	3.25	Good
	P	1%	2%	67.7%	29.3%		
The leaders show efforts to communicate to all employees	F	1	3	65	30	3.25	Good
	P	1%	3%	65.7%	30.3%		
The work unit is open with differences of opinion	F	1	7	64	27	3.18	Good
	P	1%	7.1%	64.6%	27.3%		
I can tell my opinion regarding work	F	0	6	71	22	3.16	Good
	P	0%	6.1%	71.7%	22.2%		
My presence is needed for the rock	F	1	0	76	22	3.2	Good
		1%	0%	76.8%	22.2%		

Type of Relation		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Mean	Category
I am a part of the success of the organization's goals	P	1	1	76	21	3.18	Good
	F	1%	1%	76.8%	21.2%		
Total Mean		Total Mean				3.18	Good

F = frequency, P = percentage

Table 11. Work Results

Work Result		Very unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Mean	Category
My own work	F	0	5	80	14	3.09	Satisfied
	P	0%	5.1%	80.8%	14.1%		
Income	F	4	19	65	11	2.83	Satisfied
	P	4%	19.2%	65.7%	11.1%		
Self-advancement in organization	F	2	13	73	11	2.93	Satisfied
	P	2%	13.1%	73.7%	11.1%		
Opportunities for advancement in the organization	F	3	13	70	13	2.93	Satisfied
	P	3%	13.1%	70.7%	13.1%		
Opportunities to realize new ideas in work units	F	3	10	76	10	2.93	Satisfied
	P	3%	10.1%	76.8%	10.1%		
Giving rewards for the work	F	3	22	65	9	2.80	Satisfied
	P	3%	22.2%	65.7%	9.1%		
Organizational concern for employee welfare	F	5	18	65	11	2.92	Satisfied
	P	5.1%	18.2%	65.7%	11.1%		
Efforts to build communication within the organization	F	1	11	78	9	2.95	Satisfied
	P	1%	11.1%	78.8%	9.1%		
Quality of service in the organization	F	1	16	74	8	2.8	Satisfied

F = frequency, P = percentage

The average mean of work results is 2.91 which indicate that employees are satisfied with the work results that were obtained (Table 11). The lowest average mean is regarding the giving reward for the work 2.80 , and satisfaction about service quality in organizations with a mean of 2.8. Meanwhile, employees are satisfied with the work they do, with a mean of 3.09. Job satisfaction has a stronger relationship with turnover rate when compared with the relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism level. This reason is because employees are not satisfied and feel their job no longer attractive will tend to go to find work in new place, more interesting.Colquitt, Lepine and Wesson (in Wibowo, 2011), Job satisfaction consists of several categories, such as : Pay Stisfaction, Promotion Satisfaction, Supervision Satisfaction, Coworker Satisfaction, Satisfaction with the Work itself, Alturism, Status, Environment.

5. Conclusion

This study attempted to investigate the Higher Education Institution effectiveness of internal communication among employees. The use of a communication audit over a longer period would be useful in terms of addressing the issue at HEI. The communication audit served as an initial component to evaluate HEI's communication health. Based on this study, the behavior of communication activities carried out by an HEI employee are as follows:
a.   Overall employee behavior in communication activities was effective
b.   On the need for information that is needed and obtained regarding the mistakes that were made in the work showed that it is not effective.

c. Openness to information that should be told and finally told, it was ineffective in information about problems at work, telling problems at work, complaints about work or current work conditions, giving advice regarding the performance of superiors.

d. Effective follow-up information that should be carried out and finally carried out was effective at all structural levels.

e. Sources of information needed and received did not show to be effective on gossip, but it can be said to be good because employees do not need to go to work or receive gossip while working.

f. The accuracy of the information provided by the leadership was correct.

g. Relation that occurs between employees and managers was effective; the lowest total mean is from the leaders who always give credit for the work that has been done.

h. Employees were satisfied with the work results.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

References

Hardjana, A. (2000). *Audit Komunikasi Teori dan Praktek*. Jakarta: PT. Grasindo.

Hardjana, A. (2019). *Komunikasi Organisasi: Strategi Interaksi dan Kepemimpinan*. Jakarta: Rajagrafindo Persada.

Hidayat, M.S. (1986). *Administrasi, Supervisi, dan Ketenagaan PLB*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.

Goldhaber, G.M., & Rogers, D.P. (1979). *Auditing Organizational Communication System: The ICA Communciation Audit*. United States of America: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

IORDACHE-PLATIS, M., JOSAN, I. (2009). Communication Efficiency wuthin Higher Education Institisions: The Case of Romaia. *European Research Studies, Volume XII. Issue (2)*.

Kriyantono, R. (2014). *Teknik Praktis Riset Komunikasi*. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.

Marks, M., Mathieu, J. and Zaccaro, S., A temporally based framework and taxonomy of team processes, *The Academy of Management Review*, 26, pp. 356-376, 2001. DOI: 10.2307/259182

Mulyadi. (2007). *Sistem Perencanaan dan Pengendalian Manajemen*. Salemba Empat. Jakarta.

Mohammed, R., & Bungin, B. (2015). *Audit Komunikasi*. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group

Wibowo. (2015). *Perilaku Dalam Organisasi.*.Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.

Biography

Theresia Intan Putri Hartiana is Lecturer in Communiation Science Departement, Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University Surabaya Indonesia. She earned B.S. in Communication Science Departemen from Airlangga University Surabaya Indonesia and Master of Communication from Padjadjaran Bandung. She has published journal and conference papers. Her research interests include corporate communication, marketing communication

Ig. Jaka Mulyana is a Senior Lecturer in Industrial Engineering Department, Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University Surabaya Indonesia. He earned B.S. in Agricultural Industrial Technology from Gadjah Mada University Jogjakarta Indonesia and Master in Industrial Engineering from Sepuluh Nopember Institute of Technology Surabaya Indonesia. He has published journal and conference papers. His research interests include quality engineering, lean manufacturing and supply chain management.

Lusia Permata Sari Hartanti is a lecturer in Industrial Engineering Department at Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University. She earned B.Eng. in Industrial Engineering from Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta and Master of Engineering in Mechanical Engineering from Gadjah Mada University. She has published journal and conference papers. Her research interests include quality, marketing research, manufacturing, and lean.

Identification of Employee Behavior through Communication Audit to Evaluate Employee Effectiveness