Organizational Communication and Public Relations in Strengthening Public Institutional Governance: A Literature Review from the Perspective of Development Administration

Nelly Armayanti*[1], Muhammad Dalimunte*[2], Dodi Pramana*[3]
[1,3]Universitas Negeri Medan
[2]Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara
E-mail: [1]nellyarmayanti@unimed.ac.id, [2]muhammaddalimunte@uinsu.ac.id, [3]dodipramana@unimed.ac.id

Info Articles

Article History
Received : 2025-10-23
Revised: 2025-11-21
Published: 2025-12-30

Keywords:
Organizational Communication; Public Relations; Public Governance; Institutional Capacity; Development Administration.

Abstract

Organizational communication and public relations play important roles in strengthening the governance of public institutions. However, both functions are frequently perceived as administrative activities and information dissemination mechanisms rather than strategic institutional capacities that contribute to internal coordination, transparency, accountability, and public trust. This article aims to examine the relationship between organizational communication and public relations in strengthening public institutional governance from a development administration perspective. The study employs a critical literature review by examining scholarly works on organizational communication, government public relations, public governance, institutional capacity, and public service. The literature is analyzed thematically and conceptually to identify relationships among key concepts and develop an integrative synthesis. The findings indicate that organizational communication facilitates coordination, work integration, and shared understanding within institutions, while public relations strengthens institutional relationships with society through transparency, dialogue, information management, and trust-building. The integration of these functions generates institutional communication capacity that supports organizational effectiveness, responsiveness, transparency, and accountability. This article proposes the concept of Integrated Institutional Communication Capacity as a framework for understanding communication not merely as a supporting activity, but as a strategic component of institutional governance in development administration.

I. INTRODUCTION

Strengthening public institutional governance is an essential prerequisite for achieving effective, accountable, transparent, and responsive government administration that addresses the needs of society. From a development administration perspective, public institutions are understood not merely as formal structures exercising governmental authority, but also as systems responsible for managing resources, coordinating actions, implementing policies, and building relationships with their social environments. Accordingly, the quality of governance is determined not solely by the existence of regulations, procedures, and organizational structures, but also by institutional capacity to integrate various functions and actors within the processes of public governance.

Fukuyama (2013) explains that governance is associated with the government's capacity to formulate and implement rules and deliver public services. Such capacity cannot be separated from organizational quality, human resources, coordination, and accountability mechanisms. More broadly, policy and institutional capacity constitute critical factors determining the government's ability to formulate, coordinate, and implement policies effectively (Wu et al., 2015). Therefore, governance reform needs to address both internal organizational processes and external relationships between public institutions and society.

One aspect that significantly influences both dimensions is communication. Within organizations, communication is a process through which information, instructions, ideas, and feedback flow among individuals and work units. It facilitates the development of shared understanding, task coordination, problem-solving, and the achievement of organizational objectives. Goldhaber (1993) conceptualizes organizational communication as the process of creating and exchanging messages within a network of interdependent relationships to address environmental uncertainty. Thus, communication is not merely an activity of transmitting messages; rather, it is a process that

connects different organizational components, enabling them to function as an integrated whole.

Within public institutions, the importance of organizational communication becomes even more pronounced because the implementation of governmental responsibilities involves multiple units, levels of authority, procedures, and interests. Information that is not properly communicated may lead to misunderstandings, delayed decision-making, overlapping responsibilities, and even inconsistencies between policy formulation and implementation. Conversely, well-directed internal communication can help align employees' understanding, clarify responsibilities, strengthen cross-unit coordination, and ensure the continuity of public service processes.

In addition to internal communication, public institutions also need the capacity to establish constructive relationships with society. In this regard, *public relations* occupies a strategic position. The evolving understanding of public relations extends beyond the publication of organizational activities, information dissemination, or image management. Its functions also encompass managing organizational relationships with stakeholders, fostering dialogue, understanding public needs, and maintaining public trust. Grunig and Hunt (1984) explain the development of public relations practice models, while Ledingham (2003) emphasizes the importance of managing organization-public relationships as a fundamental basis for understanding public relations effectiveness.

Within government organizations, public relations has characteristics that distinguish it from public relations practices in the business sector. Government communication operates in an environment shaped by public interests, legal requirements, public scrutiny, political dynamics, and demands for accountability. Liu and Horsley (2007) demonstrate that the distinctive characteristics of the public sector environment require government communication models that take institutional conditions and service responsibilities into account. Accordingly, public communication should be positioned as an integral component of governmental functions rather than merely an instrument for organizational promotion.

This development is also reflected in the growing emphasis on a more strategic approach to public communication. The OECD (2021) emphasizes that government communication can support policymaking, service improvement, transparency, public participation, and public trust. Effective public communication requires clear institutional mandates, coordination, planning, professionalization, and evaluation. This indicates that communication needs to be integrated into decision-making and policy implementation processes rather than activated only when organizations encounter image-related problems or media pressure.

Nevertheless, organizational communication and *public relations* are still frequently treated as two separate functions. Organizational communication is primarily associated with information dissemination, workplace relationships, and internal coordination, whereas public relations is commonly understood in terms of publicity and external relations. Such a separation may create a gap between information managed within an organization and information communicated to the public. When internal coordination is ineffective, external information may become inconsistent. Conversely, when an organization lacks mechanisms for listening to public concerns and aspirations, internal communication risks being disconnected from the feedback necessary to improve policies and public services.

Studies on *government public relations* indicate considerable opportunities for further development in this field, particularly in understanding government-society relationships, communication ethics, and the distinctive characteristics of public sector communication (Dong et al., 2023). Meanwhile, organizational communication scholarship emphasizes that communication processes are closely related to the construction of meaning, relationships, and patterns of work within organizations (Miller & Barbour, 2015). These two perspectives need to be brought together to understand communication as an institutional capacity that bridges internal organizational processes and external relationships.

From a development administration perspective, integrating organizational communication and *public relations* is particularly relevant because development requires institutional capacity to coordinate resources, implement policies, engage society, and ensure accountability for the outcomes of government activities. The *New Public Service* approach positions citizens as individuals who should be served and actively engaged, rather than merely treated as recipients of government decisions (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015). In line with this perspective, the concept of *public value*

governance emphasizes the importance of creating public value through collaboration, legitimacy, and relationships among stakeholders (Bryson et al., 2014).

Based on this discussion, this article addresses the conceptual problem of the suboptimal integration of internal and external communication in strengthening public institutional governance. Rather than examining organizational communication and *public relations* as separate functions, the article seeks to explain how these two dimensions can collectively establish institutional capacity that supports governmental effectiveness and accountability.

The objectives of this article are to analyze the role of organizational communication in strengthening internal coordination within public institutions, explain the contribution of *public relations* to building relationships and public trust, and formulate an integrative framework connecting these two functions to the strengthening of public institutional governance. The conceptual contribution proposed in this article is the notion of **Integrated Institutional Communication Capacity**, defined as the capacity of public organizations to manage internal and external communication in an integrated manner to support coordination, transparency, responsiveness, and accountability.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

This article adopts a qualitative approach through a critical literature review. This approach was selected because the purpose of the study is not to empirically measure relationships among variables, but rather to examine, compare, and synthesize theoretical perspectives on organizational communication, *public relations*, public governance, and institutional capacity from a development administration perspective.

The sources reviewed consist of academic literature and institutional publications relevant to the focus of the discussion. Academic literature includes books and journal articles addressing organizational communication, public relations theories, government communication, transparency, accountability, collaboration, and policy capacity. Institutional publications are used to enrich the understanding of developments in public communication and its application in government administration. One of the institutional references employed is the OECD report on public communication, which discusses the structures, mandates, coordination mechanisms, strategies, and professionalization of government communication (OECD, 2021).

The literature search was conducted through Google Scholar, Crossref, Garuda, as well as academic publishers' and scholarly journals' websites. The keywords used included *organizational communication*, *public relations*, *government public relations*, *government communication*, *public governance*, *institutional capacity*, transparency, and *public accountability*. These keywords were used both independently and in combination to identify literature relevant to the focus of the study.

Literature selection was conducted purposively based on three considerations. First, substantive relevance, meaning that the sources directly address organizational communication, public relations, government communication, or institutional governance. Second, conceptual contribution, meaning that the sources provide theoretical explanations or analytical frameworks that can be used to understand the relationship between communication and institutional capacity. Third, source credibility, meaning that the literature originates from academic publishers, scholarly journals, or institutions with recognized authority in the relevant fields.

The analysis was conducted in three stages. The first stage involved identifying the main concepts and theoretical arguments presented in each source. The second stage involved classifying the literature into four thematic categories: organizational communication, government public relations, public governance, and institutional capacity. The third stage involved critical synthesis to identify relationships among the themes, uncover conceptual gaps, and formulate an integrative framework. The synthesis process took into account similarities, differences, and interconnections among the arguments presented across the sources.

This study is not intended to constitute a systematic review that produces prevalence estimates or claims comprehensive coverage of all publications within a particular field. Accordingly, the article does not employ article-counting procedures based on the PRISMA flow diagram. The findings presented represent a conceptual synthesis of selected literature relevant to the research questions. This methodological limitation is important to ensure that the nature of the research approach and the strength of the claims presented remain appropriately aligned.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Research result

Organizational communication is a fundamental element in building the internal capacity of public institutions. Government organizations have work structures involving leaders, structural officials, operational personnel, and various units performing different functions. Each component requires accurate information to understand its duties, authority, priorities, and working relationships with other organizational components. Therefore, the quality of communication determines the extent to which formal structures can function as an integrated working system.

Goldhaber (1993) explains that organizational communication takes place within networks of interdependent messages and relationships. This perspective indicates that communication should not be viewed merely as the transmission of instructions from superiors to subordinates. It also encompasses information exchange among colleagues, cross-unit coordination, feedback delivery, and organizational interactions with the external environment. Miller and Barbour (2015) likewise demonstrate that organizational communication approaches are closely related to the processes of meaning construction and relationship management within organizations.

Based on the literature synthesis, internal communication within public institutions can be identified through three main functions. First, the informative function ensures that every organizational component receives relevant information concerning policies, procedures, work agendas, and changes in the organizational environment. Second, the coordinative function connects tasks among individuals and units to prevent work processes from being carried out independently of one another. Third, the integrative function develops a shared understanding of institutional objectives, enabling each organizational component to position its responsibilities within the achievement of overall organizational goals.

These three functions are interrelated. The availability of information does not necessarily produce coordination if the information is not understood and acted upon by the relevant units. Similarly, coordination does not necessarily lead to integration if individual units continue to operate according to sectoral interests. Therefore, internal communication needs to be developed as a process through which information is translated into organizational action.

In government administration, these requirements can be observed in correspondence and disposition management, coordination meetings, report preparation, data exchange, procedural implementation, and service coordination. Every administrative process contains a communication dimension. Official correspondence is not merely a formal document but also a medium for conveying information and establishing a basis for follow-up action. Dispositions are not simply administrative instructions but mechanisms for delegating responsibilities and facilitating coordination. Reports do not function solely as archival records; they also serve as information exchange instruments for decision-making and accountability.

The relationship between communication and coordination can also be understood through the *whole-of-government* approach. Christensen and Lægreid (2007) explain the importance of cross-organizational approaches in overcoming bureaucratic fragmentation and improving policy and service integration. This approach suggests that coordination cannot be established through formal structures alone; it also requires information-sharing mechanisms and collaborative practices that enable different units to work toward common objectives.

Accordingly, organizational communication contributes to strengthening internal capacity by improving role clarity, information consistency, work coordination, and process integration. When communication operates openly and reciprocally, employees also have opportunities to communicate obstacles, propose improvements, and provide feedback on policy implementation. Internal communication, therefore, is not merely instructional but also participatory.

The OECD report (2021) demonstrates that internal communication is one of the functions that needs to be managed institutionally. The existence of dedicated structures or personnel responsible for internal communication can help organizations disseminate information, develop organizational identity, and ensure that communication supports strategic objectives. These findings reinforce the argument that internal communication needs to occupy a clearly defined position within government management systems.

While organizational communication primarily concerns internal processes, *public relations* plays a role in strengthening institutional relationships with the external environment. In the context of public organizations, this environment includes citizens, interest groups, the media, civil society organizations, oversight institutions, and other stakeholders. The relationships established should not be oriented solely toward creating a positive image but must be grounded in accurate information provision, openness, responsiveness to public aspirations, and institutional accountability.

Grunig and Hunt (1984) describe various models of public relations practice, including two-way communication approaches. The development of these theoretical models demonstrates how public relations can move beyond one-way communication toward more dialogic patterns. Through dialogic communication, organizations not only convey information to the public but also seek to understand the responses, needs, and experiences of relevant stakeholders.

Kent and Taylor (2002) developed dialogic communication theory, emphasizing the importance of dialogue in building organization-public relationships. Dialogue involves more than simply providing communication channels; it encompasses an organization's willingness to listen, respond, and establish sustainable relationships. Taylor and Kent (2014) further position dialogic engagement as an important element of public relations, particularly when organizations interact with publics holding diverse interests and perspectives.

In government, dialogic approaches are particularly important because citizens are not merely recipients of information or users of public services. They are also stakeholders with the right to obtain information, express opinions, raise objections, and oversee government administration. The *New Public Service* perspective emphasizes that governments should serve citizens and establish democratic relationships with them rather than merely treating them as administrative customers (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2015).

Public trust is one of the important outcomes of well-managed relationships. Trust is not established merely through institutional statements or image-building campaigns, but through citizens' experiences in obtaining information, accessing services, expressing their aspirations, and observing the consistency of organizational actions. Van de Walle and Bouckaert (2003) demonstrate the relationship between public service performance and trust in government. This indicates that communication needs to be supported by tangible institutional performance.

Transparency is an essential element of these relationships. Rawlins (2009) explains organizational transparency through several dimensions, including integrity, respect for others, openness, participation, the provision of substantive information, and accountability. This perspective demonstrates that openness is not simply a matter of how much information is published, but also concerns the quality, relevance, and accessibility of information for stakeholders.

Meijer (2013) emphasizes that the dynamics of transparency are complex. The availability of information does not automatically generate understanding, oversight, or trust. Information needs to be understandable, placed within the appropriate context, and connected to accountability mechanisms. Therefore, public relations within government organizations must ensure that communication goes beyond publication activities and contributes to substantive transparency.

In the context of digital government, social media and online communication channels create opportunities for faster interaction between institutions and citizens. Mergel (2013a, 2013b) demonstrates that the use of social media by public sector organizations is associated with changes in government interaction patterns and communication tactics. However, the use of technology does not automatically create dialogic communication. Organizations still require channel management policies, human resource capacity, information consistency, and follow-up mechanisms for responding to public inquiries and complaints.

Accordingly, *public relations* should be understood as a strategic function that connects organizations with society. This function encompasses information provision, media relations management, policy communication, public feedback collection, issue management, and the maintenance of public trust. Within public organizations, all these activities must be grounded in the public

interest and the principles of accountability rather than being driven solely by organizational reputation.

Organizational communication and *public relations* have different areas of focus, but they are mutually dependent. Organizational communication ensures that information, decisions, and task implementation are coordinated within institutions. Meanwhile, *public relations* ensures that institutional relationships with society are maintained through accountable information, dialogue, and responsiveness to public needs.

Neither function can operate effectively if the two are rigidly separated. Information communicated to the public should originate from coordinated internal processes. Conversely, public aspirations, criticism, and needs received through public relations activities should be conveyed to the internal units authorized to address them. This relationship creates a communication cycle connecting internal and external organizational processes.

Within the public governance framework, this relationship is associated with transparency, accountability, participation, and effectiveness. Bovens (2007) defines accountability as a relationship in which actors are obliged to explain and justify their actions to a forum that has the authority to question, assess, and impose consequences. In this context, communication constitutes an essential prerequisite because accountability requires information that can be communicated, examined, and understood.

Meanwhile, Ansell and Gash (2008) emphasize the importance of collaborative processes involving governmental and non-governmental actors in public decision-making. Emerson et al. (2012) also explain collaborative governance through the interconnected dimensions of system context, collaborative dynamics, and collective action. Both perspectives demonstrate that relationships between governments and society cannot be established solely through one-way information dissemination; they require communication mechanisms that facilitate dialogue and cooperation.

Bryson et al. (2014) develop the *public value governance* perspective, which positions the creation of public value as an essential orientation of governance. Public value emerges through interactions among different actors, legitimacy, and the capacity of organizations to generate benefits that are relevant to society. Within this framework, organizational communication and *public relations* can serve as connecting mechanisms between the internal capacity of government institutions and the external needs of society.

Based on the literature synthesis, the integration of organizational communication and *public relations* can be explained through four relationships. First, internal communication generates information consistency and shared organizational understanding. Second, *public relations* translates institutional information into communication that is relevant to society. Third, public aspirations and responses are fed back into the organization as inputs for evaluation and improvement. Fourth, this process strengthens accountability because institutional decisions and actions can be explained to relevant stakeholders.

Liu and Horsley (2007) emphasize that government communication is influenced by the distinctive characteristics of the public sector, including service demands, legal constraints, media scrutiny, and political dynamics. Therefore, the integration of internal and external communication needs to consider ethics, information accuracy, neutrality, and the public interest. Poorly managed communication can create inconsistencies between official messages, organizational actions, and citizens' experiences.

Through their review of government public relations literature, Dong et al. (2023) demonstrate that government-public relationships constitute a continuously developing field that requires stronger theoretical foundations and more context-specific research. This further reinforces the need to connect public relations theories with public administration and institutional governance studies.

Accordingly, organizational communication and *public relations* should be positioned as two complementary dimensions within an integrated institutional communication system. Their separation may prevent internal information from being connected to public needs, whereas their integration creates opportunities for developing more transparent, responsive, and accountable governance.

B. Discussion

The synthesis of literature on organizational communication and *public relations* indicates that communication has a broader significance than merely serving as an administrative function or an information dissemination activity. From a development administration perspective, communication constitutes part of institutional capacity that determines the ability of public organizations to manage change, coordinate resources, implement policies, engage society, and ensure that the benefits of development are widely experienced.

Development administration provides a broader perspective for understanding the relationship between communication and governance. Development is not merely concerned with economic growth or the implementation of government programs; it also requires institutional capacity to manage change, coordinate resources, engage society, and ensure that policy benefits are experienced by the wider population.

From this perspective, public institutions occupy an important position as policy implementers and managers of collective interests. Institutional quality is determined not only by organizational structures or the completeness of procedures but also by the capacity to translate policies into coordinated actions. Fukuyama (2013) emphasizes the importance of government capacity in implementing rules and delivering public services. Meanwhile, Wu et al. (2015) demonstrate that policy capacity encompasses analytical, operational, and political capabilities required to produce effective policies.

Communication is closely related to all three dimensions of capacity. Within the analytical dimension, communication facilitates the collection and exchange of information as a basis for understanding problems. Within the operational dimension, communication helps coordinate policy implementation and the distribution of responsibilities. Within the political dimension, communication supports legitimacy-building, interest management, and relationships between governments and society.

The *whole-of-government* approach also demonstrates that successful policy implementation requires coordination across organizational units and levels of government (Christensen & Lægreid, 2007). Such coordination requires consistent information, clear communication mechanisms, and an organizational willingness to overcome bureaucratic barriers. Without these elements, policies risk becoming fragmented and public services may fail to operate in an integrated manner.

In the context of development, communication is also closely associated with public participation. The *collaborative governance* approach positions dialogue and cooperation as essential elements in addressing public problems (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Emerson et al., 2012). Open communication can help citizens understand policies, express their needs, and participate in decision-making processes. Thus, communication is not merely an administrative instrument but also a means of building collective capacity.

The OECD report (2021) reinforces the argument that effective public communication requires institutional structures, strategies, coordination, resources, and evaluation. Professional government communication can support policymaking and public service delivery while strengthening the principles of open government. This demonstrates that the development of communication capacity needs to become part of the institutional reform agenda.

Wæraas and Byrkjeflot (2012) point out that reputation management in public sector organizations presents distinctive challenges because public organizations face diverse values, mandates, and legitimacy demands. Reputation cannot be managed through image-building alone, as public organizations are required to account for their actions to various groups within society. This perspective reinforces the importance of positioning communication as an integral component of institutional performance and integrity.

Accordingly, within development administration, organizational communication and *public relations* can be understood as both supporting capacities and drivers of institutional change. They help organizations establish internal integration, develop relationships with society, and ensure that policies and public services are implemented on the basis of accountable information.

Although organizational communication and *public relations* make strategic contributions to strengthening governance, integrating these two functions involves

various structural, managerial, and technological challenges. These challenges reveal a gap between the ideal requirements of institutional communication and the actual practices of government administration.

The first challenge is bureaucratic fragmentation. The organizational structures of public institutions, which are divided into different units and levels of authority, can create information barriers. Individual units may possess different data, procedures, and priorities, resulting in information that is not always interconnected. This condition can potentially hinder coordination and produce inconsistent external communication.

The second challenge is the tendency toward one-way communication. In bureaucratic practice, communication is frequently oriented toward the delivery of instructions, announcements, or formal information. Although this pattern is necessary to ensure procedural compliance, it is insufficient for fostering organizational learning and dialogic relationships. Organizations need to provide opportunities for employees and citizens to express feedback and receive clear responses.

The third challenge concerns transparency and information management. Openness does not mean that all information can be disclosed without considering legal requirements, data protection, and legitimate interests. Public organizations need to balance openness with accuracy, security, and responsibility in information management. Rawlins (2009) demonstrates that transparency is associated with integrity, openness, participation, substantive information, and accountability. Therefore, information publication must be accompanied by verification and accountability mechanisms.

The fourth challenge is the digitalization of communication. The use of social media and digital platforms can accelerate information dissemination, but it also increases the risks of misinformation, uncoordinated responses, and the spread of misleading information. Mergel (2013a, 2013b) demonstrates that the use of social media by governments changes how organizations interact with society. These changes require digital communication competencies, channel management policies, and integrated response mechanisms.

The fifth challenge concerns limitations in human resource capacity. Institutional communication requires the ability to develop messages, understand policy contexts, manage information, identify stakeholder needs, and evaluate communication outcomes. The OECD (2021) highlights the importance of professionalizing government communication functions, including institutional support, coordination, and adequate human and financial resources. Without such support, communication risks becoming reactive and disconnected from organizational objectives.

The sixth challenge is the tendency to evaluate communication success based on outputs rather than impacts. The number of publications, news reports, social media posts, or public awareness activities may indicate communication activities, but these measures are insufficient to demonstrate whether citizens understand the information, public services have improved, or public trust has increased. Evaluation should also consider changes in public understanding, response quality, complaint resolution, citizen engagement, and communication's contribution to improving institutional processes.

These challenges indicate that strengthening institutional communication requires a change in approach. Public organizations need to move from incidental communication toward planned communication, from one-way information dissemination toward dialogue, and from activity-based measurement toward impact evaluation. Such changes must be supported by leadership, internal regulations, human resource competencies, and adequate information systems.

Based on the preceding literature synthesis and theoretical discussion, this article proposes the framework of **Integrated Institutional Communication Capacity**. This framework explains that strengthening public institutional governance requires integration among internal communication, external communication, and governance mechanisms. These three elements form mutually influential relationships and contribute to the enhancement of institutional capacity.

The first dimension is internal communication capacity. This dimension concerns an organization's ability to manage information, establish coordination, clarify roles, integrate work processes, and provide opportunities for feedback. Effective internal communication helps organizations reduce fragmentation, strengthen shared

understanding, and support consistency in policy implementation.

The second dimension is external communication capacity. This dimension concerns an organization's ability to deliver accurate information, develop dialogue with society, manage stakeholder relationships, receive public aspirations, and provide responses. *Public relations* serves as an important instrument within this dimension because it connects organizations with their social environments.

The third dimension is institutional communication integration. This dimension connects internal information with external communication. Information conveyed to the public needs to be supported by internal coordination, while public feedback needs to be forwarded to the authorized units for appropriate follow-up. Such integration prevents gaps between organizational messages and institutional actions.

The fourth dimension is governance strengthening. When the preceding three dimensions operate in an integrated manner, organizations have greater opportunities to strengthen effectiveness, transparency, accountability, responsiveness, and public trust. These outcomes are not automatic consequences of communication activities; rather, they depend on the consistency of organizational actions, the quality of public services, and institutional willingness to account for decisions.

Table 1: Integrated Institutional Communication Capacity Model

Dimension	Main Focus	Communication Mechanisms	Contribution to Governance
Internal communication capacity	Information, coordination, and work integration	Vertical and horizontal communication, and feedback	Work consistency, role clarity, and organizational effectiveness
External communication capacity	Relationships with society and stakeholders	Information dissemination, dialogue, consultation, and response	Transparency, participation, and public trust
Institutional communication integration	Interconnection between internal and external information	Message synchronization, cross-unit coordination, and follow-up on public aspirations	Policy consistency and accountability
Governance strengthening	Institutional performance and accountability	Evaluation, openness, and performance communication	Effectiveness, responsiveness, transparency, and legitimacy

The model demonstrates that internal and external communication should not be developed as two independent systems. Instead, they need to be connected through mechanisms for information integration and follow-up action. For example, when citizens submit complaints regarding public services, the information needs to be received through the public relations channel, forwarded to the relevant unit, addressed through internal procedures, and subsequently communicated back to the citizens. This sequence demonstrates that communication constitutes an integral part of the service management and accountability cycle.

This framework also broadens the understanding of the public relations function within public organizations. Rather than being limited to managing publications, public relations also serves as a connecting mechanism between organizations and society. Meanwhile, organizational communication should not be oriented solely toward the delivery of instructions; it must also ensure that citizens' experiences and aspirations can become inputs for internal improvement.

From a development administration perspective, this integrative model has several implications for strengthening institutional capacity. First, organizations need to position communication as an integral part of policy planning and implementation. Second, coordination is required among communication units, organizational leaders, technical units, and service units. Third, institutions need to establish mechanisms for managing public aspirations and complaints that are connected to decision-making processes. Fourth, communication evaluation needs to be linked to improvements in process and service quality rather than merely to the number of publication activities.

The model also has implications for human resource competency development. Public officials need more than technical capabilities relevant to their respective duties; they also need to understand organizational communication, coordination, information management, communication ethics, and stakeholder relations. For public relations practitioners, understanding policy substance and government administrative processes is essential to ensure that the information communicated remains consistent with the institutional context.

Thus, the principal contribution of the Integrated Institutional Communication Capacity model lies in its effort to connect organizational communication theory, *public relations*, and public governance within a unified conceptual framework. This framework can serve as a foundation for future empirical research, particularly studies examining how the quality of internal communication, public relations practices, and information integration mechanisms contribute to the performance of public institutions.

IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that organizational communication and *public relations* play complementary roles in strengthening public institutional governance. Organizational communication builds internal capacity through information management, coordination, role clarity, work integration, and feedback mechanisms. Meanwhile, *public relations* strengthens external relationships through information provision, openness, dialogue, public aspiration management, and the development of public trust. These two functions cannot be rigidly separated because the effectiveness of external communication depends heavily on the quality of internal coordination, while internal improvement requires information and feedback from the external environment.

From the perspective of development administration, communication constitutes an essential component of institutional capacity that supports policy implementation, inter-unit coordination, public participation, and public accountability. Therefore, communication should be positioned as a strategic governance function rather than merely an administrative or institutional publicity activity.

This article proposes the concept of **Integrated Institutional Communication Capacity**, which encompasses internal communication capacity, external communication capacity, institutional communication integration, and governance strengthening. This framework emphasizes that integrated communication can contribute to effectiveness, transparency, responsiveness, accountability, and public trust. However, achieving these outcomes requires adequate support from institutional leadership, human resources, information systems, work procedures, and organizational commitment.

This study is limited by its reliance on a critical literature review and the absence of empirical testing of the proposed model. Furthermore, the literature was selected based on conceptual relevance and was not intended to provide an exhaustive representation of all publications on organizational communication and *public relations*. Consequently, the applicability and effectiveness of the Integrated Institutional Communication Capacity model require further validation through empirical research.

B. Suggestion

From a practical perspective, public organizations should strengthen cross-unit communication coordination, develop two-way communication mechanisms, integrate public aspiration management into internal organizational processes, and systematically evaluate the impact of communication on service quality. These efforts are important to ensure that communication functions not only as a means of information dissemination but also as an integral part of institutional decision-making, policy implementation, and public accountability.

From an academic perspective, the proposed framework may serve as a foundation for empirical research examining the relationship between institutional communication capacity and governance performance across different types of public organizations. Future studies are encouraged to develop measurable operational indicators, examine the implementation of the model in diverse institutional contexts, and analyze organizational factors that influence the successful integration of communication functions.

Furthermore, empirical research employing qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-method approaches is needed to assess the applicability of the Integrated Institutional Communication Capacity model and to identify the extent to which its dimensions contribute to institutional effectiveness, transparency, responsiveness, accountability, and public trust.

REFERENCE LISTAN

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and*

Theory, 18(4), 543–571. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032

Bimpong, E., & David, A. (2024). Stakeholder engagement: A key to successful project delivery at Ghana Highway Authority. *Project Management and Scientific Journal, 7*(9), 51–67. https://doi.org/10.4314/pmsj.v7i9.4

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal, 13*(4), 447–468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x

Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Bloomberg, L. (2014). Public value governance: Moving beyond traditional public administration and the New Public Management. *Public Administration Review, 74*(4), 445–456. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12238

Christensen, T., & Lægreid, P. (2007). The whole-of-government approach to public sector reform. *Public Administration Review, 67*(6), 1059–1066. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00797.x

Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2015). *The new public service: Serving, not steering* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Dong, C., Zheng, L., & Morehouse, J. (2023). What do we know about government public relations (GPR)? A systematic review of GPR in public relations literature. *Public Relations Review, 49*(1), Article 102284. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2022.102284

Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 22*(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011

Fukuyama, F. (2013). What is governance? *Governance, 26*(3), 347–368. https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12035

Goldhaber, G. M. (1993). *Organizational communication* (6th ed.). Brown & Benchmark.

Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing public relations*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Karlina, N., Miftah, A. Z., Widianingsih, I., & Gill, A. (2025). Organizational capacity and policy integration: Government communications strategy in managing COVID-19 in Indonesia. *Cogent Social Sciences, 11*(1), Article 2563038. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2563038

Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (2002). Toward a dialogic theory of public relations. *Public Relations Review, 28*(1), 21–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111(02)00108-X

Ledingham, J. A. (2003). Explicating relationship management as a general theory of public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 15*(2), 181–198. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532754XJPRR1502_4

Liu, B. F., & Horsley, J. S. (2007). The government communication decision wheel: Toward a public relations model for the public sector. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 19*(4), 377–393. https://doi.org/10.1080/10627260701402473

Meijer, A. (2013). Understanding the complex dynamics of transparency. *Public Administration Review, 73*(3), 429–439. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12032

Mergel, I. (2013a). A framework for interpreting social media interactions in the public sector. *Government Information Quarterly, 30*(4), 327–334. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.05.015

Mergel, I. (2013b). Social media adoption and resulting tactics in the U.S. federal government. *Government Information Quarterly, 30*(2), 123–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2012.12.004

Miller, K., & Barbour, J. (2015). *Organizational communication: Approaches and processes* (7th ed.). Cengage Learning.

OECD. (2021). *OECD report on public communication: The global context and the way forward*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/22f8031c-en

Rawlins, B. (2009). Give the emperor a mirror: Toward developing a stakeholder measurement of organizational transparency. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 21*(1), 71–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/10627260802153421

Taylor, M., & Kent, M. L. (2014). Dialogic engagement: Clarifying foundational concepts. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 26*(5), 384–398. https://doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2014.956106

Van de Walle, S., & Bouckaert, G. (2003). Public service performance and trust in government: The problem of causality. *International Journal of Public Administration, 26*(8–9), 891–913. https://doi.org/10.1081/PAD-120019352

Wæraas, A., & Byrkjeflot, H. (2012). Public sector organizations and reputation management: Five problems. *International Public Management Journal, 15*(2), 186–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2012.702590

Wu, X., Ramesh, M., & Howlett, M. (2015). Policy capacity: A conceptual framework for understanding policy competences and capabilities. *Policy and Society, 34*(3–4), 165–171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2015.09.001