

MAPPING IDEA & LITERATURE FORMAT | RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Relationship Between Interpersonal Communication and Perception of Organizational Cohesion

Handyta Tiara Putri¹, Carelene Davira S², Najwa Nabila Rigusha Putri³, Bunga Ayu Junisah⁴, Sri Tiatri⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5} Department of Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta, Indonesia

Email: handyta.705220357@stu.untar.ac.id¹, carelene.705220289@stu.untar.ac.id², najwa.705220278@stu.untar.ac.id³, bunga.705220391@stu.untar.ac.id⁴

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: October 01, 2025

Revised: October 09, 2025

Accepted: October 09, 2025

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.52970/grmilf.v6i1.1777>

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the relationship between communication, interpersonal, and perception of Organizational cohesion among employees of private companies in Greater Jakarta (Jabodetabek). Interpersonal communication involves the direct exchange of messages involving aspects such as self-concept, self-expression, and openness. Organizational cohesion reflects the extent to which members feel socially connected and connected in carrying out group tasks. This study used a quantitative correlational approach with 100 respondents selected through purposive sampling. The instruments used were an interpersonal communication questionnaire based on Bienvenu's theory and organizational cohesion based on the GEQ by Carron et al. The results of the analysis showed no significant relationship between interpersonal communication and organizational cohesion ($r = -0.084$). This finding differs from previous research and is thought to be influenced by contextual factors such as organizational culture and the dominance of formal communication. Nevertheless, interpersonal communication remains important in creating a healthy and harmonious work environment.

Keywords: Communication Interpersonal, Cohesion Organization, Dynamics Place Work, Connection Employee.

I. Introduction

In an increasingly complex and collaborative working world, interpersonal communication becomes one key element in guarding harmony and effective organization. Interpersonal Communication refers to the process of exchanging messages between individuals, involving both verbal and nonverbal aspects, and influenced by social and emotional contexts. In an organizational context, this communication serves not only to convey information but also to build relationships, establish trust, and strengthen cooperation among members (Zorlu & Korkmaz, 2021). This phenomenon is becoming increasingly prominent as organizations increasingly need to build strong and adaptive teams. In a work environment that demands cross-departmental collaboration, a team's success depends heavily on its members' ability to communicate effectively and empathetically. Therefore, high-quality interpersonal communication is the foundation. Important in creating a healthy and productive work environment (Abdurrozaq et al., 2025). However, in practice, not all organizations can create a positive interpersonal communication climate. Many organizations still face challenges such as miscommunication, lack of openness, and psychological barriers. Between

individuals. Matter. This can be caused by differences in background, communication style, or even overly hierarchical organizational structures, thus hindering equal and open interactions (Zorlu & Korkmaz, 2021).

When interpersonal communication is not working well, the impact is felt not only individually but also collectively. One of the most significant impacts is a decrease in the perception of organizational cohesion. Organizational cohesion reflects the extent to which members feel emotionally connected to the organization. His group feels valued and owns a sense of togetherness in achieving common goals (Johnson & Johnson, 2002). A low perception of cohesion can lead to various negative consequences, such as increased conflict between individuals, decreased work motivation, and even high employee turnover rates. Long matter. This can affect the stability organization and hinder the achievement vision as well as the established mission. Therefore, organizations need to understand the factors that influence cohesion, one of which is the quality of interpersonal communication (Abdurrozaq et al., 2025). Although there has been much research discussing communication in an organizational context, most still focus on formal or structural communication, such as vertical communication between superiors and subordinates. Meanwhile, the more informal and emotional aspects of interpersonal communication still receive less attention. Attention, whereas precisely this aspect here it is, which often becomes a determining factor in forming social cohesion in the workplace (Zorlu & Korkmaz, 2021). In addition, most previous studies were conducted in individualistic cultural contexts, so the results may not necessarily be generalizable to collectivistic cultural contexts. Like Indonesia. In collectivist cultures, interpersonal relationships and the flavor of togetherness own role Which more dominant role in shaping organizational dynamics (Abdurrozaq et al., 2025).

This research gap indicates that more in-depth and contextual studies are needed on how interpersonal communication influences perceptions of organizational cohesion. Such research will not only enrich academic literature, but also give contributions practical for organizations in designing more effective communication strategies that are oriented towards interpersonal relationships (Johnson & Johnson, 2002). Based on this background, this study aims to investigate the relationship between interpersonal communication and perception of cohesion in the work environment. This study will examine the extent to which the quality of communication between individuals in an organization can influence the sense of attachment, solidarity, and togetherness felt by its members. By understanding these relationships, it is hoped that organizations can develop a more humanistic and relational approach to communication. This will not only strengthen internal cohesion but also create a more inclusive, harmonious work environment that supports the sustainable achievement of shared goals.

II. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

2.1. Communication Interpersonal

a. Understanding

As social beings, humans always use communication. To achieve a complete life, communication is the basis of human interaction. Communication can be done in various ways, both directly and indirectly. Communication is usually defined as a process of treating information or acting on information. Communication is a process of sending messages from one person to another (Sidiq, 2024). The following is the definition of interpersonal communication according to several experts:

- 1) Interpersonal Communication, which is referred to in context. This is process communication, which occurs directly between two or more people, face to face. In R. Wayne Tempo, he explains that "interpersonal communication is communication with two or more people face to face." (Cangara, 2006). According to Bienvenu (1974), interpersonal communication is when a communicator is able to convey his/her meaning by considering the close relationship between them.
- 2) Another definition by Devito (2013) is the instant process of sending and receiving messages between two or more people with an effect. Based on this explanation, possible for two people

talking face to talk face-to-face, like a couple Which already married, or between a father who has two people at a meeting when a paper moderator interacts with participants in a seminar, or a naughty child, etc.

- 3) Robbins (2004) explains three ways in which people communicate with each other. The first is oral communication, such as speeches, two-person conversations, or group discussions, which are advantageous because of their speed and feedback; Which second is communication written, such as memos, letters, emails, Facebook, facsimiles, organizational newsletters, bulletin board announcements, or other means transmitted through precise words or symbols; or (3) written communication, such as written messages.

b. Aspect Communication Interpersonal

According to Goodbye (1987), there are five components of interpersonal communication, that is:

- 1) Self-concept: It is self-concept, which is an important factor that influences how a person communicates with others.
- 2) Ability: Refers to the ability to be a good listener, a skill that often gets less attention.
- 3) Self-expression: A person's ability to express thoughts and ideas clearly. This skill is considered difficult because not everyone can convey their main points clearly.
- 4) Emotion: Referring to on ability individual's ability to manage and deal with emotions constructively, for example, trying to improve anger.
- 5) Self-disclosure: It is the desire to communicate openly and honestly with others, to maintain and strengthen interpersonal relationships.

According to DeVito (2011), five components form the effectiveness of interpersonal communication:

1) Openness

A quality that refers to at least three elements of interpersonal communication. First, an effective interpersonal communicator must be open. Second, it refers to the communicator's willingness to respond to stimuli. Third, it relates to "owning" one's thoughts and feelings. Openness in this sense means acknowledging that the thoughts and feelings expressed "belong" to oneself and taking responsibility for them.

2) Empathy

Empathy is ability somebody For "know" What Which currently experienced another person at a particular moment from the perspective of another person and from the perspective of another person (De Vito, 2011). People who can empathize will also be better able to understand the reasons and experiences of others, their feelings and attitudes, and their hopes and desires for the future. They will also be more capable of adapting to the situation better.

3) Attitude support

Effective relationships with others are built on a supportive attitude. In an unsupportive environment, open and empathetic communication is impossible. Being descriptive rather than evaluative, spontaneous rather than strategic, and provisional rather than confident are some ways to demonstrate a supportive attitude.

4) Attitude Positive

Showing a positive attitude and encouraging others to become friends in interpersonal communication are two methods for communicating a positive attitude. People who feel negative about themselves they Alone often say that it matter This to someone else, who will then develop feelings negative

Which The same Also. Conversely, people who feel positive about themselves will signal positive feelings, which will then also develop positive feelings.

5) Equality

Communication with others will go better in an equal situation. This means that confidentiality must be recognized by the second party. You're welcome, valuable, and valuable, and that each party has something important to offer. According to Rogers, equality means giving "unconditional positive regard" to others. Based on the description above, the aspects of interpersonal communication effectiveness used in this study are those of Bienvenu, which include Self-concept, Ability, Self-expression, Emotion, and Self-disclosure. The aspects of interpersonal communication effectiveness developed by Bienvenu offer a comprehensive and psychological framework for evaluating how someone communicates effectively in social and organizational contexts.

c. Benefit Communication Interpersonal

Communication own benefit (Sidiq, 2024), namely:

- 1) Give, gather, as well as understand all information Which needed.
- 2) Communication can tighten the connection between individuals.
- 3) Communication is very important for an organization to do well and create good cooperation.
- 4) Influence the attitude and behavior person others.
- 5) Understand the world and experience We inside.
- 6) Express personal and understand the needs person others.
- 7) Give and accept emotional support.
- 8) Make a decision and finish the problem.

2.2. Cohesion Group

a. Understanding

Group cohesion is an important concept in social psychology and group dynamics. This describes the level of attachment and unity of members in a group. According to Carron, Bray, and Eys (2012), cohesion is defined as a dynamic process influenced by the tendency of attachment and unity of the group to remain together and unite in pursuing the fulfillment of group goals and the satisfaction of members' affective needs effectively. This definition emphasizes that cohesion is not a static condition, but rather a process that continues to develop along with interactions between group members. In addition, Johnson (1991) provides a definition Which complete, that is cohesion group as a member's desire to remain in the group and the strong attraction between the individual and the group or organization. This shows that cohesion is not only related to shared goals but also to interpersonal relationships that support emotional attachment between members. High cohesion in a group is often associated with increased motivation, member satisfaction, and effectiveness in achieving group goals (Carron et al., 2001). This dynamic process reflects attachment and unity among members in carrying out group functions and fulfilling existing affective needs. Thus, cohesion can be understood as the interest and unity of members in carrying out functions and achieving group goals together, which ultimately strengthens the stability and performance of the group (Carron et al., 2001).

b. Aspects of Cohesion

In the study of cohesion groups, measurement Which accurate and comprehensive becomes It is crucial to understand the dynamics and interactions between group members. One instrument widely used in research is the Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ), developed by Carron and colleagues. This scale measures four main aspects of group cohesion:

- 1) Group Integration – Social (GIS) refers to members' perceptions of the strength of the group's unity and togetherness in social aspects, namely interpersonal relationships and social interactions among group members. This aspect assesses the extent to which members perceive the group as a cohesive social entity (Carron, Brawley, & Widmeyer, 2002).
- 2) Group Integration – Task (GIT) describes members' perceptions of group unity in terms of goal achievement and task execution. It reflects how well the group works together to complete tasks that serve a common purpose (Carron et al., 2002).
- 3) Individual Attraction to Group – Social (ATGS) is an individual's perception of the social attraction that makes him or her want to remain part of a group, including perceived social relationships and affective satisfaction with group membership (Carron et al., 1985).
- 4) Individual Attraction to Group – Task (ATGT) refers to an individual's perception of his or her involvement in the group task aspect, namely personal motivation and interest in contributing to the achievement of group goals (Carron et al., 1985).

Besides that, according to Forsyth (2010), aspects of a cohesive group are as follows:

- 1) Social cohesion: Social cohesion is an attraction between fellow member groups and group members' interest in the group.
- 2) Task cohesion: Task cohesion is the capacity of a group to display the best performance, and the capacity of an individual to display the best performance as part of a group to achieve group tasks.
- 3) Perceived cohesion: Perceived cohesion is where group members are related to each other and group members form a unity based on a sense of belonging.
- 4) Emotional cohesion: Emotional cohesion is cohesion that is based on the intensity affective group and individuals when in a group. Positive emotions in a group will increase the cohesion of group members.

Based on this explanation, the researcher used the group cohesion theory approach of Carron, Widmeyer, and Brawley (1985). The collaborative aspects used include social group integration (GI-S), group integration task (GI-T), which is the individual attraction of group tasks (ATG-S). These four aspects were developed as part of the survey (Group Environment Survey) (GEQ) and are often used in various group contexts, including organizations and non-sports teams. This model highlights the importance of groups joining individuals from a perspective task, not only the task, but also how individuals consider the integration of the group as a whole. Carron Ansatz et al This is considered comprehensive because not only does it measure individuals' perceptions of the group, but also assesses the extent to which individuals feel personally involved in social goals and intergroup relationships. Therefore, this theory can also be used in the context of student organizations that prioritize teamwork dynamics and social relationships between caregivers.

c. Factors Cohesion Group

Organizational cohesion can be understood through the Social Identity Theory approach put forward by Tajfel and Turner (1979). Social Identity Theory explains that cohesion in Groups is formed when individuals feel a strong social identity as part of the group. This occurs when individuals:

- 1) Identifying oneself as a member of a group, that is, when someone feels that he is part of a certain group and recognizes his membership psychologically, not merely administratively or structurally.
- 2) Sharing the same values, norms, or goals with a group, meaning that individuals have similar views on things that are considered important, like vision, method, Work, and group culture, which strengthens the sense of togetherness.

- 3) Feeling proud to be a member of a group, that is, when membership in the group provides emotional or symbolic meaning, such as flavor, respect, prestige, or comfort, which strengthens attachment and loyalty to the group.

McShane and Glinow, in their book *Organizational Behavior* (2018), define team cohesion (team cohesiveness) as "The degree of attraction people feel toward the team and their motivation to remain members." That is, team cohesion is the extent to which members feel emotionally invested and attached to their team, and motivated to remain a member of it. According to McShane & Glinow (2018), the following factors influence team cohesion:

- 1) Similarities between member team (similarity between members), more similarities in values, backgrounds, and experiences between members, greater likelihood of cohesion.
- 2) Amount Team (Size Team) Team Which too big can make more. A little interaction, and not enough cohesion, while small teams tend to be more cohesive because the relationships between members are closer.
- 3) Member Interaction (Interaction Member) Lots of good communication between members increases engagement. And increase mutual trust.
- 4) Team success (team success) enhances team identity and fosters a sense of pride.
- 5) External Challenges and Competition (External Pressure or Challenges). External threats or challenges make teams stronger because they need to work together to face obstacles.

2.3. Framework Think

Everyone cannot release self from the process of communication, which is a universal process in human life. Communication allows a person to express themselves, build relationships, convey ideas, and understand and evaluate the social conditions around them. Interpersonal communication is very important in an organizational context because it allows for the direct exchange of information between organizational members and rapid feedback (DeVito, 1995). Understanding each other in a deeper way more deep can be done by individuals through Open, empathetic, and responsive communication. Effective communication can strengthen work relationships and reduce the likelihood of internal conflict (Cangara, 2002). Effective communication can also lead to smoother work coordination and a supportive work environment. This helps build a better perception of cohesion within the organization, where employees feel comfortable and proud to become members group (Waqiati, Hardjajani, & Nugroho, 2013). The manifestation of high cohesion can be seen through interest between members and success in achieving group goals (Carron et al., 2001).

Research conducted by Zulfiani et al. (2021) on the Panser GAM supporter group found a significant positive relationship between interpersonal communication and group cohesion, with the effective contribution of interpersonal communication to cohesion reaching 63.2%. Based on the results of previous research conducted using the same variables, namely interpersonal communication and group cohesion, it appears that there is a positive relationship between the effectiveness of interpersonal communication and group cohesion. This means that the higher the effectiveness of interpersonal communication in an individual, the higher the group cohesion. Conversely, the lower the effectiveness of interpersonal communication in an individual, the lower the group cohesion.

2.4. Hypothesis

Based on the theoretical foundations explained, the researcher hypothesizes that interpersonal communication is positively related to perceptions of organizational cohesion. This means that the more effective an individual's interpersonal communication in the work environment, the higher their perceived organizational cohesion. Also perception of cohesion in an organization place they is. For the test hypothesis, therefore, the researcher formulated the following statistical hypothesis:

- a. Hypothesis zero (H_0) states that there is Which significant connection between interpersonal communication with perception cohesion organization, whereas
- b. Hypothesis alternative (H_1) states that there is connection positive and significant connection between interpersonal communication and perceptions of organizational cohesion.

References

- Abdurrozaq, A., Dewi, D. R., Sulusiyah, S., Ramdana, M. S., & Mualimin, M. (2025). The effectiveness of organizational communication in improving the performance of educators: A review of management psychology. *Kalijaga: Journal of Multidisciplinary Student Research*, 1(1), 54–59. <https://doi.org/10.62523/kalijaga.v1i2.35>
- Azwar, S. (2012). *Method study*. Yogyakarta: Library Students.
- Bienvenu, M. J. (1974). *Interpersonal communication inventory*. In J. W. Pfeiffer & J. E. Jones (Eds.), *The 1974 annual handbook for group facilitators*. San Diego, CA: University Associates.
- Cangara, H. (2002). *Introduction to communication knowledge*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Carron, A. V., Brawley, L. R., & Widmeyer, W. N. (2002). *The group environment questionnaire: Test manual*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Carron, A. V., & Hey, M. A. (2012). *Group dynamics in sport* (4th ed.). Fitness Information Technology.
- Carron, A. V., Widmeyer, W. N., & Brawley, L. R. (1985). The development of an instrument to assess cohesion in sport teams: The group environment questionnaire. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7, 244–266.
- DeVito, J. A. (1995). *The interpersonal communication book* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- DeVito, J. A. (2011). *Communication interhuman*. Tangerang Selatan: Charisma Publishing Group.
- Forsyth, D. R. (2010). *Group dynamics* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. P. (1991). *Joining together: Group theory and group skills* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2002). Cooperative learning and social interdependence theory. In R. S. Tindale, L. Heath, J. Edwards, E. J. Posavac, F. B. Bryant, Y. Suarez-Balcazar, E. Henderson-King, & J. Myers (Eds.), *Theory and research on small groups* (pp. 9–35). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-47144-2_2
- Loana, M. R. (2017, December). Communication and organizational cohesion in the military. *CEEOL Journal*, 12, 253–265. <https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=669091>
- McLeod, J., & Treuer, K. V. (2013, December). Towards a cohesive theory of cohesion. *Journal of Social Studies*, 3(12), 1.
- McShane, S. L., & Glinow, M. A. V. (2018). *Organizational behavior* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Saputra, D. A. (2023). *The relationship between interpersonal communication and group cohesion in the Panser Gubug Anak Manis (GAM) supporter group* (Undergraduate thesis, University of Semarang). University of Semarang.
- Sidiq, N. (2024). *Study of identification of factors influencing interpersonal communication in VIII grade students of SMP Negeri 3 Tanjung Morawa* (Doctoral dissertation, Medan Area University). Medan Area University.
- Sugiarto, A. N. (2014). Obstacle of horizontal communication at PT Masterindo Jaya Global Indonesia. *Journal of Communication Studies*, 2(3).
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D research methods*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- Usman, B. (2013, April). The influence of interpersonal communication on employee performance at the Faculty of Economics, PGRI University Palembang. *Journal of Economic Research*, 10(1).
- Widiantoro, D., Sukarti, & Budiharto, S. (2017). Training in interpersonal communication for increasing group cohesion among employees of Hotel X, Yogyakarta. *Journal of Psychological Intervention*, 9(2), 155–164.
- Zorlu, K., & Korkmaz, F. (2021). Organizational communication as an effective communication strategy in organizations and the role of the leader. In H. Dincer & S. Yüksel (Eds.), *Management strategies to survive in a competitive environment* (pp. 305–320). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72288-3_21
- Zulfiani, H., Risky, M., & Ramadhan, J. M. (2021). Group cohesion is reviewed from interpersonal communication and organizational commitment in student organizations. *Psyche 165 Journal*, 14(1), 53–58.