

## The Effect of Social Capital on Employee Brand Advocacy at PT Kimia Farma Diagnostika

**Namiratul Halimah**

Universitas Bakrie Jakarta, Indonesia  
Email: [namiratul.halimah@gmail.com](mailto:namiratul.halimah@gmail.com)

---

### Keywords:

social capital; internal communication; employee brand advocacy.

---

### Abstract

This study analyzes the influence of Social Capital on Employee Brand Advocacy, with Internal Communication as a mediating variable, at PT Kimia Farma Diagnostika (Sumatra 3 Business Unit). The phenomenon of employee advocacy is crucial in the healthcare industry for building public trust, as evidenced by the Edelman Trust Barometer (2024) which shows 71% of global consumers choose brands with strong social reputations. Using a quantitative approach with PLS-SEM analysis on 56 respondents (census sampling), the study found that Social Capital has a significant positive influence on Internal Communication (path coefficient = 0.938,  $R^2 = 0.879$ ), and Internal Communication significantly mediates the formation of Employee Brand Advocacy (path coefficient = 0.922,  $R^2 = 0.850$ ). The Specific Indirect Effects test results indicate a mediation value of 0.864, suggesting that the combination of strong social relationships (Networking dimension average = 6.44) and organizational information transparency (Risk Culture indicator = 6.46) is the primary determining factor. The Network and Risk Culture dimensions are the most dominant elements in encouraging employees to become brand advocates. The theoretical implication confirms Putnam's social capital theory and Grunig's internal communication excellence theory in the healthcare context. Practically, PT Kimia Farma Diagnostika management should strengthen internal social ties, maintain transparent communication channels, and leverage the productive age employee profile (27-28 years, 48% S1 education) for digital health education campaigns.

---

## INTRODUCTION

In today's business environment, companies are required to do marketing not only relying on conventional approaches, but also considering social factors that affect people's perception of brands. In the healthcare sector, the challenges faced are not only through products or services, but also through brands or brands. This is relevant to the expression of the World Health Organization (2023) in the healthcare sector, where trust, social relationships, and reputation are key factors in building consumer choice for service providers.

Through Kotler (2000), a brand or brand is defined as a name, sign, symbol, design, or combination of these elements that function to recognize and distinguish a product or service. One of the most powerful manifestations of brand power today is Employee Brand Advocacy. According to Keller (2001), the strength of a brand does not only depend on external promotion, but on the extent to which the organization's members act as authentic brand advocates. Employee brand advocacy is a condition in which employees voluntarily promote and defend the company's image to external parties, which is considered more credible than formal advertising.

The strengthening of advocacy by employees is greatly influenced by the quality of internal communication within the organization. Effective internal communication serves as a strategic bridge that connects company values with employee understanding through symmetrical and transparent distribution of information. Without a consistent and two-way flow of information, employees will find it difficult to align their perceptions with the company's vision (Argenti, 2016).

The determining factor that supports this advocacy is social capital. According to Putnam (1993), social capital is defined as elements in social structure, such as relationships between individuals, rules, and beliefs that support collaboration and joint action for mutual benefit. Research shows that social capital can be a driver of innovation, customer orientation, and organizational performance (Setini, 2022). The results of the Edelman Trust Barometer survey (2024) show that 71% of global people tend to choose brands that have a good social reputation and are active in community relationships.

As a provider of laboratory and diagnostic services, PT Kimia Farma Diagnostika (KFD) faces a major challenge in maintaining its brand visibility (Zhang et al., 2019). KFD has extensive social capital, both internally (relationships between medical practitioners and staff) and externally (relationships with doctors, hospitals, and agency partners). This research is here to fill a gap in the literature by positioning internal communication as a factor that bridges the relationship between social capital and employee brand advocacy.

Based on this background, the formulation of this research problem is: (1) Can social capital contribute to building the effectiveness of internal communication of PT Kimia Farma Diagnostika? (2) Can internal communication contribute to building employee brand advocacy of PT Kimia Farma Diagnostika? (3) How much influence can social capital have on building employee brand advocacy of PT Kimia Farma Diagnostika?

Claride (2018) defines social capital as the accumulation of actual and potential resources embedded in the network of social relationships owned by individuals or organizational units. In the context of modern business, social capital allows companies to coordinate more efficiently, minimize transaction costs, and accelerate knowledge exchange (Bhandari & Yasunobu, 2022). Villalonga-Olives (2015) describes the mechanism of social capital through three dimensions: bonding (focusing on strong internal relationships within the team), bridging (cross-departmental relationships that allow for new information flow), and linking (vertical relationships between employees and senior management).

Bakker et al. (2020) simplify the elements of social capital into three main dimensions: (1) Structural Dimension (social interaction ties), namely the quality and frequency of interaction between members of the organization; (2) Relational Dimension (trust & reciprocity), namely the existence of deep trust and reciprocal norms; and (3) Cognitive Dimension (shared vision & language), which is a common understanding of the company's goals and culture. In this study, social capital is measured through three main dimensions (Setini, 2022): Networking, Trust, and Shared Norms.

Internal organizational communication is the process of conveying information, exchanging messages, and creating common understanding among organizational members to achieve common goals (Men, 2014). In this study, the dimension of internal communication refers to the theory of Markgraf (2003) which includes ten dimensions: (1) Two-way communication; (2) Interpersonal skills; (3) Risk awareness and culture; (4) Clarity of message

or information; (5) Frequency of information messages; (6) Periodic learning; (7) Risk management governance; (8) Internal communication structure; (9) Management knowledge; and (10) Leadership strength.

Internal communication not only serves as a tool for exchanging information, but also plays a strategic role in creating productive relationships among organizational members (Rizkyana et al., 2024). Without a consistent and two-way flow of information, employees will find it difficult to align their perceptions with the company's vision (Argenti, 2016).

Employee Brand Advocacy (EBA) is defined as the voluntary behavior of employees to promote, defend, and provide positive recommendations regarding their organization and services to external parties through personal and professional communication channels. According to Melanthiou, Pavlou, & Constantinou (2017), there are three main dimensions in measuring Employee Brand Advocacy: (1) Positive Word-of-Mouth; (2) Brand Defense; and (3) Value Alignment. Mazzarol, Sweeney, & Soutar (2007) emphasized that in the service sector such as healthcare, advocacy by employees has a much higher level of trust in the eyes of potential patients than conventional advertising.

This research integrates the strategic role of Social Capital and Internal Communication as a driving factor for the creation of Employee Brand Advocacy at PT Kimia Farma Diagnostika. Social capital, which consists of networks, beliefs, and norms, is a social glue that allows members of the organization to act collectively (Setini, 2022). The synergy between strong social capital and transparent internal communication will lead to the formation of Employee Brand Advocacy. Employees who feel clearly informed (Internal Communication) and have a strong relationship with the organization (Social Capital) will have a higher intrinsic motivation to promote the company's services.

## **METHOD**

### **Research Design and Approach**

This study used a quantitative approach with explanatory research methodology. Explanatory research aims to explain causal relationships and test hypotheses regarding the influence between the variables studied. This research is based on the paradigm of positivism. According to Sugiyono (2021), the positivism paradigm views reality as something singular, concrete, observable, and objectively measurable.

### **Population and Sample**

The subjects of this study are employees of PT Kimia Farma Diagnostika in the Sumatra 3 Region who are involved in health services or supporting businesses. The research population was 56 people. The sampling technique uses the census method, where all members of the population are sampled (Sugiyono, 2021). A total of 56 questionnaires were distributed to respondents and all of them were filled out.

### **Data Collection Techniques**

The types of data used in this study are primary data and secondary data. Primary data was taken by taking data directly to the research location using a questionnaire. Secondary data was obtained from official documents of PT KFD, scientific journals, books, and other relevant literature. Details of the data collection techniques are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Data Types and Data Collection Techniques**

| <b>Data Collection Techniques</b>  | <b>Data Collected</b>  | <b>Data Type</b> |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------|
| Questionnaire                      | Social capital in employee relations with internal communication; Internal communication used in building EBA PT KFD | First            |
| Literature Study and Document Data | Overview of PT KFD; Previous research related to PT KFD  | Secondary        |

**Variable Operational Definition**

This study involved three main variables. The operational concept of variables is summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2. Variable Operational Concepts**

| <b>Variable</b>             | <b>Basic Concepts</b>  | <b>Main References</b>                                 |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Social Capital (X)          | Resources that emerge from networks of relationships, trusts, and norms that facilitate collective action.     | Putnam (1993), Ahmad (2020), Nahapiet & Ghoshal (1998) |
| Internal Communication (Y)  | Exchange of information and building mutual understanding among internal stakeholders within the organization. | Verčič & Špoljarić (2020), Saputra (2025)              |
| Employee Brand Advocacy (W) | Voluntary behavior of employees to promote and defend the company's image to external parties.                 | Lokanath & Gopan (2023), Nguyen (2021)                 |

Table 3 presents the operational definition of the Social Capital (X) variable.

**Table 3. Definition of Social Capital Operations (X)**

| <b>Dimensions</b> | <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Data Type</b> |
|-------------------|---|------------------|
| Trust             | a. Trust between individuals b. Trust in the organization             | Interval (1-7)   |
| Networking        | a. Intensity of social interaction b. Cross-division cooperation      | Interval (1-7)   |
| Shared Norms      | a. Work norms and professional ethics b. Compliance with common rules | Interval (1-7)   |

Table 4 presents the operational definition of the Internal Communication variable (Y).

**Table 4. Operational Definition of Internal Communication (Y)**

| <b>Dimensions</b>                 | <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Data Type</b> |
|-----------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Two-Way Communication             | The level of employee involvement in providing and receiving information in exchange with management.   | Interval (1-7)   |
| Interpersonal Abilities           | An individual's ability to convey a clear message to colleagues and superiors.                          | Interval (1-7)   |
| Risk Awareness & Culture          | Employees' ability to recognize potential risks and report them according to procedures.                | Interval (1-7)   |
| Message/Information Clarity       | Similarity of perception between the sender and recipient of the message.                               | Interval (1-7)   |
| Frequency of Information Delivery | The intensity of sending information related to work, risks, and policies.                              | Interval (1-7)   |
| Periodic Learning                 | The level of implementation of socialization, knowledge refreshing, or routine training.                | Interval (1-7)   |
| Risk Management Governance        | Effectiveness of risk monitoring and reporting systems through committee structures.                    | Interval (1-7)   |
| Internal Communication Structure  | Clarity of formal and informal communication flows as part of operational risk protection.              | Interval (1-7)   |
| Management Knowledge              | Leadership's level of understanding of risk-related and operational communication flows and mechanisms. | Interval (1-7)   |
| The Power of Leadership           | The role of the leader in directing and ensuring the effectiveness of risk communication.               | Interval (1-7)   |

Table 5 presents the operational definition of the Employee Brand Advocacy (Z) variable.

**Table 5. Operational Definition of Employee Brand Advocacy (Z)**

| <b>Dimensions</b>      | <b>Indicator</b>  | <b>Data Type</b> |
|------------------------|---|------------------|
| Positive Word of Mouth | a. Tell others about the advantages of laboratory services<br>b. Recommend the company as a good place to work                  | Interval (1-7)   |
| Brand Defense          | a. Straightening out negative or hoax information about the company<br>b. Defending the company's reputation in times of crisis | Interval (1-7)   |
| Value Alignment        | a. Alignment of personal values with company values<br>b. Pride in using corporate identity attributes                          | Interval (1-7)   |

## Data Analysis Methods

This study uses the Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) method with the help of SmartPLS 4 software. The selection of PLS-SEM is based on its ability to test complex structural models with latent variables as well as their non-parametric nature, so they do not require strict data normality assumptions (Hair et al., 2021). The analysis includes: (1) Outer Model Evaluation to assess the validity and reliability of the instrument; and (2) Inner Model Evaluation to test the relationships between variables through bootstrapping procedures. The mediation analysis was carried out by looking at the value of Specific Indirect Effects through the bootstrapping procedure (Hair et al., 2021).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Overview of Research Objects

PT Kimia Farma Diagnostika (KFD) is a subsidiary of PT Kimia Farma Apotek which operates as a provider of medical laboratory and clinic services. PT KFD Business Unit Sumatra 3 has areas in South Sumatra Province, Jambi Province, and Bangka Belitung Province. The distribution of outlets is presented in Table 6.

**Table 6. Distribution of Outlets of PT Kimia Farma Diagnostical Business Unit Sumatra 3**

| No. | Outlet Name                         | Service Type               | Regency/City |
|-----|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| 1   | KF Palembang Medical Laboratory     | Primary Medical Laboratory | Palembang    |
| 2   | KF Jambi Medical Laboratory         | Primary Medical Laboratory | Jambi        |
| 3   | KF Lubuk Linggau Medical Laboratory | Primary Medical Laboratory | Lubuklinggau |
| 4   | KF Sudirman Main Clinic             | Main Clinics               | Palembang    |
| 5   | KF Merdeka Nifido Clinic            | Primary Clinic             | Palembang    |
| 6   | KF Kalidoni Clinic                  | Primary Clinic             | Palembang    |

### Respondent Profile

This study used a census method with 56 respondents from all employees of PT KFD UB Sumatra 3. Table 7 shows the profile of respondents by gender.

**Table 7. Respondent Profiles by Gender**

| No. | Gender       | Quantity | Percentage |
|-----|--------------|----------|------------|
| 1   | Male         | 19       | 34%        |
| 2   | Women        | 37       | 66%        |
|     | <b>Total</b> | 56       | 100%       |

Based on Table 7, the majority of respondents are women (66%). This reflects the dominance of female health workers in the laboratory and clinic sectors. The age distribution of respondents is presented in Table 8.

**Table 8. Respondent Profiles by Age and Gender**

| Age          | Male | Women | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|--------------|------|-------|-----------------------|------------|
| 23-24        | 1    | 2     | 3                     | 5%         |
| 25-26        | 4    | 3     | 7                     | 13%        |
| 27-28        | 6    | 14    | 20                    | 36%        |
| 29-30        | 4    | 10    | 14                    | 25%        |
| 31-32        | 2    | 3     | 5                     | 9%         |
| 33-34        | 0    | 5     | 5                     | 9%         |
| 35-36        | 1    | 0     | 1                     | 1,5%       |
| 37-38        | 1    | 0     | 1                     | 1,5%       |
| <b>Total</b> | 19   | 37    | 56                    | 100%       |

The majority of respondents aged 27-28 years (36%), indicated that the workforce is in the golden age of their careers (early career stage). Table 9 shows the distribution of education levels.

**Table 9. Respondent Profiles by Education Level and Gender**

| Education Level | Male | Women | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|-----------------|------|-------|-----------------------|------------|
| D3              | 7    | 13    | 20                    | 36%        |
| D4/S1           | 9    | 18    | 27                    | 48%        |
| Profession      | 2    | 6     | 8                     | 14%        |
| S2              | 1    | 0     | 1                     | 2%         |
| <b>Total</b>    | 19   | 37    | 56                    | 100%       |

The majority of respondents have D4/S1 (48%) and D3 (36%) backgrounds. This indicates that PT KFD is supported by a workforce with relevant academic competencies. The distribution of working lengths is presented in Table 10.

**Table 10. Respondent Profiles Based on Length of Employment and Gender**

| Long Work Rate | Male | Women | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|----------------|------|-------|-----------------------|------------|
| 0-2 years      | 4    | 6     | 10                    | 18%        |
| 2-4 years      | 6    | 10    | 16                    | 29%        |
| 4-6 years      | 5    | 12    | 17                    | 30%        |
| > 6 years old  | 4    | 9     | 13                    | 23%        |

| Long Work Rate | Male | Women | Number of Respondents | Percentage |
|----------------|------|-------|-----------------------|------------|
| <b>Total</b>   | 19   | 37    | 56                    | 100%       |

This data shows that the majority of respondents (more than 80%) have been working for more than 2 years, which gives an idea that respondents have a fairly mature level of attachment to the organization.

### Validity and Reliability Tests

Validity tests were carried out on all 56 samples using SmartPLS 4.0. The value of the outer loading/loading factor  $> 0.70$  was declared valid (Hair et al., 2019). Table 11 shows the results of the validity test.

**Table 11. Validity Test Results (Outer Loadings)**

| No. | Variable | Outer Loadings | Conclusion |
|-----|----------|----------------|------------|
| 1   | X1.1     | 0.955          | Valid      |
| 2   | X1.2     | 0.758          | Valid      |
| 3   | X2.1     | 0.862          | Valid      |
| 4   | X2.2     | 0.868          | Valid      |
| 5   | X3.1     | 0.916          | Valid      |
| 6   | X3.2     | 0.902          | Valid      |
| 7   | Y1.1     | 0.838          | Valid      |
| 8   | Y1.2     | 0.838          | Valid      |
| 9   | Y10.1    | 0.935          | Valid      |
| 10  | Y10.2    | 0.841          | Valid      |
| 11  | Y2.1     | 0.916          | Valid      |
| 12  | Y2.2     | 0.863          | Valid      |
| 13  | Y3.1     | 0.873          | Valid      |
| 14  | Y3.2     | 0.973          | Valid      |
| 15  | Y4.1     | 0.841          | Valid      |
| 16  | Y4.2     | 0.893          | Valid      |
| 17  | Y5.1     | 0.907          | Valid      |
| 18  | Y5.2     | 0.919          | Valid      |
| 19  | Y6.1     | 0.841          | Valid      |
| 20  | Y6.2     | 0.913          | Valid      |
| 21  | Y7.1     | 0.855          | Valid      |

| No. | Variable | Outer Loadings | Conclusion |
|-----|----------|----------------|------------|
| 22  | Y7.2     | 0.875          | Valid      |
| 23  | Y8.1     | 0.934          | Valid      |
| 24  | Y8.2     | 0.896          | Valid      |
| 25  | Y9.1     | 0.962          | Valid      |
| 26  | Y9.2     | 0.937          | Valid      |
| 27  | Z1.1     | 0.888          | Valid      |
| 28  | Z1.2     | 0.919          | Valid      |
| 29  | Z2.1     | 0.891          | Valid      |
| 30  | Z2.2     | 0.935          | Valid      |
| 31  | Z3.1     | 0.854          | Valid      |
| 32  | Z3.2     | 0.869          | Valid      |

All 32 indicators show an outer loading value  $> 0.70$ . The results of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) test are presented in Table 12.

**Table 12. Average Variance Extracted (AVE) Test Results**

| No. | Variable                    | AVE   | Remarks |
|-----|-----------------------------|-------|---------|
| 1   | Social Capital (X)          | 0.773 | Valid   |
| 2   | Internal Communication (Y)  | 0.795 | Valid   |
| 3   | Employee Brand Advocacy (W) | 0.798 | Valid   |

All variables had an AVE of  $> 0.50$ , proving adequate convergent validity. Table 13 presents the results of the reliability test.

**Table 13. Construct Reliability and Validity Test Results**

| No. | Variable                    | Cronbach's Alpha | Composite Reliability | AVE   |
|-----|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------|
| 1   | Social Capital (X)          | 0.949            | 0.953                 | 0.773 |
| 2   | Internal Communication (Y)  | 0.986            | 0.987                 | 0.795 |
| 3   | Employee Brand Advocacy (W) | 0.949            | 0.952                 | 0.798 |

All variables showed Cronbach's Alpha values  $> 0.60$  and Composite Reliability  $> 0.70$ , which means the instrument was declared reliable (Chin & Dibbern, 2010).

### Description of Research Variables

The range of the rating scale was calculated with  $RS = (7-1)/7 = 0.86$ , resulting in seven categories with the lowest ranges of 1.00-1.86 (Strongly Disagree) to 6.17-7.01 (Strongly Agree). Table 14 presents the respondents' responses to the Social Capital variable.

**Table 14. Respondents' Responses to Social Capital Variables (X)**

| Indicator                                     | Total (n=56) | Average | Categories     |
|---|--------------|---------|----------------|
| X1.1 (Trust between individuals)              | 360          | 6,43    | Strongly agree |
| X1.2 (Trust in the organization)              | 339          | 6,05    | Agree          |
| X2.1 (Intensity of social interaction)        | 363          | 6,48    | Strongly agree |
| X2.2 (Cross-divisional cooperation)           | 358          | 6,39    | Strongly agree |
| X3.1 (Work norms and ethics)                  | 363          | 6,48    | Strongly agree |
| X3.2 (Rule compliance)                        | 357          | 6,38    | Strongly agree |
| <b>Total Average Social Capital Variables</b> |              | 6,36    | Strongly agree |

The Social Capital variable obtained an average of 6.36 (Strongly Agree). The Network Dimension (X2) recorded the highest average of 6.44, indicating a relationship between highly connected work units. The Norm dimension (X3) gained an average of 6.43, while the Confidence (X1) was 6.22. Table 15 presents the responses to the Internal Communication variable.

**Table 15. Respondents' Responses to Internal Communication Variables (Y)**

| Indicator                                   | Total (n=56) | Average | Categories     |
|---|--------------|---------|----------------|
| Y1.1 (Two-way communication - top)          | 356          | 6,36    | Strongly agree |
| Y1.2 (Two-way communication - bottom)       | 338          | 6,04    | Agree          |
| Y2.1 (Interpersonal - individual abilities) | 358          | 6,39    | Strongly agree |
| Y2.2 (Interpersonal ability - leadership)   | 358          | 6,39    | Strongly agree |
| Y3.1 (Risk culture awareness – employees)   | 362          | 6,46    | Strongly agree |
| Y3.2 (Risk culture awareness – leadership)  | 359          | 6,41    | Strongly agree |
| Y4.1 (Message clarity)                      | 352          | 6,29    | Strongly agree |
| Y4.2 (Clarity of information)               | 348          | 6,21    | Strongly agree |
| Y5.1 (Information frequency - above)        | 349          | 6,23    | Strongly agree |
| Y5.2 (Information frequency - bottom)       | 356          | 6,36    | Strongly agree |
| Y6.1 (Periodic learning - socialization)    | 346          | 6,18    | Strongly agree |

| <b>Indicator</b>                                      | <b>Total (n=56)</b> | <b>Average</b> | <b>Categories</b> |
|---|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Y6.2 (Periodic learning - openness)                   | 362                 | 6,46           | Strongly agree    |
| Y7.1 (Risk governance – monitoring)                   | 347                 | 6,20           | Strongly agree    |
| Y7.2 (Risk governance - committee)                    | 351                 | 6,27           | Strongly agree    |
| Y8.1 (Communication structure - formal)               | 356                 | 6,36           | Strongly agree    |
| Y8.2 (Communication structure - protection)           | 363                 | 6,48           | Strongly agree    |
| Y9.1 (Management knowledge – risk)                    | 356                 | 6,36           | Strongly agree    |
| Y9.2 (Management knowledge – flow)                    | 357                 | 6,38           | Strongly agree    |
| Y10.1 (Leadership Strengths - Directions)             | 359                 | 6,41           | Strongly agree    |
| Y10.2 (Leadership strengths - instructions)           | 355                 | 6,34           | Strongly agree    |
| <b>Average Internal Total Communication Variables</b> |                     | 6,33           | Strongly agree    |

The Internal Communication variable obtained an average total of 6.33 (Strongly Agree). The Y8.2 indicator (Communication Structure) received the highest score (6.48), followed by Y3.1 and Y6.2 (6.46). Table 16 presents responses to the Employee Brand Advocacy variable.

**Table 16. Respondents' Responses to Employee Brand Advocacy (Z) Variables**

| <b>Indicator</b>                                       | <b>Total (n=56)</b> | <b>Average</b> | <b>Categories</b> |
|--|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Z1.1 (Tell the advantages of the service)              | 351                 | 6,27           | Strongly agree    |
| Z1.2 (Recommend company)                               | 359                 | 6,41           | Strongly agree    |
| Z2.1 (Straightening out negative information)          | 363                 | 6,48           | Strongly agree    |
| Z2.2 (Defending reputation in times of crisis)         | 360                 | 6,43           | Strongly agree    |
| Z3.1 (Personal value alignment)                        | 344                 | 6,14           | Strongly agree    |
| Z3.2 (Pride of corporate attributes)                   | 346                 | 6,18           | Strongly agree    |
| <b>Total Average Employee Brand Advocacy Variables</b> |                     | 6,32           | Strongly agree    |

The Employee Brand Advocacy variable obtained an average of 6.32 (Strongly Agree). The Brand Defense (Z2) indicator obtained the highest average (6.46), followed by Positive Word of Mouth (Z1) of 6.34, and Value Alignment (Z3) of 6.16.

### Evaluation of Structural Models (Inner Model)

Table 17 presents the R-Square values of the research model.

**Table 17. R-Square Value Results**

| Variable                    | R-Square | R-Square Adjusted |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| Employee Brand Advocacy (W) | 0.850    | 0.847             |
| Internal Communication (Y)  | 0.879    | 0.877             |

The Employee Brand Advocacy variable has an  $R^2$  value of 0.850, indicating that Social Capital and Internal Communication are able to explain 85% of the variation in Employee Brand Advocacy. The Internal Communication variable has an  $R^2$  value of 0.879, indicating that Social Capital contributes 87.9% to Internal Communication. These two values belong to the very strong category because they are above the threshold of 0.75 (Hair et al., 2021). Table 18 presents the results of the Path Coefficients test.

**Table 18. Path Coefficients Value Results**

| Correlation  | Path Coefficients |
|--|-------------------|
| Social Capital (X) → Internal Communication (Y)          | 0.938             |
| Internal Communication (Y) → Employee Brand Advocacy (Z) | 0.922             |

The value of the coefficient of the Social Capital channel to Internal Communication of 0.938 shows a very strong and significant positive influence. The value of the Internal Communication channel coefficient for Employee Brand Advocacy of 0.922 proves that internal communication is the main driver of employee advocacy behavior. Table 19 presents the results of the mediation test.

**Table 19. Specific Indirect Effects (Mediation) Test Results**

| Mediation Pathway   | Specific Indirect Effects |
|---|---------------------------|
| Social Capital (X) → Internal Communication (Y) → Employee Brand Advocacy (Z) | 0.864                     |

The indirect influence value of 0.864 proves that Internal Communication significantly plays a mediator role in strengthening the influence of Social Capital on the formation of Employee Brand Advocacy behavior.

### The Influence of Social Capital on Internal Communication (H1)

The test results showed that Social Capital had a positive and significant effect on Internal Communication with a path coefficient value of 0.938 and  $R^2$  of 0.879. These findings prove that social capital consisting of trust, norms, and networks is the main prerequisite for the effectiveness of information exchange at PT KFD UB Sumatra 3. In particular, the Network dimension recorded the highest average (6.44), indicating that the connectivity between work

units in South Sumatra, Jambi, and Bangka Belitung facilitates a faster and more accurate flow of information.

High trust between employees ( $X1.1 = 6.43$ ) plays a crucial role in suppressing information distortion. When employees trust each other, they tend to be more open to sharing knowledge and providing honest feedback to their bosses. This finding is in line with the research of Men et al. (2020) which states that trust as a key dimension of social capital is able to create a transparent communication climate. This also reinforces Claride's (2018) theory that social capital is the "glue" for organizational interaction, and supports Verčič and Sriramesh's (2018) finding that strong networks accelerate the diffusion of strategic values.

### **The Influence of Internal Communication on Employee Brand Advocacy (H2)**

The results of the analysis showed that Internal Communication had a positive and significant effect on Employee Brand Advocacy with a path coefficient value of 0.922 and  $R^2$  of 0.850. This very high value proves that when a company is able to articulate its values through effective communication channels, employees are more likely to reciprocate with voluntary pro-organizational behavior. At PT KFD UB Sumatra 3, the Risk Culture (Y3.1) and Information Disclosure (Y6.2) indicators had a very high score (6.46), implying that management succeeded in creating transparency that made employees feel involved.

These findings are consistent with the study of Verčič and Sriramesh (2018) which posited that strategic internal communication plays an important role in aligning individual identities with organizational identities. The highest score on the Brand Defense indicator ( $Z2.1 = 6.48$ ) proves that well-informed employees have a strong sense of ownership and voluntarily defend the company's reputation. This is also in line with the research of Agnihotri et al. (2021) which emphasizes that in the service industry, relational assets have a dominant influence in shaping brand identity through employees.

### **The Role of Internal Communication Mediation (H3)**

The analysis of indirect effects through the Specific Indirect Effects test yielded a value of 0.864. These findings scientifically prove the role of Internal Communication as a very strong mediating variable. Social capital acts as the foundation or potential of human resources, while internal communication becomes an operational mechanism that turns this potential into real actions in the form of brand advocacy.

The study of Men et al. (2020) emphasizes that transparent and two-way internal communication serves as an emotional bridge capable of transforming social resources into real commitments in promoting the organization's image. The profile of respondents, the majority of whom are aged 27-28 years (36%) with D4/S1 education (48%) plays a key role in this mediation mechanism. This productive age group tends to be adaptive to information technology and active in social networks. Cognitive intelligence combined with transparent internal communication creates a very strong synergy in forming competent brand ambassadors.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study concludes that social capital has a positive and significant effect on internal communication (path coefficient = 0.938;  $R^2 = 87.9\%$ ), which proves that trust, norms, and networks are the main foundations in creating effective information exchange at PT Kimia Farma Diagnostical UB Sumatra 3; Internal communication has a positive and significant effect

on employee brand advocacy (path coefficient = 0.922;  $R^2 = 85\%$ ), indicating that information transparency and management openness are the main drivers of employee advocacy behaviour; and internal communication has been proven to act as a strong mediating variable between social capital and employee brand advocacy (specific indirect effects = 0.864), proving that social capital will not maximally encourage advocacy without a healthy internal communication mechanism. Based on these findings, the management of PT Kimia Farma Diagnostical is advised to continue to strengthen internal social ties and ensure that all communication channels run effectively without obstacles, as well as maintain transparency through indicators of information disclosure and risk culture that has been running well so that a sense of belonging) employees are kept awake; Given the profile of employees who are mostly of productive age and highly educated, companies can leverage their technological prowess to conduct health education to the public as a form of competent and sustainable brand advocacy.

## REFERENCE

- Agnihotri, R., Trainor, K. J., Itani, O. S., & Rodriguez, M. (2021). Social media in B2B sales: The role of social capital and brand advocacy in the sales process. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 36(8), 1335–1348. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-01-2020-0036>
- Ahmad, S. (2020). Social capital and employee advocacy: The moderating role of internal communication. *Journal of Business and Retail Management Research*, 14(2), 54–65. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-01-2019-0021>
- Argenti, P. A. (2016). *Corporate communication* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Bakker, A. B., Hetland, J., Olsen, O. K., & Espevik, R. (2020). Daily workload and work engagement: The role of social capital. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 35(4), 220–234.
- Bhandari, H., & Yasunobu, K. (2022). Social capital and its role in sustainable development: A comprehensive review. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 37(3), 480–510.
- Chin, W. W., & Dibbern, J. (2010). An introduction to a permutation based procedure for multi-group PLS analysis. In V. Esposito Vinzi, W. W. Chin, J. Henseler, & H. Wang (Eds.), *Handbook of partial least squares* (pp. 171–193). Springer.
- Edelman. (2024). *2024 Edelman Trust Barometer: Global report*. <https://www.edelman.com/trust/2024-trust-barometer>
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2021). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Kurnia, I. A., & Pandjaitan, N. K. (2020). The role of social capital in the resilience of tsunami-prone communities. *Journal of Communication Science and Community Development*, 5(1), 85–104. <https://doi.org/10.29244/jskpm.v5i1.769>
- Lokanath, S., & Gopan, G. (2023). Internal branding and employee brand advocacy: The mediating role of brand commitment. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, 8(4), e01340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23220937221146312>

- Melanthiou, Y., Pavlou, F., & Constantinou, E. (2017). The use of social network sites as an e-recruitment tool. *Journal of Transnational Management*, 22(3), 167–188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475778.2017.1335106>
- Men, L. R. (2014). Strategic internal communication: Transformational leadership, communication channels, and employee satisfaction. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 28(2), 264–284.
- Men, L. R., Tsai, W. H. S., Chen, Z. F., & Ji, Y. G. (2020). Social media ties that bind: Examining the role of internal social media and employee-organization relationships on employee advertising and advocacy. *Journal of Communication Management*, 24(2), 75–91. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-07-2019-0105>
- Nguyen, C. T. (2021). The impact of internal marketing on employee brand advocacy: The mediating role of organizational support. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(2), 1013–1022. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-01-2021-001>
- Rizkyana, N. P., et al. (2024). The influence of internal communication on employee performance. *Socius: Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 2(5), 5–10.
- Saputra, S. A. (2025). *The influence of internal communication on internal employer attractiveness through employee-brand identification and employer branding* [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Mercu Buana]. <http://repository.mercubuana.ac.id/id/eprint/95872>
- Setini, M., Yasa, N. N. K., Supartha, I. W. G., & Giantari, I. G. A. K. (2022). The role of social capital in improving marketing performance and business sustainability. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, 6(2), 351–360.
- Sugiyono. (2021). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Villalonga-Olives, E., & Kawachi, I. (2015). The measurement of bridging social capital: A critical review. *Social Science & Medicine*, 139, 107–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.06.033>
- World Health Organization. (2023). *Trust and social reputation as key drivers in global healthcare choices*. WHO Press.
- Zhang, J., Zhu, Q., & Wang, Y. (2019). Social capital on consumer knowledge-sharing in virtual brand communities: The mediating effect of pan-family consciousness. *Sustainability*, 11(2), 339. <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/11/2/339>