

d
by W D

Submission date: 01-Dec-2020 11:54PM (UTC+0800)

Submission ID: 1461456583

File name: compare_and_contrast_two_communication_techniques.edited.docx (15.74K)

Word count: 1179

Character count: 6310

Communication Techniques

Name

Institution

Course

Instructor

Date

Communication Techniques

Effective communication is an efficient way that managers can use to conduct their daily routine functions of management like planning, organizing, controlling, and coordinating (Skidmore-Williams, 2019). Communication enhances effective organization or work and provides an avenue for essential information conveyed by the junior employees to the senior management and vice versa. Besides, the top leadership in an organization communicates to the subordinates, and this is important if they are to achieve the set objectives. Managers are also involved in this communication, either through face to face engagements or using technology like telephones and emails to pass on information. In this regard, communication plays a huge role as it is the foundation of fostering an organization's success. It is a way of ensuring the employees remain motivated and acts as a source of information to the employees (Skidmore-Williams, 2019). Therefore, informed employees have a favorable attitude because effective communication fosters clarity about what should be done to achieve an organization's goal. This paper aims to compare and contrast on-site meetings and surveys that can be used to improve employee trust and engagement in an organization.

A happy and informed employee is productive. However, employee happiness is pegged, to a large extent, on trust established through open and effective communication. Hargie (2016) suggests that employees want to know what is expected of them and what they can do to achieve the set goals, hence the role of communication in establishing this trust. Two of the techniques used to improve employee engagement and improve trust are surveys and on-sight meetings with employees. Whereas on-sight meetings involve face to face interactions between the top management and the employees, surveys take the form of an answer to questions. Nonetheless,

the two methods differ in terms of effectiveness in achieving the goal of communicating. They also differ in terms of accuracy.

During an on-site engagement, employees get an avenue to air their concerns. At the same time, the top management will get to identify where there is a shortfall in the communication channels from top leadership to the line supervisors and the employees. For instance, some staff can feel excluded from the decision-making process and sometimes the top leadership in an organization is inaccessible. Without an appropriate explanation from the top management, employees will likely feel frustrated (Skidmore-Williams, 2019). During a sit-down with the top management, an organization can and will boost its productivity by arriving at a conclusion that favors everyone within the shortest time.

On the contrary, surveys are meant to gather data that is later analyzed by the top leadership or third parties. Additionally, surveys do not allow employees to interact directly with the management of an organization. For instance, employees may not understand what is expected of them or the general direction of an organization they work for. What follows after a survey is a report prepared and presented to the top management. According to Nayak and Narayan (2019), it is very easy to miss the point because a survey report may be skewed to suit the top management's wishes, or it may fail to capture the lapse in communication between the leadership of an organization and their juniors. This happens especially in cases where what the top management says and what the managers say do not match.

Again, in organizations that have a huge number of employees like Amazon, it can be difficult to have all the employees engage directly with the top management. They can only do so by taking part in surveys, or through their representatives. Consequently, it may be difficult for the top leadership of an organization to sit down and have a fruitful discussion with the

employees during on-site visits. And even if such an organization was to have a one on one engagement with the leadership, it will still be impossible for everyone to contribute. On the other hand, surveys can be conducted online where everyone's concerns are captured and recorded into the final report that is presented to the top management. Once a report has been submitted, it is scrutinized and appropriate communication strategies can be adopted. However, this process is time-consuming, from the moment the employees are told about the survey being conducted to the point where appropriate action is taken to improve communication.

Furthermore, surveys are limited in terms of scope. Surveys might not involve the questions the employees might want to ask or the information they might want to convey to an organization's leadership. On the contrary, during on-site meetings, employees raise concerns that can either be addressed directly at the time of engagement or they can even be asked to recommend proposals that make their communication with the leadership flawless. It is a straight-forward process that is not time-sensitive and can help improve engagements within the shortest time.

A survey is a technique that is most effective when there is a huge number of employees involved. For instance, as discussed earlier the founder of a company like Amazon can not have an on-site interaction with all the employees of the company. Even though it might be possible in some instances, operations might still go on in the background in one of the subsidiaries, as other employees are excluded from the process of having an on-site meeting with the company's leadership. A survey is also important where a company makes it mandatory for employees to participate in the process and provide their feedback. On the contrary, on-site meetings can effectively work where the number of employees is small. Such meetings are meant to bring people together in a manner that allows them to have a meaningful interaction, where everyone

can get an opportunity to speak. For instance, such a meeting is possible in a school environment where parents can engage a school leadership in a question-answer session.

In conclusion, having compared and contrasted on-site meetings and surveys that can be used to improve employee trust and engagement in an organization, it is clear that organizational leadership must ensure there is efficient communication in entities where they lead. Furthermore, this communication must use the right channel. If an on-site meeting will work then it is better to adopt it, on the other hand, where a survey is the best option it is better to adopt it to capture employee's concerns. In my view, an on-site meeting is the best strategy as it allows employees to access their senior leaders. It also gives them an avenue to air their concerns and the leadership can come up with on-the-spot solutions to their problems. Employees also feel appreciated when their managers take time to interact with them, hence improving their morale. This enables employees to excel at meeting and exceeding the organization's goals and objectives.

References

Hargie, O. (2016). The importance of communication for organizational effectiveness.

Nayak, M. S. D. P., & Narayan, K. A. (2019). Strengths and weakness of online surveys. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 24(5), 31-38.

Skidmore-Williams, K. (2019, August 1). *Communication provides Foundation for being a 'Best place to work.*

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches Off