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This paper studies different styles of leadership in modern organizations touristic and their benefits and disadvantages, with a focus on the characteristics of leaders driven by achievement and what happens when this leadership style crosses the line and becomes damaging for any organization.

Even if the overachieving style of leadership may be successful in the short term, the long term performance of an organization may be damaged and an overachieving leader may demolish trust and undermine morale, reducing overall productivity. In the end, there are presented the different styles of leadership with their pro’s and con’s, giving details to some extent of what makes a good leader nowadays and how personal characteristics affect leadership styles.

It goes on to discuss benchmarking programmes and finishes with a discussion of monitoring within local authorities, both in terms of service delivery and internal management performance.
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Introduction

In the present, we can see more and more very talented leaders crash their business as they are putting ever more pressure on their employees and themselves and this can demolish and undermine morale, reducing productivity and eroding confidence in management, both inside and outside the corporation. On the surface, controlling overachievement sounds like a basic rule: to be less coercive and more collaborative, but this is very difficult to master, as some successful and experienced executives fall into overachievement again and again.

The drive to achieve is very tough to resist, as most people in Western cultures are taught the value of achievement early on and this feeling of achievement becomes like a drug to them. Meeting or exceeding a standard of excellence or improving personal performance is one of the three internal drivers or “social motives” that explain human behaviour; the other two being affiliation – maintaining close personal relationships and power – influencing or having an impact on others. The power motive comes in two forms: personalized – controlling others and making them feel weak; and socialized – empowering others to make great things.

This doesn’t mean that an individual is controlled by either one or the other and every leader is described by the percent these three motives coexist. Although they are not usually conscious of them, they are influencing their behaviour. It is believed that a high concern with achievement within a country is followed by rapid growth, while a drop is linked to a decline in the economy.

But the tendency to cheat and cut corners is one of the downsides of overachieving leaders, as they are too fixated on finding shortcuts for the goal and tend to overlook the means used for reaching them. In contrast, the most effective leaders are primarily motivated by socialized power, channeling their efforts into helping others be successful.
A leader’s motives affect the he or she leads, and despite the advantages of an achieving mentality, overachievement can weaken a company’s or group’s working climate and its ability to perform well. There have been identified six leadership styles used to motivate, reward, direct and develop others. These styles are:

- **Directive** – which entails command-and-control behaviour that sometimes becomes coercive? When leaders use this approach, they tell people what to do, when to do it and what will happen if they fail. It is appropriate in crises and when poor performers must be managed, but it eventually damages creativity and initiative;

- **Visionary** – this style is also authoritative, but rather than simply telling people what to do, these leaders gain support by expressing clearly their challenges and responsibilities in the organization’s overall strategy. This makes goals clear, increases commitment and energizes a team. It is best used by people with a high personalized power drive under low-stress situations and people with a high socialized-power drive when stress is high;

- **Affiliate** – leaders with this style emphasize the employee and his or her emotional needs over the job and they tend to avoid conflicts. The approach is effective when a manager is dealing with employees who are in the midst of personal crises or in high-stress situations. It is affective in combination with visionary, participative or coaching styles;

- **Participative** – this style is collaborative and democratic, leaders who use it engaging others in the decision-making process. It’s great for building trust and consensus, especially when the team consists of highly competent individuals and when the leader has limited knowledge and lacks power or authority, being favored in high-stress conditions, by leaders with high affiliation drives;

- **Pacesetting** – this style involves leading by example and personal heroics. Leaders who use it have high standards and make sure they are met, even if they have to do the work themselves. It can
be effective in short-term situations, but it can demoralize employees on the long-term;

- Coaching – which involves the executive in long-term professional development and mentoring of employees? It’s powerful, but underused approach and should be a part of any leader’s usual repertoire. Leaders with high socialized-power prefer it under low-stress conditions.

There is not just one best style of leadership, each one having it’s strengths and limits, the most effective leaders use a combination of all six styles, resorting the best one to use in each situation. But most managers use the style they are comfortable with, a preference that reflect the person’s dominant motive, combined with the level of pressure in the workplace. People motivated mainly by achievement tend to favor pacesetting in low-pressure situations, but to become directive when the pressure is on. People high in socialized power, by contrast, naturally gravitate to coaching in low-stress situations and become visionary under pressure.

There have also been identified six factors that contribute to performance by affecting the workplace climate and a leader’s behaviour heavily influences the degree each of these factors is present and is a positive influence:

- Flexibility reflects employee’s perceptions about whether rules and procedures are really needed or not. It also reflects the extent to which people believe they can get new ideas accepted;
- Responsibility is the degree in which people feel free to work without asking their managers for guidance at every decision, and in high-performing climates, people feel they have a lot of responsibility. When overachievers use too much the directive and pacesetting styles, as they often do, they limit or destroy flexibility and responsibility in a group;
- Standards represent the degree in which people perceive that the company emphasizes excellence – which the bar is set high, but also attainable, and managers hold people accountable for doing
their best. When standards are strong, employees are confident they can meet the company’s challenges;

- Rewards are the reflection of whether people feel they are given regular, objective feedback and are rewarded accordingly. While compensation and formal recognition are important, the main component is feedback, that is immediate, specific and directly linked to performance;

- Clarity refers to whether people know what they are expected to do and understand how their work contributes to the company’s main goals. This has the strongest link to productivity and without it, all other aspects often suffer. Leaders who create high clarity often rely heavily on the visionary, participative and coaching styles;

- Team commitment is the extent to which people are proud to belong to a team or organization and believe that everyone is working towards the same objectives. The more widely shared the team’s values are, and the greater its commitment to performance, the higher the team’s pride.

A climate with high levels of standards, clarity and team commitment and at most one gap in the other dimensions is very strong. A climate with no significant gaps in standards, clarity and team commitment and two gaps in the other factors is still energizing to employees. Any more gaps and the climate is neutral or demotivating. In such an environment, people tend to do only the minimum required, and performance suffers.

One good news about achievers is that when they have a goal, they do everything to reach it, even if the goal is to manage their achievement style. For an overachiever to broaden his range, the first step is to become aware of how motives influence leadership style. In seeking to assess themselves as managers, there are calibrated tools for measuring the three leadership motives, but this can be simply done by examining the activities they like and why.
People with high achievement drives tend to like challenging projects that allow them to accomplish something new. They also like to outperform people who represent a high standard of excellence. Achievers tend to be utilitarian in their communication – often brief and to the point;

Those high in affiliation are energized by personal relationships. They like to spend time with family and friends and are attracted to group activities, simply for the opportunities to build relationships. They make heavy use of the phone and e-mail just to stay connected;

People mainly motivated by personal personalized power need to be seen as important. They tend to be driven by status and image. They often seek status symbols and engage in prestigious activities;

Individuals mainly driven by socialized power enjoy making a positive impact. They get satisfaction by helping people feel stronger and more capable. They like to advise and assist, whether or not the advice is wanted or needed. Such people are often attracted to teaching or politics and tend to be charismatic leaders.

A prerequisite for the effective management of destinations is the ability to secure a detailed knowledge and understanding of its characteristics and performance. It is essential to help shape strategies and action plans required to meet future challenges in a structured way. Information should be accurate and timely. If the effect of any actions is not regularly evaluated, the management process will become flawed.

The collection of up-to-date information and the regular monitoring of performance against plans is a fundamental component of good destination management. At the very simplest level, performance monitoring should include a checklist of actions completed. To be robust it should embrace a broader methodology that monitors, interrogates, evaluates and compares performance.
The process should be embedded as an integral part of an effective management system. It should be formulated to suit the individual destination, but most importantly it should be:

- simple
- effective
- easy to administer
- seen as a continuous process.

At the national level data is collected through the International Passenger Survey (IPS) and the United Kingdom Tourism Survey (UKTS). The UK Day Visits Survey measures the impact of day visits and estimates the volume and value of leisure day visits. Visit Britain’s website has more information on national tourism data.

**Key components of monitoring destination performance**

The following list gives the main aspects of a destination’s performance that are important to measure.

1. **Audit of tourism supply**

   Destination managers should have a clear understanding of the number of accommodation providers, caravan and campsites, and visitor attractions in their area. Ideally data on supply will include the total number of bed spaces, self-catering units, and caravan and campsite pitches as well as identifying businesses with quality accreditation, green business and accessibility ratings. This data should be kept on a spreadsheet and updated regularly.

2. **Volume and value of tourism data**

   An assessment of the number of visitors to a destination and the value of these visits to the economy is the most basic but significant piece of information required for an area. It is an essential part of the understanding process and is more fully covered in 3C: Determining the Local Economic Impact of Tourism. Once collected the information needs to be regularly updated so that basic trends can be established.
There is a cost in using either of the main models currently available, but as the data provided is essential for understanding, planning and development purposes, it is well worth the investment. For the purpose of identifying trends it is important to continue to use the same model and to obtain the data on a regular basis, preferably annually.

3. Overall visitor satisfaction

Visitor surveys are essential to evaluate customer perceptions of a destination and to identify needs. Again, it is imperative that surveys are carried out on a regular basis and that the data collected is consistent to allow for comparison to enable the monitoring of trends, to evaluate the impact of new developments and to assess changing needs. This is covered more fully in 3B: Surveying Visitor Satisfaction. A suggested basic visitor survey questionnaire is given in Appendix 2. This is an example for seaside resorts, but using the basic format with alterations for non-resort destinations will allow for benchmarking across destinations.

4. Local resident satisfaction

On a regular basis, for example every three years, seek the views of local residents as to their level of satisfaction with the tourism services in their area, and their views on the impact of visitors and the provision made for them. This is covered more fully in 3D: Surveying Local Community Attitudes to Tourism.

5. Tourist Information Centre satisfaction

A suggested survey form for use in assessing customer satisfaction with TICs is given in Appendix 3. The form can be handed out to a sample percentage of TIC visitors to provide some feedback on satisfaction levels. Incentives can be offered to encourage completion and return, and attempts should be made to secure the views of a full cross section of visitors.

6. Local industry satisfaction

Regular surveys of the local tourism service providers are essential to ensure that the resources devoted to tourism are being used to best effect and satisfy the needs of local businesses. Suggested
questionnaires for evaluating local business satisfaction are given as Appendix 4A (operators) and Appendix 4B (accommodation providers). The relevant form should be sent to all tourism businesses, preferably on an annual basis.

7. Evaluating the effect of marketing

It is important that some method is used to evaluate the success and impact of marketing activities, including brochures campaigns and websites. A simple response form included in a destination brochure with an incentive to provide important feedback is given as Appendix 5. Survey forms can also be sent out subsequently to those requesting a brochure and questionnaires can be made available in local accommodation to help assess what influenced someone to visit.

Similarly, processes, which can also be used on a comparative basis, are available to evaluate the effectiveness of a destination website in attracting visitors to an area. With increasing pressure on budgets, and increasing competition for market share, measuring the cost effectiveness of all marketing activity is becoming more and more important. Information on website evaluation and methodology for evaluating the return on investment of campaigns are both available as Destination Performance UK (DP: UK) advice sheets. The Advice Sheet Evaluating Marketing Campaigns is included as Appendix 6.

8. Quality issues

A regular review of the tourism businesses operating in an area and an awareness of the take up of quality standards is a fundamental part of basic intelligence and monitoring. A reliable up-to-date database of all establishments (accommodation, self-catering, caravan sites and campsites, hostels, attractions) is essential to monitor capacity and change. Information collected should include at the base level:

- quality grading
- number of rooms, units and bed spaces in serviced and self-catering accommodation
- the number of pitches at caravan sites and campsites.
The number of accessible establishments (both attractions and accommodation) should also be recorded including the take-up of the National Accessible Scheme. Information about changes and the opening of new establishments should be gained from local authority staff, e.g. environmental health officers, building control officers, planning officers and rating staff, by creating an integrated collaborative framework for regular intelligence sharing.

9. Environmental considerations

Environmental considerations should be an integral part of the service planning and delivery process. Monitoring systems need to be put in place to ensure that sustainability issues are adequately addressed. At the simplest level, the impact of any new development needs to be assessed in broad environmental terms. An evaluation of the effectiveness of any environmental management processes instituted, e.g. local produce sourcing, recycling programmers, green business programmers, should also be part of the monitoring process. See also 3E: Determining Local Recreational Carrying Capacity.

Comparative performance indicators

Regular monitoring programmers as described above will provide the information for destination performance indicators that can be used as comparators against other destinations. The quality of performance indicators is often debated; it seems very difficult to devise ones that appear to have any intellectual rigor yet can still be easily collected on a regular basis. What is essential is that there are sufficient monitoring programmers in place to provide the destination manager with the range of knowledge required to inform decision making and planning, evaluate overall performance and allow for easy comparison with other destinations.

The Single Improvement Tool has been developed for local authority cultural services by IDeA in association with the key national cultural organizations. Tourism, as it forms part of the national cultural
services block, has been included in the process. The tool applies equally well to local authority tourism services, even if they are based in other service areas such as economic development or regeneration. The tool contains a list of suggested performance indicators for tourism services. These are based on a set suggested in the Tourism Sustainability Group (TSG) report to the European Commission, and on indicators that have been adopted by Destination Performance UK and the Welsh Audit Commission. It is anticipated that local authority tourism services, and those providing tourism services to or on behalf of local authorities, will use the list in determining indicators for Local Area Agreements.

The indicators have been divided into four main groups to cover.

1. Satisfaction
2. Economic factors
3. Sustainability
4. Organization

The indicators should not be viewed as prescriptive or definitive. The choice of indicators to be used will depend on the nature of the destination, its organizational structure and the level of progress made towards sustainable destination management. However an attempt should be made to collect as many of the core indicators as possible.

The collection of key or core performance data in a standardized format enables a direct comparison to be made of overall performance within a specific sector or grouping. Benchmarking clubs have been in existence for a number of years but their distribution is patchy and they have highlighted the lack of accurate, simple and timely locally-based comparative data. The emergence of individual benchmarking clubs has also emphasized the need for more universal recognition of the role and value of core comparable information to support more effective performance management in destinations.

In England, the establishment of the National Tourism Best Value Group in 1999 was, at its simplest, an attempt to standardize baseline data collection processes for all local authorities.
Across Europe, destination groupings and networks have been seeking the ‘holy grail’ of the perfect set of sustainable performance indicators to be used for Europe-wide benchmarking. Without co-ordination a plethora of different processes have been emerging.

In addition, the apparent need to be exhaustive and visibly rigorous has led to the creation of endless sets of potential indicators that do not pass the acid tests of simplicity, collectability, comparability and reliance. There is much to be learnt from fellow practitioners across Europe and there are benefits to be gained from the ability to share information with a much broader range of destinations. It is hoped that adoption of the TSG report by the European Commission (see Further reading) and the Commission’s commitment to increasing the sustainability and competitiveness of European tourism will lead to increasing use of comparable indicators for benchmarking.

In addition to self-assessment performance benchmarking processes, Tourism South East offers a specific process that can be bought in to provide destination and TIC benchmarking. Destination benchmarking consists of collecting and analyzing a standardized set of visitor survey information for comparison directly with the scores from other destinations. The process is very useful for providing a definitive baseline or starting point for understanding visitor perceptions of the destination and visitor profiles. Regular reviews, using the same process, are essential to monitor changes and the results of any improvements over time. If the full benchmarking process is carried out every three to five years then interim data can be collected as a check, using less expensive techniques.

To provide a definitive baseline, a professionally undertaken TIC benchmarking survey is also an extremely useful exercise. If the surveys are carried out every three to five years, for example, interim data can be obtained by using the TIC customer satisfaction survey referred to in Appendix 3.

Since the mid-1980s, Central Government has been striving to make local government more accountable for its actions and
expenditure. An evaluation of the effectiveness of individual authorities in delivering their services was seen as an essential prerequisite in being able to assess value for money. The Best Value initiatives made it a statutory requirement for all authorities to measure performance and review their services. The Best Value regime evolved around 2002 into Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) whereby the whole performance of an authority was evaluated through a self-completed appraisal. CPA itself is now evolving and the performance focus will be increasingly on Local and Comprehensive Area Agreements and a reduced set of less than 200 national performance indicators.

Performance plans are still an integral part of the process. So is a clear demonstration that service delivery is set within a robust and comprehensive strategic framework, and that performance and customer satisfaction are regularly monitored, and that actions are reviewed.

Authorities need to be able to demonstrate clearly that they can set their performance in the context of other similar destinations, making comparative benchmarking an essential and integral part of the management process. Advice from IDeA and the Audit Commission is that whilst the nature of the process has changed, the expectation that authorities will be engaged in effective and robust performance management most definitely has not. The emphasis has moved considerably towards self-assessment and self-improvement. Whilst there are still no specific tourism indicators in the national set, suggestions have been provided through the Single Improvement Tool for cultural services to support Local Area Agreements. As well as monitoring the performance of their destination, a number of local authorities and DMOs are now using business planning techniques to understand and improve the individual components of their management processes. Integrated quality management, the EFQM Business Excellence Model, and ISO 9000 are the main techniques being deployed. Visit Wales has useful information on the application of integrated quality management in tourism. EFQM is a membership foundation working on quality management and sharing experience.
The processes include an evaluation of the key components of management: planning, leadership, understanding, resources, most important of all, monitoring.

**Conclusions**

More complicated and more important than recognizing an overactive drive to achieve is figuring out how to channel that drive into new behaviors and continually practice them until they become second nature.

While behavior is the responsibility of the individual, organizations play a role, even unintentionally, in influencing the executive’s actions. Some companies create cultures that foster and reward the achievement-at-all-costs mentality, but most organizations are less calculated; they simply select and promote high achievers for their obvious assets, let nature take its course, and then look the other way as long as the numbers are good.

But companies can redirect their focus and still achieve good numbers. For example, IBM in the 1990’s set out to regain control of the market by transforming the company into a flatter matrix-driven organization through managers that would orchestrate and enable rather than command and control. IBM needed to move away from its culture of personal heroics and individual achievement and begin valuing socialized power and managers who pay attention to the greater needs of the company.

A large part of the company’s managers were focusing on their own departments or divisions, even if doing so had a negative impact on performance in other parts of the organization. Their client focus was also driven by achievement: they were devoting more time and energy in making the sale than understanding the customer’s needs. The dominant leadership style, which reflected this emphasis on individual achievement, was pacesetting, and the climate lacked a number of the attributes that contribute to high performance.
However, there was a small but successful group of managers that led very differently, as they were working through others, creating strong teams, providing coaching and focused on increasing the capability of the whole organization. IBM incorporated these behaviors into a competency model that over the next years was used to select, develop and promote leaders and also created a group to develop and coach managers in the desired new behaviors. The results obtained after some years were that the coaching style had increased by 17 %, while pacesetting had decreased by 5 %.

Of course, a high achievement drive is still a source of strength, but companies must learn when to draw on it and when to rein it in. The challenges for managers today is to return some of the balance, seeking an approach to leadership that uses socialized power to keep achievement in check.
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