ABSTRACT

You don't get the sales team you want. You get the sales environment you build. This article takes that premise seriously — and examines what the research actually says about how that environment gets built, what it consists of, and what it costs when it is not. Talent explains part of what makes a sales team perform. Methodology explains a bit more. But neither accounts for the most powerful variable: the quality of the environment the manager builds around the people on their team. This article reviews four approaches to sales management — transactional, transformational, servant, and situational-adaptive — and examines what each produces in practice, with a particular focus on roles that require sustained autonomy and long-cycle relationship building. The principles apply to any sales manager. The examples are drawn primarily from business development and key account management, where the environment a manager creates has the highest commercial stakes. Drawing on leadership research, empirical studies, and practitioner experience across EMEA, the article argues that the most effective managers combine servant leadership as a guiding philosophy with situational leadership as a daily practice. It then examines five dimensions of what that environment looks like in concrete terms — direction, protection, rhythm, culture, and presence — and what the data tells us about the cost of neglecting any of them.

Keywords: *sales management, leadership styles, servant leadership, situational leadership, sales environment, team performance, transactional, transformational, BD teams, key account management*

1. INTRODUCTION: THE MANAGER'S REAL JOB

In the first article of this series, we looked at 13 sales methodologies and landed on something most experienced salespeople already know: the specific framework matters far less than how rigorously it gets applied. Korn Ferry's 2025 research puts numbers on it — teams with high adoption rates outperform low-adoption peers by 21% on quota attainment and 15% on win rate, regardless of which approach they chose [1]. The method is interchangeable. The execution discipline is not.

So where does that discipline come from? Not from personality. Research on how habits form — Duhigg [2], Wood and Neal [3] — is consistent: what people do reliably is shaped by the environment around them, not by willpower alone. The structures, rhythms, and expectations a manager builds determine whether good intentions turn into repeatable behavior. Get those right and the team performs. Leave them to chance and even talented people produce inconsistent results.

This is the argument the article makes: a sales manager's primary job is not to drive performance. It is to create the conditions in which performance becomes possible — and sustainable. That applies to any sales team. The principles here are broadly relevant. But the examples and emphasis are drawn from roles where the environment matters most: business development and key account management, where deal cycles are long, relationships are the primary currency, and a manager's choices about how to lead have consequences that compound over years.

> ***You don't get the sales team you want.***
> **You get the sales environment you build.**

2. FOUR APPROACHES TO SALES MANAGEMENT

Every sales manager operates from one of these orientations — whether they have named it or not. The leadership literature identifies four main approaches. Here is what each one actually produces in practice.

Approach	Core Logic	Strength	Failure Mode in BD/KAM
Transactional	Clear targets, incentives, consequences. You deliver, I reward. Simple contract.	Fast clarity. Works well when tasks are structured and cycles are short.	Reps optimize for watched metrics, not customer relationships. Disappears when unsupported.
Transformational	Shared vision, elevated ambition, commitment beyond self-interest.	Strong for culture change, team identity, and raising performance ceilings.	Inspiration without structure. Works in crisis, fades in normal operations.
Servant Leadership	The manager enables the team — direction, protection, development, removing friction.	Deeper customer orientation, stronger retention, validated in sales research. [6]	Misread as people-pleasing. Without directness, it protects comfort instead of driving growth.
Situational / Adaptive	Style matched to each individual's current development level.	Most flexible approach. Avoids both micromanagement and abandonment.	Depends on accurate diagnosis. Misjudging someone's level quietly costs performance.

Table 1. Four approaches to sales management — core logic, strengths, and failure modes in BD and KAM contexts.

2.1 Four Styles — What Each Produces in Practice

The table above gives a quick read on each approach. What it cannot show is the mechanism — why each style succeeds or fails in the specific context of BD and KAM work. That requires a closer look.

Transactional management is the default in most sales organizations — and its failure mode in complex selling is not immediately obvious, because it works well enough in the short term. Targets are clear, activity is tracked, month-end reviews happen. The problem surfaces over time: research by Schwepker and Goode [4] found that transactional environments increase the risk of reps optimizing for the metrics being watched rather than the behaviors that build long-term customer relationships. A KAM who hits renewal numbers by discounting rather than by deepening the account is a transactional success and a strategic failure. By the time the pattern is visible in the data, the damage is done.

Transformational leadership's limitation is not in what it does but in when it stops working. A manager who can rally a team through a difficult year — through a market shift, a product gap, a reorganization — can be genuinely exceptional at that. The gap appears in normal operating conditions, when the team needs structure and rhythm rather than inspiration. Inspiration sustains motivation. It does not, by itself, build the habits and disciplines that BD and KAM work requires day after day.

> *"Transformational leadership behaviors show stronger relationships with sales performance than transactional ones — but the most effective managers combine both: transactional clarity to set expectations, transformational energy to raise*

> *motivation."* — MacKenzie, Podsakoff & Rich, Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science (2001) [8]

The causal path Grisaffe, Chonko and Roberts [6] established is direct: genuine managerial concern for the rep's development → customer orientation → adaptive selling → performance. The mechanism is reciprocal. How a manager treats their team shapes how the team treats their customers. What makes servant leadership distinctive is the starting point — development, not approval.

Situational leadership's challenge is diagnostic accuracy. The model is straightforward in theory: match your style to the individual's current competence and commitment level. In practice, managers systematically misread this. High performers get too much autonomy on new challenges they have not yet mastered. Struggling reps get too much direction when what they actually need is support and encouragement. The result in both cases is a mismatch that costs performance — and in BD and KAM roles, where the consequences of that mismatch play out over months, the cost accumulates before it becomes visible.

2.2 Servant Leadership Is Not People Pleasing

The servant foundation means the manager's instinct is toward the team: clearing the path, giving direction, protecting time, recognizing effort. The situational instrument means that support is not uniform. A BDM in their first quarter needs something very different from a senior KAM who has managed the same accounts for five years. Applying the same approach to both — whether too directive or too hands-off — damages one of them.

One common misreading of servant leadership is worth addressing directly. A servant leader is not a people pleaser. They are not in the role to keep people comfortable or to avoid difficult conversations. The opposite is closer to the truth: because their orientation is toward the long-term development of the people they lead, a servant leader will often be the most direct person in the room. They will tell a rep that their pipeline is not credible. They will confront a KAM who has retreated into comfortable accounts and stopped developing new relationships. They will have the conversation about what it will actually take to succeed — even when that conversation is uncomfortable. The difference between a servant leader and a micromanager is not the absence of high expectations. It is the intent behind them. The servant leader challenges people in order to grow them. The micromanager challenges people in order to control them.

Servant leadership is not about making people comfortable.
It is about making them better.

2.3 Why Servant Leadership Wins the Comparison

When you compare the three styles directly, a clear pattern emerges. Transactional leadership produces short-term output but erodes the intrinsic motivation that complex selling depends on. Transformational leadership raises commitment and vision but lacks the structural discipline that keeps a team grounded over time. A meta-analysis on leadership and intrinsic motivation found that servant leadership is a stronger driver of lasting intrinsic motivation than transformational leadership [20] — motivation built on genuine care outlasts motivation built on inspiration.

For BD and KAM specifically, this matters because the work requires people who are genuinely interested in their customers — not because a metric demands it, but because that curiosity is what produces the insight and trust that drive long-term performance. Transactional management suppresses that curiosity. Transformational management stimulates it temporarily. Servant leadership sustains it — because the dynamic flows both ways: a manager who is genuinely invested in the rep's development produces a rep who is genuinely invested in the customer's success.

But servant leadership alone is not a complete instrument. It answers the question of orientation — how the manager fundamentally sees their role. It does not answer the question of calibration — how to lead a new BDM who needs structure very differently from a senior KAM who needs challenge. That is where situational leadership completes the picture. Servant as the philosophy. Situational as the daily practice.

WHAT THE RESEARCH SHOWS

Grisaffe, Chonko and Roberts [6] traced a direct causal path in sales contexts: servant manager behavior → salesperson customer orientation → adaptive selling → sales performance. The mechanism is social exchange — people who feel genuinely supported by their manager extend the same quality of engagement to their customers.

The Journal of Selling research [7] maps out six situational styles — from Directing (high instruction) to Delegating (full autonomy). The key insight: the right style depends not on seniority but on the individual's current competence and commitment level for a specific challenge — which shifts over time and across situations.

2.4 KPIs and CRM: Tool or Control System?

No discussion of sales management approaches is complete without addressing one of the most misused tools in the manager's arsenal: the KPI dashboard. CRM data and activity metrics are genuinely valuable. They make pipeline health visible, surface early signals, and give the manager the information they need to coach effectively. Used well, they are an instrument of development. Used poorly, they become an instrument of control — and the difference matters enormously for the kind of environment a manager creates.

The failure mode is familiar: the manager who shows the team their dashboards at the end of the month, uses the data to identify who fell short, and interprets low activity numbers as evidence of insufficient effort. This approach treats the CRM as a surveillance system rather than a management tool. Research on employee monitoring confirms the pattern: data overload without proper analysis produces employee distrust, with people feeling surveilled rather than supported. In sales teams specifically, that distrust has a direct commercial consequence — people optimize for the metrics that are being watched, not for the behaviors that actually build long-term customer relationships.

WHAT THE RESEARCH SHOWS

HubSpot's research on sales performance management [16] identifies a consistent pattern: sales reps who experience additional tracking as micromanagement rather than support actively resist the systems designed to help them. The most effective KPI frameworks, the research notes, balance activity metrics with quality measures — specifically to prevent gaming behaviors where reps optimize for numbers rather than outcomes.

The practical implication: KPIs and CRM data are most valuable when they are owned by the rep as much as by the manager — when they serve as a shared language for understanding the state of a territory, not a reporting obligation that flows upward. That requires the manager to have already established the direction, trust, and coaching rhythm described in the sections that follow.

3. WHAT THE ENVIRONMENT ACTUALLY CONSISTS OF

A management philosophy means nothing until it shows up in what people actually experience day to day. Five dimensions determine the quality of that experience. Each one is a choice the manager makes — actively or by default.

Dimension	What it looks like when done well	What it looks like when missing
DIRECTION	Every BDM and KAM has a territory or account plan, understands the sales cycle, and knows the commercial logic of their portfolio. Expectations are explicit before performance is demanded.	*Reps navigate by instinct. Energy is high but misdirected. Early habits form in the absence of structure — and those habits are the hardest to change.*
PROTECTION	The manager absorbs internal friction at the organizational level. Non-selling tasks are tracked, patterns identified, and systemic problems solved centrally rather than distributed to individuals.	*Reps spend 70% of their time on work that is not their job. Relationships suffer. The team is busy, but not commercially productive.*
RHYTHM	A monthly review creates a fixed discipline point — pipeline verified, forecast honest, key signals surfaced. Daily work integrates these habits until they become automatic.	*Pipelines drift. Forecasts become optimistic. Problems grow quietly until they surprise everyone. The manager-rep conversation never gets past the basics.*
CULTURE	Wins and losses are shared openly. Recognition is specific and public. The team's success feels more important than individual standing. The manager leads by example — modeling the behavior they expect rather than just describing it.	*Knowledge stays private. Mistakes stay hidden. The manager appears to inspect, not to support. Internal competition erodes the trust that makes complex selling sustainable.*
PRESENCE	When a high-stakes customer situation arises, the manager is operationally involved through all three phases: preparation (aligning on goals, stakeholders, and approach before the meeting), the conversation itself (stepping into the difficult moments so the rep can maintain the relationship), and debrief (reflecting on what worked, what to do differently, what the rep takes forward). The rep owns the relationship. The manager backs them when it counts.	*The manager appears only when problems have already escalated — without preparation, without follow-up. Experienced as control rather than support. The rep feels exposed rather than covered.*

Table 2. The five dimensions of the sales environment — what each looks like when built well, and what it looks like when missing.

These five dimensions connect. Direction makes disciplined habits possible. Rhythm makes planning real rather than theoretical. A team that shares knowledge openly outperforms one that does not, even when individual capability is identical. And a manager who shows up in the moments that matter — not to inspect but to participate — demonstrates something that no handbook can: that they will stand behind their people when it counts.

One thing no environment can substitute for is who the person actually is. A salesperson who is genuinely curious about their customers — who asks questions because they want to understand, not because the script says to — will go places that a technically superior but less engaged colleague will not. Management cannot produce authenticity. But it can create space for it. And it can absolutely destroy it: through micromanagement, through excessive admin pressure, through a culture where showing vulnerability is punished. The environment does not determine character. It either gives it room or it does not.

4. THE COST OF GETTING IT WRONG

Most writing about sales management focuses on what good looks like. The numbers below describe what a poor environment actually costs — in time, in engagement, and in commercial output.

29%	**70%**	**21%**
of time actually spent selling	of engagement variance explained by manager quality	quota attainment gap between high and low environment teams
Salesforce State of Sales, 2024 [9]	*Gallup, State of the Global Workplace, 2023 [10]*	*Korn Ferry, 2025 [1]*

Figure 1. Three data points on what poor sales environments cost in measurable terms.

The 29% figure from Salesforce is the one that tends to land hardest. Less than a third of a working week spent on activities that actually reach a customer. The rest goes to CRM entry, internal requests, meetings with other functions, and administrative tasks that belong to someone else. For people whose work depends on being in front of customers — building trust, reading a room, having the conversation that a video call cannot — that is not a personal productivity problem. It is a management design failure.

> *"If your team spends 70% of their time on internal work, you are not managing a sales team. You are managing a coordination problem."*

Gallup's finding on manager quality [10] is the one that should concern anyone responsible for retaining talent. Approximately 70% of the variance in team engagement scores is explained by who the manager is and how they lead. In BD and KAM roles, disengagement does not just affect productivity — it walks out the door. A senior KAM who leaves takes years of customer relationship with them. Dirks and Ferrin's meta-analysis [11] puts the trust-to-turnover correlation at –0.40: teams that do not trust their manager are actively planning to leave, whether or not they say so.

These numbers do not advocate for a particular leadership style. They make a simpler argument: the environment a manager creates is not background noise. It is a primary driver of what the team produces — and what it costs when people leave.

5. Concluion

The question is not which leadership style to adopt. It is what kind of environment you are actually building — and whether it is one where your team can do their best work. The five dimensions in Section 3 offer a starting point for that honest self-assessment. The data in Section 4 gives a sense of what is at stake when the answer falls short.

You don't get the sales team you want.
You get the sales environment you build.

REFERENCES

[1] Korn Ferry. (2025). Supercharging Sales Effectiveness Study. Korn Ferry Institute.

[2] Duhigg, C. (2012). The Power of Habit. Random House.

[3] Wood, W., & Neal, D. T. (2007). A new look at habits and the habit-goal interface. Psychological Review, 114(4), 843–863.

[4] Schwepker, C. H., & Goode, M. R. (2010). Transactional Leadership and Sales Behavior. Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management. — Transactional leadership and risk of unethical behavior under performance pressure.

[5] Wang, G., Oh, I.-S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational Leadership and Performance Across Criteria and Levels: A Meta-Analytic Review. Group & Organization Management, 36(2), 223–270.

[6] Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009). Examining the Impact of Servant Leadership on Sales Force Performance. Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 29(3), 257–275.

[7] Journal of Selling & Major Account Management. (2006). Situational Sales Leadership Framework. Northern Illinois University. — Six situational styles based on trust and sales control dimensions.

[8] MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Rich, G. A. (2001). Transformational and Transactional Leadership and Salesperson Performance. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 29(2), 115–134.

[9] Salesforce. (2024). State of Sales Report, Sixth Edition. Salesforce Research.

[10] Gallup. (2023). State of the Global Workplace Report. Gallup Press.

[11] Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in Leadership: Meta-Analytic Findings and Implications for Research and Practice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 611–628.

[12] Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). The Servant as Leader. Center for Applied Studies.

[13] Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. Training and Development Journal, 23(5), 26–34.

[14] Edmondson, A. (2018). The Fearless Organization. Wiley.

[15] Homburg, C., et al. (2023). Coopetition in the presence of team and individual incentives. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science.

[16] HubSpot. (2024). Sales Performance Management — Research on KPI frameworks, CRM adoption, and micromanagement resistance. Available at: hubspot.com/glossary/sales-performance-management.

[17] Sun, J., Liden, R. C., & Ouyang, L. (2019). Are servant leaders appreciated? An investigation of how relational attributions influence employee feelings of gratitude and prosocial behaviors. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 40(5), 528–540. — On servant leadership, feedback-seeking, and the role of direct challenge in development.

[18] Bandura, A. (1977). Social Learning Theory. Prentice Hall. — Behavioral modeling as the primary mechanism for learning in organizational contexts.

[19] Brooks Group. (2025). The Impact of Manager-Accompanied Sales Calls. — Research on preparation, joint calls, and debrief as a coaching structure for high-stakes customer situations.

[20] Guo, Y., et al. (2022). A meta-analysis of leadership and intrinsic motivation: Examining relative importance and moderators. Frontiers in Psychology. — Servant, ethical, and empowering leadership emerged as stronger contributors to intrinsic motivation than transformational leadership.