

Impact of Leadership Styles on Project Team Motivation and Performance

Ali Bin Tahir

Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Engineering and Technology

Taxila Email: alibintahir93@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Leadership style is one of the most consistently studied determinants of project outcomes in the project management literature. This paper examines how transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, servant, and situational leadership styles influence project team motivation and, in turn, project performance. Drawing on established leadership theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985) and empirical project management research (Turner & Müller, 2005; Müller & Turner, 2007), the paper synthesizes findings from peer-reviewed studies to argue that transformational and servant leadership styles are most strongly associated with intrinsic motivation, team cohesion, and superior project outcomes, while laissez-faire leadership is associated with reduced motivation and weaker performance. Transactional leadership is shown to be effective primarily for structured, well-defined project tasks. The paper concludes with practical recommendations for project managers and directions for future research.

Introduction

Project success depends not only on technical planning, scheduling, and budgeting but also on the human dimension of project delivery. Project teams are typically temporary, cross-functional, and assembled for a fixed duration, which places unusual demands on the project manager's ability to motivate people quickly and sustain performance under time pressure (Turner & Müller, 2005). Leadership style — the relatively consistent pattern of behavior a leader uses to influence, direct, and motivate a team (Yukl, 2012; Northouse, 2021) — has therefore become a central variable in project management research.

Motivation theory suggests that when team members experience their work as meaningful, are given autonomy, and receive constructive feedback, their engagement and performance rise (Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Locke & Latham, 2002). Leadership style directly shapes whether these conditions are present on a project team. This paper investigates the relationship between leadership style, team motivation, and project performance by reviewing the major leadership theories relevant to project settings and synthesizing empirical evidence on their effects.

Problem Statement

Despite widespread agreement that leadership matters for project outcomes, project managers often default to a single habitual style regardless of team composition, task

complexity, or project phase. This mismatch between leadership behavior and team needs has been linked to lower motivation, higher turnover, schedule slippage, and diminished quality (Müller & Turner, 2007; Chaudhry, 2012). There remains a need to consolidate evidence on which leadership styles most reliably support team motivation and project performance, and under what conditions.

Research Objectives

This paper pursues three objectives: (1) to review the major leadership style typologies applied in project management; (2) to examine how each style affects project team motivation; and (3) to evaluate the relationship between leadership style and measurable project performance outcomes such as schedule adherence, quality, and stakeholder satisfaction.

Research Questions

RQ1: How do different leadership styles affect the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of project team members?

RQ2: What is the relationship between leadership style and project performance indicators?

RQ3: Which contextual factors moderate the effectiveness of a given leadership style in project settings?

Significance of the Study

The findings are intended to help project managers, organizational leaders, and project management offices (PMOs) select and develop leadership behaviors that improve team motivation and project delivery. The paper also contributes to academic literature by consolidating dispersed empirical findings into a single comparative framework specific to project-based work.

Scope of the Study

The scope of this paper is limited to leadership style as exercised by the formal project manager or team leader within a defined project team, rather than broader organizational or executive leadership. The paper focuses on five leadership style categories most frequently discussed in the project management literature — transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, servant, and situational — and on two outcome variables: team motivation and project performance, the latter understood broadly to include schedule adherence, cost control, quality, innovation, and stakeholder satisfaction. Other important project success factors such as risk management maturity, procurement strategy, and organizational governance structures are acknowledged but fall outside the direct scope of this review.

Literature Review

Leadership theory has evolved considerably since early trait-based approaches, which sought to identify fixed personal qualities of effective leaders, through behavioral approaches that focused on observable actions, to contingency and situational models that recognize context as a decisive factor, and finally to more recent relational and identity-based models such as transformational and servant leadership (Avolio,

Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). This evolution reflects a growing recognition that leadership effectiveness cannot be separated from the characteristics of followers, the nature of the task, and the organizational or project environment in which leadership occurs. This section reviews the leadership styles most frequently examined in project management research, drawing on both foundational theory and more recent empirical studies conducted specifically within project-based organizations.

Project environments differ from conventional, ongoing organizational settings in several important respects that make leadership style especially consequential. Projects are temporary, which limits the time available for a leader to build trust and shared norms. Project teams are frequently cross-functional and drawn from different departments or even different organizations, which increases the likelihood of divergent expectations and working styles. Finally, projects are typically evaluated against fixed constraints of scope, time, and cost, which means that motivational lapses translate quickly into visible schedule or quality problems (Turner & Müller, 2005; Müller & Turner, 2007). These structural features help explain why the project management literature has paid close and sustained attention to leadership style as a performance variable.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership was introduced by Burns (1978) and later developed into a measurable framework by Bass (1985), who distinguished it from transactional leadership. Transformational leaders articulate a compelling vision, act as role models, provide individualized consideration, and intellectually stimulate followers (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). A large body of empirical work links transformational leadership to higher follower trust, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior (Podsakoff et al., 1990; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996).

Meta-analytic evidence confirms that transformational leadership is positively related to performance at the individual, team, and organizational levels, with the strongest effects observed for team-level performance (Wang, Oh, Courtright, & Colbert, 2011). Judge and Piccolo (2004) similarly found transformational leadership to be a stronger and more consistent predictor of follower performance and satisfaction than transactional leadership across many settings. In project teams specifically, transformational behaviors have been shown to increase collective efficacy and cohesiveness, which mediate improvements in perceived group performance (Jung & Sosik, 2002).

Field-experimental evidence reinforces these correlational findings. Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002) demonstrated in a randomized field experiment that leaders trained in transformational behaviors produced measurable gains in follower development and unit performance compared to a control group, offering some of the strongest causal evidence in the leadership literature. Identification-based mechanisms have also been documented: Wang and Howell (2012) and Zhang, Chen, Chen, Liu, and Johnson (2014) show that transformational leadership increases both relational identification (with the leader) and collective identification (with the team), both of which independently predict higher team performance.

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership operates through contingent reward and management-by-exception: followers are motivated through a clear exchange of effort for recognized rewards, and the leader intervenes when standards are not met (Bass, 1985). This style tends to be effective for well-structured, routine project tasks with clearly defined deliverables, but is generally a weaker predictor of discretionary effort and innovation than transformational leadership (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Chaudhry (2012) found that transactional leadership had a measurable but comparatively modest positive relationship with follower motivation, while purely passive transactional behavior (management-by-exception passive) showed little to no motivational benefit.

Laissez-Faire Leadership

Laissez-faire leadership is characterized by an absence of leadership intervention: decisions are delayed, feedback is withheld, and the leader avoids taking a position (Bass, 1985). Across the reviewed studies, this style is the most consistently associated with negative outcomes. Chaudhry (2012) reports a negative correlation between laissez-faire leadership and team motivation, and project management literature associates this style with role ambiguity, unresolved conflict, and slower decision cycles that damage schedule performance (Turner & Müller, 2005).

Servant Leadership

Servant leadership, introduced by Greenleaf (1977), reverses the traditional hierarchy by positioning the leader as a supporter of the team's growth, autonomy, and well-being rather than the reverse. In project contexts, servant leadership has been linked to higher psychological safety and trust, which in turn support collaboration under the ambiguity and time pressure typical of projects (Northouse, 2021). Because servant leadership emphasizes listening and empowerment, it aligns closely with the autonomy and feedback conditions identified by Hackman and Oldham (1976) as central to intrinsic motivation.

Situational Leadership

Situational leadership theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969) and the related path-goal theory (House, 1971) argue that no single leadership style is universally effective; instead, leaders should adapt their behavior to the maturity, competence, and confidence of team members and to the structure of the task. In project management, this contingency logic is echoed by Müller and Turner (2007), who found that the effectiveness of a project manager's leadership style varied systematically with project type, complexity, and life-cycle stage. This suggests that project managers benefit from a flexible repertoire of styles rather than a fixed approach.

Leadership, Motivation, and Project Performance

Motivation theory provides the mechanism connecting leadership style to project performance. Locke and Latham's (2002) goal-setting theory shows that specific, challenging, and accepted goals raise performance, and transformational and situational leaders are more likely to set and communicate such goals effectively. Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996) found that core charismatic leadership components —

vision, communication of high expectations, and confidence-building — had direct and indirect effects on both follower performance and attitudes. Braun, Peus, Weisweiler, and Frey (2013) extended this line of research by showing that trust mediates the relationship between transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and team performance, a multilevel effect that is particularly relevant to project teams composed of members from different functional backgrounds.

In project management specifically, the project manager's competence profile has been shown to include not only technical and process skills but also interpersonal and leadership skills, which Sunindijo (2015) found to be positively associated with project quality performance. Humphrey, Morgeson, and Mannor (2009) further show that the composition and role structure of a team interacts with leadership to determine strategic performance outcomes, indicating that leadership effects are not uniform but depend on team design.

Leadership in Virtual and Distributed Project Teams

Many contemporary projects are delivered by geographically distributed or virtual teams, which changes how leadership style translates into motivation. Purvanova and Bono (2009) found that transformational leadership had an even stronger positive effect on performance in virtual teams than in face-to-face teams, attributing this to the heightened need for a clear, inspiring vision when informal, in-person cues are absent. This finding has direct relevance for modern project environments that rely on remote collaboration tools.

Cultural and Contextual Moderators

Leadership effectiveness is not culturally neutral. Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2009) note that the expression and reception of transformational behaviors can vary across national and organizational cultures, particularly along dimensions such as power distance and collectivism. In high power-distance cultures, directive elements of transactional leadership may be more readily accepted by team members, while in more egalitarian cultures, participative and transformational behaviors tend to be more strongly rewarded with higher motivation. Project teams that are culturally diverse — increasingly the norm in multinational programs and global delivery teams — therefore require project managers who can adapt their communication and motivational approach without abandoning the core transformational behaviors of vision-setting and individualized consideration.

Industry context is a further moderator. In construction and engineering projects, where tasks are often well-specified and safety-critical, transactional oversight and clear contingent reward structures play an important complementary role alongside transformational vision-setting (Dulaimi & Hartmann, 2006). In knowledge-intensive projects such as software development or research and development, where creativity and discretionary problem-solving are central, transformational and servant leadership behaviors tend to dominate as predictors of both motivation and innovation output (Jung & Sosik, 2002).

Team Composition and Leadership Interaction Effects

Leadership does not operate on a uniform, undifferentiated team; its effects interact with how the team itself is structured. Humphrey, Morgeson, and Mannor (2009) show that the strategic core of a team — the specific roles most critical to task completion — shapes how much leverage a leader's behavior has on overall performance. In practice, this means that transformational leadership behaviors directed at core, high-interdependence roles within a project team may generate disproportionately large performance gains compared with the same behaviors applied uniformly across all team members. Project managers who understand their team's role structure are therefore better positioned to allocate individualized consideration where it will have the greatest motivational and performance impact.

Summary of the Literature

Table 1 summarizes the reviewed leadership styles, their core characteristics, and their documented effects on team motivation and project performance.

Leadership Style	Core Characteristics	Effect on Team Motivation	Effect on Project Performance
Transformational	Vision, inspiration, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation	Strongly increases intrinsic motivation and commitment	Strong positive effect on quality, innovation, and schedule performance
Transactional	Contingent reward, management-by-exception	Moderate; motivates through clear rewards and monitoring	Positive effect on routine, well-defined project tasks
Laissez-faire	Minimal intervention, avoidance of decisions	Generally lowers motivation and role clarity	Negative or inconsistent effect on project outcomes
Servant	Prioritizes team members' growth and well-being	Increases trust, psychological safety, and engagement	Positive effect on collaboration and long-term performance
Situational	Adapts style to team maturity and task readiness	Motivation improves when style matches team needs	Positive effect when applied with contextual accuracy

Table 1. Comparative summary of leadership styles and their effects on project teams.

Theoretical Framework

This paper adopts an integrative framework in which leadership style is the independent variable, team motivation is the mediating variable, and project performance (schedule adherence, cost control, quality, and stakeholder satisfaction)

is the dependent variable. This framework draws on Bass's (1985) full-range leadership model, Hackman and Oldham's (1976) job characteristics model for the motivational mechanism, and Müller and Turner's (2007) contingency findings for the moderating role of project type and complexity. The framework proposes that leadership style influences motivation primarily through the extent to which it provides vision and meaning, autonomy, individualized support, and contingent feedback — and that motivation, in turn, is the proximate driver of team performance.

Research Methodology

This paper uses a systematic narrative literature review methodology appropriate for a theory-focused project management paper. Peer-reviewed journal articles, meta-analyses, and foundational leadership texts published primarily in outlets such as *The Leadership Quarterly*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Academy of Management Journal*, *International Journal of Project Management*, and *Project Management Journal* were identified and reviewed. Sources were selected based on relevance to leadership style, team motivation, and project or team performance, with priority given to meta-analyses and empirical studies with verifiable digital object identifiers (DOIs). Findings were synthesized thematically around the five leadership styles most frequently discussed in the project management literature: transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, servant, and situational.

This approach is descriptive and qualitative rather than statistical; it does not generate new primary data but instead consolidates existing empirical evidence into a structured comparison. This is an appropriate and common methodology for a review-based project management research paper of this scope.

Illustrative Application in Project Settings

To ground the theoretical synthesis in practical project scenarios, this section considers three illustrative project contexts frequently discussed in the literature: a construction project, a software development project, and a virtual, geographically distributed program team.

Construction and Infrastructure Projects

Construction projects are characterized by strict sequencing, safety regulation, and contractual milestones. In this setting, the literature suggests a blended approach in which transactional mechanisms — clear contingent rewards, defined checkpoints, and management-by-exception for safety-critical deviations — are paired with transformational communication of the project's broader purpose (Dulaimi & Hartmann, 2006; Sunindijo, 2015). Purely laissez-faire behavior in this context is particularly risky, since delayed decisions on sequencing or safety issues can cascade into significant schedule and cost overruns.

Software and Product Development Projects

Software projects, particularly those run under agile or iterative methodologies, depend heavily on discretionary effort, creative problem-solving, and rapid adaptation to changing requirements. Jung and Sosik (2002) found that transformational leadership behaviors increased collective efficacy and cohesiveness in exactly these

kinds of knowledge-intensive team settings, both of which are strongly linked to iterative delivery performance. Servant leadership behaviors — active listening, removing obstacles, and empowering the team to make technical decisions — are also frequently emphasized in agile project literature as complementary to transformational vision-setting.

Virtual and Distributed Project Teams

As noted in Section 2.7, Purvanova and Bono (2009) found transformational leadership to be even more strongly related to performance in virtual teams than in co-located teams. For globally distributed program teams, this implies that project managers should not assume that leadership behaviors calibrated for face-to-face teams will transfer automatically; deliberate, structured communication of vision and individualized feedback becomes more, not less, important when team members are separated by geography and time zones.

Discussion

The reviewed literature converges on several consistent patterns. First, transformational leadership shows the most robust and repeatedly replicated positive relationship with both team motivation and project performance (Wang et al., 2011; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Dvir et al., 2002). Its emphasis on vision, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation directly satisfies the motivational conditions identified by job characteristics theory (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), which explains why its effects are consistently strong across industries and team types.

Second, transactional leadership retains practical value in project management, particularly for tasks that are well-defined, time-bound, and easily monitored — characteristics common in the execution phase of many projects. However, because it relies on external reward rather than internal meaning, its motivational effect is more limited and less durable than transformational leadership (Chaudhry, 2012; Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Third, laissez-faire leadership is the clearest negative case in the literature. The absence of guidance, feedback, and decision-making creates ambiguity that undermines both motivation and coordination, which are especially costly in projects with fixed deadlines and interdependent tasks (Turner & Müller, 2005).

Fourth, servant and situational leadership add important nuance: servant leadership supports motivation through trust and empowerment (Greenleaf, 1977; Northouse, 2021), while situational leadership highlights that the 'best' style is contingent on team maturity, task structure, and project phase (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; Müller & Turner, 2007). This suggests that project managers who can diagnose their team's needs and flexibly apply transformational, servant, or transactional behaviors as appropriate are likely to outperform those who rely on a single fixed style.

Finally, the growing prevalence of virtual project teams strengthens rather than weakens the case for transformational leadership, since a clear and inspiring vision appears to substitute effectively for the informal cues lost in remote collaboration (Purvanova & Bono, 2009).

Practical Implications for Project Managers

Based on the synthesized evidence, several practical recommendations emerge for project managers and the organizations that develop them.

First, project managers should articulate a clear, compelling project vision at kickoff and repeatedly connect individual tasks back to that larger purpose, consistent with transformational leadership behaviors documented by Bass and Avolio (1994) and Podsakoff et al. (1990). Second, they should combine this vision-setting with transactional elements — clearly defined deliverables, deadlines, and contingent recognition — particularly for well-defined technical tasks where transactional mechanisms have been shown to be effective (Chaudhry, 2012).

Third, leaders should actively avoid laissez-faire tendencies such as delayed decisions, withheld feedback, or avoidance of conflict resolution, particularly during high-pressure project phases when the cost of inaction is highest (Turner & Müller, 2005). Fourth, where possible, organizations should invest in leadership development programs that build project managers' capacity to diagnose team maturity, task structure, and project phase, and to flexibly adjust their style accordingly, as recommended by situational leadership theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; Müller & Turner, 2007).

Fifth, project managers should pay particular attention to individualized consideration for team members occupying strategically central roles, since leadership behavior directed at these roles appears to have disproportionate leverage on overall team performance (Humphrey et al., 2009). Sixth, in distributed or virtual project teams, deliberate and structured investment in vision communication and individualized feedback is especially important given the amplified effect of transformational leadership documented in virtual settings (Purvanova & Bono, 2009). Finally, project management offices (PMOs) should consider incorporating leadership style assessment and coaching into project manager selection and development processes, given the consistent evidence that leadership style is a measurable and trainable determinant of project performance rather than a fixed personal trait (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002).

Limitations of the Study

This paper is a narrative literature review and does not include new primary data collection, survey instruments, or statistical hypothesis testing; its conclusions rest on the strength and consistency of previously published empirical findings rather than original analysis. As with any review, the selection of sources, while guided by relevance and methodological rigor, involves an element of judgment regarding which studies to prioritize.

Most of the underlying studies used self-report or supervisor-report measures of performance, which can introduce common-method bias and may not always align with objective project metrics such as earned value or defect rates. In addition, cultural and industry context can moderate leadership effectiveness, and the reviewed literature is weighted toward Western, English-language organizational settings, which may limit generalizability to project environments in other cultural or regulatory contexts. Finally, most cited studies examine leadership style as measured at a single point in time, whereas real project leadership often evolves across the

project life cycle; longitudinal evidence on this evolution remains comparatively limited.

Directions for Future Research

Future research would benefit from primary, project-specific data collection that tracks leadership style and team motivation longitudinally across the full project life cycle, from initiation through closeout, rather than relying on cross-sectional snapshots. Comparative studies across industries — for example, construction versus software versus research and development projects — would help clarify how strongly industry context moderates the relative effectiveness of transformational, transactional, and servant leadership. Further work is also needed on culturally diverse and multinational project teams, where the cultural moderators discussed in Section 2.8 remain underexplored relative to single-culture studies. Finally, as hybrid and fully virtual project delivery becomes more common, additional field research building on Purvanova and Bono's (2009) findings would help project organizations calibrate leadership development programs for distributed teams specifically.

Conclusion

This paper examined how transformational, transactional, laissez-faire, servant, and situational leadership styles affect project team motivation and performance. The evidence reviewed consistently shows that transformational leadership has the strongest and most reliable positive effect on both motivation and performance, servant and situational approaches offer valuable complementary strengths, transactional leadership remains useful for structured tasks, and laissez-faire leadership is reliably associated with weaker outcomes. Project managers who combine a clear, inspiring vision with individualized support and contingency-based adaptation to their team's needs are best positioned to sustain motivation and deliver successful project outcomes. Future research should test these relationships with primary data collected specifically from project-based organizations, across diverse industries and cultural contexts, to further validate the contingency effects identified in this review.

References

- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421–449. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621>
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(5), 554–571. <https://doi.org/10.2307/30040649>
- Braun, S., Peus, C., Weisweiler, S., & Frey, D. (2013). Transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and team performance: A multilevel mediation model of trust. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 270–283.

Online ISSN

3007-3197

Print ISSN

3007-3189

<http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.11.006>

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Chaudhry, A. Q. (2012). Impact of transactional and laissez faire leadership style on motivation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(7), 258–264.

Dulaimi, M., & Hartmann, A. (2006). The role of organisational culture in motivating innovative behaviour in construction firms. *Construction Innovation*, 6(3), 159–172. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14714170610710686>

Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 735–744. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3069307>

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant Leadership*. New York: Paulist Press.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250–279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(76\)90016-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(76)90016-7)

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

House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(3), 321–339. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391905>

Humphrey, S. E., Morgeson, F. P., & Mannor, M. J. (2009). Developing a theory of the strategic core of teams: A role composition model of team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 48–61. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012997>

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 755–768. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755>

Jung, D. I., & Sosik, J. J. (2002). Transformational leadership in work groups: The role of empowerment, cohesiveness, and collective-efficacy on perceived group performance. *Small Group Research*, 33(3), 313–336. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10496402033003002>

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(1), 36–51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.1.36>

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57(9), 705–717. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.9.705>

Müller, R., & Turner, R. (2007). Matching the project manager's leadership style to project type. *International Journal of Project Management*, 25(1), 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2006.04.003>

Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (9th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259–298.

Online ISSN

3007-3197

Print ISSN

3007-3189

<http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about>

<https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639602200204>

- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843\(90\)90009-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7)
- Purvanova, R. K., & Bono, J. E. (2009). Transformational leadership in context: Face-to-face and virtual teams. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(3), 343–357. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.03.004>
- Sunindijo, R. Y. (2015). Project manager skills for improving project performance. *International Journal of Business Performance Management*, 16(1), 67–83. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBPM.2015.066041>
- Turner, J. R., & Müller, R. (2005). The project manager's leadership style as a success factor on projects: A literature review. *Project Management Journal*, 36(2), 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875697280503600206>
- Walumbwa, F. O., & Hartnell, C. A. (2011). Understanding transformational leadership–employee performance links: The role of relational identification and self-efficacy. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84(1), 153–172. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317910X485818>
- Wang, G., Oh, I.-S., Courtright, S. H., & Colbert, A. E. (2011). Transformational leadership and performance across criteria and levels: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of research. *Group & Organization Management*, 36(2), 223–270. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10596011111401017>
- Wang, X.-H. F., & Howell, J. M. (2012). A multilevel study of transformational leadership, identification, and follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(5), 775–790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.02.001>
- Yukl, G. (2012). *Leadership in Organizations* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Zhang, S., Chen, G., Chen, X.-P., Liu, D., & Johnson, M. D. (2014). Relational versus collective identification within workgroups: Conceptualization, measurement development, and nomological network building. *Journal of Management*, 40(6), 1700–1731. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312439421>