Reality Check: Is Your Behaviour Aligned With Organizational Goals? Article Reviews

Posted on January 14, 2020

Introduction

Arthur Lazarus's 2004 article "Reality Check: Is Your Behavior Aligned with Organizational Goals?" addresses a recurring challenge in healthcare leadership: physicians promoted into executive positions may possess excellent clinical knowledge but still struggle to lead organizations because management requires different habits, relationships, and measures of success. The original review correctly identifies organizational behavior, interpersonal skill, customer orientation, employee engagement, and alignment between personal and institutional goals as central themes. It can be strengthened by examining the article as an argument rather than simply repeating its advice. Lazarus writes for physician executives and uses a direct, corrective tone. His principal claim is that leadership credibility depends on behavior consistent with the organization's mission, not merely on clinical reputation or formal authority. The article remains relevant, although contemporary healthcare leadership requires broader attention to patient partnership, psychological safety, equity, team-based care, burnout, and the risk of demanding "alignment" in ways that suppress legitimate dissent. (Lazarus, 2004)

Article Context and Purpose

The article appeared in *Physician Executive* during a period when healthcare organizations were expanding formal physician-leadership roles. Hospitals, medical groups, insurers, and integrated systems needed executives who could interpret clinical practice while managing finance, quality, operations, and relationships. Many physicians entered these roles after years of education emphasizing individual expertise and autonomous decision-making. Lazarus's purpose is to provide a reality check: executive work is not an extension of clinical prestige. A physician leader succeeds by accomplishing goals through other people, understanding stakeholders, and modeling the behavior expected across the organization. The article is therefore practical and normative rather than an empirical research study. It offers professional counsel based on organizational experience.

The Central Thesis

Lazarus's argument can be summarized in one proposition: a leader's daily conduct must support the institution's stated goals, or the leader will weaken the very performance they are expected to improve. Alignment includes communication, collaboration, customer attention, operational discipline,

and willingness to learn management. A physician executive who speaks about teamwork but treats administrators contemptuously creates misalignment. A leader who demands quality while rewarding only volume produces the same problem. The article's strength is that it moves strategy away from abstract plans and toward observable conduct. Organizational goals become credible only when decisions, incentives, and interactions embody them.

Organizational Behavior as the Analytical Lens

Organizational behavior studies how individuals and groups act within institutions and how structure, leadership, culture, power, motivation, and communication shape outcomes. Lazarus uses the concept broadly to explain why technical expertise alone does not guarantee executive effectiveness. In healthcare, organizational behavior is especially important because work is interdependent. A physician cannot deliver safe care without nurses, pharmacists, technicians, administrators, information systems, facilities, and patients. Leadership behavior affects whether those groups share information, report errors, coordinate transitions, and trust one another. The article appropriately directs physician leaders to examine their own contribution to the environment rather than assuming that resistance comes only from difficult employees. (Schein, 2017)

From Expert Performer to Leader Through Others

Clinical training often rewards individual knowledge, decisive judgment, and personal responsibility for a patient. Executive leadership requires influence across systems where the leader does not perform every task directly. Lazarus emphasizes the classic management principle of accomplishing work with and through others. This transition can be psychologically difficult because a respected physician may be accustomed to being the final technical authority. In an executive role, expertise remains valuable but must be translated into delegation, coaching, negotiation, and institutional design. The leader's success is increasingly measured by the capability of teams and systems, not by the leader's own ability to solve each case. (Shanafelt & Noseworthy, 2017)

Interpersonal Skill

The article correctly identifies interpersonal skill as essential. Physician executives communicate with clinicians, employees, boards, vendors, regulators, patients, and community partners who have different knowledge and interests. Strong interpersonal skill includes listening, conflict management, clarity, emotional regulation, and the ability to explain difficult decisions without humiliation. It does not mean being agreeable in every conversation. Leaders must sometimes deny requests, enforce standards, or remove people from roles. The quality of the interaction is judged by fairness, evidence, respect, and consistency. A leader who relies on rank or intellectual superiority may achieve compliance briefly while reducing the willingness of others to share uncomfortable information.

Customer Orientation in Healthcare

Lazarus encourages physician executives to recognize both internal and external customers. The term can be useful because departments depend on one another and patients experience the result of those relationships. However, healthcare should not reduce patients to ordinary consumers. Patients may be ill, frightened, unable to compare options, or dependent on emergency care. Their rights and needs cannot be understood only through market satisfaction. A contemporary interpretation should combine customer responsiveness with patient-centered care, safety, informed consent, access, and shared decision-making. Internal service also matters: a laboratory, pharmacy, or information-technology team should understand how delays affect clinicians and patients, while clinical departments should communicate requirements clearly rather than treating support functions as invisible.

Personal Goals and Organizational Goals

The article asks physician executives to examine whether their personal ambitions support or compete with the institution’s direction. A leader may seek reputation, publication, income, influence, or control while the organization prioritizes safety, access, or financial stability. Misalignment becomes dangerous when personal goals drive selective data, favored projects, or resistance to collaboration. Complete uniformity is neither possible nor desirable. Organizations benefit from leaders who question flawed strategy. The ethical standard is transparency: executives should disclose conflicts, distinguish personal preference from institutional need, and use formal processes to challenge decisions. “Alignment” should refer to commitment to mission and accountable procedure, not unquestioning obedience to senior authority.

Motivation and Reward

The original review summarizes Lazarus as recommending punishment and reward systems. That phrasing needs refinement. Motivation is shaped by compensation, recognition, autonomy, competence, fairness, meaning, workload, and belonging. Punitive management may produce concealment rather than improvement, especially in safety-critical healthcare. Leaders should align incentives with desired outcomes while avoiding narrow measures that encourage gaming. If clinicians are rewarded only for volume, time spent on coordination or education may decline. If quality metrics are imposed without adjustment for patient complexity, teams may avoid high-risk patients. Effective motivation requires a balanced system and opportunities for employees to influence how performance is measured.

Operational Excellence

Lazarus connects leadership behavior with execution. Operational excellence involves reliable processes, clear responsibilities, timely decisions, and learning from variation. A physician executive may possess an inspiring vision yet fail if meetings produce no accountable actions or if problems are revisited without resolution. Conversely, efficiency without mission can produce fast but harmful care. The leader must connect operational measures with clinical purpose. Wait time, discharge delay, medication reconciliation, staff turnover, and patient complaints are not merely administrative numbers; they describe how the system affects people. Operational discipline becomes ethical when it reduces avoidable harm and waste.

Communication Through Presentations and Publications

The article encourages physician leaders to communicate through presentations, publications, and other visible channels. Communication helps create shared understanding, but broadcast is not the same as engagement. Leaders should explain the evidence, assumptions, tradeoffs, and expected actions behind strategy. They also need mechanisms through which employees can question or correct the message. Repeated slogans about excellence may become cynical when staffing and incentives contradict them. Credible communication is specific and linked with resource decisions. A leader who admits uncertainty and reports what changed after feedback demonstrates stronger alignment than one who delivers polished statements without follow-through.

Leadership Identity

Lazarus urges physician executives to recognize themselves as leaders rather than remain primarily clinicians with administrative titles. This identity shift can help because executive decisions require sustained attention to culture, finance, people, and systems. The risk is abandoning clinical humility or overidentifying with corporate status. Physician leaders retain a special obligation to patient welfare and professional ethics even when organizational pressures emphasize revenue or growth. The strongest identity integrates clinical understanding with management competence. It allows the executive to translate between professions without claiming that medical credentials provide automatic expertise in every organizational domain.

Employee Engagement

Employee engagement is more than enthusiasm or willingness to work extra hours. It concerns whether people understand the purpose of their work, have resources, experience fairness, receive

useful feedback, and believe they can influence improvement. Lazarus appropriately places engagement on the executive agenda because disengaged staff may comply minimally, withhold ideas, or leave. Contemporary healthcare adds the problem of burnout. Leaders should not describe exhaustion as lack of commitment when staffing, administrative burden, violence, or moral distress drive it. Alignment requires the organization to examine whether its demands are consistent with its stated concern for employee wellbeing.

Psychological Safety

Although the article predates much of the current management discussion of psychological safety, the concept strengthens its argument. Teams perform more reliably when members can report mistakes, ask questions, and challenge assumptions without fear of humiliation or retaliation. Physician executives influence this climate through responses to bad news. A leader who punishes the messenger teaches employees to hide risk. A leader who treats every error as blameless may also fail to maintain accountability. A just culture distinguishes human error, risky choices, and reckless behavior while examining system conditions. Such a culture aligns behavior with the goal of patient safety more effectively than generalized calls for loyalty.

Power and Professional Hierarchy

Lazarus's focus on physician executives is important because medicine carries status that can amplify a leader's behavior. Interrupting a nurse, dismissing an administrator, or bypassing a policy may be imitated or tolerated because of professional hierarchy. Physician leaders need awareness of how others experience their authority. Inviting input is not enough if dissent has previously produced retaliation. Meeting structure, decision rights, speaking order, and follow-up can distribute voice more fairly. The article's advice about affinity for people should therefore be interpreted as disciplined respect for expertise across roles, not simply personal sociability.

Ethics of Organizational Alignment

Organizational goals are not automatically ethical. A hospital may pursue market growth that weakens access for underserved communities or set financial targets that encourage unsafe workload. Leaders should align behavior with mission, law, evidence, and professional duties, while challenging goals that create harm. This qualification is essential because historical organizational-behavior literature sometimes treats effectiveness as the highest value. Healthcare executives are responsible for how goals are chosen as well as how efficiently they are achieved. Ethical alignment includes truthfulness in data, protection of patients, equitable treatment, and willingness to state when an organizational objective conflicts with care.

Evidence and Limitations of the Article

Lazarus writes persuasively from professional experience, but the article does not present a research design, systematic sample, or measured outcomes. Its claims should therefore be read as informed leadership guidance rather than proof that one behavior causes a specified performance result. The article also centers the individual executive, which may understate structural constraints such as reimbursement, regulation, labor shortage, governance, information systems, and organizational history. A leader's behavior matters greatly, but even excellent interpersonal skill cannot compensate indefinitely for inadequate resources or contradictory strategy. The review should appreciate the article's practical clarity while recognizing the limits of an executive self-improvement model.

Contemporary Relevance

The article remains relevant because healthcare organizations continue to promote clinicians into leadership roles and because credibility still depends on consistency between words and actions. Contemporary leaders face additional conditions: digital transformation, value-based payment, cybersecurity, public-health emergencies, workforce distress, consolidation, and stronger expectations for equity and transparency. These challenges make cross-functional collaboration even more important. A physician executive cannot rely on an old division between clinical and business concerns; technology, finance, access, quality, and patient experience are interdependent. Lazarus's reality check should therefore be expanded from "learn management" to "build systems in which expertise, voice, and accountability are integrated."

A Practical Alignment Audit

A physician executive can evaluate alignment through a set of observable questions. Do calendar and budget allocations reflect stated priorities? Are quality concerns escalated even when they threaten a favored project? Do meetings invite input from people closest to the work? Are performance measures balanced across finance, safety, access, workforce, and patient experience? Does the leader follow policies expected of others? Are conflicts of interest disclosed? Do employees receive reasons and appeal routes for decisions? Is feedback followed by visible action? This audit moves alignment from personality to evidence. It also reveals when organizational systems, rather than one leader's intentions, send conflicting signals.

Recommendations for Physician Executives

First, leaders should obtain formal management education rather than assume clinical excellence transfers automatically. Second, they should seek multisource feedback from colleagues, employees, patients, and supervisors. Third, organizational goals should be translated into a limited number of

behavioral expectations and measures. Fourth, leaders should create psychological safety while maintaining fair accountability. Fifth, incentive systems should be reviewed for unintended effects. Sixth, patient and employee perspectives should be included before major decisions. Finally, executives should examine their own use of power and disclose when personal ambition or professional loyalty may affect judgment. These practices operationalize Lazarus's central idea without reducing leadership to charisma.

Conclusion

"Reality Check: Is Your Behavior Aligned with Organizational Goals?" offers a valuable warning to physician executives who assume that medical expertise and title are sufficient for leadership. Lazarus correctly emphasizes interpersonal skill, customer awareness, employee engagement, communication, management knowledge, and the ability to achieve results through others. The article's most durable insight is that strategy is revealed through conduct: leaders teach the real priorities of an organization by what they reward, tolerate, fund, and model. A contemporary review must add important qualifications. Patients are more than customers, alignment should not suppress ethical dissent, punishment can damage safety, and individual behavior operates within structural constraints. Physician executives succeed when they integrate clinical values with management competence, create conditions for honest communication, and ensure that organizational goals are themselves worthy of the behavior required to achieve them. (Lazarus, 2004)

References

Edmondson, A. C. (2019). *The fearless organization*. Wiley.

Lazarus, A. (2004). Reality check: Is your behavior aligned with organizational goals? *Physician Executive, 30*(5), 50–52.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2019). *Taking action against clinician burnout*. National Academies Press.

Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2017). *Organizational culture and leadership* (5th ed.). Wiley.

Shanafelt, T. D., & Noseworthy, J. H. (2017). Executive leadership and physician well-being. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings, 92*(1), 129–146.