

ISSN: 2577 - 8005

Medical & Clinical Research

The Situational Physician: Adaptive Leadership Styles in Clinical Practice

Julian Ungar-Sargon, MD, PhD*

Borra College of Health Science, Dominican University IL, United States

*Corresponding Author

Julian Ungar-Sargon, Borra College of Health Science, Dominican University IL, United States.

Submitted: 22 May 2025; Accepted: 02 Jun 2025; Published: 14 Jun 2025

Citation: Ungar-Sargon, J. (2025). The Situational Physician: Adaptive Leadership Styles in Clinical Practice. *Med Clin Res, 10*(6), 01-09.

Abstract

Background: The clinical encounter inherently positions physicians as leaders, yet leadership dynamics within physicianpatient relationships remain undertheorized and undertaught in medical education. This article examines how the principles of situational leadership theory can enhance clinical practice across diverse patient scenarios and healthcare contexts.

Methods: This discursive analysis integrates Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory with contemporary scholarship on physician-patient relationships, utilizing evidence from medical ethics literature, clinical communication studies, and a formal leadership self-assessment tool (AUXLAMS). AUXLAMS stands for Auxiliary Leadership and Management School. It is a formal training program developed by the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary to provide leadership development and management training for Auxiliarists—volunteer members who support the U.S. Coast Guard in non-military roles. The model is evaluated through application to representative clinical scenarios across the continuum of care.

Results: Four distinct leadership styles—directing, coaching, supporting, and delegating—align with varying levels of patient health literacy, decision-making capacity, emotional readiness, and clinical complexity. Strategic deployment of these styles correlates with improved clinical outcomes, patient satisfaction, and physician resilience. Failure to adapt leadership approaches to patient needs may constitute both clinical and ethical shortcomings.

Conclusions: The "situational physician" model offers a pragmatic framework for medical education and clinical practice that balances technical expertise with relational intelligence. Physicians who consciously modulate their leadership styles to match patient needs and contextual demands can enhance therapeutic alliance, promote patient autonomy, and improve outcomes. Medical curricula should explicitly incorporate adaptive leadership training to prepare clinicians for the complex interpersonal demands of contemporary healthcare.

Keywords: Situational leadership, Physician-patient relationship, Medical education, Clinical ethics, Adaptive communication, Patient autonomy, Professional development, Healthcare team dynamics

1. The Physician as an Unacknowledged Leader

While medical training rigorously develops diagnostic reasoning and technical competence, the leadership dimension of clinical practice often remains implicit and unexamined [1]. The physicianpatient relationship is fundamentally characterized by asymmetries of knowledge, power, and vulnerability that demand sophisticated leadership capabilities [2]. As Pellegrino observed, "To be a healer is, of necessity, to stand in a special relationship of inequality" [3]. This inequality creates an inherent leadership dynamic that physicians navigate, often without formal training or conscious reflection. Contemporary healthcare faces increasing complexity: aging populations with multimorbidity, fragmented care delivery systems, information asymmetry diminished by internet access, and evolving patient expectations around shared decision-making [4]. These challenges demand physicians who can adapt their relational styles to diverse patient needs and contexts. Katz and Alegre note that "the modern clinician must be able to pivot between authoritative expert and collaborative partner, often within the same clinical encounter" [5].

The limitations of static models of the physician-patient

relationship have been well-documented. Emanuel and Emanuel's influential taxonomy of paternalistic, informative, interpretive, and deliberative models provided useful ethical grounding but offered limited practical guidance for navigating the dynamic nature of clinical encounters [6]. As Cassell argues, "The physician's role changes not merely between patients but within the trajectory of care for any single patient" [7].

This paper proposes that Situational Leadership Theory (SLT), developed by Hersey and Blanchard, offers a valuable framework for conceptualizing and operationalizing adaptive physician behavior across clinical contexts [8]. Unlike fixed relationship models, SLT emphasizes the need for leaders to modulate their approach based on follower readiness and task complexity—a flexibility particularly suited to the variable demands of patient care.

Drawing on insights from a formal leadership assessment (AUXLAMS) and integrating literature from medical ethics, communication studies, and clinical psychology, this paper introduces the concept of the "situational physician" as an adaptive leader who consciously shifts between directing, coaching, supporting, and delegating styles based on patient needs and clinical circumstances.

2. Origins and Core Principles

Situational Leadership Theory emerged from Hersey and Blanchard's work in the late 1960s as a response to the limitations of one-dimensional leadership models [8]. The theory posits that effective leadership is contingent upon matching one's style to the "readiness" of followers—defined as their ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task. This readiness exists on a continuum from low to high, requiring corresponding adjustments in leadership behavior [9].

The model identifies four leadership styles characterized by varying combinations of task behavior (directive) and relationship behavior (supportive):

- 1. Directing (S1): High directive/low supportive behavior
- 2. Coaching (S2): High directive/high supportive behavior
- 3. Supporting (S3): Low directive/high supportive behavior
- 4. Delegating (S4): Low directive/low supportive behavior

Each style correlates with a corresponding level of follower readiness:

- 1. R1: Unable and unwilling or insecure
- 2. R2: Unable but willing or confident
- 3. R3: Able but unwilling or insecure
- 4. R4: Able and willing or confident

While originally developed for organizational management, SLT has demonstrated applicability across diverse sectors including education, military training, and volunteer organizations [10,11]. Its emphasis on adaptability rather than fixed traits aligns with contemporary understanding of effective leadership as contextual

rather than universal [12].

3. Adapting SLT to Clinical Medicine

In clinical contexts, the "task" encompasses health literacy, decision-making capacity, treatment adherence, and selfmanagement behaviors. "Readiness" includes not only cognitive understanding and technical ability but also emotional preparedness and motivational state. The physician must assess these dimensions and respond accordingly [13].

Northouse's comprehensive review of leadership theories noted that SLT's strength lies in its prescriptive value and practical applicability [14]. These qualities are particularly relevant to clinical medicine, where physicians must make rapid assessments and adjustments in communication approaches. Thompson and Vecchio's empirical testing of SLT across organizations found strongest support for the theory's core premise—that leadership effectiveness depends on matching style to follower development level [15].

Critics of SLT have noted its limited empirical validation in some contexts and potential oversimplification of complex interpersonal dynamics [16]. However, in medicine, where clear frameworks for adaptive communication are needed, its pragmatic orientation offers particular utility. As Roter and Hall note, "The physician who possesses only one communication style is perpetually mismatched to many clinical situations" [17].

The application of SLT to medicine builds upon previous work examining contingency models in clinical communication. Street's ecological model of medical communication [18] and Makoul's essential elements of communication in medical encounters both recognize contextual factors that should influence physician approach, but neither offers specific guidance on how to modulate leadership behavior in response [19].

4. Physician Leadership Self-Assessment

The U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary Leadership and Management School (AUXLAMS) employs a validated 16-scenario assessment tool to evaluate leadership adaptability across Hersey and Blanchard's four styles [20]. Scenarios present leadership challenges requiring the respondent to select from four possible responses, each representing a distinct leadership style. Scores indicate both style preference and adaptability across contexts.

In a self-assessment using this instrument, I identified a strong preference for coaching (S2) and supporting (S3) styles, with moderate facility in delegating (S4) and lowest comfort with directing (S1). This pattern aligns with the relationship-centered care approach emphasized in contemporary medical education but highlights potential deficiencies in scenarios requiring decisive action [21].

Buck's analysis of physician leadership assessments reveals common patterns: surgeons and emergency physicians typically

score higher on directing (S1) styles, while primary care physicians and psychiatrists often demonstrate strengths in supporting (S3) approaches [22]. These patterns reflect both selection bias and professional socialization but may limit effectiveness across the full spectrum of clinical scenarios.

Grashow and colleagues' study of leadership adaptability among resident physicians found that those with greater stylistic range reported less burnout and higher patient satisfaction scores [23]. This finding suggests that leadership flexibility serves both physician wellbeing and patient experience—a critical consideration given current concerns about physician burnout and its impact on care quality.

The self-assessment process itself promotes metacognition about leadership behavior—a quality Schön identified as essential to reflective practice [24]. As Flavell noted, awareness of one's cognitive and communicative patterns is prerequisite to intentional adaptation [25]. For physicians, developing this metacognitive awareness through instruments like AUXLAMS may enhance professional development and clinical effectiveness. Her is my score:



4.1 Interpretation:

Dominant Style: Coaching/Supporting – You excel at motivating others, fostering collaboration, and nurturing competence through trust and communication.

Growth Area: Directing (LS1) – You may underutilize directive leadership, even in cases where structure and clarity are required for new or uncertain members.

Delegating (LS4) is also well-developed (score of 40), indicating strong confidence in capable teams.

The Four distinct leadership styles—directing, coaching, supporting, and delegating—align with varying levels of patient health literacy, decision-making capacity, emotional readiness, and clinical complexity. For instance, a directing style may be appropriate when working with patients who have low health literacy or are in acute distress, requiring clear, step-by-step

instructions. In contrast, a coaching style is effective for individuals with moderate literacy and developing decision-making skills such as a patient managing a new chronic condition who needs both guidance and encouragement to build self-efficacy. The supporting style works well for patients with high emotional readiness but who may still seek reassurance in complex decisions. Finally, delegating suits those with high literacy, stable conditions, and strong self-management capacities."

AuxLMS and Other Testing/Learning Sites



4.2 Contextual Note on AUXLAMS

This framework draws inspiration from the Auxiliary Leadership and Management School (AUXLAMS), a professional development program within the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary. AUXLAMS is designed to cultivate leadership through situational awareness and adaptive strategy. It assesses leadership readiness across task-oriented and relationship-oriented domains and is grounded in validated instructional models, including Situational Leadership Theory by Hersey and Blanchard. While primarily used for maritime volunteer leadership, its conceptual tools translate effectively into healthcare settings where adaptability and person-centered communication are keys.

5. Clinical Correlates

5.1Directing (S1): Acute and Emergent Care

The directing style—characterized by clear instruction, minimal explanation, and decisive action—is essential in time-sensitive, high-acuity situations. In trauma resuscitation, cardiac arrest management, and other emergent scenarios, patients typically lack both the capacity and opportunity for participatory decision-making [26].

Cole-Kelly and colleagues found that emergency physicians who effectively employed directive communication during critical interventions achieved faster time-to-treatment metrics and improved team coordination [27]. However, this style becomes problematic when extended beyond its appropriate context. Levinson's landmark study of malpractice claims identified overly directive communication in non-emergent settings as a risk factor for litigation [28]. The ethical principle of beneficence justifies directive leadership during true emergencies under implied consent, but prolonged use of this style without transition to more collaborative approaches may constitute medical paternalism [29]. As the patient stabilizes, the skillful physician begins to incorporate greater relationship behavior and reduced directive behavior—a transition that requires situational awareness and communicative flexibility.

Lammers and Hobbs found that novice physicians often struggle with this transition, maintaining directive styles beyond their clinical necessity due to insecurity or habit [30]. This finding underscores the need for explicit training in recognizing contextual cues that signal when leadership style adjustments are appropriate.

5.2 Coaching (S2): Chronic Disease Management and Health Behavior Change

The coaching style combines strong direction with high supportive behavior—an approach particularly suited to chronic disease management where both technical guidance and motivational support are essential [31]. This style operationalizes the concept of "physician as teacher" articulated by Hippocrates while acknowledging the emotional dimensions of health behavior change.

A coaching approach is especially valuable when patients face complex self-management demands but lack complete understanding or confidence. Bodenheimer's studies of diabetes self-management found that physicians who combined structured education with supportive relationship-building achieved significantly better glycemic control than those employing either approach alone [32].

The coaching style aligns with contemporary motivational interviewing techniques that balance directiveness about outcomes with patient autonomy regarding methods [33]. Miller and Rollnick's extensive work demonstrates that this balanced approach enhances treatment adherence across behavioral health contexts [34]. Similarly, Thom's randomized controlled trial of health coaching in primary care showed significant improvements in medication adherence and patient activation measures [35].

Critics like de Zulueta caution that coaching approaches may still perpetuate power imbalances if they presume the physician's goals should automatically become the patient's goals [36]. This critique highlights the need for coaching physicians to remain attentive to patient priorities and values—aspects addressed more fully in supporting leadership styles.

5.3 Supporting (S3): End-of-Life Care and Emotional Complexity

The supporting leadership style—characterized by high relationship behavior and low directive behavior—proves particularly valuable in scenarios where patients possess adequate information but struggle with emotional readiness or confidence in decisionmaking [37]. End-of-life care, fertility treatment decisions, and

genetic testing contexts often call for this approach.

Back and colleagues' work on communication in oncology demonstrates that patients facing life-limiting illness frequently need emotional processing space more than additional medical information [38]. The supporting physician provides presence and validation while empowering patient agency. Quill's influential work on non-abandonment emphasizes this supportive presence as an ethical imperative in situations of medical uncertainty and existential distress [39].

Empirical evidence supports the efficacy of supportive leadership in complex emotional contexts. Tulsky's study of palliative care conversations found that physicians who employed primarily supportive communication behaviors elicited more patient values and preferences than those using information-dominant approaches [40]. Similarly, Roter's analysis of genetic counseling sessions demonstrated that supportive rather than directive counseling led to higher patient comprehension and satisfaction [41].

The supporting style requires emotional intelligence and comfort with silence—qualities that Curtis and colleagues found to be underdeveloped in medical training [42]. Their work suggests that physicians often default to information-giving (coaching) or decision-making (directing) when confronted with patient distress, potentially missing opportunities for deeper connection and understanding.

5.4 Delegating (S4): Patient-Led Care and Chronic Illness Self-Management

The delegating style—involving minimal directive and supportive behavior—serves patients with high readiness: those who possess both the ability and willingness to manage their health independently [43]. This approach recognizes patient expertise and autonomy, particularly relevant in chronic illness management and patient-led care movements.

Delegating leadership can be appropriate for "expert patients" who have developed sophisticated understanding of their conditions. Tattersall's research on long-term survivors of chronic illness found that physician willingness to adopt a consultative rather than directive role correlated with patient self-efficacy and reduced healthcare utilization [44]. For patients with extensive experience managing conditions like type 1 diabetes, cystic fibrosis, or rheumatoid arthritis, overcommunication of basic information may be perceived as patronizing and inefficient [45].

The movement toward patient-centered medical homes has formalized aspects of delegating leadership through structured self-management support and shared care planning [46]. Hibbard's Patient Activation Measure provides a validated tool for assessing readiness for this leadership style, allowing for evidence-based decisions about when delegation is appropriate [47].

However, delegation carries risks when misapplied. Greenfield's

study of vulnerable populations found that premature delegation disproportionately disadvantaged patients with limited health literacy or cultural barriers to assertiveness [48]. This finding highlights the ethical dimension of leadership style selection physicians must assess not only clinical but also social determinants of health when determining appropriate levels of directive behavior.

5.5 Leadership Failures as Moral Failures

The selection of inappropriate leadership styles can constitute ethical as well as clinical failures. Berry and colleagues' analysis of medical error found that communication mismatches between physician style and patient needs contributed to adverse events in 21% of cases studied [49]. These mismatches often represented ethical lapses in respecting autonomy, ensuring justice, or fulfilling beneficence.

Beauchamp and Childress's four principles of biomedical ethics provide a useful framework for evaluating leadership styles in ethical terms [50]:

Autonomy: Overly directive styles may violate autonomy when used with capable patients, while excessively delegative approaches may abandon patients who require guidance.

Beneficence: Failure to adapt leadership style to patient needs may constitute a failure to act in the patient's best interest.

Non-maleficence: Inappropriate leadership styles can cause harm through miscommunication, distress, or decision regret.

Justice: Blanket application of any single leadership style across all patients fails to account for differing needs and capabilities—a potential injustice in care delivery.

Brody's concept of "transparent" vs. "opaque" power in medicine offers another ethical lens. Physicians who remain unaware of their leadership styles exercise opaque power, which limits patient agency [51]. Those who consciously select and communicate about their approach exercise transparent power that can be ethically negotiated within the relationship.

The ethical dimension extends to physician well-being as well. Shanafelt's research on physician burnout identified "compassion fatigue" as prevalent among physicians who consistently employ high-relationship leadership styles without appropriate boundaries [52]. This finding aligns with Figley's seminal work on the costs of caring, suggesting that situational flexibility may protect physician sustainability as well as patient interests [53].

5.6 The Situational Physician in Interprofessional Teams

Physicians function not only as leaders of patient care but as members and leaders of interprofessional teams—contexts that require additional leadership adaptability [54]. The situational physician must adjust leadership styles based on team composition,

clinical urgency, and institutional culture.

Lingard's ethnographic studies of operating room teams revealed that surgical success depended not only on technical skill but on the surgeon's ability to modulate leadership behavior based on team experience and case complexity [55]. Similarly, Weller's simulation research demonstrated that resuscitation team performance improved when team leaders adapted their style to member experience levels [56].

Interprofessional education increasingly recognizes leadership flexibility as a core competency. The IPEC Collaborative Practice Competencies specifically identify the need for health professionals to "choose effective communication tools and techniques, including information systems and communication technologies, to facilitate discussions and interactions that enhance team function" [57]. This competency directly parallels the situational leadership principle of adapting communication approach to context.

The challenge of leadership adaptation intensifies in teaching hospitals where physicians simultaneously manage patient care and trainee development. Stickley and Freshwater have termed this "parallel process leadership"—the need to simultaneously address patient readiness and learner readiness through nested applications of situational leadership principles [58].

5.7 Training Adaptive Leadership in Medical Education

Despite its importance, leadership adaptability remains undertaught in medical education. A systematic review by Webb and colleagues found that only 12% of medical schools included explicit leadership training in their curricula, with even fewer addressing contextual adaptability [59]. This gap represents a significant opportunity for educational innovation.

Several promising approaches have emerged:

Simulation offers a controlled environment for practicing leadership style transitions. Gordon's pilot program using simulated patients with changing clinical scenarios demonstrated significantly improved leadership adaptability scores among participating residents [60]. Participants reported greater conscious awareness of their leadership behaviors and improved confidence in styleswitching during actual patient encounters.

Structured reflection through instruments like AUXLAMS, followed by targeted coaching, shows promise in developing leadership adaptability. Chen's longitudinal study of leadership coaching for medical faculty found that participants demonstrated greater range of leadership behaviors after a six-month intervention compared to controls [61].

Mahant and colleagues developed a case-based curriculum examining leadership challenges across the continuum of care [62]. Using standardized cases with decision points requiring different leadership approaches, the program improved participants' ability to identify appropriate leadership styles for specific clinical contexts.

Joint training sessions with nursing, pharmacy, and social work students provide opportunities to practice leadership adaptability across professional boundaries. Bridges' interprofessional leadership curriculum demonstrated improved team communication and role clarity through structured opportunities to practice different leadership styles [63].

Challenges to implementing leadership adaptability training include crowded curricula, faculty development needs, and assessment difficulties. Swing's work on competency assessment suggests that workplace-based observation with structured feedback may provide the most valid evaluation of leadership adaptability [64]. 6.Barriers and Limitations

While situational leadership offers a valuable framework for physician-patient interactions, several barriers and limitations warrant acknowledgment. First, time constraints in contemporary healthcare systems may discourage leadership style adjustments that require additional assessment or explanation [65]. West's time-motion studies found that physicians in high-volume settings defaulted to familiar communication patterns regardless of patient needs [66].

Second, cultural and linguistic differences between physicians and patients complicate readiness assessment and style selection. Betancourt's work on cross-cultural communication highlights how leadership behaviors may be interpreted differently across cultural contexts [67]. What constitutes appropriate "directive" behavior in one culture may appear offensive or inappropriate in another.

Third, the model assumes a dyadic relationship between physician and patient that may not fully capture the complexity of modern healthcare delivery involving multiple providers, family members, and digital health interfaces [68]. Patients increasingly receive care from teams rather than individuals, creating challenges for consistent leadership approach.

Finally, political and economic forces in healthcare delivery systems may incentivize particular leadership styles regardless of appropriateness. Fee-for-service payment models may discourage time-intensive coaching approaches, while quality metrics may overemphasize directive methods that achieve short-term adherence at the expense of patient agency [69].

Despite these limitations, the situational leadership model offers a practical framework for physicians seeking to improve adaptability. As Katz and Alegre note, "Awareness of these barriers does not diminish the value of the model but rather highlights the structural changes needed to support its implementation" [5].

7. Future Directions

The situational physician model suggests several promising research directions. First, validation studies could establish correlations between leadership style-matching and clinical outcomes across specialties and settings. Preliminary work by Thompson in primary care shows associations between leadership adaptability and medication adherence [70], but broader outcome measures across specialties would strengthen the evidence base.

Second, investigation of leadership style preferences among diverse patient populations could inform more culturally responsive applications of the model. Street's research suggests that leadership preferences vary significantly across demographic groups, information that could enhance the precision of style selection [71].

Third, integration of situational leadership principles with emerging technologies presents opportunities for innovation. Telemedicine platforms could incorporate leadership style assessment tools, while artificial intelligence applications might analyze linguistic patterns to suggest optimal approaches [72].

Implementation science offers frameworks for translating situational leadership into practice. Proctor's implementation outcomes taxonomy provides metrics for evaluating adoption, including acceptability, adoption, appropriateness, and feasibility— all relevant to introducing situational leadership models in clinical settings [73].

Ultimately, the situational physician model calls for a reconceptualization of clinical excellence that integrates technical proficiency with leadership adaptability. This integration aligns with Epstein's concept of mindful practice and Schön's reflective practitioner —ideals that emphasize metacognition and contextual responsiveness as core professional competencies [24, 74].

8. Conclusion

The physician-patient relationship has evolved from paternalistic authority to collaborative partnership, yet the leadership dimension of this relationship remains largely implicit. This paper has argued that conscious application of situational leadership principles can enhance clinical effectiveness, patient satisfaction, and physician sustainability.

The model of the "situational physician" reconceptualizes clinical excellence to include not only what physicians know and do, but how they adapt their leadership approach to patient needs and contextual demands. In doing so, it bridges the historical divide between relationship-centered and evidence-based approaches to medicine, recognizing that both technical proficiency and interpersonal adaptability are essential to healing.

As healthcare grows increasingly complex, team-based, and patient-centered, the ability to consciously shift between directing, coaching, supporting, and delegating styles becomes not merely advantageous but necessary. The physician who masters this adaptive capacity fulfills Osler's vision of medicine as "a science of uncertainty and an art of probability"—responding with both precision and wisdom to the unique needs of each clinical encounter [75].

References

- 1. Reinertsen, J. L. (1998). Physicians as leaders in the improvement of health care systems. Annals of Internal Medicine, 128(10), 833–838.
- Goold, S. D., & Lipkin, M. (1999). The doctor-patient relationship: Challenges, opportunities, and strategies. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 14(S1), S26–S33.
- Pellegrino, E. D. (1983). The healing relationship: The architectonics of clinical medicine. In E. E. Shelp (Ed.), The clinical encounter (pp. 153–172). D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- 4. Berwick, D. M. (2009). What 'patient-centered' should mean: Confessions of an extremist. Health Affairs, 28(4), w555– w565.
- Katz, J. N., & Alegre, M. (2021). The clinical encounter in transition: Physician leadership in the 21st century. Journal of Clinical Ethics, 32(1), 45–52.
- 6. Emanuel, E. J., & Emanuel, L. L. (1992). Four models of the physician-patient relationship. JAMA, 267(16), 2221–2226.
- 7. Cassell, E. J. (2013). The nature of healing: The modern practice of medicine. Oxford University Press.
- 8. Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life-cycle theory of leadership. Training and Development Journal, 23(2), 26–34.
- 9. Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources (4th ed.). Prentice-Hall.
- Johansen, B. (1990). Situational leadership: A review of the research. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 1(1), 73-85.
- 11. Heim, A. (2005). Strategic leadership type indicator. HRD Press.
- 12. Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. Harvard Business Review, 78(2), 78–90.
- Stewart, M. A. (1995). Effective physician-patient communication and health outcomes: A review. Canadian Medical Association Journal, 152(9), 1423–1433.
- 14. Northouse, P. G. (2019). Leadership: Theory and practice (8th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Thompson, G., & Vecchio, R. P. (2009). Situational leadership theory: A test of three versions. The Leadership Quarterly, 20(5), 837–848.
- Graeff, C. L. (1997). Evolution of situational leadership theory: A critical review. The Leadership Quarterly, 8(2), 153–170.
- 17. Roter, D. L., & Hall, J. A. (2006). Doctors talking with patients/ patients talking with doctors: Improving communication in medical visits (2nd ed.). Praeger.
- 18. Street, R. L., Jr. (1991). Information-giving in medical consultations: The influence of patients' communicative styles

and personal characteristics. Social Science & Medicine, 32(5), 541–548.

- Makoul, G. (2001). Essential elements of communication in medical encounters: The Kalamazoo consensus statement. Academic Medicine, 76(4), 390–393.
- Buck, T. M. (2012). Auxiliary Leadership and Management School (AUXLAMS): Leadership style assessment. U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary.
- Frankel, R. M., & Stein, T. (2001). Getting the most out of the clinical encounter: The four habits model. Journal of Medical Practice Management, 16(4), 184–191.
- 22. Buck, T. M. (2015). Leadership style correlations with medical specialty choice. Journal of Healthcare Leadership, 7, 33–40.
- Grashow, R., Kinder, K., & Brubaker, L. (2020). Leadership style adaptability and physician burnout: An analysis of resident physicians. Journal of Healthcare Leadership, 12, 97–106.
- 24. Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books.
- 25. Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. American Psychologist, 34(10), 906–911.
- Risser, D. T., Rice, M. M., Salisbury, M. L., Simon, R., Jay, G. D., & Berns, S. D. (1999). The potential for improved teamwork to reduce medical errors in the emergency department. Annals of Emergency Medicine, 34(3), 373–383.
- Cole-Kelly, K., Yanoshik, M. K., Campbell, J., & Flynn, S. P. (2021). Direct observation of emergency physician communication styles. Academic Emergency Medicine, 28(4), 428–437.
- Levinson, W., Roter, D. L., Mullooly, J. P., Dull, V. T., & Frankel, R. M. (1997). Physician–patient communication: The relationship with malpractice claims among primary care physicians and surgeons. JAMA, 277(7), 553–559.
- 29. Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019). Principles of biomedical ethics (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Lammers, R. L., & Hobbs, N. (2018). Physician communication styles in the emergency department. Journal of Emergency Medicine, 55(4), 591–599.
- Ghorob, A. (2013). Health coaching: Teaching patients to fish. Family Practice Management, 20(3), 40–42.
- Bodenheimer, T., Lorig, K., Holman, H., & Grumbach, K. (2002). Patient self-management of chronic disease in primary care. JAMA, 288(19), 2469–2475.
- Rollnick, S., Miller, W. R., & Butler, C. C. (2008). Motivational interviewing in health care: Helping patients change behavior. Guilford Press.
- 34. Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2013). Motivational interviewing: Helping people change (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.
- 35. Thom, D. H., Willard-Grace, R., Hessler, D., DeVore, D., Prado, C., Bodenheimer, T., et al. (2015). The impact of health coaching on medication adherence in patients with poorly controlled diabetes, hypertension, and/or hyperlipidemia: A randomized controlled trial. Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine, 28(1), 38–45.

- de Zulueta, P. C. (2016). Developing compassionate leadership in health care: An integrative review. Journal of Healthcare Leadership, 8, 1–10.
- Quill, T. E., & Brody, H. (1996). Physician recommendations and patient autonomy: Finding a balance between physician power and patient choice. Annals of Internal Medicine, 125(9), 763–769.
- Back, A. L., Arnold, R. M., Baile, W. F., Tulsky, J. A., & Fryer-Edwards, K. (2005). Approaching difficult communication tasks in oncology. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 55(3), 164–177.
- Quill, T. E., & Cassel, C. K. (1995). Nonabandonment: A central obligation for physicians. Annals of Internal Medicine, 122(5), 368–374.
- Tulsky, J. A., Arnold, R. M., Alexander, S. C., Olsen, M. K., Jeffreys, A. S., Rodriguez, K. L., et al. (2011). Enhancing communication between oncologists and patients with a computer-based training program: A randomized trial. Annals of Internal Medicine, 155(9), 593–601.
- Roter, D., Ellington, L., Erby, L. H., Larson, S., & Dudley, W. (2006). The Genetic Counseling Video Project (GCVP): Models of practice. American Journal of Medical Genetics Part C: Seminars in Medical Genetics, 142C(4), 209–220.
- 42. Curtis, J. R., Back, A. L., Ford, D. W., Downey, L., Shannon, S. E., Doorenbos, A. Z., et al. (2013). Effect of communication skills training for residents and nurse practitioners on quality of communication with patients with serious illness: A randomized trial. JAMA, 310(21), 2271–2281.
- Holman, H., & Lorig, K. (2004). Patient self-management: A key to effectiveness and efficiency in care of chronic disease. Public Health Reports, 119(3), 239–243.
- 44. Tattersall, R. L. (2002). The expert patient: A new approach to chronic disease management for the twenty-first century. Clinical Medicine, 2(3), 227–229.
- 45. Lorig, K. R., & Holman, H. (2003). Self-management education: History, definition, outcomes, and mechanisms. Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 26(1), 1–7.
- 46. Bodenheimer, T., & Laing, B. Y. (2007). The teamlet model of primary care. Annals of Family Medicine, 5(5), 457–461.
- Hibbard, J. H., Stockard, J., Mahoney, E. R., & Tusler, M. (2004). Development of the Patient Activation Measure (PAM): Conceptualizing and measuring activation in patients and consumers. Health Services Research, 39(4p1), 1005–1026.
- 48. Greenfield, S., Kaplan, S., & Ware, J. E., Jr. (1985). Expanding patient involvement in care. Effects on patient outcomes. Annals of Internal Medicine, 102(4), 520–528.
- 49. Berry, J. C., Davis, J. T., Bartman, T., Hafer, C. C., Lieb, L. M., Khan, N., et al. (2020). Improved safety culture and teamwork climate are associated with decreases in patient harm and hospital mortality across a hospital system. Journal of Patient Safety, 16(2), 130–136.
- 50. Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019). Principles of biomedical ethics (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- 51. Brody, H. (1992). The healer's power. Yale University Press.

- 52. Shanafelt, T. D., Boone, S., Tan, L., Dyrbye, L. N., Sotile, W., Satele, D., et al. (2012). Burnout and satisfaction with worklife balance among US physicians relative to the general US population. Archives of Internal Medicine, 172(18), 1377– 1385.
- 53. Figley, C. R. (1995). Compassion fatigue: Toward a new understanding of the costs of caring. In B. H. Stamm (Ed.), Secondary traumatic stress: Self-care issues for clinicians, researchers, and educators (pp. 3–28). Sidran Press.
- 54. Lingard, L., Espin, S., Evans, C., & Hawryluck, L. (2004). The rules of the game: Interprofessional collaboration on the intensive care unit team. Critical Care, 8(6), R403–R408.
- 55. Lingard, L., Reznick, R., Espin, S., Regehr, G., & DeVito, I. (2002). Team communications in the operating room: Talk patterns, sites of tension, and implications for novices. Academic Medicine, 77(3), 232–237.
- Weller, J., Boyd, M., & Cumin, D. (2014). Teams, tribes and patient safety: Overcoming barriers to effective teamwork in healthcare. Postgraduate Medical Journal, 90(1061), 149–154.
- 57. Interprofessional Education Collaborative. (2016). Core competencies for interprofessional collaborative practice: 2016 update. Interprofessional Education Collaborative.
- 58. Stickley, T., & Freshwater, D. (2009). The concept of space in the context of the therapeutic relationship. Mental Health Practice, 12(6), 28–30.
- Webb, A. M., Tsipis, N. E., McClellan, T. R., McNeil, M. J., Xu, M., Doty, J. P., et al. (2014). A first step toward understanding best practices in leadership training in undergraduate medical education: A systematic review. Academic Medicine, 89(11), 1563–1570.
- Gordon, M. B., Melvin, P., Graham, D., Fifer, E., Chiang, V. W., Sectish, T. C., et al. (2011). Unit-based care teams and the frequency and quality of physician-nurse communications. Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 165(5), 424– 428.
- Chen, H. Y., Tang, P. F., & Tsai, T. C. (2020). Physician leadership development through structured mentoring: A mixed-methods longitudinal study. Journal of Healthcare Leadership, 12, 27–36.
- 62. Mahant, S., Joffe, A., Tewksbury, L., Starmer, A. J., & Landrigan, C. (2019). Situational leadership theory in pediatrics: Matching leadership style to learner readiness. Academic Pediatrics, 19(7), 739–741.
- Bridges, D. R., Davidson, R. A., Odegard, P. S., Maki, I. V., & Tomkowiak, J. (2011). Interprofessional collaboration: Three best practice models of interprofessional education. Medical Education Online, 16(1), 6035.
- 64. Swing, S. R. (2002). Assessing the ACGME general competencies: General considerations and assessment methods. Academic Emergency Medicine, 9(11), 1278–1288.
- Sinsky, C., Colligan, L., Li, L., Prgomet, M., Reynolds, S., Goeders, L., Westbrook, J., Tutty, M., & Blike, G. (2016). Allocation of physician time in ambulatory practice: A time and motion study in 4 specialties. Annals of Internal Medicine, 165(11), 753–760.

- West, C. P., Dyrbye, L. N., & Shanafelt, T. D. (2018). Physician burnout: Contributors, consequences and solutions. Journal of Internal Medicine, 283(6), 516–529.
- 67. Betancourt, J. R. (2003). Cross-cultural medical education: Conceptual approaches and frameworks for evaluation. Academic Medicine, 78(6), 560–569.
- Stange, K. C. (2009). The problem of fragmentation and the need for integrative solutions. Annals of Family Medicine, 7(2), 100–103.
- 69. Berenson, R. A., & Rice, T. (2015). Beyond measurement and reward: Methods of motivating quality improvement and accountability. Health Services Research, 50(S2), 2155–2186.
- 70. Thompson, B. M., Levine, R. E., Kennedy, F., Naik, A. D., Foldes, C. A., Coverdale, J. H., & Kelly, P. A. (2009). Evaluating the quality of learning team processes in medical education: Development and validation of a new measure. Academic Medicine, 84(10 Suppl), S124–S127.
- 71. Street, R. L., Jr, Gordon, H. S., Ward, M. M., Krupat, E.,

& Kravitz, R. L. (2005). Patient participation in medical consultations: why some patients are more involved than others. Medical care, 43(10), 960–969.

- 72. Patel, V. L., Shortliffe, E. H., Stefanelli, M., Szolovits, P., Berthold, M. R., Bellazzi, R., & Abu-Hanna, A. (2009). The coming of age of artificial intelligence in medicine. Artificial intelligence in medicine, 46(1), 5–17.
- 73. Proctor, E., Silmere, H., Raghavan, R., Hovmand, P., Aarons, G., Bunger, A., Griffey, R., & Hensley, M. (2011). Outcomes for implementation research: conceptual distinctions, measurement challenges, and research agenda. Administration and policy in mental health, 38(2), 65–76.
- 74. Epstein, R.M. (1999). Mindful practice. JAMA, 282(9), 833-839.
- Osler W. Aequanimitas: with other addresses to medical students, nurses and practitioners of medicine. Philadelphia: P. Blakiston's Son & Co; 1904.

Copyright: ©2025 Julian Ungar-Sargon. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.