

“It Looked Great On Paper” Companion Guide

A Practical Companion to “It Looked Great On Paper: How to Translate Strategy Into Everyday Actions”

By Andrea Belk Olson
© 2026

This 13-page companion guide is designed to help leaders, teams, and practitioners understand the behavioral mechanisms which impact successful strategy execution.

Execution Has Gravity

Execution can be described as something that simply carries strategy into action.

In this view, strategy is the active force, and execution is the passive recipient.

And when execution falters, the assumption is that something downstream failed.

People resisted.

Systems were misaligned.

Incentives were wrong.

Communication broke down.

Yes, these things might be true. But these are not causes. They are effects.

Execution isn't passive at all.

It is dynamic, adaptive, and subject to forces that shape its direction over time.

Those forces are what cause 'Execution Drift' — the slow, systematic breakdown of strategy implementation. And it is caused by the one, most powerful force that exists within an organization.

Behavior.

You see, execution has gravity. Like physical gravity, it is invisible, continuous, and unavoidable. It pulls action in particular directions regardless of stated intent.

Leaders do not stand outside of this gravitational field. In fact, they are its primary source.

Through their behavior, leaders exert a constant force on how strategy is interpreted, prioritized, and ultimately enacted.

This gravitational pull is rarely intentional. Leaders do not set out to bend strategy away from its original objectives. Yet over time, execution moves.

Priorities soften.

Boundaries blur.

Decisions migrate upward.

What remains looks recognizably related to the original strategy, but meaningfully different in practice. This is Execution Drift.

Understanding Execution Drift requires abandoning the idea that execution problems originate at the edges of the organization. Drift begins near the center. It emerges where leadership behavior meets pressure.

Pressure is the condition under which strategic commitment reveals its true nature. In stable environments, almost any strategy can appear to work. It is pressure — time compression, resource constraints, political tradeoffs, competing priorities — that tests whether it has real staying power.

Under pressure, leaders adapt. They respond. They adjust. These responses are often sensible. In isolation, they are often defensible. But adaptation without contextual awareness accumulates.

Over time, leadership behavior under pressure becomes patterned. Those patterns become predictable. And predictability, in organizations, becomes structure.

This leadership behavior is not merely influential, it is formative. It shapes the execution environment in which everyone else operates. People do not execute strategy as written. They execute strategy as experienced — through the signals leaders send when decisions become difficult.

Organizations often underestimate the extent to which execution is learned. People learn how to execute by observing what leaders do when strategy collides with reality. They learn which priorities are firm and which are flexible. They learn whether tradeoffs are real or rhetorical. They learn when to decide and when to wait. These lessons are rarely taught explicitly. They are absorbed through repeated exposure to leadership behavior.

And once learned, these patterns are remarkably durable. They persist even when leaders attempt to correct them through communication or rearticulation of strategy. This is why Execution Drift is so resistant to traditional fixes. The force shaping execution is not the strategy document; it is the gravitational pull of leadership behavior.

The concept of gravity is useful because it reframes Execution Drift as movement rather than failure. Drift is not collapse. It is directional change over time.

No, adaptation is not inherently problematic. The ability to respond to changing conditions is essential. The problem arises when that adaptation contradicts the strategy's foundation.

And this is where execution gravity becomes visible. Leaders may continue to articulate the same strategy, but their behavior begins to tell a different story. The organization responds to the story told by behavior.

Consider an organization whose strategic objective is to, say, 'customers are at the heart of everything we do'. How quickly will that organization's actions shift when, say, their leaders begin to focus on profit, internal metrics, and ignoring customer feedback?

A one-time misstep rarely matters. But this behavior, repeatedly and doggedly, teaches people what the unwritten expectations are. If employees resist, decision-making starts to migrate upward. Execution slows. Leaders become the bottlenecks.

This outcome is rarely planned.

It is the result of leadership behavior exerting gravitational pull.

The same is true of tradeoffs. Strategy depends on tradeoffs to succeed. Yet under pressure, leaders often soften tradeoffs to preserve momentum or avoid immediate friction. Going back on their 'declared' strategy and reverting to 'this is the way we've always done it'.

Each softened tradeoff reduces the force of strategy. The organization learns that priorities are conditional. Execution drifts toward what is easiest to justify rather than what is most strategically aligned.

This is why Execution Drift is so often misdiagnosed. Leaders search for discrete causes —one decision, one leader, one team — when the true cause is cumulative. Drift is the sum of many small behaviors interacting over time.

This perspective challenges the common belief that better communication is sufficient to correct execution problems. Leaders often recognize drift intellectually long before they can stop it behaviorally. Communication alone does not alter gravity. Behavior does.

Execution gravity also explains why alignment initiatives so often disappoint. Alignment efforts typically focus on clarifying intent, improving collaboration, or redesigning processes. These interventions assume that execution problems stem from misunderstanding or misconfiguration. They rarely address the gravitational force exerted by leadership behavior under pressure.

As long as leaders continue to respond to pressure in ways that contradict strategic intent, alignment efforts will struggle. People will believe what leaders do, not what they say. Gravity wins.

To understand Execution Drift, then, we must examine leadership behavior not as a set of skills or traits, but as a force. A force that operates continuously. A force that shapes execution even when leaders are not consciously directing it.

This reframing has significant implications. It suggests that execution integrity is not

achieved by designing better systems alone. It must be preserved through discipline and clarity.

It also suggests that drift is not an anomaly but a natural tendency in complex systems. And it suggests that leadership is not only about setting direction, but about continually counteracting the gravitational pull of one's own behavior. Execution does not drift because leaders lack commitment. It drifts because commitment alone does not overcome gravity.

This companion guide examines the specific behavioral mechanics through which leadership gravity operates. It explores how tradeoffs erode, how decisiveness becomes control, how reinforcement shapes execution norms, and why tolerance quietly rewrites standards. It explains why drift persists even when leaders know better, and what it means to preserve execution integrity over time.

Until leaders understand this, Execution Drift will continue to be treated as a downstream problem. Something to fix in others, rather than something to examine in themselves. Until then, strategy will remain vulnerable not to failure, but to movement.

Execution does not fail. It drifts. And it's not whether it will drift, but in which direction — and under whose influence.

The Behavioral Mechanics of Drift

Execution drift is produced through a small set of recurring behaviors that reshape execution with remarkable consistency. These behaviors are not flaws in character or gaps in competence. They are adaptive responses to complexity and conflict.

And their danger lies not in their intent, but in their accumulation. So, understanding drift requires understanding these mechanics as forces acting together over time.

The first of these mechanics concerns tradeoffs.

Tradeoffs are what convert aspiration into constraint. They tell the organization not only what matters, but what matters less. Without tradeoffs, strategy cannot guide action.

Under pressure, however, tradeoffs become socially and politically expensive. Leaders face demands from multiple directions — customers, boards, partners, internal stakeholders — each of which can plausibly claim priority. In these moments, leaders often soften tradeoffs to preserve relationships, maintain momentum, or avoid conflict.

This softening rarely feels like abandonment. It feels like flexibility.

Yet flexibility without commitment erodes strategy's authority. When leaders repeatedly allow tradeoffs to bend, they teach the organization that priorities are negotiable. Over time, people learn to test boundaries rather than operate within them. Execution shifts from alignment to justification.

This erosion of tradeoffs also has a compounding effect. As priorities become less firm, decision-making slows. People seek additional confirmation. Escalation increases. Leaders become more involved, which further weakens distributed ownership. Drift accelerates not because people resist strategy, but because the constraints that once made strategy actionable no longer hold.

The second behavioral mechanic concerns decisiveness.

Decisiveness is one of the most consistently rewarded leadership traits. In uncertain environments, leaders are expected to act, to provide clarity, and to resolve ambiguity. Yet decisiveness becomes a mechanism of drift when it consistently overrides distributed decision-making.

When leaders step in to decide, they remove uncertainty — but they also remove ownership. Each intervention subtly teaches people that initiative carries risk, while deferral carries safety. Over time, decision-making migrates away from those driving strategy execution, and leaders become increasingly central to it. Not by design, but by habit.

This migration has predictable outcomes. Strategic intent becomes filtered. Leaders spend more time managing consequences and less time protecting direction. What began as decisiveness becomes control, and control becomes constraint.

The third behavioral mechanic involves reinforcement.

Organizations are shaped less by what leaders announce than by what they reinforce. Reinforcement occurs through attention, praise, promotion, and response time. It tells people which behaviors are rewarded, and which are tolerated.

Under pressure, reinforcement patterns shift. Leaders respond fastest to what feels urgent.

Availability, responsiveness, and heroics are rewarded, often unintentionally. Discipline, focus, and restraint are harder to see and therefore easier to overlook.

These reinforcement patterns accumulate. People learn which behaviors are safest

when stakes are high. Strategic compliance becomes optional, while responsiveness becomes mandatory. Execution norms drift toward what is most immediately rewarded rather than what is most strategically aligned.

The fourth mechanic is rescue.

Rescue is among the most emotionally satisfying leadership behaviors. It resolves immediate problems, protects outcomes, and reinforces the leader's value. Yet rescue is also among the most powerful accelerators of drift.

When leaders repeatedly rescue teams from the consequences of misalignment, they remove the feedback required for learning. Accountability again shifts upward. Over time, teams stop owning outcomes fully, not because they are unwilling, but because ownership has been made unnecessary.

Rescue creates dependency. Leaders become the solution to problems the system should be solving. Execution weakens, reliant on constant intervention. Strategy suffers because execution capacity is no longer distributed.

The fifth mechanic is tolerance.

What leaders tolerate becomes the operating standard. Tolerance is rarely deliberate. It emerges through fatigue, competing demands, and the gradual normalization of exceptions.

Missed commitments, informal workarounds, and side agreements often begin as temporary accommodations. When leaders stop addressing them, silence communicates acceptance. Over time, these exceptions redefine execution norms.

Tolerance is particularly insidious because it often reflects empathy and pragmatism. Leaders tolerate deviations to support people or maintain morale. Yet each tolerated deviation again, weakens the authority of strategy. Drift accelerates as standards erode.

These five mechanics — tradeoff erosion, decisive intervention, reinforcement misalignment, rescue, and tolerance — do not operate independently. They reinforce one another.

Softened tradeoffs increase uncertainty, which invites intervention. Intervention concentrates decision-making, which increases reliance on rescue. Rescue shifts reinforcement toward responsiveness. Misaligned reinforcement increases the behaviors leaders eventually tolerate.

Tolerance further erodes tradeoffs.

This feedback loop is what makes execution drift so persistent. Each behavior strengthens the conditions that make the others more likely. Understanding execution drift as a behavioral system rather than a collection of isolated issues changes the nature of intervention. Drift is not addressed by eliminating individual behaviors. It is addressed by altering the conditions that foster these behaviors.

This reframing also clarifies why Execution Drift is so often misattributed to culture. Culture is not the cause; it is the residue. The true cause lies in the repeated behavioral responses of leaders under pressure. Until leaders understand these mechanics as a system, attempts to correct drift will focus on symptoms rather than causes.

Why Drift Persists Even When Leaders Know Better

One of the most perplexing aspects of Execution Drift is that it persists even when leaders can see it happening. Many leaders recognize the behaviors that undermine strategy. Yet recognition alone rarely alters the trajectory of execution.

If leaders understand the problem, the logic goes, they should be able to correct it. Execution Drift exposes the limits of this assumption.

Knowing better does not reliably lead to doing differently.

The reason is not hypocrisy or lack of discipline. It is that Execution Drift is sustained by forces that operate below the level of conscious intent. Leadership behavior is shaped not only by what leaders believe, but by who they understand themselves to be, what risks they are rewarded for taking, and what costs they bear personally for restraint.

At the center of this persistence is identity. Leadership identity is formed through years of reinforcement. Leaders are promoted because they deliver results, resolve problems, and take responsibility. They are praised for decisiveness, responsiveness, and availability. These behaviors become woven into how leaders understand their value. Over time, acting becomes synonymous with leading.

Execution Drift exploits this identity. Many of the behaviors that produce drift — intervening, rescuing, accommodating — are behaviors leaders associate with

competence and care. Choosing not to intervene can feel like neglect. Allowing consequences to unfold can feel irresponsible. Holding a hard tradeoff can feel uncaring.

Even when leaders intellectually recognize the long-term cost of these behaviors, the short-term identity cost of restraint can feel higher.

Restraint is quiet. It is rarely rewarded.

It often produces visible discomfort without immediate payoff.

For leaders whose sense of legitimacy is tied to action, restraint feels risky.

Risk perception further reinforces drift.

Leaders operate in environments where the cost of visible failure is immediate and personal. Missed targets, dissatisfied stakeholders, and public missteps carry reputational consequences. The cost of Execution Drift, by contrast, is delayed and diffuse. It shows up months or years later, distributed across outcomes and rarely attributable to a single decision.

This asymmetry biases leadership behavior toward short-term risk mitigation.

Leaders intervene to prevent visible problems, even when doing so undermines strategy over time. Drift persists not because leaders prefer misalignment, but because they rationally prioritize the risks they will personally bear.

Organizational reward systems amplify this bias. Most organizations reward responsiveness more reliably than restraint. Leaders who solve problems quickly are recognized. Leaders who prevent problems through consistency are often invisible.

Reinforcement follows what can be observed and measured, not what is preserved through absence.

As a result, leaders receive continuous feedback encouraging behaviors that accelerate drift. Intervention, accommodation, and rescue are reinforced through praise, advancement, and social approval. Strategic restraint is rarely acknowledged. This reinforcement creates a gap between espoused values and lived experience. Leaders may believe in strategic discipline, but they are rewarded for behaviors that contradict it. Over time, behavior follows reward.

Social dynamics further entrench drift. Leadership does not occur in isolation. Leaders operate within networks of peers, superiors, and stakeholders. Deviating from established response patterns carries social risk. Leaders who consistently enforce tradeoffs or resist accommodation may be perceived as rigid, unsupportive, or politically naive.

Conformity pressures encourage leaders to behave in ways that maintain legitimacy within their peer group. If others intervene, rescuing becomes normalized. If others accommodate, enforcement feels risky. Drift becomes socially reinforced.

These dynamics create what might be called the illusion of awareness. Leaders can articulate the problem, but articulation does not dismantle the forces sustaining it.

Drift persists because awareness addresses cognition, while drift is sustained by identity, risk, reward, and social pressure.

This explains why Execution Drift often survives leadership development efforts. Programs that emphasize insight, reflection, and skill-building assume that better understanding will translate into better behavior. Yet without altering the conditions that make certain behaviors costly or rewarding, insight alone is insufficient.

The persistence of drift also explains why organizations cycle through repeated alignment initiatives. Each initiative promises to correct execution problems, yet similar patterns reemerge. Leaders interpret recurrence as resistance or fatigue, rather than recognizing that the underlying behavioral forces remain intact.

Execution drift is therefore not a failure of leadership learning. It is a failure of leadership context.

Understanding this reframes the challenge of execution. The question is not how to help leaders know more, but how to change the conditions under which leadership behavior is enacted. Drift persists because those conditions remain unchanged.

This does not imply that leaders are powerless. It implies that leadership requires a different form of discipline than is commonly acknowledged. The discipline to act less, to tolerate discomfort, and to accept short-term risk in service of long-term integrity.

Such discipline runs counter to many leadership norms. It requires leaders to separate their identity from immediate problem-solving and to redefine success as preservation rather than intervention.

Execution Drift persists when leaders know better because knowing better does not alter gravity. Behavior alters gravity.

Execution Integrity as a Leadership Discipline

Organizations speak of “getting aligned” as if execution were something that could be set correctly and then left alone.

This language implies stability — that once strategy and execution are aligned, the work is done. Execution Drift reveals why this assumption is flawed.

Execution does not remain aligned on its own. It moves. Pressure, adaptation, and behavioral reinforcement continuously act on it.

In such conditions, integrity is not achieved once; it is preserved and maintained.

Integrity, in this sense, is not moral. It is structural. It refers to the ability of strategy to retain its shape as it moves through execution. When execution has integrity, behavior reflects intent even under pressure. When it does not, strategy may still be visible, but it no longer constrains action.

The distinction between alignment and integrity is critical.

Alignment assumes a static environment in which coherence can be achieved and maintained through agreement. Integrity assumes a dynamic environment in which coherence is constantly threatened by drift. Alignment is about shared understanding. Integrity is about sustained behavioral consistency.

Execution Drift exposes the limits of alignment thinking. Organizations can be aligned and still drift. Leaders can agree on priorities and still behave in ways that undermine them.

The problem is not disagreement, but erosion.

Preserving execution integrity is the ongoing work of protecting strategic intent against the forces that erode it. And this work is largely invisible. When leaders preserve integrity successfully, little appears to happen. There are fewer interventions, fewer escalations, fewer exceptions.

The absence of action is precisely the point. Integrity is preserved through what leaders do not do as much as through what they do.

This invisibility makes integrity difficult to reward. Organizations tend to celebrate visible effort, decisive action, and immediate results. Integrity, by contrast, produces delayed benefits. It prevents problems rather than solving them. As a result, it is often undervalued and underdeveloped.

Execution integrity requires leaders to tolerate tension. Strategy creates tension by design. It prioritizes some outcomes over others. Under pressure, the impulse is to relieve tension through accommodation or intervention. Integrity requires leaders to hold that tension instead.

Holding tension is not passive. It is an active refusal to collapse tradeoffs prematurely. It requires leaders to absorb discomfort rather than transferring it downward or upward.

Integrity also requires leaders to accept short-term risk. Preserving strategic intent under pressure often means allowing visible discomfort — missed opportunities, dissatisfied stakeholders, slower decisions. These risks are immediate and personal. The benefits of integrity are delayed and collective. This asymmetry explains why execution integrity is rare.

Leaders are rewarded for mitigating immediate risk, not for preventing long-term erosion. Choosing integrity therefore requires leaders to redefine success, separating it from constant action.

Importantly, execution integrity cannot be delegated. While systems, processes, and governance structures can support it, the gravitational force shaping execution originates in leadership behavior. Integrity is preserved or lost at moments when leaders respond to pressure.

This reframing also clarifies why execution integrity cannot be sustained through persuasion. Asking leaders to “be disciplined” or “stay aligned” does not alter the conditions that make discipline costly. Integrity emerges when leadership behavior changes in consistent, observable ways.

Execution integrity is best understood as continuous calibration. Leaders monitor how execution is responding to pressure and adjust their behavior accordingly. They notice when interventions become habitual, when tradeoffs soften, when tolerance expands. They correct course early, before drift accelerates.

This calibration is not episodic. It is not triggered by failure. It is ongoing. Leaders who preserve integrity treat execution as something that must be tended, not fixed.

This perspective also reframes accountability. In organizations with execution integrity,

accountability is distributed. People are expected to make decisions within clear constraints. Leaders resist reclaiming ownership when outcomes are uncertain. This restraint strengthens execution rather than weakening it.

Integrity-oriented leadership also reshapes organizational learning. When leaders allow consequences to unfold within strategic boundaries, the organization learns what strategy actually requires. Learning accelerates because feedback is preserved rather than absorbed by leadership intervention.

Over time, execution integrity produces resilience. Organizations become better able to adapt without drifting because adaptation occurs within constraints. Strategy remains authoritative even as execution evolves.

Execution Drift itself, by contrast, produces fragility. Adaptation occurs without boundaries. Leaders become central points of failure. Execution depends on constant correction rather than shared understanding.

The difference between these two trajectories is not intelligence or effort. It is discipline. The discipline of consistency.

Execution drift is not an aberration. It is the natural tendency of complex systems under pressure. Leadership behavior determines whether that tendency is amplified or constrained.

Execution integrity, then, is the discipline of using leadership behavior deliberately — to preserve strategy's shape as it moves through execution. It is quiet work. It is difficult work. And it is the work that distinguishes organizations that merely launch strategies from those that sustain them.

The question facing leaders is not whether execution will drift. It will. The question is whether leadership behavior will allow that drift to accumulate — or will continually pull execution back toward intent.

©2026

The Pragmadik Company

www.pragmadik.com

www.andreabelkolson.com

An accompaniment to the book “It Looked Great On Paper”, publishing September 2026.

<https://www.andreabelkolson.com/book>