

Developing a team performance framework for the intensive care unit*

Tom W. Reader, PhD; Rhona Flin, PhD; Kathryn Mearns, PhD; Brian H. Cuthbertson, MD, FRCA

Objective: There is a growing literature on the relationship between teamwork and patient outcomes in intensive care, providing new insights into the skills required for effective team performance. The purpose of this review is to consolidate the most robust findings from this research into an intensive care unit (ICU) team performance framework.

Data Sources: Studies investigating teamwork within the ICU using PubMed, Science Direct, and Web of Knowledge databases.

Study Selection: Studies investigating the relationship between aspects of teamwork and ICU outcomes, or studies testing factors that are found to influence team working in the ICU.

Data Extraction: Teamwork behaviors associated with patient or staff-related outcomes in the ICU were identified.

Data Synthesis: Teamwork behaviors were grouped according to the team process categories of “team communication,” “team

leadership,” “team coordination,” and “team decision making.” A prototype framework explaining the team performance in the ICU was developed using these categories. The purpose of the framework is to consolidate the existing ICU teamwork literature and to guide the development and testing of interventions for improving teamwork.

Conclusions: Effective teamwork is shown as crucial for providing optimal patient care in the ICU. In particular, team leadership seems vital for guiding the way in which ICU team members interact and coordinate with others. (Crit Care Med 2009; 37: 1787–1793)

KEY WORDS: intensive care unit; teamwork; team performance framework; training interventions; patient safety; leadership

Teamwork refers to the way in which the team members function and coordinate to produce a “synchronized” output (1). Patient safety research has demonstrated that poor teamwork is a causal factor underlying critical incidents in the intensive care unit (ICU) (2). Because of this, a growing amount of research has been conducted within the ICU to identify the specific components of teamwork that influence patient outcomes (3, 4). The main purpose of this research is to guide the design of training materials and workplace interventions to improve teamwork. However, at present, the findings from studies investigating ICU teamwork are disparate

and lack synthesis; therefore, the extent to which they can influence practice, training, and future research is limited. This review takes an industrial psychology perspective to summarize the ICU teamwork literature and develops a conceptual team performance framework tailored for intensive care medicine.

Team Performance Frameworks. Psychology researchers in high-risk industries (e.g., aviation, military, nuclear power) have found effective teamwork as crucial for maintaining safety within these domains (5, 6). To better understand the relationship between teamwork and performance in these settings, team performance frameworks (or models) have been developed. These show team outputs (e.g., team effectiveness, performance, errors) to be influenced by group “processes” related to team communication, leadership, coordination, and decision making (7–11). Furthermore, group processes are influenced by a range of “inputs” (e.g., group structures, member characteristics, work tasks) (12–14). The purposes of team performance frameworks are three-fold. First, they systematize the mechanisms that predict team performance, thus facilitating the design and structure of evidence-based team training materials and interventions for

improving teamwork. Second, they detail the conditions, structures, and procedures known to be indicative of effective teamwork, thereby providing valuable information for the training and assessment of teamwork skills. Finally, team frameworks guide the evaluation of teamwork interventions by developing a structure against which to test expected change (e.g., attitudes, behaviors, performance).

In aviation, team performance frameworks have been used to develop sets of team competencies for flight crews (15). With respect to health care, it is necessary to develop tailored team performance frameworks that reflect the demands of specialties, such as intensive care medicine (16). This article reviews the ICU teamwork literature to consolidate knowledge on the relationship among teamwork structures, behaviors, and performance in the ICU and to begin the development of a team performance framework. It uses a standard group process model from psychology to consider studies that have collected data on the relationship between teamwork behaviors and ICU outcomes.

METHODS

The identification of studies related to ICU teamwork involved a search of the Pubmed, Sci-

*See also p. 1828.

From the School of Psychology (TWR, RF, KM), University of Aberdeen, Kings College, Aberdeen, Scotland, UK; Health Services Research Unit (BHC), University of Aberdeen and Intensive Care Unit, Aberdeen Royal Infirmary, Foresterhill, Aberdeen, Scotland, UK.

Supported by the College of Life Sciences and Medicine (University of Aberdeen) and the Scottish Funding Council.

The authors have not disclosed any potential conflicts of interest.

For information regarding this article, E-mail: tom.reader@abdn.ac.uk

Copyright © 2009 by the Society of Critical Care Medicine and Lippincott Williams & Wilkins

DOI: 10.1097/CCM.0b013e31819f0451




Figure 1. Literature review flow diagram.

Table 1. Methods used to study teamwork in the literature review

Methods Used to Study Teamwork	Total Number of Articles	Study Reference Number
Observations in real life	8	19, 27, 28, 32, 55, 56, 57, 66
Observations in a simulator	4	25, 26, 41, 52
Intensive care unit staff interviews	2	23, 33
Intensive care unit staff surveys	17	24, 29, 30, 31, 42, 47, 50, 53, 54, 58, 59, 62, 64, 65, 69, 70, 71
Error analysis	4	17, 20–22

ence Direct, and Web of Knowledge Psychology databases for articles on teamwork in the ICU published since 1990. The search terms, method, and inclusion criteria are shown in Figure 1. Articles captured by the search strategy (initially 984 articles) were selected (by TR) on the relevance of their titles and abstracts with respect to whether the article considered the topic of teamwork and performance in the ICU. The remaining articles (n = 59) were then filtered to ascertain whether they actually provided empirical information on the relationship between ICU teamwork and outcomes (whether quantitative or qualitative). An examination of reference lists from the filtered articles (n = 31) uncovered a further four items.

RESULTS

In total, 35 studies were identified as having investigated teamwork in the ICU. This set incorporates 31 peer-reviewed articles (of which 29 were published in medical journals), two book chapters, and

two peer-reviewed conference papers. Among the articles was a human factors error analysis of critical incident data that reported on 10 studies of error in the ICU (17). This article was included rather than the individual critical incident studies discussed in it. The data collection methods used for the 35 studies included in the review varied considerably and are listed in Table 1.

Of the articles not included in the final selection, many did not empirically investigate teamwork and focused on topics, such as education, promoting multidisciplinary teamwork, decision-support mechanisms, and communicating with patients. The sections below discuss the key findings from the 35 studies that were identified by the search strategy. The findings are considered in terms of four teamwork processes (team communication, team leadership, team coordination, and team decision making) identi-

fied as crucial for predicting team performance within the psychology teamwork literature (7–14).

Team Communication. *Team communication* relates to the transfer of information, ideas, and opinions among the members of a team (18). Observations of ICU teams (19) have shown errors in the ICU to be concentrated after communication events (e.g., shift changes and handoffs), and 37% of errors to be associated with communication between nurses and physicians. Pronovost's group (20–22) at Johns Hopkins University has analyzed ICU adverse event/critical incident data from incident reporting systems. Their analysis has identified recurring team communication failures that lead to patient harm, with written and verbal communications during routine care, handoffs, and crises being found most susceptible to error. More specifically, they found critical incidents to occur because of the reluctance of nursing staff to report observed errors or patient care issues, the lack of communication between clinicians and nursing staff on treatment changes, inaccurate information transfer between different ICU care teams, and poor information dissemination on newly admitted patients. Survey and interview research have also examined the relationship between ICU team communications and patient outcomes (23), with timely, accurate, and open communication between nurses and physicians being shown as predictive of patient length of stay and staff turnover (24).

Observations in high-fidelity simulator studies have studied team communication behaviors. Video analysis of teamwork during simulated patient resuscitations has found the communication skills of ICU residents to be rated most highly if they communicate clearly at all times, encourage team member input, listen to staff feedback, and consistently use directed verbal and nonverbal communications. Conversely, the communication skills of residents are rated most poorly when they fail to acknowledge staff communications and do not use directed verbal and nonverbal communications (25). High-fidelity simulator research has also established a relationship between team communication and technical performance (26), with ICU teams being assessed during the management of septic shock. Teams were rated highly if team members made clear and direct requests, used closed loop communications, communicated the urgency of patient problems, and shared information

on the patient care plan. Teams were rated poorly if team members did not request appropriate information or did not communicate treatment priorities and problems with patients. Teams rather than individuals were assessed, and correlations were found between ratings on technical performance (e.g., making diagnoses) and scores on the behavioral aspects of performance (e.g., communication).

Thomas et al. (27) have built on measurements for assessing teamwork in commercial aviation to develop an observational rating system for assessing teamwork skills during neonatal resuscitation. Their research has investigated the relationship between assessments of teamwork and noncompliance with neonatal resuscitation standards during 132 videoed neonatal resuscitations (27). The frequency with which neonatal ICU teams were observed to demonstrate team behaviors related to communication (e.g., information sharing, asking questions about infant status, or treatment plans), and also management and leadership, was found to be weakly correlated with compliance for neonatal resuscitation standards. Furthermore, interns who received team training as part of neonatal resuscitation training were shown to display more teamwork-related behaviors (e.g., information sharing) than those who did not receive training (28).

Survey research has investigated aspects of team structure, and, in particular, how status hierarchies influence perceptions of teamwork (29, 30). For example, a majority of physicians report highly positive perceptions of communication openness between nurses and physicians, when compared with just more than one third of nurses (30). A similar difference was found between senior and junior physicians. Survey research has also shown that ICUs with teams reporting high levels of group development (e.g., whether team members trust one another, discuss goals, and are not in conflict) have lower risk-adjusted mortality rates (31). Observational research during the ICU round has shown team member roles to influence interruptive behaviors, with physicians interrupting other caregivers roughly twice as often as nurses do (32). Ethnographic work in Canada has identified factors that influence whether ICU team members communicate collaboratively (33). These include whether the team has a shared perception of who was in the decision-making role during a specific scenario, whether team members work together to reach an understanding on patient

conditions, and whether there are demanding time constraints on the delivery of care.

Team communication research in the ICU has shown communication to be linked to safety and performance, and that team structures and characteristics influence teamwork. Research in military and aviation has found similar trends (34), with team leadership being identified as particularly important for structuring and regulating team communication processes (35).

Team Leadership. Data from ICU critical incident studies have indicated the importance of effective *team leadership* for safety (17, 22). Team leadership refers to the guidance of a team (36) and involves defining goals, setting expectations, organizing team resources, and coordinating team activities (37). Studies of leadership in industry and acute medicine tend to concentrate on four levels: action leaders (e.g., *ad hoc* emergency teams), operational leaders (e.g., unit-level supervisors), tactical leaders (e.g., departmental managers), and strategic leaders (e.g., board level directors) (38–40). Leadership research in the ICU mostly focuses on the “action” level. For example, simulator and real-life observations have shown associations between ratings of performance and leadership behaviors, such as encouraging team member input, stating and evaluating plans, asserting opinions when appropriate, listening to staff feedback, delegating tasks effectively, prioritizing aspects of care, and ensuring team member comfort with allotted duties (25–27).

Simulator research has shown that team performance during cardiovascular resuscitation is optimal when the first arriving team leader (e.g., senior nurse, junior physician) demonstrates more immediate directive leadership behaviors (i.e., coordinating the teams), and when the late arriving senior physician systematically evaluates the situation and guides the team rather than taking charge immediately (41). Stockwell et al. (42) have investigated the impact of physician management skills on the care provided to pediatric ICU patients. Using the Physician Management Index, 827 residents and fellows rated daily the ability of eight attending physicians on 20 dimensions, including their ability to effectively lead and communicate with the ICU team, to manage resources, to set high standards, and to provide support on issues of performance and team development. The study found that higher overall daily rat-

ings by staff for attending physicians on the Physician Management Index were associated with higher numbers of patient goals being completed during NICU shifts. However, because of the small sample of physicians being assessed, it is not clear which specific attitudes/behaviors lead to this association.

Although effective team leadership seems important for the ICU, there are still relatively few in-depth investigations of senior physician leadership skills (43). Data from trauma centers, which face many similar challenges to the ICU, provide interesting insights into the nature of team leadership in acute healthcare teams. Observational and interview research with trauma center teams has shown that team leaders demonstrate “dynamic delegation” behaviors, whereby the senior physician delegates and withdraws the leadership role to junior physicians to spread the intense workload and to build junior physician confidence (44). Furthermore, scenario-based research investigating leadership during trauma resuscitation has indicated that leadership behaviors vary according to the situation. Team leaders show more directive leadership behaviors when the severity of trauma is high or when a team is inexperienced (45). However, when trauma severity is low or teams are highly experienced, team leaders delegate more responsibility to junior team members. This indicates the “contingent” nature of team leadership within the ICU, whereby leadership behaviors are adapted according to the situation (46).

Research in neonatal ICUs has also indicated that the leadership style of the *team leader* influences teamwork. Specifically, leader inclusiveness (e.g., listening and encouraging junior team member ideas) has been shown to result in team members becoming more involved in ICU quality improvement programs (47). Such research resonates with a long tradition of psychology research investigating leadership style (48, 49). Additionally, leadership-oriented interventions that focus on training teamwork skills (e.g., conflict management) to senior nurses and physicians are shown to result in staff having positive perceptions of unit leadership (50). However, very little research has been published on how ICU senior physicians lead medical teams while managing ICUs on a day-to-day basis, and a better understanding is required on how team leadership behaviors influence the communication and coordination behaviors of ICU team members.

Team Coordination. Team coordination refers to the concerted and synchronous performance of work activities by team members, with each team member maintaining an awareness of one another's work (51). Researching team coordination can be challenging, because it is difficult to distinguish between these behaviors, and team communication and leadership behaviors. Both of these are precursors (e.g., distributing workloads) and integral (e.g., information transfer) for effective team coordination, yet do not fully account for how team members adapt their activities to dovetail with one another.

Analyses of teams managing critical events during crisis management training have indicated errors to result from poor coordination, for example, nurses being overloaded with requests, poor task delegation, and a lack of prioritization for care activities (52). Additionally, attitudinal research with ICU staff has found positive perceptions of team coordination (e.g., timely information transfer, awareness of team member activities, team member role clarity) to be associated with lower error rates (53). Survey research has also shown high levels of cooperation between ICU nurses and physicians to reduce reports of staff burnout (54). Observations during the real-life provision of ICU care have been used to study the behaviors ICU team members use to coordinate activities together. These behaviors include nurses cross checking physician-generated patient care plans, physicians, and nurses providing "heads-up" alerts to each other about pertinent information outside of the rounds, and patient summaries being used to recap the discussion and highlight the core duties of team members (55, 56). Finally, structured observations in the NICU have shown effective workload management (i.e., task distribution and prioritization) to be associated with independent measures of neonatal resuscitation quality (27).

Although team coordination is determined by factors such as team communication and team leadership, attempts have been made to restructure ICU tasks to improve coordination. For example, an intervention to improve patient transfers between surgery and ICU has adopted coordination principles from *Formula 1* racing pit stop teams (57). By segmenting the handover process into different stages (prehandover, equipment and technology handover, information handover, discus-

sion, and planning), using checklists, and assigning ICU and surgical team members clear roles, there were improvements in teamwork (e.g., less omissions of patient information) and fewer technical errors (e.g., equipment preparation) during intrateam handovers. Interventions have also focused on ICU rounds to make them more concise; to ensure patient care plan information is explicit; to ensure decision makers are present; and to generate a secure team-based environment (58). This resulted in ICU staff reporting a better understanding of patient care plans alongside higher levels of satisfaction during rounds. Furthermore, adopting daily goal sheets (which structure the round process) has been shown to result in ICU residents and nurses better understanding their patient care duties and in turn reduced patient lengths of stay (59). This resonates with the psychology "shared mental model" literature, whereby teams communicate and coordinate more effectively when members form a shared mental model for goals, tasks, and team member roles and responsibilities (60). These shared mental models facilitate team decision making, which has also been of interest to ICU researchers.

Team Decision Making. Team decision making relates to decision making (either by the leader on behalf of the team or among the members of a team) by integrating information and perceptions from the members of a team (61). As with team coordination, team decision making is influenced by team communication and leadership. In the ICU, collaborative decision making has been linked to improved patient outcomes. For example, units with higher levels of collaboration between nurses and physicians during patient-transfer decisions have lower rates of risk-adjusted mortalities and higher levels of nurse and resident job satisfaction (62). High levels of collaboration have also been suggested to potentially improve end-of-life care (63). Poor decision-making processes, for example, the application of inappropriate plans and the use of unsuitable techniques, have been shown to contribute to the occurrence of critical incidents (17). Clinician encouragement of team member communication and contributions during the ICU round patient decision-making process are associated with a reduction in adverse event rates (64). Furthermore, nurses and physicians tend to agree that junior team members should be able to question

senior physician decision making and that decision making should include junior team member input (65).

Observational research in the ICU by Patel and Arocha (66) has shown that levels of collaboration during decision-making processes are influenced by the severity of patient conditions. When patient illnesses are well understood, team communication processes tend to be more "democratic," and decisions are made after contributions from all team members. However, for more complicated patients, senior physicians tend to make key decisions autocratically, and with nurses communicating after performing information-gathering tasks. This reflects findings from trauma centers, which indicate team leaders to adapt their behaviors according to the situation. In particular, during high-pressure phases of work, senior physicians adapt their behaviors to effectively lead the team (e.g., by adopting a swift and autocratic decision-making style) (45, 67). This is aligned with the literature on decision making and incident command within the military, emergency services, and aviation industries (68). Perceptions of caregiver involvement during decision making in the ICU have also been shown to be influenced by the team member's role. When asked to report about the perceptions of involvement in patient decision making during the ICU round, senior nurses and junior physicians tend to report feeling uninvolved compared with senior physicians (69). This is consistent with survey research showing that nurses report finding it difficult to speak-up during decision making, with fewer nurses than physicians feeling that disagreements in the ICU are properly resolved, or that input from nurses about patient care is well received (70). Furthermore, ICU management tends to overestimate the extent to which nurses will have positive attitudes toward teamwork, with variations in attitudes even existing between the ICUs of a single institution (71).

DISCUSSION

The findings from the ICU research investigating teamwork are incorporated into a prototype team performance framework for the ICU (Fig. 2). In the framework, team processes are subdivided into the processes of communication, leadership, coordination, and decision making. These processes (and behaviors drawn from the literature that




Figure 2. Intensive care unit team performance framework.

are indicative of effective team processes) are shown as influencing ICU “outputs.” Additionally, the inputs of “team,” “task,” and “leader” are listed. These are factors that have been shown in either the ICU or the general psychology literature to influence teamwork processes (7–14). The concepts included in the framework are limited to those that have been directly addressed in the ICU teamwork literature. However, it must be noted that there are a number of teamwork concepts within the applied psychology literature that still have to be investigated within the ICU, yet have been shown as important for safety and performance in other high-risk settings. For example, shared mental models for teamwork and task work information (72), team adaptability to changing circumstances (73), and the influence of organizational culture upon teamwork behaviors (74, 75) are just some of the additional factors known to influence team performance. Furthermore, the framework does not necessarily illustrate the frequent changes in team composition that occur in ICU, the influ-

ence this can have on performance (73), or the techniques that are used to mitigate the impact of constant changes in team personnel (e.g., having a well-established understanding of team roles [76]). Finally, it is worth noting that the framework better reflects the leadership structure in “closed” ICU, where unlike in the “open” ICUs, leadership and decision making tend to rest with the intensivist (77).

There are a number of issues for discussion regarding this literature review. First, the article search strategy focused on the relationship between teamwork and performance outcomes. It did not fully consider the consistency or quality of the ICU teamwork measurement tools. For example, data have been published on safety climate surveys containing subscales that focus on attitudes toward teamwork (65, 71, 78), and several observational measures have been developed to assess teamwork (25–27). It was beyond the scope of this review to assess or compare measures for their reliability or validity. However, there does exist a need to

develop a comprehensive listing and review of the various tools available for measuring teamwork in the ICU.

It is also necessary to consider the types of data (self-report, observational, attitudinal, interviews) that have been collected to understand teamwork in the ICU (Table 1). Each has well-documented limitations (79), such as the Hawthorn effect (80) or common method bias (81), and studies vary considerably in design, sampling strategies, and statistical analysis. For example, surveys and observations in simulators tend to associate quantitative data measuring teamwork and patient/team outcomes, whereas real-life observations and interviews tend to generalize from the behavioral patterns observed by investigators or practitioner reflections on teamwork. This makes it difficult for this review to compare the weight or significance of individual study findings.

It was found that the majority of reviewed studies supported the relationship between teamwork and ICU performance. As with any review of published literature, it is likely to be influenced by a

publication bias (82). However, it is noticeable that a number of articles reported nonsignificant relationships between teamwork and outcome data. For example, although teamwork interventions and perceptions of teamwork are often associated with reduced patient length of stay, they are rarely associated with risk-adjusted mortality (24, 42). Furthermore, when ICUs are compared against one another, units with higher ratings of teamwork do not necessarily perform better on measures of unit performance (23). Finally, many studies use correlation analyses to test the relationship between measures of teamwork and measures of performance. More complicated predictive analyses are required to fully understand the relationship between teamwork processes and technical or organizational outcomes. This in itself poses numerous difficulties, for example, ensuring that study sample sizes are adequate and that teamwork metrics are reliable. Furthermore, there is a need to develop longitudinal research designs and to identify a wider range of ICU outcome data that can be used for assessing team performance (16, 83).

CONCLUSIONS

The prototype team performance framework (Fig. 2) consolidates the existing knowledge regarding teamwork and outcomes in the ICU and provides a structure against which to design and evaluate teamwork interventions. An emerging direction for future research is the relationship between team leadership and team performance. Because of the hierarchical nature of acute medical teams, the behaviors of senior physicians seem to significantly influence the perceptions and behaviors of other team members. In developing interventions and team training programs, it is therefore critical to fully understand the role of leadership in ICU teams.

REFERENCES

- Paris C, Salas E, Cannon-Bowers J: Teamwork in multi-person system: A review and analysis. *Ergonomics* 2000; 43:1052–1075
- Wright D, Mackenzie M, Buchan I, et al: Critical incidents in the intensive therapy unit. *Lancet* 1991; 14:676–681
- Institute of Medicine: To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System. Washington, DC, Institute of Medicine, 2000
- Reader T, Flin R, Cuthbertson B: Communication skills and error in the intensive care unit. *Curr Opin Crit Care* 2007; 13:732–736
- Lucas D: The causes of human error. In: Human Factors in Safety Critical Systems. Redmill R (Ed). Oxford, Butterworth Heinemann, 1997, pp 37–65
- Helmreich R, Foushee H: Why crew resource management? Empirical and theoretical bases of human factors training in aviation. In: Cockpit Crew Resource Management. Weiner E, Kanki B, Helmreich R (Eds). San Diego, CA, Academic Press, 1993, pp 3–45
- Weiner E, Kanki B, Helmreich R: Cockpit Resource Management. San Diego, CA, Academic Press, 1993
- O'Connor P, HoÈrmann J, Flin R, et al: Developing a method for evaluating crew resource management skills: A European perspective. *Int J Aviat Psychol* 2002; 12: 263–285
- McGrath J: Social Psychology: A Brief Introduction. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964
- Brown R: Group Processes: Dynamics Within and Between Groups. Oxford, UK, Blackwell, 1988
- Steiner I: Group Processes and Productivity. New York, Academic Press, 1972
- Salas E, Dickinson T, Converse S, et al: Towards an understanding of team performance and training. In: Teams: Their Training and Performance. Swezey R, Salas E (Eds). Norwood, NJ, Ablex, 1992, pp 3–29
- Tannenbaum S, Beard R, Salas E: Team building and its influence on team effectiveness: An examination of conceptual and empirical developments. In: Issues, Theory, and Research in Industrial/Organizational Psychology. Kelley K (Ed). Amsterdam, Elsevier, 1992, pp 117–153
- Unsworth K, West M: Teams. The challenges of cooperative work. In: Introduction to Work and Organizational Psychology. Chanel N (Ed). Cornwall, UK, Blackwell, 2000, pp 327–346
- Bowers C, Jentsch F, Salas E: Establishing aircrew competencies: A comprehensive approach for identifying CRM training needs. In: Aircrew Training and Assessment. O'Neil H, Andrews D (Eds). New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000, pp 67–83
- Manser T: Team performance assessment in healthcare: Facing the challenge. *Simul Healthc* 2008; 3:1–3
- Reader T, Flin R, Lauche K, et al: Non-technical skills in the intensive care unit. *Br J Anaesth* 2006; 96:551–559
- Flin R, O'Connor P, Crichton M: Safety at the sharp end. A guide to non-technical skills. Aldershot, Ashgate, 2008
- Donchin Y, Gopher D, Olin M, et al: A look into the nature and causes of human errors in the intensive care unit. *Crit Care Med* 1995; 23:294–230
- Pronovost P, Wu A, Dorman T, et al: Building safety into ICU care. *J Crit Care* 2002; 17: 78–85
- Pronovost P, Wu A, Sexton J: Acute decompensation after removing a central line: Practical approaches to increasing safety in the intensive care unit. *Ann Intern Med* 2004; 140:1025–1033
- Pronovost P, Thompson D, Holzmüller C, et al: Toward learning from patient safety reporting systems. *J Crit Care* 2006; 21: 305–315
- Zimmerman J, Shortell S, Rousseau D, et al: Improving intensive care: Observations based on organizational case studies in nine intensive care units: A prospective, multi-center study. *Crit Care Med* 1993; 21: 1443–1451
- Shortell S, Zimmerman J, Rousseau D, et al: The performance of intensive care units: Does good management make a difference? *Med Care* 1994; 32:508–525
- Kim J, Neilipovitz D, Cardinal P, et al: A pilot study using high-fidelity simulation to formally evaluate performance in the resuscitation of critically ill patients: The University of Ottawa critical care medicine, high-fidelity simulation, and crisis resource management I study. *Crit Care Med* 2006; 34:2167–2174
- Ottestad E, Boulet J, Lighthall G: Evaluating the management of septic shock using patient simulation. *Crit Care Med* 2007; 35: 769–775
- Thomas EJ, Sexton J, Lasky R, et al: Teamwork and quality during neonatal care in the delivery room. *J Perinatol* 2006; 26:163–169
- Thomas EJ, Taggart B, Crandell S, et al: Teaching teamwork during the neonatal resuscitation program: A randomized trial. *J Perinatol* 2007; 27:409–414
- Miller PA: Nurse-physician collaboration in an intensive care unit. *Am J Crit Care* 2001; 10:341–350
- Reader T, Flin R, Mearns K, et al: Interdisciplinary communication in the intensive care unit. *Br J Anaesth* 2007; 98:347–352
- Wheelan S, Burchill C, Tilin F: The link between teamwork and patients' outcomes in intensive care units. *Am J Crit Care* 2003; 12:527–534
- Alvarez G, Coiera E: Interruptive communication patterns in the intensive care unit ward round. *Int J Med Inf* 2005; 74:791–796
- Hawryluck LA, Espin SL, Garwood KC, et al: Pulling together and pushing apart: Tides of tension in the ICU team. *Acad Med* 2002; 77:73–76
- Guzzo R, Dickson MW: Teams in organizations: Recent research on performance and effectiveness. *Annu Rev Psychol* 1996; 47: 307–338
- Salas E, Burke C, Stagl K: Developing teams and team leaders: Strategies and principles. In: Leader Development for Transforming Organizations. Growing Leaders for Tomorrow. Day D, Zaccaro S, Halpin S (Eds). New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004, pp 325–355
- Stewart G, Manz C: Leadership for self-managing work teams: A typology and integrative model. *Hum Relat* 1995; 48:747–770
- Salas E, Wilson-Donnelly K, Sims D, et al:

- Teamwork training for patient safety: Best practices and guiding principles. *In: Handbook of Human Factors and Ergonomics in Health Care and Patient Safety*. Carayon P (Ed). New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2007, pp 803–822
38. McCormick S, Wardrope J: Major incidents, leadership, and series summary and review. *Emerg Med J* 2003; 20:70–74
 39. Flin R, Yule S, Perry S: Leadership behaviours and safety in the emergency department. *In: Croskerry P, Cosby K, Schenkels, Wears R (Eds)*. Patient Safety in Emergency Medicine. Philadelphia, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2004, pp 375–381
 40. Yukl G: Leadership in Organisations. New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 2006
 41. Tschan F, Semmer N, Gaustchi D, et al: Leading to recovery: Group performance and coordinative activities in medical emergency driven groups. *Human Perform* 2006; 19: 277–304
 42. Stockwell D, Slonim A, Pollack M: Physician team management affects goal achievement in the intensive care unit. *Pediatr Crit Care Med* 2007; 8:840–845
 43. Strach van Schijndel R, Burchardi H: Bench-to-bedside review: Leadership and conflict management in the intensive care unit. *Crit Care* 2007; 11:234
 44. Klein K, Ziegert J, Knight P, et al: Dynamic delegation: Shared, hierarchical, and deindividualized leadership in extreme action teams. *Adm Sci Q* 2006; 51:590–621
 45. Yun S, Faraj S, Sims H: Contingent leadership and effectiveness of trauma resuscitation teams. *J Appl Psychol* 2005; 90: 1288–1296
 46. Hersey P, Blanchard K, Johnson D: Management of Organizational Behavior. Upper Saddle River, NJ, Prentice Hall, 1996
 47. Nembhard I, Edmondson AC: Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. *J Organ Behav* 2006; 27:941–966
 48. Bass B, Avolio B, Jung D, et al: Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *J Appl Psychol* 2003; 88:207–218
 49. Stodgill R: Personal factors associated with leadership: A review of the literature. *J Appl Psychol* 1948; 24:35–71
 50. Boyle D, Kochinda C: Enhancing collaborative communication of nurse and physician leadership in two intensive care units. *J Nurs Adm* 2004; 34:60–70
 51. McIntyre J, Salas E: Measuring and managing for team performance: Emerging principles from complex environments. *In: Team Effectiveness and Decision-Making in Organizations*. Guzzo R, Salas E (Eds). San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass, 1995, pp 9–45
 52. Lighthall G, Barr J, Howard S, et al: Use of a fully simulated intensive care unit environment for critical event management training for internal medicine residents. *Crit Care Med* 2003; 31:2437–2443
 53. Van Beuzekom M, Akerboom SP, Boer F: Assessing system failures in operating rooms and intensive care units. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2007; 16:45–50
 54. Poncet M, Toullic P, Papazian L, et al: Burn-out syndrome in critical care nursing staff. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2007; 175: 698–704
 55. Albolino S, Cook R, O'Connor M: Sensemaking, safety, and cooperative work in the intensive care unit. *Cogn Technol Work* 2007; 9:131–137
 56. Patterson E, Hofer T, Brungs S, et al: Structured interdisciplinary communication strategies in four ICUs: An observational study. Paper Presented at the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society 50th Meeting, San Francisco, CA, 2006
 57. Catchpole K, de Leval M, McEwan A, et al: Patient handover from surgery to intensive care: Using Formula 1 pit-stop and aviation models to improve safety and quality. *Paediatr Anaesth* 2007; 17:470–478
 58. Dodek P, Raboud J: Explicit approach to rounds in an ICU improves communication and satisfaction of providers. *Intensive Care Med* 2003; 29:1584–1588
 59. Pronovost P, Berenholtz S, Dorman T, et al: Improving communications in the ICU using daily goals. *J Crit Care* 2003; 18:71–75
 60. Mathieu J, Heffner J, Goodwin G, et al: The influence of shared mental models on team process and performance. *J Appl Psychol* 2000; 85:273–283
 61. Zsombok C: Naturalistic decision making research and improving team decision making. *In: Naturalistic Decision Making Research and Improving Team Decision Making*. Zsombok C, Klein G (Eds). New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1997, pp 111–120
 62. Baggs J, Schmitt M, Mushlin A, et al: Association between nurse-physician collaboration and patient outcomes in three intensive care units. *Crit Care Med* 1999; 31:1991–1998
 63. Puntillo K, McAdam A: Communication between physicians and nurses as a target for improving end-of-life care in the intensive care unit: Challenges and opportunities for moving forward. *Crit Care Med* 2006; 34: S332–S340
 64. Jain M, Miller L, Belt D, et al: Decline in ICU adverse events, nosocomial infections and cost through a quality improvement initiative focusing on teamwork and culture change. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2006; 15:235–239
 65. Sexton J, Thomas EJ, Helmreich RL: Error, stress and teamwork in medicine and aviation: Cross sectional surveys. *Br Med J* 2000; 320:745–749
 66. Patel VL, Arocha JF: The nature of constraints on collaborative decision making in health care settings. *In: Linking Expertise and Naturalistic Decision Making*. Salas E, Klein GA (Eds). New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001, 383–405
 67. Xiao Y, Seagull J, Mackenzie C, et al: Adaptive leadership in trauma resuscitation teams: A grounded theory approach to video analysis. *Cogn Technol Work* 2004; 6:158–164
 68. Flin R, Arbutnot, K (Eds): Incident Command: Tales from the Hot Seat. Aldershot, Ashgate, 2002
 69. Reader T, Flin R, Mearns K, et al: Team cognition in the intensive care unit. Paper Presented at the Society of Industrial and Organizational Society 22nd Annual Meeting, New York, 2007
 70. Thomas EJ, Sexton J, Helmreich RL: Discrepant attitudes about teamwork among critical care nurses and physicians. *Crit Care Med* 2003; 31:956–959
 71. Huang D, Clermont G, Sexton J, et al: Perceptions of safety culture across the intensive care units of a single institution. *Crit Care Med* 2007; 35:165–176
 72. Smith-Jentsch K, Mathieu J, Kraiger K: Investigating linear and interactive effects of shared mental models on safety and efficiency in a field setting. *J Appl Psychol* 2005; 90:523–535
 73. LePine J: Team adaptation and postchange performance: Effects of team composition in terms of members cognitive ability and personality. *J Appl Psychol* 2003; 88:27–39
 74. Ilgen D, Hollenbeck J, Johnson M, et al: Teams in organizations: From input-process-output models to IMO models. *Annu Rev Psychol* 2005; 56:517–543
 75. Carrol J, Quijada M: Tilting the culture in health care: Using culture strengths to transform organizations. *In: Handbook of Human Factors and Ergonomics in Health Care and Patient Safety*. Carayon P (Ed). New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2007, pp 823–832
 76. Marks M, Sabella M, Burke C, et al: The impact of cross-training on team effectiveness. *J Appl Psychol* 2002; 87:3–13
 77. Carson S, Stocking C, Podsadecki T, et al: Effects of organizational change in the medical intensive care unit of a teaching hospital: a comparison of 'open' and 'closed' formats. *J Am Med Assoc* 1996; 276:322–328
 78. Sexton J, Helmreich R, Neilands T, et al: The safety attitudes questionnaire: Psychometric properties, benchmarking data, and emerging research. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2006; 6:44
 79. Rogelberg S: Handbook of Research Methods in Industrial and Organisational Psychology. Oxford, UK, Blackwell, 2004
 80. Adair G: The Hawthorne effect: A reconsideration of the methodological artefact. *J Appl Psychol* 1984; 69:334–345
 81. Podsakoff P, Scott B, Mackenzie J, et al: Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *J Appl Psychol* 2003; 88:879–903
 82. Dickersin K: The existence of publication bias and risk factors for its occurrence. *J Am Assoc* 1990; 263:1385–1389
 83. Scott T, Mannion R, Marshall M: Does organisational culture influence health care performance? A review of the evidence. *J Health Serv Res Policy* 2003; 8:105–117