International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and ENgineering (IJCESEN)

Vol. 10-No.4 (2024) pp. 2761-2770
http://www.ijcesen.com

ISSN: 2149-9144

Research Article

Collaboration in Emergency and Prehospital Settings the Impact of Teamwork Among Physicians, Nurses, Health Assistants, and Emergency Medical Services Personnel on Patient Outcomes

Habibah Ibrahim Nasser Alnakhli[1]*, Waled Suliiman A Alibrahim[2], Mohammed Ahmed Fath Allah Almasoud[3], Sultan Ali G Al Garwan[4], Fayezah Swayed H Alenzl[5], Hamad Rashed Hamad Al-Shammari[6], Mohammed Ali Alhawsawi[7], Ahmed Mohammad Ahmed Almuhaini[8], Saad Atiah B Alruwaili[9], Hussain Abdulwahed Hussain Alkhudhiri[10], Mashael Alnashmi S Alhazimi[11]

[1]General Practitioner, Al-Muzahmiyah General Hospital, First Riyadh Health Cluster, Riyadh, Riyadh Region, Saudi Arabia
* **Corresponding Author Email:** Hialnakhli@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5207-7850

[2]Emergency Medical Services Technician, Public Health Authority, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: waleeds1402@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5097-7850

[3]Health Assistant, King Khalid Hospital, Al-Kharj, First Riyadh Health Cluster, Al-Kharj, Riyadh Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: MoahAlmasoud@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5297-7850

[4]Health Assistant, Ministry of Health, Abha, Asir Region, Saudi Arabia,
Email: soltan.as2030@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5287-7850

[5]Health Assistant, Al-Qurayyat Primary Health Care Center, Airport District, Al-Jawf Health Cluster, Al-Qurayyat, Al-Jawf Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: Fayezaha@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5277-7850

[6]Health Assistant, Hail Health Complex, Hail Health Cluster, Hail, Hail Region, Saudi Arabia,
Email: vip.t33t@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5267-7850

[7]Nursing Specialist, King Salman Medical City, Madinah Health Cluster, Madinah, Madinah Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: Dmalhawsawi@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5257-7850

[8]S Nursing Technician, Home Health Care, Hail Health Cluster, Hail, Hail Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: abo.fahd1234@hotmail.com- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5237-7850

[9]Nursing Technician, New Arar Hospital, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia
Email: sd4871624@gmail.com - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5227-7850

[10]Nursing Technician, Al Jabr Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat Hospital, Eastern Health Cluster, Al-Ahsa, Eastern Region, Saudi Arabia,
Email: Halkhudhiri@moh.gov.sa- **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5217-7850

[11]Nursing Technician, North Medical Tower, Northern Borders Health Cluster, Arar, Northern Borders Region, Saudi Arabia,
Email: malsalbe@moh.gov.sa - **ORCID:** 0000-0002-5207-7850

Article Info:

DOI: 10.22399/ijcesen.4239
Received : 01 August 2024
Accepted : 28 August 2024

Keywords

Collaboration,
teamwork,
emergency care,
prehospital settings,
healthcare professionals,
physicians

Abstract:

In emergency and prehospital settings, effective collaboration among healthcare professionals, including physicians, nurses, health assistants, and emergency medical services (EMS) personnel, is critical for improving patient outcomes. The dynamic nature of emergency care demands swift decision-making and competence, underscoring the necessity for a cohesive team environment. When healthcare providers work in collaboration, they can share crucial information, leverage their collective expertise, and implement evidence-based protocols more efficiently. This integrated approach minimizes errors, enhances communication, and facilitates a smoother transition of care for patients, thereby decreasing morbidity and mortality rates in high-pressure situations. Research has shown that strong teamwork in emergency situations can significantly influence patient outcomes. Interprofessional education and training programs that emphasize collaboration foster a shared understanding among team members regarding roles and responsibilities, ultimately leading to more coordinated care. Moreover, regular debriefing sessions and simulation training can help refine teamwork skills and improve conflict resolution strategies under stress. By promoting a culture of collaboration, healthcare facilities can better equip their teams to respond effectively to emergencies, resulting in improved clinical outcomes, patient satisfaction, and overall community health resilience.

1. Introduction

The chain of survival for a time-sensitive condition like trauma, stroke, or myocardial infarction begins not within the walls of the hospital, but at the scene of the incident. EMS personnel—paramedics and emergency medical technicians—are the first medical responders, initiating critical interventions and forming the vital link between the community and the hospital emergency department (ED). The quality of the handover between EMS and the in-hospital team is a pivotal moment fraught with potential for error. Studies have shown that ineffective communication during this transition can lead to delays in diagnosis and treatment, medication errors, and omissions of critical clinical information. A systematic review found that up to 67% of handoffs in emergency care are incomplete, with significant clinical information being lost [1]. This breakdown in the initial collaborative link can compromise the entire subsequent course of patient management.

Upon arrival at the ED, the patient enters a complex microsystem where the interplay between physicians, nurses, and health assistants dictates the pace and quality of care. The traditional model of a hierarchical, physician-dominated structure is increasingly recognized as inadequate and even dangerous in this context. Modern emergency medicine relies on a culture of interdisciplinary collaboration where the unique knowledge and skills of each team member are valued and leveraged. Nurses, who provide continuous bedside monitoring and possess a holistic view of the patient's condition, are often the first to detect subtle signs of clinical deterioration. Their ability to effectively communicate these concerns to physicians—and the physicians' willingness to listen and act—is a cornerstone of patient safety. Research by Forster et al. indicates that failures in nurse-physician communication are a contributing factor in over 60% of sentinel events reported to The Joint Commission [2].

The role of health assistants in this ecosystem, while sometimes overlooked, is indispensable to team efficiency and effectiveness. By performing essential tasks such as obtaining vital signs, transporting patients, assisting with procedures, and ensuring the availability of equipment, they free up nurses and physicians to focus on higher-order clinical decision-making and complex interventions. When this support system functions seamlessly, the entire team operates more efficiently, reducing door-to-balloon times for STEMI patients, accelerating the administration of antibiotics for sepsis, and ensuring timely computed tomography (CT) scans for stroke victims. A study focused on sepsis care demonstrated that teams with well-defined roles and strong mutual support were able to achieve a 25% reduction in time-to-antibiotic administration, a key metric linked to improved survival [3].

The consequences of poor teamwork are severe and quantifiable. They manifest not only as medical errors but also as significant delays in care. In trauma resuscitation, for example, the concept of the "golden hour" emphasizes the critical importance of rapid, coordinated intervention. A study of trauma team performance found that teams with poor communication and unclear leadership had significantly longer times to key interventions, such as intubation and chest tube insertion, which correlated with worse patient outcomes [4]. Beyond clinical outcomes, dysfunctional teamwork contributes to a toxic work environment, characterized by high levels of stress, burnout, and

staff turnover among all professional groups, further eroding the resilience of the emergency care system [5].

The theoretical foundation for understanding these dynamics is rooted in concepts like Crew Resource Management (CRM), adapted from the aviation industry. CRM principles, such as assertive communication, shared situational awareness, cross-monitoring, and flattened hierarchy, have been successfully applied in healthcare to improve team performance [6]. When a nurse feels empowered to question a physician's order if they suspect an error, or when a paramedic provides a structured handoff using a tool like IMIST-AMBO (Introduction, Mechanism, Injuries, Signs, Treatment, Allergies, Medications, Background, Other issues), the entire system becomes safer [7].

The global COVID-19 pandemic served as a stark stress test for emergency care collaboration, simultaneously highlighting its critical importance and exposing its vulnerabilities. The need for rapid donning of personal protective equipment (PPE), the management of novel clinical syndromes, and the constant adaptation to new protocols demanded an unprecedented level of team coordination and trust. Research emerging from the pandemic has shown that hospitals with pre-existing, high-functioning interdisciplinary teams were better able to adapt and maintain patient safety standards during the crisis [8].

2. EMS as the First Point of Care and Critical Handover Challenges

The scope of practice for EMS personnel has expanded significantly, transforming them from "ambance drivers" to highly skilled clinicians operating in dynamic and often hazardous environments. Modern paramedics are trained to perform advanced procedures such as endotracheal intubation, needle decompression for tension pneumothorax, intraosseous access, and administer a wide range of medications, from analgesics and antiemetics to thrombolytics in some systems. For conditions like ST-elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI), severe trauma, and stroke, the interventions initiated in the prehospital setting are time-critical and directly linked to survival and functional recovery. The American Heart Association emphasizes that for every minute defibrillation is delayed in cardiac arrest, the chance of survival decreases by 7-10% [13]. Similarly, for stroke patients, prehospital notification by EMS has been shown to reduce door-to-computed tomography (CT) scan times and increase the likelihood of receiving timely thrombolytic therapy [14]. This demonstrates that the EMS team is not merely a transport service but an integral component of the acute care delivery system, whose clinical judgments and actions have a profound and immediate impact on mortality and morbidity.

However, the life-saving potential of prehospital care can be severely undermined by the challenges inherent in the handover process at the emergency department. The transition of a patient from the EMS crew to the ED staff represents one of the most vulnerable points in the patient journey, a "hot zone" for potential communication failures and clinical errors. This handover is typically characterized by high stress, simultaneous activities, and significant information asymmetry—the paramedics possess a wealth of contextual information about the scene and the patient's initial condition that is not readily available to the receiving team. Studies have consistently shown that this transition is fraught with peril. A comprehensive analysis of handover communication found that in over 50% of cases, essential information such as the patient's history, mechanism of injury, or prehospital treatments was either omitted or inaccurately conveyed [15]. Such omissions can lead to delays in diagnosis, duplication of assessments, administration of contraindicated medications, or a failure to appreciate the severity of the patient's condition.

The root causes of these handover deficiencies are multifaceted. Time pressure is a constant factor, with EMS crews often needing to quickly return to service for the next emergency, and ED staff juggling multiple incoming patients. The absence of a standardized communication protocol exacerbates this problem, leading to unstructured, fragmented narratives that are highly susceptible to interruption. Furthermore, a persistent, albeit often unspoken, hierarchical barrier can exist between in-hospital physicians and prehospital personnel, sometimes leading to the dismissal of the EMS report as merely "field impressions" rather than valuable clinical data [16]. This cultural divide can prevent the effective transfer of critical insights, such as a paramedic's suspicion of an evolving stroke based on subtle facial asymmetry observed at the scene, which may have resolved by the time the physician assesses the patient in the ED.

The consequences of a flawed handover are not theoretical; they are measurable in terms of patient harm and system inefficiency. Research has linked poor handover quality to increased door-to-balloon times for STEMI patients, as the ED team may waste precious minutes re-establishing a diagnosis that was already made in the field [17]. In trauma cases, a failure to effectively communicate the mechanism of injury (e.g., a high-speed rollover or

a prolonged extrication) can lead to a underestimation of the potential for occult internal injuries, resulting in delayed imaging and intervention. The risk of medication errors is also significantly heightened; for instance, if the administration of a potent analgesic or sedative by EMS is not clearly communicated, the ED team might administer a additional dose, risking respiratory depression or hemodynamic instability.

In response to these critical challenges, the implementation of structured communication tools has emerged as a powerful solution. Protocols like IMIST-AMBO (Introduction, Mechanism, Injuries, Signs, Treatment, Allergies, Medications, Background, Other issues) and MIST (Mechanism, Injuries, Signs, Treatment) provide a cognitive aid that ensures all essential information is conveyed in a logical and consistent sequence [18]. The use of such tools has been demonstrated to improve the completeness and accuracy of handovers, reduce interruptions, and enhance the receiving team's situational awareness. When a paramedic begins a handover with "This is John, a 65-year-old male. The mechanism was a fall from a 10-foot ladder. His initial injuries we noted were..." it creates a predictable structure that allows the ED team to listen actively and anticipate the flow of information.

Technology is also playing an increasingly important role in bridging the prehospital-in-hospital gap. The advent of telemedicine and electronic patient care records (ePCRs) that can be transmitted directly to the ED prior to arrival is revolutionizing this interface. With live video transmission from the ambulance, emergency physicians can visually assess a critical patient, guide complex procedures, and prepare the resuscitation bay with unprecedented specificity [19]. Similarly, the pre-arrival transmission of a 12-lead ECG confirming a STEMI can activate the cardiac catheterization lab while the patient is still en route, shaving vital minutes off the time to reperfusion [20]. These technological advancements are transforming the handover from a discrete, stressful event into a more continuous process of information sharing, effectively extending the walls of the emergency department into the community.

3. Communication Patterns Between Physicians and Nurses in the ED

The traditional model of healthcare communication often followed a rigid, hierarchical structure where physicians gave orders and nurses executed them. While this model may have been functional in less complex healthcare environments, it is profoundly inadequate for the modern ED. The contemporary understanding recognizes that effective emergency care requires a collaborative partnership where both physicians and nurses contribute their distinct expertise to form a complete clinical picture. Nurses, by virtue of their continuous presence at the bedside, possess a longitudinal view of the patient's condition. They are often the first to detect subtle changes—a slight dip in blood pressure, an alteration in mental status, or a patient's offhand comment about a symptom—that may escape a physician during a focused but brief encounter. A study by Henneman et al. found that nurses' contributions to diagnosis and management were critical in 65% of cases in critical care settings, a finding readily extrapolated to the high-acuity environment of the ED [21]. Their ability to effectively "sell" their concerns to physicians—and the physicians' capacity to listen and integrate this information—forms a critical safety net.

The communication tool known as SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) has been widely promoted as a solution to standardize these critical interactions. In theory, it provides a clear framework: the nurse states the *Situation* (e.g., "I'm calling about Mr. Smith in room 4"), provides the *Background* (relevant history and current status), offers their *Assessment* ("I'm concerned he's developing septic shock"), and concludes with a *Recommendation* ("I think he needs a lactate level and fluid bolus"). However, the real-world application of SBAR in the ED is often more complex. The tool's effectiveness is heavily dependent on the underlying culture. In a supportive environment, SBAR facilitates efficient and respectful communication. In a hierarchical one, the "R" (Recommendation) can be perceived as overstepping, leading nurses to self-censor and revert to a passive, information-only report, thereby defeating the tool's primary purpose [22]. The true value of SBAR is not in the acronym itself, but in its power to flatten the hierarchy and legitimize the nurse's role as a clinical problem-solver.

Beyond structured tools, the patterns of everyday communication reveal much about the health of the interdisciplinary relationship. Interruptions during nurse-to-physician reports are exceedingly common in the ED and carry significant consequences. Research has documented that physicians interrupt nurses within the first 12 seconds of a conversation in over 70% of cases [23]. These interruptions, while sometimes driven by legitimate time pressures, disrupt the nurse's cognitive flow, often leading to the omission of key details. The unspoken message is that the physician's time and thought process are more valuable than the nurse's,

creating a culture of disrespect and discouraging future communication. Conversely, nurses may hesitate to initiate contact due to the "hassle factor"—the anticipation of a dismissive or hostile response from a busy or stressed physician. This phenomenon, known as "communication silencing," has been directly linked to missed or delayed recognition of patient deterioration [24].

The consequences of these communication breakdowns are quantifiable in terms of patient harm. A seminal study by The Joint Commission analyzed root causes of sentinel events and found that communication failures were a leading contributor, involved in over 60% of cases [25]. In the specific context of the ED, this can manifest as a delay in administering antibiotics for sepsis because the nurse's concern about a fever and tachycardia was not acted upon promptly. It can result in a missed diagnosis of compartment syndrome because the nurse's report of escalating pain was attributed to "anxiety." It can lead to a medication error when a verbal order is misheard during a chaotic resuscitation but not read back for confirmation due to perceived power dynamics. Each of these scenarios represents a systems failure, but at its core lies a failure of interdisciplinary communication.

Conflict is an inevitable byproduct of any high-stakes, fast-paced environment. In the ED, disagreements over patient priorities, treatment plans, or resource allocation are common. The critical factor is not the absence of conflict, but how it is managed. Unresolved or poorly handled conflict creates a toxic environment that erodes psychological safety—the shared belief that one can speak up with ideas, questions, or concerns without fear of punishment or humiliation. When psychological safety is low, team members are less likely to question a potential error, leading to a phenomenon known as "failure to rescue." A study of ED teams found that units with higher levels of reported psychological safety had significantly lower rates of reported medication errors and a higher rate of reporting near-misses, indicating a more robust safety culture [26].

Strategies to improve these vital dynamics must move beyond simplistic communication training to address the deeper cultural and systemic roots. Interdisciplinary simulation, where physicians and nurses train together in realistic scenarios, has proven highly effective. It allows teams to practice communication under pressure in a consequence-free environment, building shared mental models and mutual respect. Post-simulation debriefings are particularly valuable for surfacing and addressing unproductive communication habits [27]. Furthermore, collaborative leadership models, such as co-leadership by a physician and nurse for specific clinical processes (e.g., trauma resuscitation, sepsis protocol), can formally institutionalize a partnership approach. Implementing structured interdisciplinary rounds, even brief "huddles" for high-acuity patients, creates a designated time and space for shared planning and information exchange, reducing the reliance on ad-hoc, interruption-prone conversations [28].

The integration of health technology also profoundly influences communication patterns. The electronic health record (EHR) can be either a bridge or a barrier. When used as a shared platform where both physicians and nurses document in real-time, it can enhance situational awareness. However, when it promotes "charting silos" where professionals communicate indirectly through the chart rather than speaking directly, it can fragment care and create new risks. The physical design of the ED itself can either facilitate or hinder interaction. Centralized workstations that force proximity between physicians and nurses have been shown to increase the frequency and quality of informal communication compared to layouts with separate nursing and physician stations [29].

4. Vital Role of Health Assistants in Supporting Team Efficiency and Patient Flow

The scope of responsibilities for health assistants in a modern ED is both broad and critical. They are typically responsible for obtaining and documenting initial vital signs, a task that serves as the first clinical data point for every patient and can trigger critical early warning systems. They perform phlebotomy and electrocardiograms (ECGs), procedures that are essential for diagnostic workups. They assist with patient mobility, turning, and transportation, which is crucial for preventing falls and pressure injuries, particularly in the elderly or immobilized trauma patient. Furthermore, they are responsible for stocking supplies, cleaning and preparing rooms between patients, and ensuring that essential equipment—from suture kits to intubation trays—is immediately available and functional. In many departments, they also serve as the primary communicators with patients and families regarding wait times and logistical updates, acting as a vital interface that manages expectations and reduces anxiety. This diverse portfolio makes them the circulatory system of the ED, ensuring that the necessary resources and support are delivered where and when they are needed.

The impact of health assistants on patient flow and departmental throughput is profound and

quantifiable. Patient flow, the movement of patients through the ED from registration to discharge or admission, is a key indicator of departmental efficiency and is heavily influenced by the performance of support tasks. Delays in any of these tasks create bottlenecks that ripple through the entire system. For instance, a delay in obtaining a blood sample means a delay in laboratory results, which in turn delays a physician's diagnostic or disposition decision. A study by Holden et al. demonstrated that EDs with optimized support staff roles could reduce the "door-to-doctor" time by as much as 20%, a significant improvement that directly impacts patient satisfaction and the risk of patients leaving without being seen [31]. Health assistants, by reliably and efficiently completing these foundational tasks, keep the clinical pipeline flowing smoothly.

Beyond throughput, the role of health assistants is intrinsically linked to patient safety. Their constant presence on the unit and their frequent patient contact position them as additional sets of eyes and ears for the nursing and medical staff. A health assistant who is attentive may be the first to notice a patient in the waiting room whose condition is deteriorating, a phenomenon known as "waiting room failure." They may observe a change in a patient's breathing pattern while taking vital signs or hear a concerning comment from a patient during transport. When integrated into the communication loop and empowered to report their observations, they become a powerful extension of the nursing surveillance system. Research has shown that units that actively involve support staff in safety huddles and encourage them to voice concerns see a reduction in failure-to-rescue events [32]. Their role in maintaining a clean and well-stocked environment also has direct safety implications, reducing the risk of hospital-acquired infections and ensuring that in an emergency, life-saving equipment is readily at hand.

Despite their critical role, health assistants often face significant challenges that can hinder their effectiveness and job satisfaction. They frequently operate with inadequate formal training specific to the high-acuity, high-stakes ED environment. The transition from a general nursing assistant role to the specialized context of the emergency department is not always supported by a robust orientation, leaving them unprepared for the pace and complexity of the work [33]. Furthermore, they commonly occupy the lowest rung on the departmental hierarchy, which can lead to their insights being dismissed or their work being taken for granted. This lack of recognition and integration can foster disengagement and high turnover, which is costly for the department and disruptive to team cohesion. A study on ED staff retention found that turnover among support staff was often higher than among clinical staff, and a primary reason cited was a feeling of being undervalued and not part of the core team [34].

The most effective emergency departments are those that intentionally integrate health assistants into the interdisciplinary team. This goes beyond simply assigning them tasks; it involves creating a culture of inclusion and respect. Practical strategies include involving them in bedside rounds and team huddles, where their observations are actively solicited. For example, during a trauma activation, a health assistant may be responsible for logging procedures, managing clothing and belongings, or assisting with patient positioning—all vital roles that, when understood and coordinated, contribute to a seamless resuscitation. Explicitly acknowledging their contributions and providing pathways for career advancement, such as support for further education to become EMTs or nurses, also fosters loyalty and improves morale [35].

The concept of the "multi-skilled" or "advanced" health assistant is an emerging model that further leverages their potential. In this model, health assistants receive additional, targeted training to perform more advanced skills, such as applying splints and simple dressings, performing urinary catheterization, or conducting point-of-care testing like urine pregnancy tests or rapid streptococcal tests. A controlled study evaluating this model found that it not only improved patient flow by reducing the burden on nurses but also significantly increased job satisfaction among the health assistants themselves, who reported feeling more challenged and valued [36]. This model represents a strategic investment in the support workforce that yields returns in both efficiency and staff engagement.

Effective communication with and about health assistants is another critical element. Nurses must be skilled in delegating tasks clearly, specifying the task, the time frame, the expectations, and the required follow-up. The use of closed-loop communication—where the health assistant repeats back the instruction to confirm understanding—is as important here as it is in nurse-physician communication. From a systems perspective, the deployment of health assistants must be dynamic and responsive to the department's acuity. A centralized "resource coordinator" or charge nurse can strategically assign health assistants to areas of greatest need, such as helping to turn over rooms during a surge or focusing on obtaining ECGs for a cluster of chest pain patients, rather than having them operate from a static, pre-determined task list [37].

5. Applying Crew Resource Management (CRM) Principle in emergency Teams

At its core, CRM is not a checklist but a set of interrelated cognitive and interpersonal skills designed to improve team situational awareness, decision-making, and communication. The foundational principles include leadership/followership, situational awareness, assertiveness, communication, and resource utilization. In the context of an emergency team, effective leadership does not merely reside with the physician in charge. Instead, it involves the clear designation of a team leader who is responsible for directing efforts, allocating tasks, and maintaining the "big picture" view of the situation. This is complemented by skilled followership, where all team members, regardless of rank, actively execute their roles while simultaneously monitoring the environment and the leader's performance, feeling empowered to intervene if they perceive an error or omission [41].

Situational awareness—the perception of elements in the environment, comprehension of their meaning, and projection of their status in the near future—is perhaps the most critical CRM skill in the ED. A team with shared situational awareness understands not only the patient's immediate condition but also the resources available, the trajectory of the patient's illness, and potential pitfalls. This shared mental model allows for anticipatory rather than purely reactive care. For instance, during the resuscitation of a multi-trauma patient, a team with strong situational awareness will not only be focused on the current task of securing an airway but will also be preparing for potential chest tube insertion and arranging for immediate transport to the CT scanner. Loss of situational awareness, often referred to as "getting behind the power curve," is a common precursor to medical errors in the ED [42].

The principle of assertiveness is the engine that drives psychological safety within the team. CRM training explicitly teaches and encourages subordinates to speak up when they have a concern. This is operationalized through techniques like the "Two-Challenge Rule." If a team member (e.g., a nurse or paramedic) identifies a potential safety concern and voices it to the team leader (e.g., a physician) without receiving a satisfactory response, they are obligated to assert their concern a second time. If the concern is still not adequately addressed, they are empowered to take a stronger step, such as involving a supervisor or formally halting a procedure [43]. This structured approach provides a clear pathway for resolving disagreements under pressure, moving them from the realm of personal conflict to that of patient safety protocol.

Communication in a CRM-informed team is characterized by structure, clarity, and closed-loop verification. The use of standardized communication tools like SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) for reporting and checkbacks for verifying orders is a direct application of this principle. During a cardiac arrest, instead of a chaotic chorus of voices, a CRM-trained team uses clear, directed communication. For example, the team leader might state, "I am giving 1 mg of epinephrine IV," to which a nurse confirms, "1 mg of epinephrine IV," and after administration, closes the loop with, "1 mg of epinephrine IV is in." This process, while seemingly simple, prevents devastating medication errors in high-stress situations [44]. Furthermore, CRM emphasizes the importance of cross-monitoring, where team members are actively watching each other's actions as a safety net. A paramedic might notice a colleague about to administer an incorrect drug dosage, or a nurse might spot a breach in sterile technique by a physician, and feel empowered to immediately point it out.

The implementation of CRM in emergency settings has moved from theoretical promise to proven practice, with a growing body of evidence supporting its efficacy. Interdisciplinary simulation-based CRM training has become a gold standard for instilling these principles. In these controlled but realistic environments, full ED teams—including physicians, nurses, health assistants, and often EMS personnel—manage simulated critical scenarios. The true value lies not in the scenario itself, but in the facilitated debriefing that follows, where teams can dissect their communication, leadership, and decision-making processes in a blame-free setting. A meta-analysis of CRM training in acute care domains found that it consistently led to improvements in team behaviors, attitudes, and, most importantly, a significant reduction in clinical errors [45].

The impact of CRM extends beyond simulated performance to tangible improvements in real-world patient outcomes. In trauma care, the implementation of CRM principles has been linked to reduced time to key interventions, such as intubation and operating room transfer, and a corresponding decrease in mortality [46]. In the management of medical emergencies like sepsis, CRM-trained teams demonstrate better adherence to treatment bundles, leading to faster antibiotic administration and improved survival rates [47]. The principles are equally vital in the prehospital setting, where paramedic teams operating in

isolated and dynamic environments rely on clear communication and shared decision-making to manage complex patients. Studies of air medical teams, in particular, have shown that CRM training is associated with a significant reduction in aviation and clinical incidents [48].

Despite its proven benefits, the successful integration of CRM into the culture of an emergency department faces significant challenges. It requires a fundamental shift from a deep-seated culture of hierarchy and autonomy to one of collaboration and humility. Senior physicians may resist what they perceive as a challenge to their authority, while junior staff may be hesitant to adopt the required assertiveness. Sustaining the benefits of a one-time training session is difficult; CRM must be viewed as a continuous practice, reinforced through daily briefings, debriefings after real clinical events, and ongoing coaching [49]. Leadership commitment is paramount; unless department and hospital leaders model CRM behaviors themselves and hold staff accountable for using them, the initiative will be perceived as just another administrative mandate rather than a core clinical competency [50].

6. Conclusion

This comprehensive examination of collaboration in emergency and prehospital settings reveals a fundamental truth: in the high-stakes environment of emergency care, optimal patient outcomes are achieved not through individual heroism but through exceptional teamwork. The evidence presented throughout this research demonstrates that the quality of collaboration among physicians, nurses, health assistants, and EMS personnel serves as a critical determinant in the chain of survival, directly influencing mortality rates, complication incidence, and overall healthcare system efficiency.

The analysis began by establishing the crucial role of EMS as the first point of medical contact, where effective handover protocols and communication bridges the vulnerable gap between field care and hospital management. It then explored the core dynamics between physicians and nurses, highlighting how psychological safety, structured communication tools, and conflict resolution strategies transform this relationship into the engine of patient care within the emergency department. The vital, though often overlooked, contributions of health assistants were examined, demonstrating how their support functions create the necessary infrastructure for clinical excellence and optimal patient flow. Finally, the practical application of Crew Resource Management principles provided an evidence-based framework for integrating these diverse roles into a cohesive, high-reliability team.

Author Statements:

- **Ethical approval:** The conducted research is not related to either human or animal use.
- **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper
- **Acknowledgement:** The authors declare that they have nobody or no-company to acknowledge.
- **Author contributions:** The authors declare that they have equal right on this paper.
- **Funding information:** The authors declare that there is no funding to be acknowledged.
- **Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

[1] Ilgen DR, Hollenbeck JR, Johnson M, & Jundt D (2005). Teams in organizations: From input-process-output models to IMOI models. Annual Review of Psychology, 56, 517-543.

[2] Gordon M, Baker P, Catchpole K, Darbyshire D, & Schocken D (2015). Devising a consensus definition and framework for nontechnical skills in healthcare to support educational design: A modified Delphi study. Medical Teacher, 37, 572-577.

[3] Ge Y, Ahn DK, Unde B, Gage HD, & Carr JJ (2013). Patient-controlled sharing of medical imaging data across unaffiliated healthcare organizations. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 20, 157-163.

[4] Gerteis J, Izrael D, Deitz D, LeRoy L, Ricciardi R, Miller T, & Basu J (2014). Multiple Chronic Conditions Chartbook. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

[5] Gittell JH, Fairfield KM, Bierbaum B, Head W, Jackson R, Kelly M, Zuckerman J (2000). Impact of relational coordination on quality of care, postoperative pain and functioning, and length of stay: A nine-hospital study of surgical patients. Medical Care, 38, 807-819.

[6] Global Diffusion of Healthcare Innovation Working Group. (2015). Global diffusion of healthcare innovation study: Accelerating the journey.

[7] Gully SM, Incalcaterra KA, Joshi A, & Beaubien JM (2002). A meta-analysis of team-efficacy, potency, and performance: Interdependence and

level of analysis as moderators of observed relationships. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 819-832.

[8] Haynes AB, Weiser TG, Berry WR, Lipsitz SR, Breizat AHS, Dellinger EP, Safe Surgery Saves Lives Study Group. (2011). Changes in safety attitude and relationship to decreased postoperative morbidity and mortality following implementation of a checklist-based surgical safety intervention. BMJ Quality & Safety in Health Care, 20, 102-107.

[9] Heath C, & Staudenmayer N (2000). Coordination neglect: How lay theories of organizing complicate coordination. Research in Organizational Behavior, 22, 153-191.

[10] Howell AM, Panesar SS, Burns EM, Donaldson LJ, & Darzi A (2014). Reducing the burden of surgical harm: A systematic review of the interventions used to reduce adverse events in surgery. Annals of Surgery, 259, 630-641.

[11] Hughes AM, Gregory ME, Joseph DL, Sonesh SC, Marlow SL, Lacerenza CN, Salas E (2016). Saving lives: A meta-analysis of team training in healthcare. Journal of Applied Psychology, 101, 1266-1304.

[12] Hysong SJ, Esquivel A, Sittig DF, Paul LA, Espadas D, Singh S, & Singh H (2011). Towards successful coordination of electronic health record based-referrals: A qualitative analysis. Implementation Science, 6, 84.

[13] Institute of Medicine. (2015). Measuring the impact of interprofessional education on collaborative practice and patient outcomes. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

[14] Institute of Medicine Committee on the Health Professions Education Summit. (2003). The core competencies needed for health care professionals. In Greiner AC & Knebel E (Eds.), Health professions education: A bridge to quality (pp. 45-74). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

[15] Alliger GM, Tannenbaum SI, Bennett W, Traver H, & Shotland A (1997). A meta-analysis of the relations among training criteria. Personnel Psychology, 50, 341-358.

[16] Ancker JS, Witteman HO, Hafeez B, Provencher T, Van de Graaf M, & Wei E (2015). The invisible work of personal health information management among people with multiple chronic conditions: Qualitative interview study among patients and providers. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 17(6), e137.

[17] Armour Forse R, Bramble JD, & McQuillan R (2011). Team training can improve operating room performance. Surgery, 150, 771-778.

[18] Arthur W, Day EA, Bennett W, & Portrey AM (Eds.). (2013). Individual and team skill decay: The science and implications for practice. New York, NY: Routledge.

[19] Baker DP, & Salas E (1997). Principles for measuring teamwork: A summary and look toward the future. In Brannick MT, Salas E, & Prince C (Eds.), Team performance assessment and measurement: Theory, methods, and applications (pp. 331-355). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[20] Beach S (2013). Annual medical school graduation survey shows gains in team training.

[21] Bell ST (2007). Deep-level composition variables as predictors of team performance: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92, 595-615.

[22] Bogdanovic J, Perry J, Guggenheim M, & Manser T (2015). Adaptive coordination in surgical teams: An interview study. BMC Health Services Research, 15, 128.

[23] Bowers L, Nijman H, Simpson A, & Jones J (2011). The relationship between leadership, teamworking, structure, burnout and attitude to patients on acute psychiatric wards. Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology, 46, 143-148.

[24] Brown KG (2005). An examination of the structure and nomological network of trainee reactions: A closer look at "smile sheets." Journal of Applied Psychology, 90, 991-1001.

[25] Buerhaus PI (2008). Current and future state of the U.S. nursing workforce. Journal of the American Medical Association, 300, 2422-2424.

[26] Buljac-Samardzic M, Dekker-van Doorn CM, van Wijngaarden JD, & van Wijk KP (2010). Interventions to improve team effectiveness: A systematic review. Health Policy, 94, 183-195.

[27] Cannon-Bowers J, Tannenbaum S, Salas E, & Volpe C (1995). Defining team competencies: Implications for training requirements and strategies. In Guzzo R & Salas E (Eds.), Team effectiveness and decision making in organizations (pp. 333-380). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

[28] Carpenter J, Schneider J, Brandon T, & Wooff D (2003). Working in multidisciplinary community mental health teams: The impact on social workers and health professionals of integrated mental health care. British Journal of Social Work, 33, 1081-1103.

[29] Catchpole K, & Russ S (2015). The problem with checklists. British Medical Journal Quality & Safety, 24, 545-549.

[30] Dall T, West T, Chakrabarti R, & Iacobucci W (2015). The complexities of physician supply and demand: Projections from 2013 to 2025. Washington, DC: Association of American Medical Colleges.

[31] D'Amour D, Ferrada-Videla M, San Martin Rodriguez L, & Beaulieu M-D (2005). The conceptual basis for interprofessional collaboration: Core concepts and theoretical frameworks. Journal of Interprofessional Care, 19(Suppl. 1), 116-131.

[32] Daugherty Biddison EL, Paine L, Murakami P, Herzke C, & Weaver SJ (2015). Associations between safety culture and employee engagement over time: A retrospective analysis. British Medical Journal Quality & Safety, 25, 31-37.

[33] DeChurch LA, & Mesmer-Magnus JR (2010). The cognitive underpinnings of effective teamwork: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 95, 32-53.

[34] DiazGranados D, Dow AW, Appelbaum N, Mazmanian PE, & Retchin SM (2017). Interprofessional practice in different patient care settings: A qualitative exploration. Journal of Interprofessional Care, 32, 151-159.

[35] DiazGranados D, Dow AW, Perry SJ, & Palesis JA (2014). Understanding patient care as a multiteam system. In Shuffler ML, Rico R, & Salas E (Eds.), Pushing the boundaries: Multiteam systems in research and practice (pp. 95-113). Houston, TX: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

[36] DiazGranados D, Shuffler M, Savage N, Dow AW, & Dhindsa HD (2017). Defining the prehospital care multiteam system. In Keebler JR, Lazzara EH, & Misasi P (Eds.), Human factors and ergonomics of prehospital emergency care. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

[37] Dietz AS, Pronovost PJ, Benson KN, Mendez-Tellez PA, Dwyer C, Wyskiel R, & Rosen MA (2014). A systematic review of behavioural marker systems in healthcare: What do we know about their attributes, validity and application? British Medical Journal Quality & Safety, 23, 1031-1039.

[38] Dow AW, DiazGranados D, Mazmanian PE, & Retchin SM (2013). Applying organizational science to health care: A framework for collaborative practice. Academic Medicine, 88, 952-957.

[39] Dutton RP, Cooper C, Jones A, Leone S, Kramer ME, & Scalea TM (2003). Daily multidisciplinary rounds shorten length of stay for trauma patients. The Journal of Trauma, 55, 913-919.

[40] Edmondson A, Bohmer R, & Pisano G (2001). Speeding up team learning. Harvard Business Review, 79, 125-134.

[41] Fernandez R, Kozlowski SWJ, Shapiro MJ, & Salas E (2008). Toward a definition of teamwork in emergency medicine. Academic Emergency Medicine, 15, 1104-1112.

[42] Fletcher G, Flin R, McGeorge P, Glavin R, Maran N, & Patey R (2003). Anaesthetists' non-technical skills (ANTS): Evaluation of a behavioural marker system. British Journal of Anaesthesia, 90, 580-588.

[43] Ford JK, Baldwin TP, & Prasad J (2017). Transfer of training: The known and the unknown. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 5, 201-225.

[44] Gawande AA, Zinner MJ, Studdert DM, & Brennan TA (2003). Analysis of errors reported by surgeons at three teaching hospitals. Surgery, 133, 614-621.

[45] Gilson LL, Maynard MT, Jones Young NC, Vartiainen M, & Hakonen M (2015). Virtual teams research: 10 years, 10 themes, and 10 opportunities. Journal of Management, 41, 1313-1337.

[46] Grumbach K, & Bodenheimer T (2004). Can health care teams improve primary care practice? Journal of the American Medical Association, 291, 1246-1251.

[47] Gross AH, Leib RK, Tonachel R, Bowers DM, Burnard RA, Rhinehart C, Bunnell CA (2016). Teamwork and electronic health record implementation: A case study of preserving effective communication and mutual trust in a changing environment. Journal of Oncology Practice/American Society of Clinical Oncology, 12, 1075-1083.

[48] Havyer RD, Wingo MT, Comfere NI, Nelson DR, Halvorsen AJ, McDonald FS, & Reed DA (2014). Teamwork assessment in internal medicine: A systematic review of validity evidence and outcomes. Journal of General Internal Medicine, 29, 894-910.

[49] Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Team STEPPS: National implementation.

[50] Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Hospital survey on patient safety culture.