*Int. J. Adv. Res. Sci. Technol. Volume 15, Issue 7, 2026, pp. 2228-2245.*

IJARST

*International Journal of Advanced Research in Science and Technology*

https://doi.org/10.62226/ijarst20262737

ISSN 2319 – 1783 (Print)

ISSN 2320 – 1126 (Online)

# From Cockpit to Enterprise: A Cross-Domain Unified Framework for Crew Resource Management and High-Reliability Collaborative Systems

***Seamus C. C. Phan***

*Research Director, McGallen & Bolden Pte Ltd, Singapore*

**ARTICLEINFO**

***Article history:***

| | |
|---|---|
| Received | 06 July 2026 |
| Accepted | 18 July 2026 |
| Available online | 25 July 2026 |

***Keywords:***

*Crew Resource Management (CRM), High-Reliability Organizations (HROs), Non-Technical Skills (NTS), Safety-Critical Systems, Behavioral Marker Systems, Cross-Domain Collaboration*

***Indexed in:***

doi Crossref

INDEX COPERNICUS INTERNATIONAL

Google scholar

*and in major libraries*

**ABSTRACT**

This study addresses the critical challenge of high-risk operational fragmentation, where domains such as aviation crew resource management (CRM), medical simulation, crisis communication, enterprise governance, and adversarial frameworks operate in conceptual silos despite sharing core non-technical dependencies. To bridge these gaps, we propose a cross-disciplinary, unified collaborative system framework that maps core non-technical competencies, standardizes behavioral marker metrics (e.g., NOTECHS), and models dynamic organizational safety cultures under acute human performance limitations like fatigue. The paper delivers three primary contributions: Cross-Domain Synthesis: It unifies fragmented operational insights into a structured taxonomy of team coordination, situation awareness, and adaptive leadership roles (e.g., Pilot Flying vs. Pilot Monitoring). Methodological Calibration: It reconciles the theoretical tensions between structured behavioral markers and emergent resilience engineering principles within simulation-based paradigms. Strategic Roadmap: It establishes a clear implementation agenda that pairs diagnostic validation tools with agile, local problem-solving capabilities. This suggested framework is specifically for safety-critical administrators, simulation-based training designers, enterprise risk management executives, and high-reliability operational leaders seeking to scale robust collaborative safety systems across complex socio-technical landscapes.



## 1 Introduction

Early aviation accidents caused by unmanaged malfunctions, heavy workloads, and poor fuel tracking shifted safety paradigms toward explicit training in leadership, decision-making, and crew coordination. Crew Resource Management (CRM) emerged from these investigations as a structured methodology to enhance team effectiveness under stress. However, traditional literature often isolates these principles within individual cockpits, failing to explain how micro-level non-technical skills scale up to inform broader crisis communication and enterprise governance. This paper bridges this gap by introducing a unified, cross-disciplinary framework that integrates localized tactical behaviors directly with systemic, multi-domain workflows (Alavosius et al., 2017; Wagener & Ison, 2014).

As CRM transitioned from aviation to other sectors, it came to represent the optimal use of all available resources—hardware, software, and human assets—organized around six measurable competency domains: communication, situational awareness, decision-making, teamwork, capacity management, and leadership. While these behaviors are readily observable during operational execution and simulation debriefings, current scholarship lacks a standardized method for translating them across industries. This paper provides unique value-add by demonstrating how these diverse behavioral markers can be unified into a scalable, cross-domain matrix to measure and manage human capacity thresholds in any high-reliability environment (Alavosius et al., 2017; Wagener & Ison, 2014).

This evolution also reshaped operational hierarchy. By replacing absolute commander authority with codified, collaborative roles—such as Pilot Flying (PF) and Pilot Monitoring (PM)—modern CRM stabilizes workload distribution and ensures that standard operating deviations are actively voiced rather than suppressed. A key contribution of this study is the extraction of these specialized authority-participation dynamics and their translation into a macro-level enterprise governance architecture. This integration proves that balancing rigid legal roles with flexible functional tasks is a cross-domain prerequisite for broader organizational resilience (Alavosius et al., 2017; Salvetti et al., 2020).

Contemporary CRM integrates Threat and Error Management (TEM) through high-fidelity, scenario-based simulator training, utilizing closed-loop feedback from operational audits to continuously update curricula. While powerful, these feedback loops rarely intersect with adversarial stress-testing or proactive risk modeling. This review advances current scholarship by combining simulation-driven training data with adversarial simulation frameworks, establishing a proactive roadmap for continuous risk adaptation across high-stress socio-technical landscapes (Alavosius et al., 2017; Wagener & Ison, 2014).

As CRM has diffused beyond aviation, frameworks like NOTECHS have been deployed to classify core competencies, yet substantial variations persist regarding how different industries incorporate procedural compliance and individual stress management. The distinct value added by this paper lies in its ability to reconcile these conceptual variations. By anchoring flexible resilience engineering within structured, diagnostic behavioral taxonomies, the integrated framework offers a comprehensive, adaptable methodology for global risk operations (Bergström et al., 2011; Dahlström et al.; Havinga et al., 2017).

## 2 Methodology and Scope

### 2.1 Study Design and Scope

This paper uses a systematic conceptual review framework to map, analyze, and synthesize cross-disciplinary research across aviation crew resource management (CRM), medical simulation, crisis communication theory, enterprise risk governance, and adversarial simulation frameworks. The primary objective is to bridge conceptual silos by reconciling structural compliance metrics with dynamic resilience engineering to build a unified, scalable operational safety taxonomy, applicable to enterprise-wide environments in handling crises and acute events.

### 2.2 Search Strategy and Database Selection

Comprehensive literature searches were executed across major multidisciplinary and specialized databases, including Academia, Scopus, Web of Science, PubMed/MEDLINE, IEEE Xplore, and Google Scholar. Searches were supplemented by technical reports from aviation and maritime safety authorities, Joint Aviation Requirements (JAR-TEL) document repositories, and established enterprise risk management frameworks. Boolean strings were optimized using paired terms such as "crew resource management," "non-technical skills," "NOTECHS," "threat and error management," and "adversarial simulation" cross-referenced with "crisis governance."

### 2.3 Inclusion, Exclusion, and Analysis

Studies were included if they were peer-reviewed journal articles, foundational textbooks, or official regulatory technical reports focusing on observable non-technical skill taxonomies, behavioral marker systems, or organizational safety architectures. Localized corporate whitepapers, opinion pieces, and engineering papers restricted to pure hardware or software mechanics were excluded.

The retrieved literature underwent a three-phase qualitative thematic synthesis:

First, localized non-technical competencies and operational roles (such as Pilot Flying and Pilot Monitoring) were extracted and mapped across operational boundaries.

Second, conceptual tensions between rigid behavioral marker compliance (e.g., NOTECHS) and flexible sharp-end adaptation (resilience engineering) were systematically analyzed.

Third, these decentralized workflows were integrated with simulation-driven audit data and adversarial stress testing to form a macro-level enterprise risk governance model.

### 2.4 Scope Limitations

Although this approach draws systematically from established high-reliability literature, the synthesized framework relies heavily on structured environments like aviation, healthcare, and industrial safety. The resultant models may require further context-specific calibration when applied to highly decentralized business structures or autonomous, AI-driven socio-technical systems that lack established simulator or human-in-the-loop tracking infrastructures.

## 3 Theoretical and Historical Foundations of Aviation CRM and Crisis Management

### 3.1 Human Factors in HighRisk Aviation Operations

Human performance issues in multicrew cockpits have been repeatedly identified as central contributors to accidents in high-risk aviation operations. Investigations of carrier incidents and accidents show that human error is implicated in nearly 80% of events, and that many of the associated problems concern group decision-making, communication, leadership, and task or resource management rather than purely technical flying skills. These findings are particularly pronounced in approach and landing phases, which account for a majority of accidents while comprising only a small fraction of total flight time. Data on unstabilized approaches and inadequate monitoring underscore how deficiencies in crew coordination and vigilance manifest at precisely the moments when workload and environmental demands peak. Historical analyses of jet transport operations accentuate how increasing technological complexity did not automatically translate into improved safety. As aircraft began to fly farther and faster and systems became more intricate, fatal accidents rose and were often classified as pilot error. Subsequent work by organizations such as NASA showed that many critical events had "little to do with the technical side of working in a multicrew cockpit" and instead reflected failures in interpersonal and cognitive domains: poor group decision-making, ineffective communication, inadequate leadership, and deficient task or resource management (Wagener & Ison, 2014).

In response, human factors training shifted attention from individual technical proficiency toward crew-level competencies that acknowledge the cockpit as a social, communicative, and organizational system (Alavosius et al., 2017; Wagener & Ison, 2014).

Within this system, crew resource management provides a behavioral framework for describing and training the human factor skills that support safe operations. CRM has been defined as the effective use of all available resources, including hardware, software, and people, to achieve the highest possible level of safety, and is explicitly conceived as a systemic model of training and behavioral change that reduces human error through optimized team processes. From its aviation origins, CRM targets situation awareness, communication skills, teamwork, task allocation, and decision-making, all organized around crews working cooperatively in dynamic environments. These processes can be structured into six broad behavioral classes: communication, situational awareness, decision-making, teamwork, management of the limits of crew members ' capacities, and leadership. Each class can be further decomposed into observable behaviors during briefing, operational execution, and debriefing, which allows human factors practitioners to assess performance in context rather than in isolation. Stress, fatigue, habituation, and workload are prominent human factors constraints in high-risk aviation operations. Complex technology and parallel monitoring of multiple data streams place demands on operators that can exceed sustainable attentional and cognitive capacities. Even when automated systems reduce workload in some domains, they can create new forms of vulnerability by shaping workflow pacing and altering opportunities for human self-management of performance. Under overwhelming demands, human responses may become unpredictable, including withdrawal, escape, inflexible repetition of ineffective behavior, or avoidance of further stimulation, all of which degrade the quality of crew coordination and decision-making. Errors in such contexts may occur as near misses that increase risk yet leave no overt negative consequence, often remaining below reporting thresholds and thus escaping organizational learning. This loss of feedback hampers the ability to refine CRM and human factors interventions aimed at preventing similar events (Alavosius et al., 2017).

Standard Operating Procedures constitute another critical human factors element. Global aviation safety organizations have reconfirmed SOPs as essential to flight safety, emphasizing that crews need a shared mental model of each task to achieve effective coordination and performance. Clear, comprehensive, and accessible SOPs support standardized operations and reduce perceptual or ad hoc actions by crew members. However, high-risk operations frequently require crews to move beyond rigid procedure adherence, detecting and responding to novel environmental variations while maintaining coordinated behavior. This tension between standardization and adaptability places human factors at the center of CRM design, particularly in training adaptive, flexible responses that remain grounded in shared expectations yet allow for context-sensitive deviations when necessary (Alavosius et al., 2017; Wagener & Ison, 2014).

Leadership operates as an integrative human factor, binding the various CRM behavioral classes into a coherent team response. Briefing, operations, and debriefing events give assessors vantage points to examine how leaders establish objectives, allocate roles, maintain situational awareness, and guide collective problem-solving. Evidence suggests that effective training and maintenance of CRM and leadership behaviors help create and sustain an organizational culture oriented toward respect and safety, and enable prosocial behavior that protects both employees and the broader environment in which aviation systems operate (Alavosius et al., 2017).

### 3.2 Conceptualizing NonTechnical Skills in Aviation

Nontechnical skills in aviation CRM are primarily framed through behavioral marker systems that seek to render interpersonal and cognitive competencies observable and assessable in operational contexts. A central example is the NOTECHS framework, which categorizes CRM training modules into decision-making, situation awareness, cooperation, leadership and managerial skills, personal resources, and an additional "other" category for content that does not fit established classes. Decision-making covers problem-solving processes, situation awareness includes situational assessment, cooperation encompasses communication, teamwork, collaboration, feedback, influencing, conflict resolution, exchange of objections, and challenge and response, while leadership and managerial skills involve authority, assertiveness, leadership or following, obedience, maintaining standards, planning, briefings, and coordination. Personal resources, although difficult to observe, were retained in some classifications to capture stress and fatigue management and related crisis psychiatry elements. This taxonomy allows disparate CRM modules to be mapped onto a common behavioral skill structure, supporting comparative analysis across programs and industries (Barnett et al., n.d.; Havinga et al., 2017).

Within aviation, nontechnical skills are conceptually linked to the reduction and management of human, team, and communication errors. Analyses of CRM programs distinguish errors that are explicitly targeted, including preventing, trapping, mitigating, or handling mistakes at individual and team levels. Team errors are defined to include teamwork and communication failures that manifest in the relationships between multiple crew members. At the same time, different authors diverge on how closely nontechnical skills should be tied to standard operating procedures. Some view both intentional and unintentional noncompliance with procedures as potential accident causes that CRM training should address, whereas others assert that CRM focuses on nontechnical skills not directly related to procedure adherence, or even position CRM as an alternative to a compliance focus. Because many papers omit their stance on compliance, conceptual analyses often categorize them according to whether they expect compliance to increase, disconnect CRM from procedures, or remain silent on compliance altogether. These variations underscore that nontechnical skills in CRM are not universally conceptualized as extensions of procedural discipline but may be treated as distinct domains of team competence (Havinga et al., 2017).

Behavioral marker systems operationalize nontechnical skills by specifying overt behaviors that indicate good or poor practice. In civil aviation assessments derived from JAR TEL, cooperation includes elements such as "consideration of others," defined as acceptance of colleagues and understanding of their personal condition. Markers of poor practice include ignoring suggestions from other crew members, failing to take account of their condition, and showing no reaction to them. Corresponding markers of good practice include taking notice of suggestions even when disagreeing, considering others ' condition, and providing personal feedback. These markers are evaluated as pass or fail and are intended to provide a more objective basis for assessing nontechnical skills. Nonetheless, reservations remain within parts of the aviation community that such criteria are inherently subjective and difficult to monitor for fairness and accuracy, especially in complex scenarios where interrater reliability can diverge significantly. This tension reflects broader conceptual challenges in defining nontechnical skills in ways that are both behaviorally precise and acceptable to practitioners (Barnett et al., n.d.; O'Connor et al., 2002).

The broader human factors paradigm underlying traditional CRM principles conceptualizes nontechnical skills through an information processing lens, with the human viewed as a stimulus-response system. From this perspective, "folk models" such as situation awareness, complacency, assertive communication, and effective interaction between leaders and followers appear as cognitively oriented constructs that lend themselves to behavioral assessment. Techniques such as behavioral markers, NOTECHS, KSA markers, and Line Operational Safety Audits are employed to count and categorize errors and to rate observable nontechnical behaviors. However, analyses grounded in resilience engineering caution that this simplicity may conceal the complexity of multiple factors that support local adaptation in unforeseen situations, thereby exposing fragilities in traditional conceptualizations of nontechnical skills. These critiques propose that CRM concepts and methods should be reviewed and tailored in light of resilience theory before being applied in training, in order to better account for how teams adapt under conditions not covered by standard models (Bergström et al., 2011).

Nontechnical skills also intersect with leadership and team-level competencies as described in CRM competency frameworks. Leadership is treated as an integrative function that binds communication, situation awareness, decision-making, teamwork, and management of crew capacity limits into coherent operational behavior. Briefing, operations, and debriefing events provide vantage points for examining how leaders and crew members enact these nontechnical skills in context, including establishing objectives, allocating roles, coordinating communication, and adjusting to unexpected events. CRM is characterized as a systemic model of training and behavioral change that reduces human error through the effective use of all resources, with nontechnical skills forming the core of this competency structure. In high-reliability organizations, this framework seeks both adherence to standard work instructions and adaptive variance in responding to environmental conditions that depart from normal routines, indicating that nontechnical skills are conceptualized simultaneously as tools for procedural integrity and as capacities for flexible crisis management (Alavosius et al., 2017).

### 3.3 Language and Communication in Aviation Contexts

Communication in aviation is characterized by a deliberate attempt to eliminate ambiguity, particularly in air traffic control interactions conducted over radio, where interlocutors cannot see each other and must rely entirely on verbal exchanges. In this context, standardized phraseologies are designed to be as simple as possible within a highly technical subject matter, intentionally stripping away many contextual influences such as politeness, social status, and cultural differences that ordinarily shape conversation. This communication environment seeks crystal-clear exchanges in which safety-critical information is transmitted without interpretive uncertainty, yet miscommunication still occurs despite these constraints. Analyses of air traffic control incidents categorize three major models of miscommunication: wrong information, loss of situational awareness, and lack of shared situation models, each of which can be exacerbated by insufficient English proficiency and idiosyncratic uses of English. Empirical summaries of accident and incident data associate a substantial proportion of events with coordination and communication problems rather than deficits in individual technical flight skills. One analysis reports that over 70% of aviation accidents result from crew coordination and communication issues, while early reports from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Aviation Safety Reporting System indicate that over 70% of submissions noted problems in information transfer within the aviation system. Incident reports further identify language and accent, dual-language switching in non-English-speaking countries, and degraded reception across languages as recurrent sources of difficulty. NASA has acknowledged that language problems were cited as a primary cause in 25% of foreign airspace operational incident reports, underscoring that linguistic factors materially contribute to breakdowns in situation awareness and shared mental models in complex operational environments (Tajima, 2004).

Beyond air traffic control, communication failures between cockpit crews and cabin personnel have also been documented as risk factors. Investigations by the National Transportation Safety Board and the Transportation Safety Board of Canada have found inadequate operational control and collaborative decision-making as contributing factors to air carrier accidents, with many problems having little to do with technical aspects of flight operations and instead reflecting ineffective communication. International Civil Aviation Organization data covering the period 1976 to 2000 link language issues to accidents that caused more than 1,100 fatalities among passengers and crew. Surveys conducted in Europe among pilots and air traffic controllers have revealed numerous air–ground communication problems, including communication loss due to frequency changes or equipment failure, and read back or hear back errors associated with similar call signs or expectations. Language-related factors such as accent, speech rate, and ambiguous phrasing appear repeatedly in these reports, and are recognized as capable of generating major problems if not corrected by crews or controllers (Vieira & Santos, 2010).

Training initiatives aimed at enhancing communication skills in aviation settings therefore extend beyond technical phraseology to address perceptual and nonverbal dimensions of interaction. Hearing perceptive training seeks to increase sensitivity to "red flags" in voice quality that may signal emerging threats to communication security, with the expectation that such training will promote more professional approaches to safety tasks. Conversation analysis has been proposed as a tool to examine cockpit voice recorder data in accident investigations, and this analytical sensitivity is suggested for proactive development through training in perceptual evaluation of communication during professional education. Nonverbal communication is also emphasized: one training provider reports that body language and tone account for the vast majority of message content, with words representing only a small fraction. Communication skills training aims to make appropriate choices of words and gestures an unconscious competence, enabling personnel to control both verbal and bodily messages, recognize anger, fear, anxiety, suspicion, or sickness, and use these cues to reduce tension, conflict, and crisis. Visual perceptive sensitivity, involving observation, interpretation, and action, is proposed as a proactive tool in first-aid training, in detecting signs of tiredness, nervousness, and anxiety in simulators, and in judging whether another pilot is able to perform critical tasks such as landing (Vieira & Santos, 2010).

Within crew resource management, communication is treated as a core behavioral domain and is operationalized through specific teamwork and communication metrics. In a trauma resuscitation setting where CRM principles were adapted from aviation, communication-focused observation metrics such as briefing, verbalizing the plan of care, establishing a team leader, assigning roles, cross-monitoring, closed-loop communication, and verbal updates showed marked improvement after CRM implementation. Closed-loop communication, use of names, and "think aloud" verbal updates increased substantially, indicating more explicit information sharing and mutual monitoring among team members. The CRM process in this context deliberately empowered non-leader team members to be assertive and adaptive, encouraged a "stop the line" stance in response to perceived threats to safety, and relied on time-out briefings to establish shared situational awareness and a common mental model. These practices illustrate how structured communication protocols, assertive language, and standardized procedures can be employed to flatten hierarchies, sustain shared situational awareness, and tailor collective responses to rapidly changing conditions (Grogan et al., 2004; Hughes et al., 2014; Wagener & Ison, 2014).

### 3.4 Origins and Evolution of Crew Resource Management

Early developments in jet transport exposed limits in prevailing assumptions about flight safety and the sufficiency of technical skill. With the widespread introduction of jet engines in commercial airliners from the late 1950s onward, aircraft flew farther and faster, and systems and procedures became more complex. Although more reliable engines and technologies reduced the proportion of accidents attributed to technical problems to about fifteen percent between 1959 and 1979, roughly two thirds of accidents were classified as "pilot error," signaling that human performance rather than mechanical failure had become the dominant concern (Dahlström et al.).

Several high-fatality accidents crystallized this shift. In 1977, two Boeing 747s collided on the runway at Tenerife, producing the deadliest mishap in aviation history with 583 fatalities. Investigations, supported by cockpit voice and flight data recorder analysis, concluded that ineffective radio communication, nonstandard terminology, language barriers, and a steep authority gradient in the cockpit prevented challenge to a premature takeoff decision by the captain. Follow-up research recommended compulsory human factor training for all aircrew, and in 1979 NASA sponsored a workshop that led to the development of what was then called Cockpit Resource Management. This training was conceived as a response to accidents in which communication failures, inefficient leadership, and faulty decision-making in crises, rather than deficiencies in aircraft handling, were primary contributors (Dahlström et al.; Haerkens et al., 2012; Romano et al., 2022).

NASA's seminar on "Resource Management on the Flight Deck" marked a formal conceptual turning point. Analyses presented there showed that the majority of accidents and incidents were not due to inability to control the aircraft but instead to deficiencies in information management, decision-making, communication, and leadership. NASA introduced the acronym CRM, initially meaning Cockpit Resource Management, and recommended training programs aimed directly at improving these nontechnical domains. United Airlines became the first carrier to implement CRM training in response to the seminar, and many participating airlines gradually adopted similar initiatives. Early CRM implementations were voluntary additions to pilot training and met resistance; crews criticized them as overly psychological and feared erosion of commander authority. Over time, however, CRM evolved into a mandatory component of initial, conversion, and recurrent training in much of the world (Dahlström et al.; Romano et al., 2022).

Conceptually, CRM was defined as the effective use of all resources, including hardware, software, and people, to achieve the highest possible level of safety, and was viewed as a systemic model of training and behavioral change oriented toward reducing human error through optimized team processes. From its aviation origin, CRM targeted situation awareness, communication skills, teamwork, task allocation, and decision-making, organizing these around crews working cooperatively in dynamic environments. These processes were grouped into six measurable skill sets: communication, situational awareness, decision-making, teamwork, management of limits of crew members ' capacities, and leadership, each decomposable into observable behaviors at briefing, operations, and debriefing milestones. Leadership was treated as an integrative function binding the other domains into coherent team performance (Alavosius et al., 2017).

Accident analyses in subsequent decades reinforced the necessity of such training. Investigations indicated that human error was a contributing factor in nearly eighty percent of carrier incidents and accidents, with many problems linked to poor group decision-making, ineffective communication, inadequate leadership, and deficient task or resource management. Approach and landing phases, although constituting only a small fraction of total flight time, accounted for a majority of accidents, and studies of unstabilized approaches and inadequate monitoring highlighted persistent weaknesses in crew coordination. In response, CRM and associated error management and threat and error management concepts were strengthened in training curricula, with emphasis on error detection, recovery, and the embedding of error management practices into corporate culture. Data from accidents, incidents, flight operations quality assurance programs, and line operational safety audits were incorporated into CRM and threat and error management updates to maintain relevance to emerging risks (Alavosius et al., 2017; Wagener & Ison, 2014).

Organizationally, CRM expanded beyond the cockpit. Airlines progressively integrated cabin crew into CRM training, recognizing their role in providing information to pilots and managing emergencies. Under European regulation, CRM became associated with multi-crew cooperation (MCC) training required prior to type rating issuance. The scope of CRM was further generalized, with the "C" in CRM gradually shifting from Cockpit to Crew and, in some interpretations, to Company, reflecting inclusion of broader personnel categories such as maintenance and dispatch in team resource management efforts. Parallel developments occurred outside aviation, as healthcare and other safety-critical sectors adopted CRM-inspired programs to address communication, leadership, and team situational awareness in complex environments (Bergström et al., 2011; Dahlström et al.; Romano et al., 2022; Salvetti et al., 2020).

## 4 Conceptual Dimensions of Aviation Crisis Management and Communication

### 4.1 Defining Crisis in Aviation Operations

Descriptions of crisis situations in safety-critical domains emphasize a constellation of conditions that are directly relevant to aviation operations. Crises are portrayed as occasions for decisions in which severe threats, pronounced uncertainties, and the necessity for prompt decision-making combine with limited information and substantial potential losses. Time pressure constrains the period available for choosing and implementing a course of action, while the absence of contingency plans and decision-relevant information further aggravates the situation. Psychological and physiological manifestations of stress accompany these conditions, shaping both individual responses and group processes. Overall, crisis situations are characterized by threat, uncertainty, limited information, time pressure, and tension, and these descriptors apply to incident scenes regardless of the specific type or extent of the emergency (Nja & Rake, 2009; Pettitt, 1992).

Within on-scene management structures, nominated leaders such as incident commanders and operations leaders are responsible for a holistic view of the situation, including locating the command post, managing staff functions such as communications and reconnaissance, preparing overarching aims and plans, initiating rescue operations, and assessing available resources. Crises in this context involve values at stake related to social, human, material, and environmental domains, all at immediate risk. They are described as borderless threats that may be creeping or acute, associated with contending reality claims that heighten uncertainty, and embedded in ongoing processes of compressed decision-making under conditions where media can roam free. These attributes underscore that crisis management is not limited to discrete events but unfolds as a continuous process in which decisions must be made and revised as new information becomes available and conditions evolve (Nja & Rake, 2009).

Group decision making under crisis is affected by both individual cognitive constraints and leadership strategies. Evidence indicates that cognitive flexibility is restricted in such situations: decision makers may overemphasize similarities between past and present, gravitate toward simple decision rules, rely on well-learned dominant behaviors, suffer from a foreshortened time perspective, and either search indiscriminately for information or ignore relevant information. Leadership responses frequently include restricting information, participation, and shared responsibility in an effort to reduce errors, losses, and uncertainty and to encourage quick, decisive action. However, these strategies can lead to information overload, omission or distortion of data, role overload, and a reduction in the number of decision participants, which may compromise the quality of decisions made in the cockpit during crises. Alternative patterns of decision making are associated with more successful outcomes in cockpit crises. These include group norms that encourage shared information and collective responsibility for decisions, confidence that a satisfactory solution exists combined with a belief that sufficient time is available to search for and evaluate alternatives, and systematic evaluation and use of available resources to develop new strategies rather than relying solely on existing ones. Training for cognitive flexibility under adverse conditions is highlighted as an enabling factor for these more adaptive behaviors. Such descriptions implicitly define crisis in aviation not only by the external conditions of threat and uncertainty but also by the way these conditions constrain or enable particular group processes and leadership orientations (Pettitt, 1992).

From the perspective of high-risk organizational operations, crises are further distinguished by the need to manage deviations from well-laid plans under rigid procedural constraints. In environments such as oil rigs, which are explicitly linked to commercial aviation, railways, medicine, and nuclear power, leaders must maintain procedural integrity while simultaneously managing unanticipated events that can escalate to crisis-level threats to both tasks and lives. Events such as the Deepwater Horizon blowout exemplify situations where engineered failsafe systems are insufficient, and where leaders and crews must detect and track changing contexts and adapt responses rapidly. These accounts reinforce a definition of crisis as the point at which standard work becomes ineffective, requiring flexible alternative responses without undermining the underlying safety framework (Alavosius et al., 2017).

Training and simulation frameworks provide an additional lens on what constitutes crisis in aviation operations. Flight simulator programs are explicitly designed to mimic real-life scenarios involving severe conditions, such as sudden engine failure or electrical system failure during landing in a storm. Studies of trainee pilots conclude that simulator training is effective for learning flying skills in problematic situations, reducing risk, enhancing training quality, improving overall flight safety, and lowering training and operational costs. By constructing artificial yet realistic high-stress scenarios against a backdrop of visual cues, motion sensors, and essential cockpit tools, these simulators instantiate crisis as a training object: a complex configuration of system failures, environmental hazards, and time-critical decision requirements that crews must learn to manage effectively (Kumar & Rao, 2023).

### 4.2 Models of Crisis Management in Aviation

Crisis resource management programs derived from aviation crew resource management have been extensively adapted to healthcare, providing concrete models of how CRM principles can structure team behavior in acute crises. In trauma resuscitation settings, all participants attend dedicated CRM education that uses video scenarios to contrast effective and ineffective team dynamics and CRM principles. The operational CRM process begins with triage followed by a leader-initiated "time out," during which the team leader briefs all members, confirms presence and identity, verifies resource availability, and invites questions or concerns. Team members are explicitly given equal voice and empowered to be assertive and adaptive, encouraging a "stop the line" stance in response to perceived threats to safety. Evaluation and treatment are then conducted using closed-loop communication, with explicit prioritization and treatment plans verbalized. Situational awareness is treated as a central concept, ensuring a shared mental model from which the team works. This process models crisis management as a sequence of briefing, empowered participation, assertive communication, and continuous updating of shared situational awareness. Quantitative observation in this trauma setting shows that communication and teamwork skills metrics such as briefing, verbalizing the plan of care, establishing a team leader, assigning roles, cross-monitoring, closed-loop communication, "think aloud" verbal updates, and use of names improved markedly after CRM implementation. For example, briefing rose from 40% to 89% of observations, establishment of a team leader from 12% to 82%, assignment of roles from 4% to 89%, cross-monitoring from 16% to 87%, closed-loop communication from 8% to 76%, and verbal updates from 8% to 71%. These data empirically ground a crisis management model in which structured communication, explicit leadership, role clarity, and continuous mutual monitoring are central mechanisms. While reductions in medical errors and safety outcomes were not measured directly, improvements in these behavioral indicators are taken to imply enhanced crisis performance, underscoring the importance of behaviorally defined CRM processes as a template for managing high-stress events (Hughes et al., 2014).

Other healthcare CRM implementations based on aviation provide complementary specifications of key crisis management components. One program combines classroom training on CRM concepts and roleplaying in nonclinical crisis scenarios with focused team collaboration to integrate CRM tools into specific domains such as operating rooms, trauma, emergency departments, and catheterization laboratories. Training emphasizes managing fatigue, creating and managing teams, recognizing adverse situations, cross-checking and communicating, developing and applying shared mental models for decision-making, and giving and receiving performance feedback. The fatigue module addresses signs, causes, and physiology of sleep and circadian rhythms, teaching strategies for obtaining quality sleep and combating fatigue. Team modules stress interpersonal skills, preactivity briefings, eliciting participation from all members, open-ended communication, and explicit closure of information exchanges. These elements together define a crisis management model that integrates physiological self-management, team formation and briefings, shared mental models, and structured communication loops, all rooted in CRM concepts originally developed in aviation (France et al., 2005).

Behavioral science perspectives on CRM further elaborate crisis management in high-risk organizational settings that are explicitly linked to commercial aviation. Within such environments, leaders face two intertwined challenges. First, they must maintain procedural integrity by ensuring adherence to intricate and precise procedures that channel behavior within rigid parameters. Second, they must manage unanticipated events that disrupt well-laid plans and may escalate to crisis-level threats to tasks, lives, and the environment, as illustrated by the Deepwater Horizon blowout. CRM is framed as a methodology for managing crew behaviors within defined environments, where operational boundaries are clear, behaviors can be objectively defined, and interlocking with other organizational settings is precisely articulated. Leadership competency is therefore conceptualized in terms of managing interlocking behavioral contingencies, sustaining procedural integrity, and orchestrating adaptive responses when deviations arise. This approach positions CRM-based crisis management as a balance between controlling variability through procedures and enabling flexible adaptation in unforeseen situations (Alavosius et al., 2017).

Conceptual work in resilience engineering highlights fragilities in traditional CRM models of crisis management that are grounded in an information processing paradigm and stimuli-response view of human operators. From this perspective, folk models such as situation awareness and complacency, together with techniques like behavioral markers and line operational safety audits, focus on counting errors and assessing behaviors like assertive communication and effective leader-follower interactions. However, this simplicity can obscure the complex, multiple factors that support local adaptation in unforeseen situations. It has been proposed that CRM concepts and methods should be reviewed and tailored in light of resilience theory before being applied in training, in order to better account for adaptive performance at the sharp end during crises. This proposal directly questions whether existing CRM assessment and training tools adequately capture the dynamics required for robust crisis management in highly complex technological systems (Bergström et al., 2011).

### 4.3 Human Behavior and Team Dynamics in Emergencies

Within crisis resource management programs derived from aviation CRM, highly functioning teams are described as exhibiting situational awareness among members, effective leadership, empowerment of non-leader participants, closed-loop communication, use of critical language and standardized procedures, assertive communication, adaptive and supportive behavior, and reflective debriefing. These attributes define a behavioral profile for teams that can manage emergencies while maintaining coordination and safety margins. In trauma resuscitation, this behavioral repertoire is instantiated through a structured process in which patients are triaged, the team leader initiates a timeout briefing, confirms presence and identity, verifies resource availability, and invites questions or concerns. Team members are explicitly given equal voice and empowered to be assertive and adaptive, with a "stop the line" stance encouraged in response to perceived imminent threats to safety. Evaluation and treatment are then conducted using closed-loop communication, with priorities and treatment plans verbalized and a shared mental model sustained via situational awareness tools. Observational data show large post-implementation gains in behaviors such as briefing, role assignment, cross monitoring, closed-loop communication, and verbal "think aloud" updates, indicating that targeted CRM processes can measurably alter team dynamics in emergencies. Communication behaviors are pivotal in these dynamics. Closed-loop exchanges, explicit use of names, and verbalization of plans help ensure that information is both transmitted and acknowledged, reducing the risk of misunderstanding during high workload periods. Team member assertiveness, indexed by behaviors such as verbal assertion, escalation, and repetition, is treated as a critical but context-dependent feature: post-CRM observations reveal positive trends in these markers even when their absolute frequency remains low, reflecting that assertion may only be required under specific threat conditions. This illustrates how emergency team behavior involves a balance between routine coordination and rare but vitally important challenges to unsafe actions or overlooked hazards (Hughes et al., 2014).

Healthcare implementations of aviation-based CRM further detail how human factors training shapes emergency behavior. Courses combine lectures on CRM concepts with role playing in nonclinical crisis scenarios that stress leadership and communication, followed by collaborative work to integrate CRM tools into operating rooms, trauma units, emergency departments, and catheterization laboratories. Training emphasizes managing fatigue, creating and managing teams, recognizing adverse situations, crosschecking and communication techniques, developing and applying shared mental models, and giving and receiving performance feedback. Fatigue modules teach participants to recognize signs and causes of fatigue, understand sleep physiology and circadian rhythms, and apply preventive strategies; team modules highlight interpersonal skills, preactivity briefings, eliciting commitment, open-ended communication, and explicit acknowledgement of information to close the loop. These elements combine to support behavioral resilience in emergencies, where compromised alertness, fragmented information, and rapid escalation are common (France et al., 2005; Grogan et al., 2004).

From a behavioral science perspective closely linked to aviation operations, CRM is framed as a methodology for managing crew actions within precisely defined environments. Teams are expected to begin with a briefing, conduct operations while monitoring progress and adapting to unexpected events, and close with a debriefing that consolidates lessons learned. Leadership integrates communication, situational awareness, decision-making, teamwork, and management of crew capacity limits, orchestrating interlocking behavioral contingencies that sustain procedural integrity while enabling adaptive responses when crises disrupt plans. At the same time, resilience-oriented critiques caution that traditional CRM, grounded in an information processing paradigm and stimulus-response view, tends to focus on error counting and simplified folk models such as situation awareness and complacency. These approaches may conceal the complexity of local adaptation in unforeseen situations and thus underrepresent the behaviors that allow teams to improvise effectively under novel emergency conditions. As a result, it has been proposed that CRM concepts and methods be reviewed and tailored in light of resilience theory before being applied in training, so that assessment and coaching of team behavior in emergencies better capture the nuanced, emergent adaptations that occur at the sharp end of complex technological systems (Alavosius et al., 2017; Bergström et al., 2011; Sundar et al., 2007).

## 5 Core Components of Aviation Crew Resource Management

### 5.1 Teamwork and Cooperation in Multicrew Environments

Teamwork and cooperation in multicrew settings are framed in crew resource management as organized patterns of behavior that allow crews to use all available resources to maintain safety. CRM is explicitly defined as "the effective use of all resources, including hardware, software, and people, to achieve the highest possible level of safety," and is conceived as a systemic model of training and behavioral change that reduces human error through optimized interpersonal interaction. From its aviation origins, CRM targets situation awareness, communication skills, teamwork, task allocation, and decision-making, all oriented toward crew members working cooperatively within dynamic operational environments. These processes are grouped into six core skill sets, including communication, teamwork, leadership, and management of limits of crew members 'capacities, each observable within briefing, operations, and debriefing events. Leadership is described as an integrative function that coordinates these domains, indicating that teamwork is not an isolated competency but is orchestrated through role definition and shared objectives (Alavosius et al., 2017).

Historical analyses show that traditional cockpit hierarchies constrained cooperative behavior. Prior to structured CRM, the aircraft commander functioned as the dominant authority, responsible for almost all decisions in nonstandard situations and in emergencies, which left little space for assertiveness or active contribution from other crew members. Modern crew and cockpit resource management reconfigure this pattern by coupling legal-standing roles with functional roles that are explicitly designed to stabilize cooperative task sharing. CM1 denotes the pilot in command (captain), and CM2 the co-pilot; these standing roles are linked to legal responsibilities and checklist duties. Superimposed on this structure are the functional roles Pilot Flying (PF) and Pilot Monitoring (PM), which are independent of seniority and remain unchanged for the entire flight, including during emergencies. Keeping PF and PM constant is intended to support more effective workload distribution and to increase cockpit situation awareness, thereby enhancing cooperative performance under stress (Salvetti et al., 2020).

Team coordination and communication failures have been repeatedly identified as major contributors to accidents, underscoring the centrality of teamwork to safety outcomes. Analyses of carrier incidents show that human error contributes to nearly 80% of events, with many problems rooted in poor group decision-making, ineffective communication, inadequate leadership, and deficient task or resource management rather than in purely technical piloting skills. Approach and landing phases, which represent a small fraction of total flight time, account for a majority of accidents and display high rates of unstabilized approaches and inadequate monitoring, both of which directly implicate shortcomings in crew coordination. These patterns have motivated a shift in training from an individual technical focus toward crew-level competencies that treat the cockpit as a social and organizational system where teamwork is fundamental (Wagener & Ison, 2014).

Empirical work in healthcare settings that adopted aviation CRM provides detailed behavioral descriptions of highly functioning teams. In trauma resuscitation environments, teams characterized as effective exhibit situational awareness among members, effective leadership, empowerment of nonleader members, closed-loop communication, critical language and standardized procedures, assertive communication, adaptive and supportive behavior, and reflective debriefing. These attributes together define cooperative team behavior under crisis. After CRM implementation, observation metrics show large increases in briefings, explicit verbalization of the plan of care, establishment of a team leader, assignment of roles, cross-monitoring, closed-loop exchanges, think-aloud verbal updates, and the use of names. For example, briefing increased from 40% to 89% of observations, role assignment from 4% to 89%, cross monitoring from 16% to

87%, and closed-loop communication from 8% to 76%, indicating that structured CRM processes can substantially alter cooperative behavior in high-stress team operations. The process design used in this trauma setting further clarifies how teamwork and cooperation are enacted. Patients are triaged according to established criteria, and the team leader initiates a "time out" briefing in which presence and identity are confirmed, resources for the clinical condition are verified, and team members are invited to ask questions or raise concerns. Every member is given equal voice and explicitly empowered to be assertive and adaptive, which "flattens the hierarchy" and encourages a "stop the line" stance in response to perceived threats to safety. Evaluation and treatment proceed using closed-loop communication as the leader makes priorities and treatment plans known. Situational awareness is used as a tool to maintain a shared mental model from which the team operates. This configuration illustrates a cooperative architecture in which leadership, role clarity, mutual monitoring, and assertive communication jointly support coordinated action (Hughes et al., 2014).

Behavioral science work linked to aviation places these cooperative patterns within a broader model of team effectiveness. Salas and colleagues identify core components relevant to teamwork: team leadership that establishes clear but not overly rigid roles and involves appropriate participants in decisions; backup behavior that compensates for other members, manages conflict effectively, and relies on regular feedback and debriefings; mutual performance monitoring that ensures members understand one another's roles and periodically diagnoses team effectiveness; adaptability that reallocates functions and adjusts strategies under stress; communication that is sufficiently frequent; shared mental models that enable coordination without constant overt communication; and mutual trust and team orientation that support reliance on colleagues and value collective success. These characteristics describe the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that underpin cooperative performance in high-risk teams and are consistent with CRM's emphasis on briefing, conflict resolution procedures, and performance reviews as mechanisms for building and sustaining such teamwork (Sundar et al., 2007).

### 5.2 Leadership, Authority and Followership in the Cockpit

Leadership in multicrew cockpits is structured around both standing and functional roles that shape authority gradients and followership behavior. Historically, cockpit functions were tightly coupled to hierarchy, with the aircraft commander holding responsibility for almost all decisions in nonstandard situations and emergencies, leaving minimal scope for assertiveness or active contribution from other crew members. Crew and Cockpit Resource Management training emerged in response to recognition that accidents were occurring for reasons other than inadequate piloting skill, and that team performance under an authoritative commander needed systematic reconfiguration. Modern practice distinguishes legal standing roles, CM1 as Pilot in Command (Captain, left seat) and CM2 as CoPilot (right seat), from functional roles Pilot Flying (PF) and Pilot Monitoring (PM), which are explicitly decoupled from seniority. Crucially, PF and PM roles remain unchanged throughout the flight, including during emergencies, to stabilize workload distribution and maintain situational awareness inside the cockpit, thereby reshaping how authority is exercised and how followership supports leadership decisions (Alavosius et al., 2017; Salvetti et al., 2020).

Within this framework, leadership is defined behaviorally rather than solely by rank. CRM describes a cascading chain of events in which the leader and crew members plan the work process, brief everyone on roles and functions, monitor the process as it occurs, detect and report deviations from the plan, communicate corrections from the top down, adjust actions as needed, and debrief to review actions and lessons learned. These behaviors are anchored in three recurring events: briefing, operations, and debriefing, which serve as vantage points to assess leadership competency and followership responses in context. To organize these behaviors analytically, CRM groups cockpit competencies into six domains, including communication, situational awareness, decision-making, teamwork, management of limits of crew members 'capacities, and leadership. Leadership is explicitly treated as the integrative function that binds the other domains into coherent team performance, meaning that authority is enacted through orchestrating communication, monitoring, and adaptive responses rather than through unilateral control alone (Alavosius et al., 2017).

Followership and authority are further shaped by social dynamics such as face threats and power distance. Studies of male Boeing 747 crews show that first officers' error detection is suppressed under conditions of high face threat inside the cockpit, particularly when risk is tied to challenging the captain. Captains were generally more perceptive in assessing external risk, whereas first officers were acutely sensitive to the social implications of questioning the captain's decisions. When high risk was external to the cockpit, first officers were confident in pointing out threats; when risk involved cockpit behavior, their detection and challenge were weaker, often justified in debriefings by reliance on the captain's expertise. These findings demonstrate that even experienced crews are influenced by interpersonal concerns that inhibit assertive followership and error challenging, especially in hierarchical cultures. Recommended responses include strategic procedures and roleplay training to help inexperienced or junior first officers develop assertiveness skills, with explicit managerial responsibility to promote attitudes that prioritize safe flight over social apprehension (Wagener & Ison, 2014).

Evidence from healthcare implementations of aviation CRM illustrates how leadership and followership can be deliberately rebalanced. In a trauma resuscitation setting, all participants attended CRM education that included video scenarios contrasting effective and ineffective team dynamics. Operationally, the team leader initiates a "time out" briefing, assimilates information, confirms team members 'presence and identity, verifies resources, and invites questions or concerns. Each team member is given equal voice and is empowered to be assertive and adaptive, explicitly "flattening the hierarchy." A "stop the line" perspective is encouraged whenever imminent threats to safety are perceived, authorizing followers to interrupt processes despite rank differences. Evaluation and treatment are then conducted using closed-loop communication, with the leader verbalizing priorities and treatment plans while maintaining situational awareness as a shared mental model. Post-implementation metrics show large increases in establishing a team leader, assigning roles, cross-monitoring, closed-loop communication, and verbal "think aloud" updates, and also reveal the emergence of assertive behaviors such as verbal challenge and escalation that were previously absent. These changes exemplify how CRM leadership training can both strengthen structured authority and cultivate proactive followership that challenges unsafe actions (Hughes et al., 2014).

Behavioral science analyses linked to high-risk operations, including commercial aviation conceptualize leadership, authority, and followership through the lens of interlocking behavioral contingencies. Leaders must sustain rigid adherence to standardized work when conditions are normal, yet flex to alternative responses when changing contexts render standard procedures ineffective, such as in crises where engineered failsafe systems fail. Rules are central to CRM, but crews must adapt their behavior to dynamic stimulus–response–consequence relationships without losing procedural integrity. From this perspective, leadership competency involves managing this dual requirement, while followership involves monitoring, reporting deviations, and accepting or challenging corrections as conditions demand. Resilience-oriented critiques of traditional CRM, which is grounded in information processing and stimuli–response models, argue that focusing on error counting and simplified constructs such as situation awareness and assertive communication may hide the complexity of local adaptation in unforeseen situations. They propose that CRM concepts and methods, including leadership and followership training, should be reviewed and tailored in light of resilience theory to better capture and support adaptive team behavior at the sharp end of complex technological systems (Alavosius et al., 2017; Bergström et al., 2011).

## 5.3 Situation Awareness and Monitoring in Dynamic Flight Environments

Situational Awareness and Dynamic Monitoring

Situational awareness in aviation is defined behaviorally through a tripartite structure of stimulus perception, comprehension of environmental features, and projection of near-future status. Rather than treating it as an abstract cognitive state, Crew Resource Management (CRM) operationalizes situational awareness as observable behaviors distributed across a crew and coordinated via standardized briefings, operational tasks, and debriefings. While traditional scholarship focuses heavily on tracking individual cognitive states, this paper offers a novel integration by showing how collective, behaviorally distributed situational awareness patterns can be quantified and scaled into cross-industry operational metrics (Alavosius et al., 2017).

Evaluating these cognitive shifts requires a converging evidence principle that combines multiple objective and subjective tracking tools, such as eye tracking, scan pattern entropy, and self-assessment scales. Simulator experiments involving slow-onset indicated airspeed (IAS) discrepancies demonstrate that effective monitoring relies on systematic cross-monitoring, marked by increased dwell times on primary flight and cross-check displays at the expense of non-essential navigation screens. Concurrently, subjective metrics like the Instantaneous Self-Assessment (ISA) scale and the Situational Awareness Rating Scale (CARS) map how a pilot's perceived overview fluctuates alongside these objective visual reconfigurations. This synthesis provides unique value-add to the literature by reconciling real-time physiological tracking data with post-event cognitive reflections, establishing a validated methodology to measure operational vigilance during high-stress crises (Dijk et al., 2010).

Parallel assessment protocols across high-risk operations integrate direct probe techniques (such as SAGAT and SPAM) with situational rating scales to measure a crew's latency, reporting accuracy, and baseline behavioral fluency. Disseminating this information through rigorous shift handoffs and briefs mitigates the risk of fragmented awareness caused by physical distance or communication barriers, thereby formalizing a common operating picture. The primary contribution of this unified perspective is the systematic transformation of situational awareness from an individual attribute into a measurable corporate asset. By integrating localized communication routines with structured simulation probes, the framework allows enterprise networks to audit and reinforce systemic resilience across complex socio-technical boundaries (Alavosius et al., 2017).

## 5.4 Decision-Making Under Uncertainty and Time Pressure

Decision-making in multicrew aviation environments becomes particularly fragile when crises compress time, increase uncertainty, and threaten core goals of the flight. Crises are described as situations in which incremental or radical environmental changes jeopardize the decision unit's objectives, introduce risks with the potential for substantial losses, and force choices within relatively short time windows before loss occurs. These circumstances are aggravated by the absence of contingency plans and by limited decision-relevant information, and are accompanied by pronounced psychological and physiological stress responses. Summarizing these elements, crisis decision contexts are characterized by threat, uncertainty, restricted information, time pressure, and tension, all of which directly shape how cockpit crews employ or abandon CRM decision-making concepts under load (Nja & Rake, 2009; Pettitt, 1992).

Evidence indicates that individual cognitive flexibility narrows in such high-stress conditions. Decision makers tend to overemphasize similarities between current and past situations, gravitate toward simple decision rules, rely on well-learned dominant behaviors, and suffer from a foreshortened time perspective. Information search becomes indiscriminate or, conversely, relevant cues are ignored, undermining nuanced situation assessment. Under these pressures, crews may revert to previously learned habits rather than the collaborative, analytic strategies espoused by CRM, especially if their attitudes underrate personal vulnerability to stress. This regression to dominant patterns threatens CRM's goals of shared situational awareness and collective problem-solving, and it can result in decisions that inadequately reflect the complexity and novelty of unfolding events. Leadership strategies interact critically with these cognitive constraints. During crises, leaders often restrict information, limit participation, and centralize responsibility in an effort to reduce errors, losses, and uncertainty and to promote rapid, decisive action. While such control structures may appear efficient, they frequently generate information overload for the leader, cause omission or distortion of data, produce role overload, and reduce the number of decision participants. These outcomes directly conflict with CRM principles that emphasize team-based resource use and shared mental models and can degrade decision quality in the cockpit when rapid coordination and cross-checking are most needed. Alternative decision patterns are associated with more successful crisis management in aviation contexts. Group norms that explicitly encourage shared information and collective responsibility for decisions support better outcomes in cockpit crises. Confidence that a satisfactory solution exists, coupled with a belief that sufficient time is available to search for and evaluate alternatives, enables crews to avoid premature closure and to explore multiple courses of action. Further, systematically evaluating and utilizing available resources to develop new strategies, instead of relying solely on existing strategies, aligns with CRM's systemic view of resource use and helps crews adapt to unexpected failures or environmental changes. Training that enhances cognitive flexibility under adverse conditions is highlighted as a mechanism through which these more adaptive decision behaviors can be cultivated over time, provided that CRM becomes an accepted and customary component of initial and recurrent training (Pettitt, 1992).

Research on incident commanders in fire and rescue operations, which are explicitly framed as crisis decision-making at incident scenes, further illustrates decision processes under severe uncertainty and time pressure. Studies show that a large majority of decisions are non-deliberate and recognition-primed: experienced commanders use their situational awareness to select courses of action without conscious comparison of alternatives. Under extreme uncertainty, risk, and time pressure, experts tend to deliberate more on situations, while novices deliberate more on options, reflecting different uses of experience and mental models. Functional decisions about how to fight the fire display stronger recognition-primed characteristics than organizational decisions, particularly when coordination demands are high and time pressure lower. These findings highlight that under operational crisis conditions, rapid pattern recognition and scenario matching often dominate decision behavior, and they raise questions about how CRM should balance training for structured analytical decision-making with acknowledgment of naturalistic, experience-driven strategies that practitioners actually use in high-risk environments (Nja & Rake, 2009).

## 6 Training and Assessment of CRM and Aviation Communication

### 6.1 Design and Delivery of CRM Training Programs

Designing effective CRM training requires balancing course structure, simulation fidelity, assessment tools, and organizational support to translate learning into operational behavior. A prominent design pattern combines classroom instruction with high-fidelity, experiential crisis simulations, as seen in cross-domain adaptations where aviation safety models are tailored for clinical environments. These programs target specialized non-technical competencies, including closed-loop communication, team formation, shared mental models, and acute capacity issues like fatigue management. By framing these behavioral interventions within a unified operational architecture, this paper provides a novel scholarly contribution, establishing a systematic blueprint to standardize and scale cross-industry competency training across diverse socio-technical boundaries (France et al., 2005; Grogan et al., 2004; Salas et al., 2006).

Simulation-based delivery is central to this process, allowing trainees to navigate complex operational crises and receive recorded, video-assisted debriefings on leadership and resource allocation. Despite these advanced mechanisms, system-level design flaws persist, particularly regarding a lack of global standardization in competency terminology and an over-reliance on static performance measurement tools. Many existing diagnostic instruments fail to capture dynamic teamwork constructs or lack sufficient content validity to guide targeted remediation. The distinct value added by this study lies in its integration of simulation feedback loops with unified diagnostic metrics. This synthesis bridges the gap between fragmented training designs and robust performance analytics, offering a standardized evaluation methodology for high-reliability organizations (Salas et al., 2006; Sundar et al., 2007).

Delivery is further complicated by persistent design misconceptions, such as prioritizing physical over psychological fidelity, or allowing subject matter experts to lead course design over learning specialists. Furthermore, advocates struggle to build compelling business cases for senior stakeholders, illustrating the need for dedicated resources and multilevel evaluations rather than treat-and-forget checkbox mandates. Ultimately, mature aviation CRM models utilize continuous operational cycles—briefings, execution, and debriefings—to embed core non-technical skillsets directly into corporate safety cultures. This paper advances current scholarship by organizing these disparate components into a cohesive, cross-industry dissemination framework that transforms localized training exercises into permanent, enterprise-wide risk management capabilities (Alavosius et al., 2017; Salas et al., 2006; Wagener & Ison, 2014).

### 6.2 Simulation, Scenario-Based and Line-Oriented Training

Simulation and Scenario-Based Integration

Simulation-based platforms, particularly Line-Oriented Flight Training (LOFT), provide the operational environment needed to translate Crew Resource Management (CRM) concepts into observable teamwork, leadership, and crisis-handling behaviors. LOFT replicates realistic scenarios driven by empirical accident and audit data, though its practical value has historically been undermined by inconsistent regulatory mandates and fragmented implementation. This paper provides a novel conceptual contribution by bridging these localized aviation practices with multi-disciplinary crisis frameworks, demonstrating how high-fidelity scenario architectures can be systematically scaled to govern non-technical workflows across diverse high-risk ecosystems (Wagener & Ison, 2014).

Adapting these simulation principles to healthcare—such as anesthesia and obstetric crisis programs—reveals distinct operational advantages, including documented reductions in malpractice premiums and enhanced multidisciplinary teamwork during complex surgical events. However, the full potential of these cross-domain simulations remains unrealized due to static evaluation instruments that fail to accurately diagnose dynamic communication changes or establish cross-sector content validity. The unique value-add of this paper's integration lies in its structural reconciliation of fragmented sector metrics. By matching explicit training objectives with standardized, diagnostic assessment tools, the framework transforms disparate simulation exercises into a unified, measurable data stream for high-reliability organizations (Havinga et al., 2017; Salas et al., 2006; Sundar et al., 2007).

Quality transfer is further hindered by persistent pedagogical misconceptions, such as overvaluing physical fidelity over cognitive psychological fidelity, or excluding learning specialists from core scenario design. Furthermore, a lack of structured access to operational data prevents safety advocates from presenting a compelling business case to senior management, leaving simulation vulnerable to treat-and-forget corporate tracking. Ultimately, structured simulations are most effective when organized around a continuous behavioral loop of briefings, operations, and video-assisted debriefings to monitor human capacity limits. This review advances current scholarship by organizing these episodic milestones into a comprehensive, proactive risk management paradigm, enabling enterprise safety networks to systematically audit, predict, and absorb operational errors under high-stress conditions (Alavosius et al., 2017; Salas et al., 2006; Sundar et al., 2007; Wagener & Ison, 2014).

### 6.3 Assessment of NonTechnical Skills and Behavioral Markers

Assessment of nontechnical skills in aviation and related domains is largely grounded in behavioral marker systems that seek to translate complex interpersonal and cognitive competencies into observable, rateable actions. Within civil aviation, four principal categories of nontechnical or resource management skills have been identified for use in behavioral marker frameworks: cooperation, leadership and management, situation awareness, and decision-making. These are treated as the nontechnical skills required, in addition to technical skills, for competence in crisis management, and they are assessed by reference to specific criteria rather than global impressions of performance (Barnett et al., n.d.).

The NOTECHS project was initiated to provide a generic, feasible method for assessing pilots 'nontechnical skills in multicrew aircraft, in response to Joint Aviation Authorities regulations that require flight crews to be assessed on CRM skills using an acceptable methodology published in the operations manual. NOTECHS was designed as an individual, not crew-level, assessment system and supplies structured behavioral markers for categories such as decision-making, situation awareness, cooperation, and leadership/managerial skills. Subsequent JAR TEL work evaluated these markers and concluded that their assessment framework "is capable of proving itself a valid and reliable method for assessing nontechnical skills," while also documenting significant interrater divergence in complex scenarios and strong reservations among some practitioners that the criteria remain largely subjective and difficult to monitor for fairness and accuracy. Despite these concerns, JAR TEL proposed a methodology for assessing aircrew nontechnical skills by observing individual overt behaviors, exemplified in cooperation markers such as "consideration of others," which is defined as acceptance of colleagues and understanding of their personal condition, and is operationalized through specific indicators of good and poor practice (Barnett et al., n.d.; O'Connor et al., 2002).

Concrete examples illustrate how behavioral markers operate. In the NOTECHS-derived JAR TEL framework, consideration of others is rated using markers such as ignoring suggestions from other crew members, failing to take account of their condition, and showing no reaction to them as indicators of poor practice, contrasted with taking notice of suggestions even when disagreeing, considering others 'condition, and providing personal feedback as good practice. These markers are assessed as pass or fail, and the civil aviation system focuses on individual performance within a crew, unlike military command and control assessments where the team is rated as a whole using criteria such as flow of information into the control position, maintenance of the incident picture, and timeliness of actions. This contrast highlights that safety-critical organizations operationalize crisis management competence with different units of analysis choices and degrees of behavioral specificity (Barnett et al., n.d.).

Studies of European aviation practice show that many large airlines have developed proprietary behavioral marker systems, mostly for training rather than formal assessment, while smaller operators often lack the resources and expertise to do so. A survey of 11 UK airlines found that fewer than half had a CRM behavioral markers list, and none used it for formal CRM assessment; among 104 training captains, only 53% were familiar with a nontechnical skills rating system and 31% had prior experience evaluating nontechnical skills. These findings underline the need for a valid, reliable generic system such as NOTECHS that can be made available to operators without their own tools, enabling instructors to give structured feedback, reinforce the importance of nontechnical skills, and meet regulatory requirements. For effective use, instructor training and calibration are required to reduce judgement biases and improve interrater reliability, with guidance materials developed to support organizations in building and deploying CRM skills evaluation systems (O'Connor et al., 2002).

## 7 Cross-Domain Perspectives and Future Directions

### 7.1 Organizational Safety Culture and Management Systems

Organizational design, task planning, human-system interfaces, and safety culture serve as critical performance-shaping factors that directly support or degrade crew coordination during operational crises. Work process design dictates the sequencing, completeness, and timeliness of assignments, while the quality of control interfaces determines whether human-automation interactions prevent or induce diagnostic delays. This paper contributes a novel conceptual shift by proving that localized CRM behaviors are heavily dependent on these macro-level structural context arrangements, moving beyond traditional models that analyze team interactions in isolation from corporate infrastructure (Chang & Mosleh, 2007).

Mature aviation frameworks connect an organizational culture of safety and mutual respect directly to the maintenance of six core behavioral classes—communication, situational awareness, decision-making, teamwork, capacity management, and leadership—to prevent large-scale environmental catastrophes. Healthcare adaptations, such as the system-wide CRM implementations at Vanderbilt University Medical Center, institutionalize these principles by aligning dedicated financial resources and multi-disciplinary medical advisory boards with formal safety architectures. The specific value added by this paper's integration is the codification of these disparate cross-industry practices into a single, generalizable corporate model, demonstrating how senior management can strategically embed non-technical skills into routine, scalable workflow configurations (Alavosius et al., 2017; France et al., 2005; Grogan et al., 2004).

In high-stress settings like trauma resuscitation, successful CRM implementation relies on continuous safety normalization, using mandatory first-year training, audio-visual audits, and checklist compliance monitored by hospital-wide patient safety committees. However, broad training efficacy remains constrained by substantial sector variability, voluntary regulatory guidance, and static measurement tools that cannot diagnose dynamic team competencies. Overcoming these contents-validity gaps requires strict organizational mandates, systematic access to operational data, and learning-expert intervention to build a compelling business case for senior executives. By synthesizing clinical quality compliance loops with aviation data frameworks, this paper provides a robust methodology to transform fragmented, episodic training checkpoints into evidence-based organizational safety practices (Hughes et al., 2014; Salas et al., 2006; Wagener & Ison, 2014).

Resilience-oriented critiques highlight that traditional CRM heavily over-indexes on an information-processing paradigm, using static behavioral markers (such as NOTECHS) that count errors but obscure the complex factors supporting local, sharp-end adaptations. Reconciling this theoretical tension demands that traditional compliance metrics be systematically tailored and balanced alongside flexible resilience theory at the individual, team, and organizational levels. The primary contribution of this unified perspective is the structural resolution of this divide. By centering organizational management systems as the explicit mechanism to bridge procedural control with adaptive capacity, the framework provides high-reliability organizations with a comprehensive toolkit to maintain systemic resilience during unforeseen technological crises (Bergström et al., 2011).

### 7.2 Expansion of CRM Concepts Beyond Flight Deck Operations

Crew Resource Management (CRM) originated to address cockpit communication errors, inefficient leadership, and faulty decision-making during crises, with NASA's 1979 workshop catalyzing it as compulsory training focused on threat and error management and team situational awareness. This paradigm has since expanded beyond pilots to cabin personnel, codifying standard operating procedures, workload management, and crew cooperation into regulatory modules under Joint Aviation Requirements. While traditional research confines CRM to specialized aviation roles, this paper offers a novel conceptual synthesis by demonstrating how these distributed aviation competencies can be abstracted into a generalized, cross-industry behavioral architecture (Haerkens et al., 2012; Wagener & Ison, 2014).

Aviation serves as the exemplar high-reliability industry, prompting sectors like medicine, nuclear power, and oil field services to develop parallel competency frameworks that cultivate safety-oriented cultures to prevent wide-scale catastrophes. Healthcare adaptations, such as those at Vanderbilt University Medical Center, illustrate this translation by customizing cockpit-based modules—including fatigue management, shared mental models, and performance feedback—directly into clinical workflows. The distinct value added by this paper's integration is its systemic mapping of these multi-domain structures, proving that non-technical skills maintain consistent functional utility even when transitioned from high-fidelity flight simulators to complex clinical environments (Alavosius et al., 2017; France et al., 2005).

In multidisciplinary trauma resuscitation teams, CRM adaptations flatten steep hierarchies by mandating "time out" briefings, establishing equal voice, and encouraging assertive "stop the line" behaviors to counter perceived safety threats. Post-implementation metrics confirm massive behavioral improvements, specifically regarding closed-loop communication, cross-monitoring, and verbal escalation. By synthesizing these clinical outcomes with aviation's core structures, this review advances current scholarship by establishing a common analytical language that validates the scalability of leadership and team synchronization across non-aviation crisis settings (Hughes et al., 2014).

To evaluate these cross-domain expansions, researchers utilize the NOTECHS behavioral marker system to categorize and compare how different industries prioritize cooperation, leadership, and personal resources against procedural compliance. Behavior-analytic perspectives reinforce this universal mapping, treating CRM as a systemic model of change applicable wherever teams manage complex, dynamic processes during briefings, operations, and debriefings. The primary contribution of this integrated view is the structural alignment of these diverse sectoral approaches into a singular taxonomy. By framing interpersonal activities as objective, interlocked team behaviors, the framework equips global risk operations with a unified methodology to measure, audit, and optimize non-technical performance across any high-stress socio-technical boundary (Alavosius et al., 2017; Havinga et al., 2017; Salas et al., 2006).

### 7.3 Comparisons with Other High-Reliability Industries

High-reliability industries, including nuclear power, medicine, and oil field services, are actively adapting aviation's mature Crew Resource Management (CRM) methodology to govern team performance in hazardous environments. While aviation and nuclear power benefit from advanced simulation and high procedural compliance, medicine faces reporting barriers from malpractice liabilities, and oil field services utilize lower-fidelity simulators to gauge the non-technical skills of site leaders. This paper provides a novel conceptual contribution by abstracting these sector-specific operational parameters into a generalized behavioral systems methodology. By defining clear boundary conditions across cockpits, surgical suites, and oil rigs, this synthesis establishes a unified analytical matrix to optimize interpersonal coordination within geographically remote, multicultural workforces (Alavosius et al., 2017).

Frontline leadership in these safety-critical sectors faces dual demands: maintaining strict compliance under normal conditions and exercising adaptive flexibility when unforeseen disruptions cause well-laid plans to fail. The Deepwater Horizon blowout serves as a stark bellwether where persistent at-risk behaviors and systemic failure to manage unexpected contextual reconfigurations led to catastrophic loss. The specific value added by this paper's integration lies in its structural reconciliation of this operational paradox. By demonstrating how crews must dynamically shift from rule-governed rigidity to alternative, non-standard responses when stimulus-consequence relationships change, the framework models safety not as passive compliance, but as a continuous, active balancing of control and adaptation (Alavosius et al., 2017).

Resilience engineering critiques challenge traditional CRM models for relying on restrictive information-processing paradigms and subjective "folk models" (like situational awareness) that capture static behavioral markers (e.g., NOTECHS) but obscure the complex variables driving localized, sharp-end problem solving. Comparative studies further demonstrate that sectors conceptualize error management inconsistently, with some viewing CRM as a strict enforcement mechanism to reduce standard operating procedure violations and others positioning it as a completely independent non-technical skill set. This review advances current scholarship by using categorized taxonomies to analyze these divergent approaches across industries. By embedding flexible resilience theory directly within structured diagnostic assessments, the integrated framework provides global risk networks with a comprehensive toolkit to maintain systemic resilience without compromising baseline procedural control (Alavosius et al., 2017; Bergström et al., 2011; Haerkens et al., 2012; Havinga et al., 2017).

### 7.4 Emerging Challenges and Research Directions

Emerging operational challenges in Crew Resource Management (CRM) stem from inadequate conceptual foundations, fragmented training assessment methodologies, and inconsistent cross-domain transfer frameworks. Resilience engineering scholars argue that traditional CRM remains limited by an information-processing paradigm and subjective "folk models" (like situational awareness) that rely on static behavioral markers (such as NOTECHS lists) to count and categorize errors. While these metrics are simple to deploy, they hide the multiple complex variables that drive localized, sharp-end adaptations during novel, unforeseen emergencies. This paper delivers a novel conceptual contribution by reframing these rigid compliance models through resilience theory, establishing a flexible taxonomy that preserves baseline procedural control while capturing the dynamic, multi-layered nature of adaptive team performance under stress (Bergström et al., 2011).

This measurement gap is further complicated by the "Recognition-Primed Decision (RPD) paradox" in training, where exposing teams to highly prescriptive, simulated scenarios can inadvertently lead to kaleidoscopic hypothesis generation or cognitive lock-in when facing truly unpredictable maritime or multiagency crises. These limitations hamper information sharing across distributed networks, as stressed operators routinely struggle to articulate tactical updates or remain oblivious to the information demands of adjacent teams. The distinct value added by this paper's integration lies in its structural reconciliation of these distributed communication barriers. By replacing isolated simulator exercises with advanced metacognitive tracking models, the framework provides a unified methodology to accurately quantify real-time information transfer and evaluate learning retention across complex socio-technical boundaries (Barnett et al., n.d.).

Furthermore, curriculum evaluation remains constrained by immense sector variability, voluntary regulatory guidance, and persistent design misconceptions, such as prioritizing high physical fidelity over cognitive psychological fidelity or excluding learning specialists from core instructional design. Correcting these content-validity gaps requires strict institutional mandates, dedicated funding, and systematic access to operational data to build a compelling business case for senior executives. By integrating these localized pedagogical requirements into a comprehensive corporate model, this review advances current scholarship. It transforms fragmented, checklist-driven training modules into rigorous, data-driven performance analytics capable of guiding targeted remediation during high-stress operational events (Salas et al., 2006; Wagener & Ison, 2014).

While aviation serves as the mature exemplar for CRM delivery, transferring these principles to less standardized environments—such as healthcare or oil field services—requires an analytical language that respects distinct sector constraints. Incorporating objective, behavior-analytic metrics that explicitly quantify verbal coordination, rule governance, and interlocked communication networks extends the traditional cognitive psychology literature and allows for more precise cross-domain auditing. The primary contribution of this unified perspective is the systematic consolidation of these diverse industrial workflows into a single operational architecture. By modeling interpersonal communications as measurable, structural relations, the framework provides high-reliability organizations with a scalable methodology to audit, predict, and continuously optimize safety cultures across any high-risk landscape (Alavosius et al., 2017).

## 8 Conclusion

### 8.1 Summary of Key Findings in Relation to Stated Objectives

This manuscript systematically synthesizes the historical developments, theoretical foundations, empirical findings, and translational applications of crew resource management (CRM) and crisis communication frameworks within high-risk operations. In alignment with the stated objectives, the review establishes that modern safety outcomes depend on treating teams, procedures, and organizational culture as highly interdependent determinants of systemic resilience. Across all analyzed sectors, six broad behavioral classes emerge consistently as core non-technical dependencies: communication, situational awareness, decision-making, teamwork, management of human capacity limits, and leadership. Empirical data confirm that structured operational protocols—including pre-event briefings, closed-loop communication, strict functional role assignments (e.g., PF vs. PM), and formalized debriefings—measurably increase observable non-technical performance and mitigate errors during high-workload intervals. Furthermore, multi-method tracking approaches combining eye tracking, scan pattern entropy, and subjective self-assessment ratings yield convergent evidence regarding how crews detect and act on deviations under acute stress.

### 8.2 Acknowledgment of Limitations

Several critical limitations must be acknowledged within this synthesis. Methodologically, the paper draws upon a relatively narrow evidence base that over-indexes on mature aviation paradigms, structured clinical simulation studies, and established high-reliability industrial frameworks. This introduces potential selection biases and limits the immediate generalizability of the integrated framework when applied to highly decentralized corporate ecosystems or automated, AI-driven socio-technical systems that lack established simulator or human-in-the-loop tracking infrastructures. Furthermore, substantial inter-rater variability and content validity gaps persist within current behavioral marker systems like NOTECHS. Because many existing assessment instruments yield static, episodic data and struggle to capture dynamic, real-time teamwork competencies directly, the underlying empirical evidence base faces inherent content validity and measurement constraints.

### 8.3 Future Research Agenda

To move beyond descriptive analysis, future scholarship must prioritize the empirical validation of integrated frameworks through tightly controlled, mixed-method studies. The following prioritized, testable questions are proposed for empirical investigation:

- Transfer Effectiveness: To what precise extent do non-technical skills and decision-making structures learned in high-fidelity simulated environments transfer to live, high-stress operational outcomes?
- Fidelity Optimization: What is the minimal level of physical and psychological simulation fidelity required to guarantee effective skill transfer while preventing cognitive lock-in or hypothesis proliferation?
- Distributed Network Synchronization: How do geographically distributed or multi-agency teams dynamically share situational awareness across conflicting technological and organizational interfaces under acute stress?
- The RPD Paradox: Can the integration of metacognitive training modules actively mitigate the Recognition-Primed Decision (RPD) paradox, preventing crews from generating over-complex hypotheses or experiencing cognitive lock-in when facing completely novel crises?
- Quantitative Network Metrics: Can the incorporation of objective, behavior-analytic metrics—such as quantifying communication network density, verbal coordination latency, and interlocked behavior sequences—provide a statistically superior predictor of safety outcomes compared to traditional qualitative error-counting taxonomies?

### 8.4 Differentiated Actionable Recommendations

To translate these findings into evidence-based practice, operational actions must be differentiated across key stakeholder groups:

#### 8.4.1 Healthcare and Clinical Educators

Mandate comprehensive CRM training for all multidisciplinary emergency and resuscitation staff within their first year of employment, supplemented by semi-annual team orientations.

Embed visual cues displaying core briefing components directly within clinical environments, and deploy web-based learning modules for annual competency reinforcement and continuing education credits.

#### 8.4.2 Enterprise Risk Managers and Executives

Embed CRM compliance metrics directly into formal corporate quality assurance and safety governance systems rather than treating them as optional, discretionary add-ons.

Secure dedicated financial resources, establish cross-functional advisory boards, and enforce organizational mandates that grant systematic access to operational data streams to build a data-driven business case for long-term safety culture investments.

#### 8.4.3 Simulation Practitioners and Training Designers

Align all scenario architectures with explicit, diagnostic learning objectives, prioritizing psychological fidelity—engaging the exact cognitive processes required in live operations—over expensive physical replication.

Invest in systematic assessor calibration and rater development programs to reduce inter-rater variability for behavioral markers, utilizing recorded audio-visual audits and structured checklists to deliver targeted performance feedback.

Incorporate explicit, dedicated modules on human capacity limitations, such as fatigue and stress physiology, to address individual physiological constraints alongside collective team coordination protocols.

## Bibliography


1. Alavosius, M. P., Houmanfar, R. A., Anbro, S. J., Burleigh, K., & Hebein, C. (2017). Leadership and crew resource management in high-reliability organizations: A competency framework for measuring behaviors. Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 37(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/01608061.2017.1325825
2. Barnett, M., Gatfield, D., & Pekcan, C. (n.d.). A research agenda in maritime crew resource management.
3. Bergström, J., Henriqson, E., & Dahlström, N. (2011). From crew resource management to operational resilience. In Proceedings of the fourth Resilience Engineering Symposium. https://doi.org/10.4000/books.pressesmines.967
4. Chang, Y. H. J., & Mosleh, A. (2007). Cognitive modeling and dynamic probabilistic simulation of operating crew response to complex system accidents. Part 2: IDAC performance influencing factors model. Reliability Engineering &Amp; System Safety, 92(8). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ress.2006.05.010
5. Dahlström, Laursen, J., & Bergström, J. Crew resource management, threat and error management, and assessment of CRM skills.
6. Dijk, H., Merwe, G. K. van de, & Zon, G. D. R. (2010). A coherent impression of the pilots' situation awareness studying relevant human factors tools. Journal of Aviation Psychology.
7. France, D. J., Stiles, R., Gaffney, F. A., Seddon, M. R., Grogan, E. L., Nixon, J., William R., & Speroff, T. (2005). Crew resource management training- clinicians' reactions and attitudes. AORN Journal, 82(2). http://www.aorn.org/journal/homestudy/default.htm
8. Grogan, E. L., Stiles, R. A., France, D. J., Speroff, T., Morris, J. A., Nixon, B., Gaffney, A. F., Seddon, R., & Pinson, W. C. (2004). The impact of aviation-based teamwork training on the attitudes of health-care professionals. Journal of the American College of Surgeons, 199(6). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2004.08.021
9. Haerkens, M. H. T. M., Jenkins, D. H., & Hoeven, J. G. van der. (2012). Crew resource management in the ICU: The need for culture change. Annals of Intensive Care, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/2110-5820-2-39

10. Havinga, J., De Boer, R. J., Rae, A., & Dekker, S. (2017). How did crew resource management take-off outside of the cockpit? A systematic review of how crew resource management training is conceptualized and evaluated for non-pilots. Safety, 3(4). https://doi.org/10.3390/safety3040026
11. Hughes, M. K., Benenson, R. S., Krichten, A. E., Clancy, K. D., Ryan, J. P., & Hammond, C. (2014). A crew resource management program tailored to trauma resuscitation improves team behavior and communication. Journal of the American College of Surgeons, 219(3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2014.03.049
12. Kumar, S., & Rao, P. (2023). Learnings from the aviation risk management into corporate risk management. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4500094
13. McNeese, M. D., Mancuso, V. F., McNeese, N. J., Endsley, T., & Forster, P. (2014). An integrative simulation to study team cognition in emergency crisis management. Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting, 58(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/1541931214581059
14. Nja, O., & Rake, E. L. (2009). A discussion of decision-making applied in incident command. International Journal of Emergency Management, 6(1). https://doi.org/10.1504/ijem.2009.025173
15. O’Connor, P., Hörmann, H.-J., Flin, R., Lodge, M., Goeters, K.-M., & JARTEL Group, T. (2002). Developing a method for evaluating crew resource management skills: A European perspective. The International Journal of Aviation Psychology, 12(3). https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327108ijap1203_5
16. Pettitt, M. (1992). Cockpit crises and decision-making: Impucations for pilot training. Collegiate Aviation Review International, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.22488/okstate.18.100248
17. Romano, T. G., Pestana, J. M. F., & Moreira, V. C. da C. D. (2022). Crew resource management (CRM) as a tool for patient safety in health. International Journal of Health Science, 2(49). https://doi.org/10.22533/at.ed.1592492219085
18. Salas, E., Wilson, K. A., Burke, C. S., & Wightman, D. C. (2006). Does crew resource management training work? An update, an extension, and some critical needs. Human Factors: The Journal of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society, 48(2). https://doi.org/10.1518/001872006777724444
19. Salvetti, F., Gardner, R., Minehart, R., Galli, C., & Bertagni, B. (2020). Crisis resource management in aviation and healthcare. International Journal of Advanced Corporate Learning (iJAC), 13(2). https://doi.org/10.3991/ijac.v13i2.17035
20. Sundar, E., Sundar, S., Pawlowski, J., Blum, R., Feinstein, D., & Pratt, S. (2007). Crew resource management and team training. Anesthesiology Clinics, 25(2). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anclin.2007.03.011
21. Tajima, A. (2004). Fatal miscommunication: English in aviation safety. World Englishes, 23(3). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0883-2919.2004.00368.x
22. Vieira, A. M., & Santos, I. C. dos. (2010). Communication skills: A mandatory competence for ground and airplane crew to reduce tension in extreme situations. Journal of Aerospace Technology and Management, 2(3). https://doi.org/10.5028/jatm.2010.02038110
23. Wagener, F., & Ison, D. C. (2014). Crew resource management application in commercial aviation. Journal of Aviation Technology and Engineering, 3(2). https://doi.org/10.7771/2159-6670.1077