Review Article ISSN: 3065-5641

Global Journal of Critical Care and Emergency Medicine

Critical Care for the Caregivers: Soulful Leadership, Humanization, and Arts-Based Micro-Practices for Burnout, Moral Distress, Moral Injury, and Compassion Fatigue in Intensive Care and Emergency Medicine

Dr. Ignacio Bonasa Alzuria*

President and Founder, Liderarte, Madrid, Spain.

ORCID ID: 0009-0001-3940-4278

***Correspondence:**
Dr. Ignacio Bonasa Alzuria, President and Founder, Liderarte, Madrid, Spain.

Received: 09 Apr 2026; **Accepted:** 10 May 2026; **Published:** 17 May 2026

Citation: Ignacio Bonasa Alzuria. Critical Care for the Caregivers: Soulful Leadership, Humanization, and Arts-Based Micro-Practices for Burnout, Moral Distress, Moral Injury, and Compassion Fatigue in Intensive Care and Emergency Medicine. Glob J Emerg Crit Care Med. 2026; 3(2); 1-10.

ABSTRACT

Background: *Intensive care units and emergency departments concentrate some of the most technically demanding, emotionally intense, and morally complex work in health systems. The professionals who sustain these settings are exposed to chronic workload pressure, suffering, death, family distress, uncertainty, violence risk, and ethical conflict.*

Problem: *Burnout, compassion fatigue, moral distress, and moral injury should not be interpreted merely as individual vulnerabilities. They also reveal the quality of work design, staffing, leadership, team culture, ethical climate, and organizational trust. When caregiver distress is ignored, patient safety, communication, retention, and the humanity of care may deteriorate.*

Proposal: *This commentary and narrative review proposes Soulful Leadership for Critical Care, a humanistic and organizational framework designed to complement, not replace, clinical governance, safe staffing, occupational health, mental health support, and quality-improvement interventions. The framework translates the author's work on leadership with soul, arts-based learning, and the 4A model - Learning, Attitude, Soul, and Action - into high-acuity clinical environments.*

Framework: *Six implementation domains are developed: dignity, meaning, compassionate communication, moral repair, arts-based micro-practices, and accountable organizational change. The article also proposes a 90-day pilot, measurement indicators, ethical safeguards, and a research agenda for feasibility and implementation studies.*

Conclusion: *The central claim is that caregiver well-being is not an optional wellness benefit but a form of patient-safety infrastructure. There can be no sustainable critical care without critical care for the caregivers.*

Keywords

Critical care, Emergency medicine, ICU, Clinician burnout, Moral distress, Moral injury, Compassion fatigue, Humanization, Arts in health, Patient safety, Soulful leadership.

Highlights

- Burnout, moral distress, moral injury, and compassion fatigue in high-acuity care are signals of organizational design, workload, ethical climate, and leadership, not simply individual fragility.
- Caregiver well-being should be treated as patient-safety infrastructure, workforce sustainability, and ethical governance.
- Soulful Leadership for Critical Care operationalizes dignity,

meaning, compassionate communication, moral repair, arts-based micro-practices, and accountable change.

- Arts-based practices are proposed only as brief, voluntary, low-risk tools for reflection, connection, and meaning-making; they are not substitutes for staffing, safety, or professional mental health support.
- The article offers a 90-day pilot, metrics, safeguards, and a research agenda suitable for feasibility, quality-improvement, or implementation studies in ICU and emergency departments.

Introduction: The hidden emergency inside emergency medicine

Critical care and emergency medicine exist because society refuses to abandon human beings at the edge of life. In the intensive care unit (ICU), patients may depend on mechanical ventilation, vasoactive drugs, renal replacement therapy, sedation, invasive monitoring, complex surgery, and the continuous vigilance of interprofessional teams. In the emergency department (ED), clinicians make high-consequence decisions under uncertainty, crowding, time pressure, variable information, violence risk, and the ethical tension of triage. These settings are not only clinical spaces. They are moral theatres where vulnerability, technology, grief, urgency, professional identity, and hope meet every day.

The technological progress of intensive and emergency care has been extraordinary. Yet the same progress has made visible a paradox: the more sophisticated the technical system becomes, the more fragile the human system may feel. Professionals can be surrounded by protocols, monitors, alarms, algorithms, electronic health records, and checklists while feeling emotionally isolated, morally trapped, and existentially depleted. The result is not merely tiredness. It can become a progressive erosion of meaning, compassion, belonging, and agency.

The World Health Organization describes burnout in ICD-11 as an occupational phenomenon resulting from chronic workplace stress that has not been successfully managed; it is not classified as a medical condition [1]. This distinction is decisive for critical care leaders. Burnout is not a character defect and should not be reduced to a private failure of resilience. It is a warning signal about work design, staffing, culture, leadership, workload, technology, and moral climate.

Critical care and emergency teams face a particular version of this problem because they repeatedly cross the border between rescue and loss. They intubate, resuscitate, stabilize, transfer, pronounce death, inform families, absorb anger, manage uncertainty, and move immediately to the next patient. They may deliver technically correct care while feeling that the system prevents them from offering the humane care that brought them into medicine, nursing, pre-hospital care, or allied health practice.

This article argues that the well-being of ICU and ED professionals should be understood as a foundational condition for safe, compassionate, and sustainable care. This position aligns with the broader call to collectively confront the clinician-burnout crisis as a human and institutional obligation. It develops a conceptual and implementation framework called Soulful Leadership for Critical Care. The term 'soulful' is used in a secular, ethical, and organizational sense: the capacity of a system to preserve coherence, dignity, care, truth, and purpose under pressure. Soulful leadership does not ask exhausted professionals to be heroic. It asks organizations to become worthy of the people who serve within them.

Aim, article type, and contribution

This manuscript is a commentary, narrative review, and conceptual implementation framework. It is not an original clinical trial, a systematic review, a clinical guideline, or a mental health treatment protocol. Its purpose is translational: to connect established concerns about burnout, moral distress, moral injury, compassion fatigue, humanization, and arts in health with a leadership framework that can be piloted in ICU and ED environments.

The article has four aims. First, it explains why caregiver distress in high-acuity care should be treated as a safety, quality, ethics, and workforce issue. Second, it clarifies the relationship between burnout, compassion fatigue, moral distress, moral injury, and psychological safety. Third, it presents Soulful Leadership for Critical Care as a six-domain model and adapts the 4A model - Learning, Attitude, Soul, and Action - for high-acuity teams. Fourth, it offers practical implementation steps, metrics, safeguards, and future research questions.

The distinctive contribution is not a new pharmacological, procedural, or diagnostic intervention. It is an organizational and humanistic framework that seeks to make existing knowledge usable in daily leadership practice. The framework is designed for chiefs of service, ICU and ED directors, nursing leaders, quality and safety teams, hospital executives, ethics committees, occupational health departments, and educators who want to protect the humanity of care without weakening clinical rigor.

Methodological note: Narrative review and conceptual translation

The literature informing this commentary includes landmark and peer-reviewed sources on clinician burnout, health worker well-being, critical care burnout, moral distress, moral injury, compassion fatigue, patient safety, humanization of intensive care, compassion in healthcare, and arts in health. Priority was given to authoritative bodies and widely cited literature, including the World Health Organization, the Critical Care Societies Collaborative, the National Academy of Medicine, the U.S. Surgeon General, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and major systematic reviews or conceptual papers relevant to health-worker well-being [1-5]. The synthesis also incorporates foundational burnout theory [6,7], compassion fatigue literature [8,9], moral injury and moral repair literature [10,11], patient-safety evidence [12,13], ICU humanization studies [14,15], the quadruple aim and collective clinician-well-being agenda [16,17], organizational leadership

and burnout-solution literature [18-21], arts and compassion research [22,23], moral resilience scholarship [24], critical-care-specific burnout and pandemic-related evidence [25,26], medical training and resilience literature [27,28], pandemic mental-health and moral-injury analyses [29,30], and CDC/NIOSH working-condition surveillance [31].

No PRISMA protocol, database search strategy, risk-of-bias assessment, or meta-analysis was conducted. Consequently, the article should not be read as evidence grading. It should be read as a hypothesis-generating and practice-oriented synthesis. The proposed framework requires empirical testing through feasibility studies, quality-improvement projects, mixed-methods implementation studies, and context-sensitive evaluation.

The article also draws on the author's previous work on leadership with soul, arts-based learning, organizational humanization, and the 4A model. Those concepts are translated here cautiously into clinical settings. The translation is bounded by an important principle: humanistic and arts-based practices can only be ethically acceptable if they complement, and never replace, safe staffing, adequate rest, psychological support, just culture, clinical governance, and concrete operational improvement.

The burden in high-acuity care: Five overlapping forms of distress

Clinician distress is often compressed into the single word 'burnout'. This may be useful for public recognition, but it can also flatten the experience of ICU and ED professionals. High-acuity care exposes staff to chronic pressure, repeated suffering, ethically constrained choices, traumatic events, family conflict, administrative burden, and sometimes physical or verbal aggression. Critical-care-specific literature has therefore treated burnout syndrome as a professional and organizational challenge requiring action, not as a private weakness [2,25]. A mature framework must distinguish at least five overlapping dimensions: burnout, compassion fatigue, moral distress, moral injury, and psychological unsafety.

Burnout as an occupational and system signal

Burnout classically includes emotional exhaustion, depersonalization or cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy [6,7]. In ICU and ED settings, these dimensions have concrete faces. Emotional exhaustion may mean that a clinician cannot recover between shifts. Depersonalization may appear as emotional distancing from patients, families, or colleagues. Reduced efficacy may be experienced as the belief that excellent care is no longer possible inside the current system. Burnout vulnerability also affects the training pipeline, including students, residents, and early-career physicians who enter demanding clinical systems before they have institutional power to change them [27].

The National Academy of Medicine has emphasized the need for a systems approach to clinician well-being, locating burnout in workflow, workload, technology, regulation, leadership, and culture [3]. The U.S. Surgeon General has likewise framed health-worker burnout as a threat to the health system and called for environments that allow health workers to thrive [4]. During the COVID-19 period, ICU specialists and front-line health workers faced intensified burnout, mental-health challenges, and moral-injury risk, reinforcing the need for preparedness, peer support, leadership honesty, and system-level protection [26,29,30]. The message is clear: individual resilience interventions may help, but they are ethically incomplete if organizations fail to address the conditions that generate distress.

Compassion fatigue and secondary traumatic stress

Compassion fatigue is often described as the cost of repeated exposure to suffering and has been studied among healthcare, emergency, and community service workers [8,9]. Emergency nurses, intensivists, residents, respiratory therapists, paramedics, nursing assistants, and other professionals may witness sudden death, severe trauma, failed resuscitation, family anguish, delirium, violence, and the vulnerability of patients who cannot speak for themselves. This empathic exposure can create secondary traumatic stress and can erode the capacity to remain emotionally present.

Compassion fatigue should not be interpreted as a failure to care. It may be a sign that caring has occurred for too long without restoration, acknowledgement, peer support, and meaning-making. When compassion fatigue becomes normalized, the system can become technically efficient but relationally cold. The patient is treated, but the person disappears. The family is informed, but not held. The clinician performs, but no longer feels human inside the performance.

Moral distress and moral injury

Moral distress arises when professionals believe they know the ethically appropriate action but are constrained from taking it. In the ICU and ED, constraints may include lack of beds, unsafe staffing, crowding, administrative pressure, non-beneficial treatment, limited time with families, inequitable access, aggressive behaviour, or policies that conflict with professional conscience. Moral distress has an organizational dimension because it is intensified when professionals feel that leaders do not listen or cannot change anything.

Moral injury refers to a deeper wound linked to acts of commission, omission, witnessing, or inability to prevent events that transgress deeply held moral beliefs [10]. In health care, the term has been used to describe the suffering clinicians experience when system barriers prevent them from providing the care patients need [11]. The concept should be used carefully because not every distress is moral injury. Nevertheless, it gives leaders a vital lens: people do not suffer only because they work too much; they also suffer when they are forced to work against their moral identity.

Psychological safety and voice

Psychological safety is the shared belief that people can speak up, ask questions, report concerns, admit uncertainty, or challenge

decisions without humiliation or retaliation. In high-acuity care, psychological safety is not a soft concept. It is part of patient safety. If a junior doctor, nurse, technician, or paramedic feels unable to speak, a weak signal may remain silent until it becomes harm.

Leadership behaviour is decisive. Teams learn quickly whether questions are welcomed, whether errors are investigated fairly, whether anger is tolerated from powerful people, and whether front-line observations lead to change. A soulful approach to critical care therefore includes protection of voice: the right to say 'I am worried', 'I do not understand', 'this is not safe', or 'this event is still affecting us'.

Why overlap matters

Burnout asks: what is chronic workplace stress doing to energy, distance, and efficacy? Compassion fatigue asks: what is repeated exposure to suffering doing to empathy and connection? Moral distress asks: what happens when the ethically appropriate action is blocked? Moral injury asks: what happens when professional conscience is wounded? Psychological unsafety asks: what happens when people cannot speak honestly about risk, fear, uncertainty, or harm?

In the lived reality of ICU and ED teams, these questions do not appear separately. The same professional may be exhausted, emotionally numb, morally conflicted, and afraid to speak within the same week. A narrow wellness strategy misses the ethical dimension. A purely moral-injury narrative may miss workload and staffing. A mature response must integrate operational, psychological, relational, ethical, and existential dimensions.

Why caregiver well-being is patient-safety infrastructure

Caregiver well-being is sometimes placed in the category of benefits, wellness, or personal health. In critical care and emergency medicine, this categorization is too weak. Exhausted and morally injured teams may still perform heroically, but persistent distress can influence attention, communication, learning, civility, turnover, absenteeism, and safety culture. Systematic reviews and large observational studies have linked clinician well-being and burnout with patient-safety outcomes, perceived errors, and quality indicators [12,13]. This is also consistent with the quadruple aim: care of the patient requires care of the provider [16].

The relationship is not simplistic or deterministic. A burned-out professional is not automatically unsafe, and safety failures cannot be blamed on individual distress. The more important point is systemic: no hospital should expect sustainable excellence from a workforce whose emotional, moral, and relational reserves are continuously depleted. Well-being is not outside quality. It is one of the conditions that makes quality possible.

This is especially relevant in ICU and ED contexts because teams must coordinate rapidly across disciplines. A single shift may require escalation, intubation, imaging, transfer, bed negotiation, medication reconciliation, infection control, family communication, and end-of-life decisions. Under such conditions, patient safety depends not only on knowledge and protocols, but also on trust, voice, attention, recovery, and moral clarity.

Humanization in ICU and emergency medicine: from patient-centered to caregiver-inclusive

Humanization in critical care has developed as a response to the risk that technologically advanced environments may unintentionally reduce patients to bodies, numbers, organs, or diagnoses. ICU patients may experience discomfort, loss of control, delirium, surreal memories, fear, dependence, and separation from ordinary identity. Families may experience uncertainty, helplessness, and grief. Humanized intensive care therefore emphasizes holistic care, dignity, communication, family involvement, professional attitude, and organizational design [14]. Practical humanization approaches, such as person-centered ICU identity tools and Get to Know Me boards, illustrate how simple relational information can help preserve patient personhood in technical environments [15].

In emergency departments, humanization faces different pressures: crowding, boarding, violence risk, noise, waiting, rapid turnover, and unpredictable demand. The professional may have only seconds to communicate. Yet brief compassion matters. The question is not whether compassion can be long; the question is whether it can be real. A twenty-second explanation delivered with presence can be more humanizing than a long conversation delivered mechanically.

However, patient-centered humanization is incomplete if it ignores the caregiver. A team that is chronically humiliated, unsafe, unheard, or exhausted will struggle to humanize others consistently. Caregiver-inclusive humanization asks two inseparable questions: how do we preserve the personhood of patients and families, and how do we preserve the personhood of the professionals who care for them?

From individual resilience to organizational soul

Healthcare organizations frequently respond to distress through resilience training, wellness applications, mindfulness sessions, or confidential counselling. These supports may be useful and should be available, and resilience remains a legitimate professional resource when it is not used to blame individuals for systemic problems [28]. Yet such supports become ethically insufficient when they invite individuals to adapt to conditions that leaders are unwilling to change. Systematic reviews suggest that organization-directed interventions are central to sustained burnout reduction, even when individual interventions also have value [20,21]. Executive leadership strategies and broader reviews of burnout contributors, consequences, and solutions reinforce the need to redesign work, improve culture, and make well-being a leadership responsibility [18,19]. The essential question is not only 'How can we make clinicians more resilient?' but also 'How can we make the system less injurious?'

In this article, organizational soul means the living coherence

between declared values and daily experience. A hospital may say that people come first, but if staff cannot take breaks, cannot speak up, cannot debrief, cannot trust leaders, and cannot see problems acted upon, the value remains rhetorical. Soul is not sentimentality. It is disciplined alignment among purpose, culture, structure, behaviour, and accountability.

Organizational soul can be observed in practical signs: leaders who understand night-shift reality; consultants who speak respectfully to nurses and residents; teams that use patient names; supervisors who reduce unnecessary administrative burden; staff who can ask for help without shame; families who receive truthful communication; and professionals who are not expected to carry grief alone. These micro-signs accumulate into culture.

Soulful Leadership for Critical Care: a six-domain framework

Soulful Leadership for Critical Care is proposed as a practical framework for caregiver well-being and humanized care in high-acuity environments. It rests on five ethical principles: coherence, dignity, care, truth, and purpose. These principles are translated into six domains that can be implemented at team and organizational levels.

The framework is deliberately operational. It is not a call for inspirational language without institutional responsibility. Each domain includes a leadership question, expected behaviours, possible practices, and suggested metrics. The model is summarized in Table 1.

Domain 1: Dignity

Dignity is the foundation of humanized care. In ICU and ED settings, dignity can be threatened by urgency, exposure of the body, sedation, delirium, mechanical ventilation, crowding, pain, fear, or the reduction of a person to a bed number or diagnosis. Staff dignity can be threatened by aggression, blame, disrespect, moral invisibility, and the normalization of exhaustion.

Soulful leadership protects dignity through visible behaviours. Leaders should challenge cynical speech that objectifies patients, introduce team members by name, encourage respectful interprofessional communication, and take seriously the phrase 'this is not safe'. In an ICU, dignity may mean speaking to an unconscious patient before a procedure. In an ED, it may mean acknowledging fear even when the waiting room is full. For staff, dignity means that a nurse, resident, paramedic, or technician can raise a concern and be heard as a professional.

Domain 2: Meaning

Meaning is a protective factor against despair, but it cannot be manufactured through slogans. It must be rediscovered in the concrete story of work. High-acuity professionals often perform acts of extraordinary value that remain invisible: noticing a subtle deterioration, calming a family, preparing medication safely, cleaning a room with care, protecting privacy, translating technical uncertainty into understandable language, or staying present at the moment of death.

A brief weekly 'meaning moment' can invite a team member to share one patient-related lesson, one act of teamwork, or one difficult event that deserves acknowledgement. The aim is not emotional exhibitionism. The aim is to prevent technical intensity from erasing human significance. Meaning is not decoration; it is oxygen for professional identity.

Domain 3: Compassionate communication

Compassionate communication is often misunderstood as lengthy communication. In ICU and ED work, compassion must sometimes be brief, truthful, and embodied. Tone, eye contact, explanation, and acknowledgement can change the moral atmosphere of an encounter even when time is scarce. The wider compassion literature also supports the idea that caring communication is not merely ornamental; it can influence trust, adherence, experience, and the moral quality of clinical relationships [23].

Table 1: Six domains of Soulful Leadership for Critical Care.

Domain	Core leadership question	Expected behaviours	Possible indicators
Dignity	Are patients, families, and staff treated as persons rather than functions?	Use names; explain actions; protect respectful language; prevent humiliation; attend to bodily, emotional, and professional dignity.	Psychological safety; patient/family experience; communication complaints; respectful-workplace incidents.
Meaning	Can professionals still connect daily work with purpose?	Name invisible work; create brief meaning moments; share stories of impact; recognize moral effort as well as technical achievement.	Meaning in work; engagement; retention intention; qualitative stories of value.
Compassionate communication	Is compassion operationally possible under pressure?	Model concise empathic communication; train brief scripts; protect time for difficult conversations; reduce avoidable ambiguity.	Family satisfaction; patient trust; communication-related incidents; staff confidence in difficult conversations.
Moral repair	What happens after ethically difficult events?	Offer ethics huddles, debriefs, peer support, non-punitive reflection, and escalation of recurrent moral constraints.	Moral distress measures; debrief participation; ethics consultation themes; action items closed.
Arts-based micro-practices	Can symbolic practices help teams process experience without disrupting care?	Use brief, voluntary writing, visual metaphor, music pauses, storytelling, gratitude boards, and remembrance rituals.	Acceptability; perceived recovery; team cohesion; qualitative reflections; absence of coercion.
Accountable change	Does leadership convert listening into action?	Track problems; reduce unnecessary burdens; close feedback loops; publish changes; distinguish unsolved from ignored problems.	Action-completion rate; workload indicators; sick leave; turnover; trust in leadership.

A practical formula is SEE: Stop, Explain, Empathize. Stop means creating a moment of presence, however brief. Explain means reducing uncertainty with plain language. Empathize means naming the emotional reality without false reassurance. A clinician might say: 'I can see this is frightening. We are treating the breathing problem now. I will update you as soon as we know more'. Such sentences do not require long conversations, but they communicate that the patient or family has not disappeared behind the emergency.

Domain 4: Moral repair

Teams need mechanisms for moral repair after ethically difficult events. These may include perceived non-beneficial treatment, triage decisions, deaths after prolonged waiting, conflict with families, violence, sudden deterioration, failed rescue, or cases where poverty, loneliness, addiction, or social exclusion make medicine feel painfully insufficient. Without repair, teams may carry moral residue into future encounters.

Moral repair can include structured debriefings, ethics huddles, peer support, access to ethics consultation, and leadership acknowledgement of system constraints. Moral resilience scholarship is especially relevant because it emphasizes the capacity to sustain or restore integrity in the face of moral adversity without denying the reality of suffering [24]. A short debrief can ask: What happened? What did we feel? What ethical tension was present? What was within our control? What should be escalated? What must we learn without blaming? The purpose is to move from private rumination to shared reflection and action.

Domain 5: Arts-based micro-practices

The arts can support expression, reflection, social connection, emotional processing, and meaning-making; a WHO scoping review summarized a broad evidence base on the role of the arts in health and well-being [22]. In clinical settings, however, arts-based interventions must be introduced with humility. They should never replace staffing, rest, fair scheduling, psychological support, violence prevention, ethics consultation, or safety measures. They should also never impose forced positivity on professionals whose distress is legitimate.

The proposal here is modest: brief, voluntary, low-cost micro-practices that help teams give form to experience. Examples include a two-minute reflective writing prompt after a difficult week; a remembrance board for patients who died; a visual metaphor exercise during team development; a music pause in staff space; a gratitude wall focused on observed behaviours; or storytelling rounds where professionals identify one moment of care that mattered. The value lies not in artistic performance but in symbolic processing.

Domain 6: Accountable change

The credibility of any well-being initiative depends on whether listening leads to action. Staff quickly recognize symbolic gestures that are not accompanied by operational improvement. A hospital that offers mindfulness while ignoring dangerous staffing sends a contradictory message. Soulful leadership therefore requires accountability: problems must be named, prioritized, acted upon, and reported back.

Accountable change may include reducing unnecessary documentation, improving shift design, addressing violence, protecting breaks, clarifying escalation pathways, supporting new staff, redesigning workflow, and involving front-line professionals in decisions. The moral contract is simple: if staff are asked to speak honestly, leaders must respond honestly. Not every problem can be solved immediately, but every serious concern can be acknowledged, tracked, and addressed with transparency.

The 4A model translated into ICU and ED practice

The author's 4A model - Learning, Attitude, Soul, and Action - can be translated into high-acuity environments as a cycle of professional and organizational development. The model is useful because it prevents reflection from becoming passivity and prevents action from becoming mechanical.

Learning means converting experience into wisdom rather than allowing it to accumulate as trauma. Attitude does not mean forced optimism; it means constructive realism, the discipline of facing reality without cynicism and seeking improvement without denial. Soul refers to coherence with dignity, care, truth, and purpose. Action means that reflection must lead to operational change, because unacted reflection can become frustration.

Arts-based micro-practices: mechanisms, boundaries, and examples

Arts-based micro-practices can be misunderstood if they are presented as entertainment or as an emotional luxury. Their relevance in critical care is different. They can provide symbolic containers for experience, help teams express what is difficult to

Table 2: The 4A cycle for high-acuity teams.

4A element	Translation in ICU/ED	Example practice	Risk if absent
Learning	Experience becomes structured learning.	After-action review that includes clinical, emotional, ethical, and human factors.	Repeated harm; silent accumulation of trauma.
Attitude	Constructive realism replaces cynicism or denial.	Team language norms: direct, respectful, solution-oriented.	Cynical culture; learned helplessness.
Soul	Values remain visible under pressure.	Dignity check: how did we preserve personhood today?	Technical success with human depletion.
Action	Reflection is translated into improvement.	One operational action assigned and tracked after each debrief.	Well-being theatre without credibility.

Table 3: Examples of brief arts-based micro-practices.

Practice	Duration	Purpose	Safeguard
Two-line reflective writing	2-3 minutes	Name one difficult moment and one learning.	Voluntary; private unless participant chooses to share.
Visual metaphor card	5 minutes	Express team climate without direct confrontation.	Facilitator prevents blaming; themes are summarized, not personalized.
Remembrance pause	1-2 minutes	Acknowledge deaths or difficult losses.	Respect religious and cultural diversity; no forced ritual.
Gratitude board	Ongoing	Make invisible acts of care visible.	Focus on specific behaviours, not personality cults.
Music pause in staff area	3 minutes	Create transition after intense periods.	Never disrupt clinical duties; staff choose whether to participate.
Story of care round	5-10 minutes weekly	Reconnect work with purpose.	Brief, non-therapeutic, and time-protected.

say directly, strengthen relational memory, and create moments of shared meaning. This can be especially useful in environments where staff move rapidly from one emotionally intense event to the next.

Possible mechanisms include emotional labeling, narrative integration, social connection, ritualized acknowledgement, aesthetic distance, and restoration of agency. A drawing, poem, music pause, or metaphor can allow a professional to approach distress indirectly and safely. Nevertheless, mechanisms remain hypotheses in this context. They require careful evaluation rather than exaggerated claims.

Boundaries are essential. Participation must be voluntary. Practices must be brief enough to fit clinical reality. No one should be required to disclose trauma. Practices should be facilitated by trained staff or external experts when emotional depth is expected. They should be linked to operational listening, not used to beautify neglect. Most importantly, any arts-based practice must be compatible with patient safety and clinical workflow.

Practical implementation: a 90-day pilot for an ICU or ED

A framework becomes useful only when it can be tested. The following 90-day pilot is designed for one ICU or ED team. It is deliberately simple, low-cost, and compatible with clinical work. It should be co-designed with front-line staff, nursing and medical leadership, occupational health, quality and safety teams, ethics support, and, where appropriate, patient or family representatives.

The pilot is not intended to solve structural burnout in three months. Its purpose is to test feasibility, acceptability, credibility, and early signals of benefit. It also tests a cultural hypothesis: teams are more willing to engage in reflective and humanizing practices when leaders simultaneously remove operational burdens and close feedback loops.

Phase 1: Listening and baseline mapping (weeks 1-2)

- Conduct confidential baseline assessment of burnout, moral distress, compassion fatigue, psychological safety, team climate, and intention to leave.
- Hold listening sessions with nurses, physicians, residents, respiratory therapists, allied health professionals, support workers, administrative staff, and pre-hospital partners when relevant.
- Identify three modifiable operational irritants and three recurring moral tensions.
- Create a visible 'you said, we heard, we will act' board or digital equivalent.
- Select one clinical champion and one executive sponsor to ensure both front-line ownership and leadership accountability.

Phase 2: Micro-practices and leadership behaviours (weeks 3-8)

- Introduce one brief voluntary reflective practice per week.
- Implement SEE communication reminders in handover rooms or staff spaces.
- Begin short post-event debriefs after selected ethically or emotionally intense cases.
- Launch a dignity practice: use patient names, explain procedures, and identify one personal detail when clinically appropriate.
- Assign leadership ownership for at least two operational improvements identified during listening.

Phase 3: Moral repair and operational closure (weeks 9-12)

- Run one interprofessional ethics huddle focused on a recurrent moral tension.
- Review progress on operational irritants and report what changed, what did not change, and why.
- Repeat selected measures and compare with baseline.
- Collect qualitative reflections: what helped, what felt artificial, what should stop, and what should continue.
- Decide whether to scale, adapt, or discontinue specific components.

Measurement framework

Evaluation should combine quantitative indicators, qualitative data, and implementation measures. The goal is not to claim that a brief intervention eliminates burnout, moral injury, or compassion fatigue. The goal is to test feasibility, acceptability, safety, relevance, and early mechanisms of change.

Measurement should also avoid creating another burden. Instruments must be selected carefully and used sparingly. Where validated tools are already used in the institution, the pilot should align with them rather than adding unnecessary surveys.

Table 4: Suggested evaluation indicators.

Outcome area	Possible quantitative indicator	Possible qualitative indicator	Implementation indicator
Burnout and distress	Maslach Burnout Inventory, single-item burnout measure, or validated local tool.	Narratives of exhaustion, cynicism, recovery, or burden.	Response rate; completion time; staff feedback on survey burden.
Moral distress	Moral Distress Scale-Revised or ethics climate measure.	Themes from debriefs and ethics huddles.	Number of huddles; number of ethical issues escalated.
Compassion fatigue	Professional Quality of Life Scale (ProQOL).	Descriptions of numbness, empathy, and connection.	Participation in voluntary reflection; perceived emotional safety.
Psychological safety	Team psychological safety scale.	Stories of speaking up or staying silent.	Number of concerns raised and closed.
Humanization	Patient/family experience and communication scores.	Stories of dignity, presence, or dehumanization.	Dignity practice completion; staff perception of usefulness.
Operational credibility	Issues resolved; time to close feedback loop.	Trust in leadership response.	Percentage of action items completed or publicly explained.
Workforce sustainability	Absenteeism, sick leave, turnover intention, retention trends.	Reasons for staying, leaving, or feeling renewed.	Leadership review cadence; executive sponsorship attendance.

Ethical safeguards

Any intervention addressing staff emotions in high-acuity settings must protect autonomy, confidentiality, psychological safety, and professional boundaries. Participation in reflective or arts-based practices should be voluntary. Leaders should not demand disclosure of personal trauma. Debriefs should not become informal investigations, performance reviews, or blame sessions. When serious mental health needs are identified, staff should be directed to appropriate professional support.

A second safeguard is anti-tokenism. Humanization must not become a branding exercise. If an organization invites staff to write about suffering while ignoring unsafe conditions, the intervention becomes ethically harmful. The arts should open meaning, not decorate neglect. Soulful leadership requires the courage to connect symbolic practices with real operational change.

A third safeguard is cultural humility. The meaning of soul, dignity, expression, silence, grief, music, touch, prayer, and compassion varies across cultures, religions, professions, and individuals. Interventions should be adapted locally and co-designed with those who will live them. In global health settings, the framework should never import European or North American assumptions without dialogue.

Implications for leaders in critical care and emergency medicine

Leadership in critical care is commonly associated with decisiveness, expertise, prioritization, command under pressure, and clinical authority. These competencies remain essential. However, the crisis of caregiver distress requires an expanded leadership identity. The leader must be not only a clinical organizer but also a guardian of moral climate.

This does not require leaders to become therapists. It requires them to become attentive to the conditions that make good care possible. A soulful leader asks operational questions with ethical depth: Are we safe? Are we listening? Are we telling the truth? Are we treating people with dignity? What are we asking staff to carry? What must change so that compassion remains possible?

Leadership development for ICU and ED professionals should therefore include human factors, communication, conflict management, trauma-informed leadership, moral distress, team learning, debriefing, reflective practice, and just culture. Simulation can include not only intubation, sepsis, trauma, or cardiac arrest, but also family conversations, staff conflict, error disclosure, moral disagreement, and debriefing after death.

A global health perspective

The burden of critical illness is global, but resources are unequally distributed. In low-resource settings, ICU and emergency professionals may face scarcity of oxygen, medications, beds, equipment, transport, trained staff, referral options, and reliable infrastructure. Moral distress may therefore be intensified by structural injustice. Any framework for caregiver well-being must avoid assuming that all settings have the same options.

Nevertheless, the core principles of Soulful Leadership for Critical Care are adaptable. Dignity, respectful communication, team reflection, ethical acknowledgement, and low-cost symbolic practices do not require expensive technology. They require permission, leadership, cultural fit, and time. Where material resources are limited, protecting the humanity of staff and patients becomes even more essential, not less.

Global implementation should also recognize local strengths. Many cultures already possess rituals of remembrance, communal care, music, storytelling, spirituality, or collective meaning-making. The task is not to import arts-based practices as novelty but to identify ethically appropriate local forms that support staff without disrupting care or imposing beliefs.

Research agenda

Future research should move from conceptual plausibility to empirical testing. Several questions are especially important. Are arts-based micro-practices feasible and acceptable in ICU and ED teams without disrupting workflow? Do dignity and

meaning practices improve psychological safety, team cohesion, or perceived meaning in work? Can moral repair huddles reduce moral distress or increase trust in leadership? Which combination of operational change and reflective practice produces the strongest signal of benefit?

Appropriate designs include mixed-methods feasibility trials, stepped-wedge implementation studies, realist evaluations, qualitative case studies, and quality-improvement projects. Outcomes should include staff self-report, qualitative narratives, operational indicators, patient/family experience, safety culture, absenteeism, retention, and communication-related events. Economic evaluation may also be relevant if reduced turnover, sick leave, and conflict generate measurable savings.

Research should avoid blaming individuals for system-level problems. CDC and NIOSH data have emphasized the relationship between working conditions and health-worker mental health, including burnout and turnover intention [31]. The central question is not 'How can exhausted professionals become more tolerant of exhaustion?' The question is: What conditions allow professionals to remain human while delivering high-acuity care?

Limitations

This article has important limitations. It is a conceptual commentary and narrative synthesis rather than a systematic review or empirical study. The proposed framework integrates evidence-informed themes, but it has not been validated as a package in ICU or ED settings. The arts-based components are intentionally modest and should not be interpreted as proven interventions for burnout, moral injury, compassion fatigue, post-traumatic stress, depression, or anxiety.

A second limitation is language. The word 'soul' may not be equally acceptable in all clinical cultures. Some readers may prefer terms such as meaning, moral coherence, values-based leadership, humanization, dignity, or professional integrity. The framework can be translated into those terms without losing its substance. The essential point is not the word but the insistence that healthcare systems must protect the humanity of those who provide care.

A third limitation is implementation risk. Without leadership credibility and operational responsiveness, reflective practices can be perceived as superficial or manipulative. Any pilot must therefore include concrete action on workload, safety, communication, workflow, violence prevention, or staffing-related concerns. Soulful leadership is not an alternative to structural reform. It is a way to make structural reform morally awake.

Conclusion: no critical care without care for the caregivers

Critical care and emergency medicine reveal the greatness and vulnerability of healthcare. They show what human beings can do for one another when knowledge, technology, courage, teamwork, and speed converge. They also reveal the cost of asking professionals to absorb suffering, scarcity, urgency, death, aggression, family grief, and moral tension without sufficient protection.

The future of ICU and emergency care cannot be built only on better devices, faster algorithms, and more refined protocols. It must also be built on cultures that preserve dignity, meaning, compassion, moral repair, psychological safety, and accountable change. Caregiver well-being is not a luxury. It is infrastructure. It is patient safety. It is ethics. It is the hidden ventilator of the system.

Soulful Leadership for Critical Care invites leaders to recover a simple but demanding truth: the people who care for the critically ill are themselves worthy of critical care. To care for them is not to weaken medicine. It is to strengthen its deepest purpose.

References

1. World Health Organization. (2019). Burn-out an occupational phenomenon: International Classification of Diseases. https://www.who.int/news/item/28-05-2019-burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases
2. Moss M, Good VS, Gozal D, et al. An official Critical Care Societies Collaborative statement: Burnout syndrome in critical care health-care professionals: A call for action. Critical Care Medicine. 2016; 44: 1414-1421.
3. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. Taking action against clinician burnout: A systems approach to professional well-being. The National Academies Press. 2019.
4. Office of the Surgeon General. Addressing health worker burnout: The U.S. Surgeon General's advisory on building a thriving health workforce. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2022.
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Health workers face a mental health crisis. CDC Vital Signs. 2023. https://www.cdc.gov/vitalsigns/health-worker-mental-health/
6. Maslach C, Schaufeli WB, Leiter MP. Job burnout. Annual Review of Psychology. 2001; 52: 397-422.
7. Maslach C, Leiter MP. Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. World Psychiatry. 2016; 15: 103-111.
8. Figley CR. Compassion fatigue: Coping with secondary traumatic stress disorder in those who treat the traumatized. Brunner/Mazel. 1995.
9. Cocker F, Joss N. Compassion fatigue among healthcare, emergency and community service workers: A systematic review. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2016; 13: 618.
10. Litz BT, Stein N, Delaney E, et al. Moral injury and moral repair in war veterans: A preliminary model and intervention strategy. Clin Psychol Rev. 2009; 29: 695-706.
11. Dean W, Talbot SG, Dean A. Reframing clinician distress: Moral injury not burnout. Federal Practitioner. 2019; 36: 400-402.

12. Hall LH, Johnson J, Watt I, et al. Healthcare staff wellbeing, burnout, and patient safety: A systematic review. PLOS ONE. 2016; 11: e0159015.
13. Tawfik DS, Profit J, Morgenthaler TI, et al. Physician burnout, well-being, and work unit safety grades in relationship to reported medical errors. Mayo Clinic Proceedings. 2018; 93: 1571-1580.
14. Kvande ME, Angel S, Nielsen AH. Humanizing intensive care: A scoping review (HumanIC). Nursing Ethics. 2022; 29: 498-510.
15. Ahmad SR, Palakshappa JA, Bhide V. Humanizing the intensive care unit: Perspectives of patients and family members on Get to Know Me boards. Mayo Clinic Proceedings: Innovations, Quality & Outcomes. 2023; 7: 134-143.
16. Bodenheimer T, Sinsky C. From triple to quadruple aim: Care of the patient requires care of the provider. Ann Fam Med. 2014; 12: 573-576.
17. Dzau VJ, Kirch DG, Nasca TJ. To care is human - Collectively confronting the clinician-burnout crisis. N Engl J Med. 2018; 378: 312-314.
18. Shanafelt TD, Noseworthy JH. Executive leadership and physician well-being: Nine organizational strategies to promote engagement and reduce burnout. Mayo Clin Proc. 2017; 92: 129-146.
19. West CP, Dyrbye LN, Shanafelt TD. Physician burnout: Contributors, consequences and solutions. J Intern Med. 2018; 283: 516-529.
20. Panagioti M, Panagopoulou E, Bower P, et al. Controlled interventions to reduce burnout in physicians: A systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA Internal Medicine. 2017; 177: 195-205.
21. West CP, Dyrbye LN, Erwin PJ. et al. Interventions to prevent and reduce physician burnout: A systematic review and meta-analysis. The Lancet. 2016; 388: 2272-2281.
22. Fancourt D, Finn S. What is the evidence on the role of the arts in improving health and well-being? A scoping review. WHO Regional Office for Europe. 2019.
23. Trzeciak S, Mazzarelli AJ. Compassionomics: The revolutionary scientific evidence that caring makes a difference. Studer Group. 2019.
24. Rushton CH. Moral resilience: Transforming moral suffering in healthcare. Oxford University Press. 2018.
25. Mealer M, Moss M, Good V, et al. What is burnout syndrome (BOS)? Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2016; 194: P1-P2.
26. Azoulay E, De Waele J, Ferrer R, et al. Symptoms of burnout in intensive care unit specialists facing the COVID-19 outbreak. Ann Intensive Care. 2020; 10:110.
27. Dyrbye LN, West CP, Satele D, et al. Burnout among U.S. medical students, residents, and early career physicians relative to the general U.S. population. Acad Med. 2014; 89: 443-451.
28. Epstein RM, Krasner MS. Physician resilience: What it means, why it matters, and how to promote it. Acad Med. 2013; 88: 301-303.
29. Greenberg N, Docherty M, Gnanapragasam S, et al. Managing mental health challenges faced by healthcare workers during COVID-19 pandemic. BMJ. 2020; 368: m1211.
30. Williamson V, Murphy D, Greenberg N. COVID-19 and experiences of moral injury in front-line key workers. Occupational Medicine. 2020; 70: 317-319.
31. Nigam JAS, Barker RM, Cunningham TR, et al. Vital signs: Health worker-perceived working conditions and symptoms of poor mental health - Quality of worklife survey, United States, 2018-2022. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2023; 72: 1197-1205.