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THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

- Simulation trainings are important to train scenarios that happen too infrequently or are too dangerous (Chernikova et al., 2020)
- Debriefings are of utmost importance for learning (Ryoo & Ha, 2015)
- Debate about the form of debriefings: with incorporated videos from the simulated scenario or only verbal debriefing (VD) (Ali & Miller, 2018)
- Not “one way” to perform a video-assisted debriefing (VAD), but different techniques depending on complexity and budget
- Analysing the experiences with each debriefing modality is needed to get an understanding how people learn from their debriefings

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

I. How do the participants experience VAD in comparison to VD?
II. How do the participants experience high-tech VAD in comparison to lower-tech VAD?

METHOD

Sample

- N = 42 participants from the Bavarian mountain rescue organization
- Varying medical background (e.g. emergency physician or paramedic)

Debriefing modalities

- VD – verbal debriefing without any audio-visual help, one facilitator
- Lower-tech VAD – one central microphone, tablet recording, one facilitator
- High-tech VAD – personal microphones, video-software with time markers and two facilitators

Instruments

- Standard biographical questionnaire (e.g. age, gender, experience)
- Focus group interviews with participants to assess:
  - Overall rating and feelings
  - Experienced ability to learn and reflect
  - Perceived skills of the facilitator
  - Relevant additional aspects

Setting

- 3 x SIMMED Simulation cycle
- Air Rescue Simulation Centre (Bad Tölz, Germany)
- Complex scenarios within an approx. 30 min timeframe

PROCEDURE

- Short introduction for lower-tech VAD and hands-on testing day for high-tech VAD (facilitators)
- Simulation day:
  - Start: Biographical questionnaire
  - End: Focus group interviews
- All participants experienced VD, lower-tech VAD, and high-tech VAD on different stations during their simulation cycle

RESULTS

- Large preference for VAD in general (n = 33), with high-tech VAD being the most popular debriefing modality (n = 20)
- High-tech VAD was seen as the “technically best solution” with better audio-visual quality and more precise feedback compared to lower-tech VAD
- Participants reported problems with the audio quality and video-replay in the lower-tech VAD debriefings
- Negative emotions towards VAD related to feeling stressed because of the video-recording as well as seeing own mistakes
- Participants mentioned a positive influence of VAD on their understanding of the scenario, their made mistakes and the acceptance of feedback
- The importance of the facilitator was repeatedly mentioned

DISCUSSION

- The use of VAD was generally preferred over VD
- The technical quality and reliability of the VAD greatly influenced the opinions towards it
- VAD showed the participants the „bigger picture“ of the scenario that would have been lost otherwise
- Negative experiences with VAD might dissolve in the future as soon as the participants get used to this modality and psychological safety is created
- The facilitator impacts the quality of the debriefing and as such influences the perceptions of the debriefing (regardless of the modality)
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