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ABSTRACT

Objectives Video-assisted debriefing (VAD) of real-life obstetrical emergencies provides an opportunity to improve quality of care, but is rarely used in clinical practice. A barrier for implementation is the expected mental reservations among healthcare providers. The aim of this study was to explore healthcare providers’ perceptions and expectations of VAD of real-life events.

Setting Participants were recruited from two Labour and Delivery Units in Denmark. In both units, VAD of real-life obstetrical emergencies had never been conducted.

Participants 22 healthcare providers (10 physicians, 9 midwives and 3 nursing assistants). During the study period (August–October 2021), semi-structured, individual interviews were conducted. Interviews were analysed using thematic analysis.

Primary and secondary outcome measures A qualitative description of healthcare providers’ perceptions and expectations of VAD of real-life events.

Results Three major themes were identified: (1) Video-assisted debriefing (VAD) as an opportunity for learning: All participants expected VAD to provide an opportunity for learning and improving patient care. All participants expected the video to provide a ‘bigger picture’, by showing ‘what was actually done’ instead of ‘what we believed was done’. (2) Video-assisted debriefing (VAD) as a cause for concern: The primary concern for all participants was the risk of being exposed as less competent. Participants were concerned that being confronted with every minor detail of their clinical practice would enhance their self-criticalness. (3) Preconditions for video-assisted debriefing (VAD): Participants emphasised the importance of organisational support from management. In addition, creating a safe environment for VAD, for example, by using only expert debriefers was considered an essential precondition for successful implementation.

Conclusions The risk of being exposed as less competent was a barrier towards VAD of real-life events. However, the majority found the educational benefits to outweigh the risk of being exposed.

INTRODUCTION

Ensuring high performance in emergency obstetrics is a challenge worldwide. Audits into maternal care reveal that adverse outcomes in obstetrical care are frequent, both in low and high resource settings. Initiatives that have demonstrated an effect on improving obstetrical care include education, simulation-based training, checklists and debriefings. A complementary approach likely to improve clinical practice could be video-assisted debriefing (VAD), where all team members collectively review a video recording of the real-life event as part of a debriefing session. VAD has been found to improve the performance of trauma teams and neonatal resuscitation teams. However, VAD of real-life events is considered controversial for routine use due to ethical, legal and technical challenges. In addition, VAD of real-life events has never been implemented at the Labour and Delivery Unit. The first step towards introducing VAD of real-life events at the Labour and Delivery Unit at Horsens Regional Hospital, Denmark, and at Aarhus University Hospital, Denmark, has been solved by (1) an automatic recording system designed specifically to record obstetrical emergencies and (2) an established procedure that ensures informed consent from all participants. Nevertheless, perceived
challenges related to the motivation and support of healthcare providers, their mental reservations associated with reviewing videos and concerns regarding being exposed may impede successful implementation of VAD of real-life events. Previous research on these barriers has been sparse.

We aimed to explore healthcare providers’ perceptions and expectations of VAD of real-life events at the Labour and Delivery Unit to identify what barriers to overcome for VAD to be implemented successfully.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Design
An explorative qualitative research design was chosen, and a qualitative interview study of healthcare providers was conducted. The Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research was used to improve transparency of the study.

Setting
The study was conducted at two Danish Labour and Delivery Units, maternity care level II and maternity care level III, respectively. In both hospitals, VAD of real-life obstetrical emergencies had never been conducted. Video recording of real-life events had however been introduced for research purposes, but no feedback was given to healthcare providers. In the two hospitals, all 18 delivery rooms were equipped with two to three cameras and a microphone. This recording system was automatically activated in case of emergencies by the presence of the physician’s phone. Initially, some healthcare providers expressed a concern towards the potential use of videos for malpractice lawsuits; however, this was overcome by emphasising that video-recording was based on consent from all participants (women, partners and healthcare providers) and for research purposes only. Furthermore, explicit procedures ensured confidentiality, safekeeping and destruction of videos. All healthcare providers in the participating hospitals were trained in simulation-based team training with video-assisted debriefing. In addition, cases of severe adverse maternal or neonatal outcomes were debriefed in both units (a rare but known phenomenon).

The organisation at Labour and Delivery Units in Denmark are characterised by a high degree of cross-functional cooperation between midwives and physicians. Normal labour is managed by midwives and the physician is only involved in the case of pathology.

Participants
Healthcare providers from the Labour and Delivery Unit in the participating hospitals were recruited through a combination of convenience and purposive sampling strategy across profession and experience. First, all potential participants were informed and invited to participate in the study via emails and posters. Thirteen participants of different professions volunteered. Subsequently, 9 participants were purposively recruited to ensure that all professions and experience levels were appropriately represented (11 were invited, and 2 declined due to lack of time). Inclusion continued until sufficient information power had been obtained. A total of 22 participants were interviewed (table 1).

Data collection
All interviews were conducted between August 2021 and October 2021. Participants were given the option of a face-to-face or telephone/video interview (table 1). Prior to the interview, participants were reinforced about study purpose, anonymity as well as their right to withdraw consent at any time. An audio-recorded oral consent was obtained.

Interviews were conducted using a semi-structured interview guide with open-ended questions developed by the research group, based on the international literature and on the authors’ clinical experience (online supplemental file S1). The interview guide was tested in a pilot interview without any further corrections. The interviews lasted 13–24 min and were performed by LHR. In all interviews, participants were encouraged to speak freely. Reflexivity on how the composition of the research group may have affected the research process is presented in box 1. All interviews were digitally recorded, transcribed verbatim and rendered anonymously before coding and analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Interviewed</th>
<th>Experience with debriefing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwife, experience &lt;3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwife, experience ≥3 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing assistant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident physician</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending/consultant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Simulation-based in situ obstetrical team training with video-assisted debriefing.
†Severe adverse neonatal or maternal outcomes are debriefed a few days after the event (without video).
Data analysis

Thematic analysis was used to identify patterns in data. All materials were thoroughly read, and a list of initial codes were generated. After a discussion of codes by all authors, three interviews were test-coded independently by LHR and SL, and any discrepancies between the coding were discussed and agreed on to ensure consistent coding. Subsequently, all interviews were coded by LHR using NVivo V.12 software. The coded material was read and sorted into main themes and subthemes in a thematic map (figure 1), which was discussed among all authors. Additionally, the themes were investigated in relation to the entire data set looking for disconfirming evidence.

Patient and public involvement

Informal conversations with healthcare providers at the participating departments inspired and guided the design of the present study including research questions. Participants were not directly involved in the data analysis, but following the interviews, preliminary findings were discussed with participants to validate and/or challenge preliminary understandings and interpretations. As a result of this study, the participants’ perspectives will guide the implementation of VAD of real-life events at the departments.

RESULTS

Overall, the interviewed healthcare providers were positive towards the introduction of VAD of real-life obstetrical emergencies. The three central themes in the participants’ perceptions and expectations of VAD were identified during analysis: (1) Video-assisted debriefing (VAD) as an opportunity for learning by providing new insights into individual and collective clinical practices. (2) Video-assisted debriefing (VAD) as a cause for concern due to potential exposure of professional incompetence. (3) Perceived preconditions for video-assisted debriefing (VAD) to be a successful tool for development of clinical practice (see figure 1 for overview of themes and subthemes).

Figure 1  Thematic map.
Theme 1: video-assisted debriefing (VAD) as an opportunity for learning

Development as the driving force

In the interviews, most participants expressed an explicit desire for continuous professional development and the introduction of VAD of real-life events was seen as a potential tool for learning. Half of the participants had positive experiences with debriefing in simulation-based team training.

I actually think that the debriefing is a really humane and comfortable process to be in. And you learn so much from it. It is not a space for you to be criticized, and I think that it works really well. (Attending physician)

Several participants described how these positive experiences contributed to their high expectations towards the educational value of VAD of real-life events. The prospect of being able to view and discuss—difficult—clinical practices with colleagues was appreciated as an opportunity for professional development, individually and collectively, and ultimately as a contributing factor to job satisfaction and a good work environment.

But when you sit down and talk [with colleagues], it supports the general work environment. That you have related to each other and discussed things. Maybe even shown vulnerability. I believe that it benefits the personal as well as the professional work environment. (Resident physician)

Thus, the main motivating factor for accepting VAD was professional aspirations. Professional development was a consistent driving force among all professions and among all levels of experiences, and analysis reveals a core of professional identity within participants driving them towards a higher professional level.

Recall bias solved

Many participants described how situation awareness can be challenged during emergencies, which can make it difficult to remember and thus to discuss performance afterwards. Adding video recordings to the debriefing was understood as an opportunity to pause and revisit, discuss and learn from actual events. Most participants suggested that the videos would reveal less appropriate routine practices and ‘blind spots’ that were probably indiscernible in stressful emergency situations.

I think that when you have the video and you are able to revisit what happened in the delivery room—it really makes a positive difference. Because very often, there will be details that you don’t remember. And I have a feeling that it’s exactly those details that you can learn from the most. (Midwife, experience <3 years)

Most participants expressed curiosity about the alignment of their recall of the case and the actual behaviour captured on video. They emphasised how this potential misalignment could produce valuable information and generate new learning and, ultimately, improved care.

But I think that it [video-assisted debriefing] will be great. And it’s an excellent way of discovering “what is it that we actually do?” To find out where there’s room for improvement, you need to look at what we actually “DO” and not just what we “BELIEVE WE DO”. (Resident physician)

Most participants made comments similar to the quote above and thus indicated a potential in revealing this misalignment. Videos were perceived to provide access to tacit knowledge and unacknowledged practices that are missed in ‘normal’ debriefings due to unawareness or forgetfulness. Thus, these new insights were perceived as key to adaptation and development.

Access to live interactions

Being able to view the emergency situation unfold from an outside perspective was considered intriguing by many participants. A few participants emphasised the opportunity to lean back and learn from watching admired, senior colleagues ‘in action’. However, the majority of participants focused mainly on the opportunity to learn from reviewing their own performance:

Well, you always think you do things in a certain way […] So being able to get some feedback directly on that [could be rewarding]. I really believe that I could benefit from video-assisted debriefing personally. (Attending physician)

For example, several participants suggested that they would be more likely to accept comments or feedback from others, if these comments were supported by video ‘evidence’. In addition, several participants were curious about their attitude and appearance, and how their body language and communication would affect the woman and partner as well as the team and how their actions contributed to the team dynamic and collaboration.

Being able to see yourself and your own role in the event [would be interesting]. Because as a physician, it can sometimes be difficult to enter a delivery room—because what is expected of me? And do I communicate clearly enough? (Resident physician)

Several participants expected to gain new insights into how roles were allocated in the team, for example, leadership appointment and the redistribution of roles, such as when new team members entered the room. In addition, the atmosphere in the room was an expressed learning goal, for example, how to keep the atmosphere calm, even when the event seemed chaotic. Some participants mentioned that the ‘outside view’ provided by video could possibly provide a better understanding of how clinical actions affected the patient, for example, to see if the woman seemed in pain or the partner was in distress and how this was managed. Similarly, many participants mentioned that video could contribute to improved
communication between the team and the patient, for example, by showing if, how and by whom the woman and partner were informed during the event.

Viewing live situations was hoped to provide new information about clinical practice and routines and thus offer a new starting point for collective, professional development towards superior clinical performance. For example, several participants were curious about the actual execution of treatment protocols in obstetrics emergencies, and believed that VAD had the potential to create an opportunity for reflection and discussion of clinical practice, otherwise not available.

**Theme 2: video-assisted debriefing (VAD) as a cause for concern**

**Being exposed as less competent**

As all legal issues regarding safe data protection and legal issues had already been satisfactorily solved, the main concern among participants was the risk of being exposed as less competent by the video.

Being exposed, if you have some lack [of knowledge] or something that you are not updated on. And in some way maybe also feel that you are being reprimanded. (Attending physician)

Thus, ‘being exposed’ encompassed feeling professionally inadequate in a setting where high performance is a core value and in revealing this (true or perceived) inadequacy to colleagues.

However, the stakes differed depending on levels of experience. The less experienced participants expressed concern about having potential lack of skills exposed in front of senior colleagues. They were painfully aware of the many skills and practices that they had yet to master and some worried about being easy targets in debriefings. More experienced participants expressed concern about not being able to live up to the perceived high expectations from colleagues concerning their skill level. Particularly for the very experienced consultants, lack of skills was perceived as unacceptable and getting feedback from colleagues was unfamiliar territory. Additionally, several participants described themselves as self-critical and were concerned that being confronted with every minor detail of their clinical practice would enhance this self-consciousness and self-criticalness.

I think that it could hurt my ego, if I in some way realized that I haven’t been as amazing as I wanted to be. I would consent [to video inclusion], because I believe that it is a great opportunity for learning. But I am sure that my ego would prefer believing that I’m just an awesome midwife – and that is easier [to be] behind closed doors. (Midwife, experience ≥3 years)

Overall, the participants expressed willingness to face their own imperfect practices and allow it to become a topic for team discussions; for example, a suboptimal performance that might not be recognised during the chaos of an emergency event but could be revealed by video. All participants underscored how VAD could generate feelings of anxiety and vulnerability. Thus, they considered it essential that debriefings only included the involved team members and debriefers, as equal vulnerability among participants was crucial in order to feel safe and in order to ensure the mutual respect and caution that these potentially vulnerable situations demand.

**Not being able to participate**

Most participants expressed concern about being unable to attend a debriefing and having their performance revealed and discussed without their presence. They stressed the importance of having the opportunity to account for their actions and reasoning themselves, as they were afraid of being judged unreasonably.

It feels kind of intimidating to be evaluated [on your performance] with some of my colleagues present—while I am not there to explain or defend myself. (Midwife, experience <3 years)

For example, some participants stressed that one might not be fully aware of one’s latest performance. Thus, the idea that colleagues would uncover and assess their mistakes without their presence was uncomfortable. However, all participants acknowledged that full participation from all involved team members would not always be feasible, and many stressed the importance of prioritising the presence of the team members that were most involved in the events. It was considered essential that team members unable to attend the debriefing should always consent for the debriefing to occur without them. In addition, it was suggested that a debriefing summary could alleviate some concern related to being unable to attend.

I think it’s important to get some feedback, if things were said that I could benefit from or that concerns my performance. And it [a summary] would have me reassured that people weren’t talking behind my back—or at least you would be informed, if some things are being said about you. (Attending physician)

Thus, clear guidelines on (non-)participation in debriefing were found to be essential for successful implementation of VAD.

**Interpersonal relations during debriefing**

Participants perceived their everyday working environment at the wards as collaborative and respectful, and most participants were confident that debriefings would be conducted with mutual respect.

Working in these multidisciplinary teams has meant that we discuss our professional skills. We have learned to speak up in a constructive way. And we also share difficult experiences. I really believe that this shared vulnerability has turned into something positive, and it [vulnerability] is not something that I am afraid of. (Midwife, experience ≥3 years)
However, a few participants of different professions suggested that the debriefing dynamics would vary depending on the interprofessional and interpersonal relations between attending colleagues, for example, being more uncomfortable in an unfavourable work relationship.

Some residents mentioned that the presence of a senior mentor could enhance feelings of safety, for example, in case of the need for backup in discussions. However, the presence of a senior colleague could cause uncertainty, as a few participants wondered if being exposed as less competent could reduce chances of a permanent position.

In relation to the more experienced physicians....... that’s where the insecurity would matter the most. Because I really want to stay in this field [obstetrics]. So who is going to view the video? Is it my boss? Is it just you [the interviewer]? Is it all of my supervisors? (Resident physician)

However, for none of the interviewed participants did the potential concerns about the use of video in debriefings outweigh the perceived educational benefits. Participants expressed a willingness to risk individual exposure in order to gain new insight into individual and collective clinical practice, which was considered important in order to be able to improve clinical performance and patient care.

**Theme 3: preconditions for video-assisted debriefing (VAD)**

**Organisational support**

Striving for excellence was indeed a personal motivation as well as a wish to succeed as an organisation, but participants were very aware that improvement comes with a cost, in this case; time, energy and risk of exposure. Thus, the motivation for attending VAD was not without limits and support from organisational structures was identified as an essential precondition. First, as most participants expected the workload and—organisation of the wards to challenge the organisation of VAD, the importance of managerial support was emphasised.

I would appreciate if the management showed flexibility. If, for instance, other work challenged me in terms of being able to participate [in a debriefing], then I would value knowing that it was of high priority for the management [that I attended]. (Midwife, experience >3 years)

Second, all participants preferred VAD to be conducted during working hours. Most participants stated that family was their priority, and especially physicians stated that ‘work’ outside official working hours was quite enough already.

I would really prefer if the debriefing was conducted within regular working hours, even if it means that we have to cancel a scheduled outpatient appointment. I feel like I do so many work-related tasks outside regular working hours already. (Attending physician)

Participants needed to feel that the organisation would support them in attending and rank VAD alongside other work-related tasks. In addition, when extending beyond regular working hours, overtime payment was expected and considered necessary for continuous motivation and thus successful implementation.

**A safe environment**

Similarly, in order to invest time, energy and risk of exposure in the VAD, creating a safe debriefing environment was a precondition of importance to the participants. The analysis identified three aspects of a ‘safe’ environment. First, structural conditions such as sufficient allocation of time and no interruptions were repeatedly mentioned. Having enough time to allow a thorough debriefing without being disturbed by on-call telephones or other scheduled obligations were perceived as a prerequisite for establishing a safe environment for sensitive conversations. This finding also points to the hospital setting as a specific, organisational set-up where time and peace are in shortage and a potential threat to VAD. Second, the availability of trained, expert debriefers was emphasised as essential in establishing a safe environment, ensuring dialogue progress and preventing critical feedback, for example, by ensuring that all team members were heard and all perspectives addressed. Several participants expected the debriefers to ‘set the scene’, for example, by performing an initial clarification of expectations and the participants also emphasised how the debriefers should be experts in performing team-focused rather than individual-focused debriefing to prevent the risk of feeling criticised. Third, confidentiality was a natural demand to support a safe learning environment.

One thing [of importance] is that "what we discuss during a debriefing, we do not discuss elsewhere". I think that [knowing that] would make me feel safe. (Midwife, experience <5 years)

Overall, the analysis showed that if the right organisation in combination with a safe learning environment were fulfilled, then participants were prepared to prioritise participation.

**DISCUSSION**

To the best of our knowledge, this study was the first to explore healthcare providers’ perception and expectations of VAD of real-life obstetrical emergencies. We found that VAD did cause some concern of being exposed as less competent or insecure. This concern was found among all professions and at all levels of experience. Despite this, healthcare providers generally requested additional education and reflection on daily practice. Thus, they perceived the educational benefits of VAD to outweigh the risk of being exposed. In addition, participants from both departments highlighted the prevailing culture in their departments as a resource for successful implementation.
The strength of this qualitative study was that we were able to continue inclusion until sufficient information power had been obtained. Furthermore, the purposeful sampling strategy included participants from two hospitals and three different professions to ensure maximum variation in perspectives. We also sought to strengthen the quality and credibility of the study through active use of researcher triangulation. The data material was based on participants who were willing to share their perspectives (a precondition in much research). This may have induced selection bias, and one might speculate that only participants with a positive attitude towards VAD would volunteer. However, participants were found to be willing to share both positive and negative perceptions of VAD (box 1). When considering the transferability of the present results, it should be kept in mind that participants in our study were trained in simulation-based team training, and that they were familiar with the concept of debriefing cases of severe adverse maternal or neonatal outcomes. Furthermore, all participants had some experience with being filmed during obstetrical emergencies. Therefore, they may have been less apprehensive of both technology and debriefing. However, using these videos for debriefing and feedback was new to all participants. Future research should investigate how the actual experience of VAD in obstetrics matches the expectations and considerations presented in the current study.

In line with previous research, we found that VAD was perceived as an opportunity to review ‘what was done’ as well as an opportunity to reflect on team behaviour and the care provided. The participants thus appreciated VAD as an opportunity for professional development despite the perceived barriers. These findings resonated with previous research on trauma teams. In our study, professional development was described as a contributing factor for job satisfaction, which was also found in studies of other professions, where clinical supervision was associated with increased job satisfaction and prevention of burnout. Participants in our study represented a regional hospital as well as a university hospital, and no discrepancy between educational motivations existed between the two departments. Instead, our results indicated a strong professional ambition at obstetrical departments in general and support previous research describing how learners can be motivated if they understand the potential value as well as how this motivation can result in high-quality learning. In our study, striving for excellence outweighed the risk of being exposed; thus, participants expressed a willingness to risk exposure to enable learning. These findings could be linked to the healthcare providers’ perception of the psychological safety in both departments, as the majority of participants expressed confidence in the set-up and their colleagues (including debriefers) to provide constructive feedback.

Our study provided insight into obstetrical team members’ underlying concern of being exposed as less competent and criticised professionally during VAD, coherent with previous studies of obstetrical teams and trauma teams. We found that concern for exposure existed among all professions and at all levels of experience. An underlying expectation of high clinical standards was echoed among all our participants, and results revealed how professional identity was at stake at all levels of professional expertise, coherent with previous research describing professional vulnerability during performance assessment. The set-up of a VAD invites attending team members to comment on performance, and mistakes are more open to ‘why didn’t you just…’ comments. A central issue in VAD is ‘hindsight bias’; as assessment of the video may be biased by knowledge of the outcome. Hindsight bias may lead to an unfair assessment, as the healthcare providers may assess their behaviour on the video knowing that the patient needed further treatment; however, at the time they treated the patient, this was not obvious. As the purpose of debriefing is to reflect on how to improve future performance, the uncertainty about what might come up during a debriefing provokes concern. Despite investigating the perspectives of participants in the context of a supportive work environment, these concerns still existed.

Our study did not demonstrate perceived concerns revolving around privacy issues and legal concerns as described in previous studies, which is most likely due to the previous exposure to being video recorded in the departments. However, such issues may be of central concern in other settings. In the USA, some emergency departments had to stop VAD of trauma care due to healthcare providers’ fear of disciplinary actions and legal concerns. This was done despite the healthcare provider’s conviction that video reviews were of high educational value and associated with improved patient care.

Our results complement studies on the importance of creating a psychologically safe learning environment during debriefing, as participants need to view the set-up as being conducive to interpersonal risk taking and that the debriefing will be conducted with mutual respect among participants. To accommodate for barriers towards VAD, our participants provided several recommendations for the set-up of VAD, such as no interruptions, trained debriefers and confidentiality. Our results thus complement previous research on how to support psychological safety during debriefings. In addition, previous research described the importance of establishing psychological safety at the beginning of each debriefing by clarifying expectations, inviting participants to actively participate and acknowledging it when they do.

**CONCLUSION**

VAD provides an opportunity to learn from real-life events, but special attention needs to be directed towards potential barriers during implementation. This qualitative study identified healthcare providers’ perceptions and expectations of VAD of real-life obstetrical emergencies. We found that healthcare providers supported VAD and were willing to risk exposure and professional critique, if the right preconditions for a safe learning environment were fulfilled. Results from the present study will guide
the implementation of VAD of real-life obstetrical emergencies at the departments.
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