Breaking bad news Education program for residents

Liran Korotkin, Sackler TAU



שיבא - מרכז רפואי אקדמי מצטיין

Breaking bad news – introductions and objectives



Methods – study design

cohort study, pre and post interventions.

Our training (the intervention) includes videotaped simulations with actors, followed by videos debriefing, feedback and discussion. Afterwards we continue with the theoretical unit, Peer roleplaying, and conclusions.



Methods – study design

The data will be collected through three intervals:

- **T1** beginning of the training day.
- **T2** the end of the first training day.
- **T3** the end of the second training day a month and a half after T1/T2.



Methods - setting

Recruitment of 6 residents every 6 weeks, from Geha, Abarbanel and Sheba.



Methods - setting

The training (the intervention) will take place in MSR – The Israel Center for Medical Simulation.

Each group will be guided by an attending psychiatrist and a medical-

education specialist from MSR, and will be assigned a conference room and

two simulation rooms.



In addition, every training day includes me, as the study coordinator.

Methods - participants

The recruitment of the psychiatric residents occurs continuously, in the home medical centers of the participants.

eligibility criteria — the participant should be a psychiatric resident that agrees to participate in the study.

PARTICIPANTS

Shiba Abarbanel Geha

The pilot we did took place on the 25-3 (first training) and on the 5-5 (first/second training). We had in total eleven residents from medical centers in Israel.



Biases – potential sources

Inauthentic actors, incoherent with the character they are portraying , the same for the settings.

We will address it by special days for acting instructions and rehearsals.

As for the settings - MSR team is highly experienced and professional so we do not per Familiarity of the scenario or the actor - no participant sees the same actor in two different scenarios or does the same scenario in both of the days –to make it as realistic as possible.

Biases – potential sources

Biases that stem from the different scenarios: it can happen if one of the scenarios

is a bit easier than the other one, or tends to better solutions.

The way we address it: In each day (1 and 2) the group is divided to scenario 1 and

scenario 2, so the two scenarios take place in both of the days.

Respondent bias: Survey questions taken from Tobler K, Grant E, Marczinski C.

Evaluation of the impact of a simulation-enhanced breaking bad news workshop in

pediatrics. Simul Healthc. 2014;9(4):213-9. The reliability, validity and effectiveness of

the competency questionnaire and the feedback questions were strictly checked before.

Statistical methods

We did the **Friedman** test in order to check if there's difference between **T1**, **T2** and **T3**.

We did Wilcoxon between each pair to understand the source of difference –

we can do it as post hoc test it if Friedman test is significant.

As for the **satisfaction** questionnaire – we did **Wilcoxon** test.

Friedman compares three or more groups, Wilcoxon compares two groups.

Study size

Study size – according to ANOVA repeated measures and Cohen (1988), ANOVA (F) = 0.4 is a significant effect. For significance of 5% and statistical power of 80% of a group that Is measured three times, we need n=62.

Preliminary results

Feedback questionnaire that checks satisfaction with the training:

		M_T1	M_T2
Ν	Valid	11	7
	Missing	0	4
Mean		4.3970	4.2619
Std. Deviation		.58223	.37090
Minimum		3.00	3.67
Maximum		5.00	4.83
Percentiles	25	4.2000	4.0000
	50	4.5000	4.3333
	75	4.8333	4.5000

For each questions, please note your degree of agreement with the headline statement

1 – Strongly disagree 2 – Disagree 3 – Neither agree or disagree 4 – Agree 5 – Strongly agree

	A	В	С	
I feel:	KNOWLEGEABLE about how to	CONFIDENT in my ability to	COMFORTABLE when I	
1				Break bad news in general
2				Create a supportive environment
3				Reduce or eliminate signs that I am nervous or anxious
4				Use language that is nontechnical and easily understood
5				Adjust the rate and amount of information I provide
6				Listen to parents' concerns
7				Explore a parents' concerns
8				Empathize with a parent
9				Avoid portraying more hope or optimism than I believe exists to deal with parents' emotions
10				Summarize information in a way that is easy to understand
11				Anticipate possible responses by parents
12				Deal with difficult emotions from families
13				Close the conversation in an appropriate way

competency questionnaire, there are three levels that relates to each one of the statements – A, B, C.

```
In the Friedman Test,
A and C were
significant.
```

Preliminary results



As you can see, A and C are significantly different between

T1 and T2, and between T1 and T3

Further investigation:

- Participants recruitment for the upcoming sessions.
- How can we change the experience so that B will be significant as A and C?
- What does the significance between T1 and T3 imply? Can we hypothesize skill retention over time?
- What is the proper way to check skill retention over time? Should we add another time interval ?

Thank you for your attention !

