



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Jackson, J., Iacovides, J., Duncan, M., Alders, M., Maben, J. & Anderson, J. E. (2020). Operationalizing resilient healthcare concepts through a serious video game for clinicians. *Applied Ergonomics*, 87, 103112. doi: 10.1016/j.apergo.2020.103112

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/24925/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apergo.2020.103112>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk

Manuscript Number:

Title: Operationalizing resilience engineering concepts through a serious video game for healthcare professionals

Article Type: Full Length Article

Keywords: resilience; safety II; serious video game; healthcare; resilience engineering; gamification; resilient healthcare; serious games; safety; feasibility; reflection; survey

Corresponding Author: Miss Jennifer Jackson,

Corresponding Author's Institution: King's College London

First Author: Jennifer Jackson

Order of Authors: Jennifer Jackson; Jo Iacovides; Myanna Duncan; Matthew Alders; Jill Maben; Janet Anderson

Abstract: Resilient healthcare emphasises the importance of adaptive capacity for the quality of healthcare. It has had extensive theoretical development, but comparatively limited translation for clinicians in practice. This study was the first in the world to present resilient healthcare principles in a serious video game. Serious games are an effective tool for engaging users, sharing ideas and eliciting reflections. The purpose of this study was to communicate principles from resilient healthcare to clinicians through a serious video game, and to evaluate the game's feasibility as a prompt to reflect on practice. The game, Resilience Challenge, is scenario-based and requires players to resolve dilemmas in clinical practice. It was disseminated online, and was played 1,949 times during the four-month study. The game was evaluated using an immediate cross-sectional survey, which included both Likert-style and free text responses (n=141). Participants reported that the game was engaging (93%) and that they would recommend it to others (89%). Fewer participants reported learning about resilient healthcare concepts (64%). Resilience Challenge is a promising way to engage with healthcare professionals and potentially improve safety in healthcare, and warrants further research.

King's College London
Florence Nightingale
Faculty of Nursing,
Midwifery, & Palliative
Care

Post Graduate Research
James Clerk Maxwell Building
57 Waterloo Road
London SE1 8WA
Telephone 020 7848 1234



February 14, 2019

Dear Dr. Dempsey and Members of the Editorial Board:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit an article, in response to the call for papers for the special issue on Resilience Engineering. Our paper discusses a world-first study, where we operationalized resilience engineering concepts through a serious video game for healthcare professionals.

This paper will be of interest to AE readers as it outlines of how we created the resilience engineering videogame, *Resilience Challenge*. In this game, a player guides a patient's journey through a hospital by making trade-off decisions, and receiving feedback. There has been very limited translation of resilience engineering concepts to healthcare professionals, and our evaluation demonstrates the advantages and challenges in using a medium like a videogame. It is hoped that the information from this research can help clinicians and safety scientists engage with the concepts of resilience engineering, and that other researchers may be inspired to carry this work further.

Please let me know if I can provide any additional information. I appreciate your consideration of this article.

Best Wishes,

Jennifer Jackson PhD(c), RN
Post-Graduate Researcher
King's College London

Title Page

Title: Operationalizing resilience engineering concepts through a serious video game for healthcare professionals

Corresponding Author: Jennifer JACKSON, Doctoral Researcher

Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care

King's College London

Room 1.32, James Clerk Maxwell Building

57 Waterloo Road, London, SE1 8WA,

jennifer.jackson@kcl.ac.uk

Dr. Jo IACOVIDES

Department of Computer Science

University of York

Deramore Lane

York, YO10 5GH

jo.iacovides@york.ac.uk

Dr. Myanna DUNCAN

The Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience

King's College London

Room 2.14, Addison House, Guy's Campus

London, SE1 1UL

E-mail: myanna.duncan@kcl.ac.uk

Dr. Matthew ALDERS

Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care

King's College London

Room 1.32, James Clerk Maxwell Building

57 Waterloo Road, London, SE1 8WA,

E-mail: matthew.alders@kcl.ac.uk

Professor Jill MABEN

School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences

University of Surrey

Duke of Kent Building

Guildford, GU2 7XH

j.maben@surrey.ac.uk

Dr. Janet E. ANDERSON

Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery & Palliative Care

King's College London

Room 4.38, James Clerk Maxwell Building

57 Waterloo Road, London, SE1 8WA,

E-mail: janet.anderson@kcl.ac.uk

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest has been declared by the authors.

The funding for this project was received from the Cultural Institute at King's College London.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the design contribution of [Karman Interactive](#), who brought Resilience Challenge to life.

The authors also acknowledge the academic contribution of Dr. Jonathan Back.

Operationalizing resilience engineering concepts through a serious video game for healthcare professionals

Abstract

Resilient healthcare emphasises the importance of adaptive capacity for the quality of healthcare. It has had extensive theoretical development, but comparatively limited translation for clinicians in practice. This study was the first in the world to present resilient healthcare principles in a serious video game. Serious games are an effective tool for engaging users, sharing ideas and eliciting reflections. The purpose of this study was to communicate principles from resilient healthcare to clinicians through a serious video game, and to evaluate the game's feasibility as a prompt to reflect on practice. The game, [*Resilience Challenge*](#), is scenario-based and requires players to resolve dilemmas in clinical practice. It was disseminated online, and was played 1,949 times during the four-month study. The game was evaluated using an immediate cross-sectional survey, which included both Likert-style and free text responses (n=141). Participants reported that the game was engaging (93%) and that they would recommend it to others (89%). Fewer participants reported learning about resilient healthcare concepts (64%). *Resilience Challenge* is a promising way to engage with healthcare professionals and potentially improve safety in healthcare, and warrants further research.

Keywords: resilience; safety II; serious video game; healthcare; resilience engineering; gamification; resilient healthcare; serious games; safety; feasibility; reflection; survey

Highlights:

- Resilient healthcare was translated into a series of scenarios in a videogame, where players make decisions to guide a patient's journey through the hospital.
- Resilience Challenge was found to be acceptable, feasible, and engaging. Participants reported that the game helped them to reflect on their practice.
- Serious video games can prompt reflection on practice, and start discussions about competing priorities in healthcare

1 Introduction

1
2 Error rates in healthcare remain at 10% worldwide, despite concerted efforts to improve
3
4 safety and quality (World Health Organization, 2014). Current approaches to addressing
5
6 errors in healthcare, such as root cause analysis, have been criticised for being reactive and
7
8 focused on individuals, rather than systemic issues (Anderson et al., 2016a; Cook and
9
10 Nemeth, 2010; Wears et al., 2015). A new safety approach is being developed, which is
11
12 termed resilient healthcare (Hollnagel, 2014). Resilient healthcare is a coherent set of
13
14 principles that highlight the complexity of everyday clinical work and propose that clinicians'
15
16 ability to adapt to pressures is key to safe, high quality care (Wears et al., 2015). Resilient
17
18 healthcare has the potential to improve the quality of care by focusing on understanding the
19
20 challenges and problems in clinical work that require constant adjustments and adaptations to
21
22 ensure safe care. In this paradigm, understanding and increased adaptive capacity is essential
23
24 for ensuring high quality care. Using these insights to improve quality provides better support
25
26 for healthcare workers (Anderson et al., 2016a). In contrast, current regulatory and
27
28 improvement approaches emphasise controlling healthcare work through policies,
29
30 procedures, and checklists (Hollnagel et al., 2015).

31
32 Whilst there has been extensive theoretical development of resilient healthcare, there has
33
34 been comparatively little translation of this theory to clinicians. There is evidence to suggest
35
36 that resilient healthcare concepts can positively impact safety in healthcare practice (Back et
37
38 al., 2017), but for this potential to be realised, there is an urgent need to engage clinicians in
39
40 debate and discussion around these principles. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to
41
42 develop a serious video game to communicate principles from resilient healthcare to
43
44 clinicians, and to evaluate its feasibility as a prompt to reflect on practice.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 Serious videogames offer an engaging medium to communicate new concepts, and have been
57
58 shown to be effective training tools within healthcare in areas such as surgery, emergency
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 care and nursing (Ricciardi and Paolis, 2014). The serious videogame in this study was
2 designed around a patient's journey through a hospital.
3

4 2 Theory

5 Resilient healthcare is concerned with organisational resilience, which is the ability of a
6 work system to adapt safely to pressures (Ross and Anderson, 2015). An organisation is said
7 to be resilient when its systems perform safely under pressure (Fairbanks et al., 2014).
8
9 However, these principles are difficult to study in practice. The Concepts for Applying
10 Resilience Engineering (CARE) model (Anderson et al., 2016a), presented in Figure 1, was
11 developed to define and operationalise resilient healthcare principles to enable scientific
12 study. In the CARE model, care outcomes are conceptualised as emerging from the interplay
13 of misalignments between demand and capacity that generate the need for adaptation. Work-
14 As-Imagined, in policies and procedures, does not always fit the reality of the clinical
15 environment. For example, patients can be late, staff can be on leave and not replaced,
16 equipment can be missing and so forth, requiring staff to compensate and adapt their work
17 (Anderson et al., 2016a).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65




Figure 1: CARE Model of Organisational Resilience (Anderson et al., 2016a)

1
2
3 These adjustments are termed Work-As-Done, reflecting what actually happens in real world
4 operations. Adaptation can lead to either successful or unsuccessful outcomes, based on
5 emergent system conditions. Success is relative in this context; what may be acceptable for a
6 healthcare professional is not necessarily acceptable for a patient, and what works one day
7 may not work the next. The CARE model provides a framework for investigating and
8 understanding how clinicians reconcile such tensions in their work environment, in order for
9 an organisation to respond resiliently to pressures. This is in contrast to the implicit
10 assumption behind many safety and quality improvement projects - that actions will always
11 lead to the specified, planned outputs.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

3 Serious Games

25
26
27 The domain of serious games is an academic discipline, which uses gamified tools to support
28 learning and engagement (Iacovides and Cox, 2015; Lu, 2013). This format was chosen
29 specifically because video games are able to promote reflection (Iacovides and Cox, 2015;
30 Khaled, 2018; Mekler et al., 2018) and are known to influence attitudes and behaviours
31 (Connolly et al., 2012). Hart et al. (2017) refer to serious games that are used to support
32 training in domains such as the military, emergency services and healthcare as ‘safety-critical
33 games’, as errors within these areas are likely to have significant physical and psychological
34 consequences.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 In healthcare, serious games have been successfully used with healthcare providers to, for
48 example, support training in surgical procedures, to allow nurses to practice assessment,
49 prevention and treatment related patient skin integrity, to simulate the placing of electrodes,
50 and the recording and reading of electrocardiographs (Ricciardi and Paolis, 2014). Many
51 games have focused on specific skills and activities, but others have broader aims. For
52 instance, Iacovides and colleagues (Iacovides et al., 2019; Iacovides and Cox, 2015) explored
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

the use of different games to raise awareness of ‘blame culture’ in healthcare. Moreover, Hannig et al. (2012) describe *eMedOffice*, which introduces medical students work system problems that can affect practice. The findings of these studies indicate that games may serve as powerful tools for engagement, reflection and learning.

4 Methods

4.1 Development of the game

The serious video game *Resilience Challenge* (also referred to as ‘the game’) was created through a series of stages. This work was completed through collaboration between nurses, safety scientists, a serious games expert, and a digital arts studio. The initial setup, planning, development, launch, and evaluation are summarised in Table 1, and discussed in more detail below.

Table 1: Stages of Video Game Development over 7 months

Initial setup	Apply for and receive funding Attend Serious Games conference Write brief and recruit agency bids, including social media marketing strategy Write and broker contract
Planning	Review best practices/research literature around serious games Host afternoon workshop to develop scenarios, with 2 nurses, a safety scientist, a serious games expert, and a digital arts studio Create storyboard of the game Meet with game developers to outline project Provide developers with contextual information, and images of hospitals
Development	Review resilient healthcare literature and identify key concepts Refine game narrative Design game process and develop pilot Extensive user testing, including a focus group Provide iterative feedback to developers about game design, including accuracy of medical imagery Ensure characters in the game represent healthcare workforce diversity Develop evaluation survey for the game
Launch	Approve final version of game Design social media strategy Write blog and social media posts for target audiences Plan and host launch event

1	Dissemination	Game publicised on social media
2		Public presentation of game (9 presentations, Feb 2017- Sept 2018)
3		Write and publish blog posts on various websites (9 to date)
4		Email game link to healthcare and safety staff mailing lists
5		Promotional game postcards distributed with QR code
6		
7		
8	Evaluation	Complete evaluation of game content and process, using survey (Feb-June
9		2017)

11

12

13 An initial workshop was held to develop the game’s narrative, which was refined during

14 further development and testing. At the beginning of the game, a player receives a brief

15 introduction to organisational resilience, then starts the game itself. *Resilience Challenge*

16 presents a series of five scenarios, in which the player guides a patient’s journey through the

17 hospital. The player takes on a variety of healthcare roles, and must choose from three

18 options to respond to dilemmas presented during each scenario. The options presented are not

19 ideal; all require an element of adjustment from what would be considered best practice. The

20 player has to decide which option is most acceptable as part of patient care delivery. For

21 example, in the first scenario, a patient needs to be transferred out of the emergency

22 department but there is no bed on the appropriate ward. The player must choose between

23 keeping the patient in the emergency department, moving the patient to a different ward, or

24 moving the patient to a hallway. Figure 2 presents an image from Scenario 1 in *Resilience*

25 *Challenge*, where the patient is waiting in the emergency department.

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65




Figure 2: Image from *Resilience Challenge*

There is only one path, or set of responses that allows a player to move through the game. A player could not progress in the game unless they had chosen an ‘optimal’ response. When a response was chosen, the players received feedback about their answer and why it was or wasn’t considered the optimal response. There is an ambient soundtrack that accompanies the game, to simulate a busy clinical environment. At the end of the game, the patient has improved, and thanks the player for their care.

Resilience Challenge was launched online in February 2017. An evaluation survey questionnaire was integrated with the game and players could choose to complete the survey after playing. The purpose of the survey was to evaluate the content of the game and to assess the feasibility of using a video game to convey resilient healthcare principles. The survey was live from February to June 2017 and is described below.

4.1.1 Ethical Considerations

1
2 Full ethical approval from the Florence Nightingale Faculty of Nursing, Midwifery &
3 Palliative Care at King's College London was obtained on November 3, 2016, LRS-16/17-
4
5 3787. There were no known risks to participating in this research. Participants were required
6
7 to confirm that they had read an informed consent information page before completing the
8
9 survey.
10
11
12

4.1.2 Data Collection

13
14 The original on-line survey developed to evaluate *Resilience Challenge*, contained 12
15
16 questions for clinicians. There was also a survey for people who were not clinicians, which
17
18 will be reported elsewhere. The healthcare professional survey consisted of four demographic
19
20 questions, followed by six Likert-type questions, asking participants to rank their agreement
21
22 with statements about the game on a five point scale from Strongly Agree, to Strongly
23
24 Disagree. Finally, there were two open ended questions: a) Has playing the game caused you
25
26 to reflect on your own practice? If so, in what ways? and b) Do you have any other comments
27
28 regarding the game?
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

4.1.3 Data Analysis

36
37 Survey data were automatically generated from the website as descriptive statistics. The
38
39 surveys yielded quantitative and qualitative data and analytic data in the form of fixed-
40
41 response survey questions were analysed with descriptive statistics using SPSS v22.
42
43 Framework Analysis (FA) (Gale et al., 2013; Smith and Firth, 2011) was used to analyse
44
45 findings from the free-text responses in the survey. FA is well suited to cross-sectional,
46
47 descriptive data (Ritchie et al., 2003). In contrast with other methods of qualitative data
48
49 analysis, FA allows for deduction using existing models and theories, and induction for
50
51 emergent themes (Ward et al., 2013) which is the approach used for this analysis. The CARE
52
53 Model (Anderson et al., 2016a), shown in Figure 1, was used deductively. Inductive themes
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 were also created when these data presented concepts outside of the CARE model. The
2 NVivo v12 software management tool was used to organise these data. The following section
3 presents the findings from this evaluation.
4
5

6 7 **5 Results**

8 9 **5.1 Analytic and demographic data**

10 The website hosting the game was designed with automatic analytic capacity to monitor how
11 many times the game was played and where. These data are presented in Table 2: Gameplay
12 analytic dataTable 2. The top five locations accounted for 86% of the total game plays. Please
13 note: the N value varies in the tables, as not all participants answered every question.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Table 2: Gameplay analytic data

23 24 Location	25 Number	26 Percentage
27 (where applicable)		
28 United Kingdom	1,230	63%
29 United States	145	7%
30 Canada	122	6%
31 Australia	111	6%
32 Belgium	80	4%
33 Other	261	14%
34 Total Game plays	1,949	
35 Number of Unique 36 users	1,559	

37
38
39 The demographic information for the participants is presented in **Error! Reference source**
40 **not found..** Overall, 141 people completed the survey, from the February 2- June 8, 2017. Of
41 these, 107 self-identified as healthcare professionals. The mean age of participants was 40
42 years (N=103, SD 1.8 years). There were 87 female participants and 20 male participants
43 (N=107) in the study. Table 3 displays the professional role of participants.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 3: Professional roles of healthcare participants (n=99)

Role	No of Participants	Percentage
Registered Nurse	54	54.5%
Student	11	11.1%
Physician	13	13.1%
Midwife	4	4.0%
Human Resources	3	3.0%
Occupational /Physiotherapist	3	3.0%
Research Associate	3	3.0%
Dentist	2	2.0%
Physician Assistant	2	2.0%
Psychologist	2	2.0%
Pharmacy Technician	1	1.0%
Therapeutic Radiographer	1	1.0%

5.2 Likert-style questions

There were 107 participants who self-identified as working in healthcare settings. These participants responded to six statements about the game, as reported in Table 4. These statements assessed whether the game translated concepts from resilient healthcare effectively, and if the game was engaging.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 4: Survey responses from clinicians

Item	Disagree		Somewhat Disagree		Neither Agree nor Disagree		Somewhat Agree		Agree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
The game is relevant to my work	1	1	6	6	12	11	31	29	57	53
The game is engaging	1	1	1	1	6	6	34	32	65	61
I would recommend the game to others	0	0	2	2	10	9	26	25	68	64
Playing the game increased my awareness of how clinicians adapt safely at work	5	5	9	8	17	16	32	30	44	41
Playing the game helped me think through the impact of my actions on patient safety	1	1	4	4	13	12	33	31	56	52
The game introduced me to the concept of organisational resilience	12	11	8	8	18	17	39	36	30	28

1 From Table 4, it can be seen that the modal response for items 1-5 was ‘Agree’, indicating
2 that most participants found the game relevant to their work, and engaging, and would
3 recommend the game to others. Participants found that playing the game increased their
4 awareness of how clinicians need to adapt and the impact of their own actions on patient
5 safety. For the final item, the modal response was ‘Somewhat Agree’, and responses were
6 more spread across the scale than previous questions. This indicates that participants were
7 less sure that the game introduced them to the concept of organisational resilience.
8
9

10 **5.3 Findings: Qualitative Data**

11 Framework analysis was used to analyse 153 free text comments written by participants.
12 These findings are presented in the following section. Section 5.3.1-4 refer to deductive
13 themes generated from the CARE Model (Figure 1) and Section 5.3.5-9 refer to themes that
14 were generated inductively.
15
16

17 **5.3.1 Demand**

18 The first deductive theme was demand, which “refers to pressure in the clinical environment
19 and includes requirements for effective care, such as the targets and standards set by
20 regulators and policy makers” (Anderson et al., 2016b, p. x). Participants placed a particular
21 emphasis on the role of daily pressures and challenges in their work. Participants reported
22 that the pressures presented in the game reflected clinical realities. [The game] *highlights day*
23 *to day issues that are frequently seen in practice (A39)* and *highlights the pressures we all*
24 *face every day (A35)*. Participants highlighted that clinical staff face the brunt of the
25 demands within the healthcare system. However, some participants thought that *Resilience*
26 *Challenge* did not go far enough to capture reality of their clinical environments. *This was not*
27 *comparable to the stress and pressure that you can be put under in the clinical environment*
28 *(A11)*. It was notable that participants referred to pressures as a whole, without naming things
29 like staffing as specific examples.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Participants discussed the way that the expectations of senior managers can add to the pressures and demands of their roles.

I know I always put patients' safety first. What (the game) gave me was the knowledge that I can make the right decisions but that's not how the NHS works.

You have to make the right decisions (based on) your senior management and what they have in their heads as priority (A29).

Participants also recognised that management staff face their own demands. *It helped see the pressures other staff are under too (A7)* and reported that the different professional roles in the game raised their awareness of the universality of pressures in healthcare.

5.3.2 Capacity

Capacity refers to resources within a system that are available to meet demands. These can include “a range of capacities, including numbers of staff, their skill mix, physical infrastructure and equipment, processes, procedures and protocols” (Anderson et al., 2016b, p. x). A participant identified the organisation as a whole as being the source of organisational capacity. *This is interesting because it's about more than expensive technology- it's about having more strategic approaches and an organization-wide culture of robust systems (C22).* An emphasis on staff adapting to pressures could mask chronic under-resourcing in the system. Conflicting views were reported on how this was represented in the game.

I worry that [Resilience Challenge] can be seen as passive acceptance of an unsafe situation rather than also talking about how front-line staff can engage in improving the capacity of the system (C52).

Participants felt they must meet demands, but might not feel empowered to try and increase capacity in the system.

5.3.3 Adaptation

1
2 The third deductive theme was adaptation, referring to “mismatches of demand and capacity
3 that require clinicians to work around problems and devise solutions” (Anderson et al.,
4
5 2016b, p. x). Participants remarked on how the adaptations required in *Resilience Challenge*
6
7 helped them to recognise the value of adaptation. *Made me reflect on fact that adapting my*
8
9 *behaviour and not always giving a " textbook " answer and deviating from protocols may be*
10
11 *the correct thing to do (A2).*

12
13
14
15
16
17 Participants discussed at length the nature of decision-making in adapting to pressures,
18
19 including one free text response of over 300 words, in which the participant described
20
21 decision-making scenarios in other settings, such as mental healthcare. Participants also
22
23 identified the limits of adaptation, through decision making.
24

25
26
27 *Some decisions has (sic) to be done under pressure and playing the game showed*
28
29 *me that sometimes taking a plan B is right but breaking policies is not. Thinking*
30
31 *outside (or inside the problem box) can help patients. This is a concept that shows*
32
33 *that flexibility is necessary in some scenarios [sic] (A5).*

34
35
36
37 Participants clearly identified the difficulty associated with making decisions. Participants
38
39 reflected on the potential trajectories that their decisions could create, and how difficult it
40
41 could be to reconcile these outcomes with their goals for care. The emotional aspects of
42
43 decision-making was highlighted as being difficult, and a source of stress and anxiety.
44

45
46
47 *What the game also did was help me reflect on how frustrated I get with some of the*
48
49 *scenarios as I could feel my anxiety increasing with each scenario. I can imagine all*
50
51 *of those scenarios happening and how unsupported I feel when they do happen.*
52
53 *Each scenario usually involves a conflict with other workers/patients/family*
54
55 *members and as an RN how I navigate these stressors is important too. (A20)*
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

5.3.4 Outcomes

The fourth deductive theme was outcomes, which “are broadly viewed, and include consequences for patients, staff and the organisation” (Anderson et al., 2016a, p. 3).

Participants considered the potential outcomes of each scenario, and the consequences for patients. It was the outcomes with which participants most frequently disagreed; for example in Scenario 5:

I disagree with one answer, when the man starts talking about going home and it is the drug round I would have spoken to the patient when they ask a question even (for) just a few minutes and it can make the patient feel valued and listened to. By making a promise to go back to him and something happens and you are unable to go back it can muddy the therapeutic relationship (C3).

This demonstrates how much clinicians prioritise engagement with patients. Others agreed: *Remember to put patient above your own needs (A38)*. The emphasis was placed on supporting patients and providing safe care, despite challenging circumstances.

5.3.5 Reactions to the game

Overall, the process and design of *Resilience Challenge* was well received. The process refers to how the game moved from one scenario to another, and how users interacted with the game. Participants generally liked the design, use of sound, and the images in the game, although there was critical feedback as well (Table 5).

Table 5: Participant comments on the design of Resilience Challenge

Technology	<i>It looks and feels great, is simple, realistic and very interactive. (C12)</i>
and Design	<i>Well designed and smoothly functioning. Good software. (C35)</i> <i>Well constructed learning resource - short and to the point. Well done!! (C32)</i>
Sound	<i>I like the background distracting sounds, gives an element of realism (C50)</i>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

I liked the noisy background - felt real (C36)

Images *The graphics are really good (C30)*

I didn't find the pictures helped - they weren't easy to interpret. A bit of animation or video would have been better. (C54)

Overall, the game process and design were liked by participants, and were felt to support the content of the game.

5.3.6 *Reflecting on Practice*

Participants suggested the game helped them reflect on different aspects of their practice. For example, participants responded that playing *Resilience Challenge* highlighted interactions with colleagues. *Made me reflect how my actions can affect other healthcare professionals (A27).* The game prompted participants to reflect on their decision-making. *I realized I did not always make the best choice the first time, so I need to think more before reacting (A44).*

Overall, clinicians felt that the game encouraged them to reflect on their practice.

5.3.7 *Safety*

The game helped participants to reflect on the connection between their actions and safety. *Playing the game confirmed that I have patient safety at the forefront of all my decision making at work (A20).* Another participant focused on skills depicted in the game.

It was actually very helpful. It made me realize that when I'm distracted while giving meds, yes it's annoying to me, but also affects my patients negatively. I started thinking, what habits have I picked up in my practice that are causing me to practice unsafely. (A37).

This demonstrates the utility of *Resilience Challenge* to start discussions about safety, as clinicians consider the safety implications of their decision-making.

5.3.8 *The Correct Answer?*

1
2 Some participants were adamant that there was a ‘correct answer’ to the scenarios and
3
4 approached *Resilience Challenge* as a tool that evaluated whether they were making the
5
6 ‘correct’ decisions. *I was relieved to note that most of the decisions I made in the video game*
7
8 *were correct and I hope this is reflected in my practice (A28).* Other participants disagreed
9
10 with the outcome of the scenarios, opining that a different choice should have been labelled
11
12 ‘correct’.
13
14
15

16
17 *Also, in a real scenario, I would not have moved a medical patient to an orthopaedic*
18
19 *ward without reassurance that they had medical doctors to cover them. And if that*
20
21 *reassurance could not be provided I would not be moving my patient, especially if*
22
23 *they were showing signs of sepsis. I would be escalating that case to bed managers.*
24
25 *Patient safety first (A32).*
26
27

28
29 Some participants suggested that the game could serve as a means for an organisation to test
30
31 its employees about safety, or be used to screen future employees.
32
33

34
35 *I think this would be a great tool for hospitals to assess their care givers culture of*
36
37 *safety. Especially new caregivers or new hires. As an organization I’m sure*
38
39 *hospitals want to know what each individual does in their practice to ensure safety.*
40
41 *As well as identify where caregivers need more education and support from the*
42
43 *hospital to facilitate safety [sic] (C33).*
44
45

46
47 Others discussed decision-making in a nuanced way, reflecting the view that there is often no
48
49 one correct answer to problems in healthcare.
50

51
52 *Some of the choices given were challenging and my response was not considered to*
53
54 *be the best response by the game authors. This allowed me to consider why the*
55
56 *game’s best choice was selected and whether this sat well with me (A25).*
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

These differences demonstrate varied perspectives on safety. There is a tension between a clear idea of right and wrong, and the perspective that patient care is complex, and doesn't necessarily have a correct answer and that adaptations are driven by contextual nuance and understanding.

5.3.9 Organisational Resilience

Resilience Challenge aimed to communicate ideas about organisational resilience to clinicians. However, there was a lack of understanding about organisational resilience for most participants. The survey comments suggested that only a few participants connected the principles of organisational resilience to the scenarios in the game. It appears that the principles of organisational resilience were not translated in a way that was accessible to participants. This could have been related to the current trend of the word 'resilience' being synonymous with personal resilience and emotional coping. *I think it would be helpful to include something about how the individual feels/ reacts in these situations when under pressure and what options they would take to maintain their personal resilience (C12)*. Other participants referred to ideas from organisational resilience, but using different terms. *We continually risk assess and shift the parameters to maintain a safe functioning unit, by continually stretching the boundaries we have impact on all parts of the pathway (A33)*. Some participants expressed confusion about the connection between the game and the concept of resilience. *This feels like a fairly simplistic approach and how does this transfer into an understanding of resilience? (A13)*. These findings are discussed in the following section.

6 Discussion

This study has demonstrated that it is feasible to design an authentic serious video game to promote staff engagement with concepts from resilient healthcare. Overall, participants found the game to be relevant, engaging, and said they would recommend to others. Participants

1 also agreed that the game sparked thinking about adaptation and the impact of their actions
2 on safety, even if they did not always connect these reflections explicitly to the concept of
3 organisational resilience. While some reflected that flexible adaptation is an integral part of
4 their jobs, others were more aligned with the idea that adapting practice to pressures is not
5 always desirable. Debates about the contribution of individual responsibility and system
6 shortcomings to quality and safety problems are highly topical. This can be seen in recent
7 cases like that of Bawa Garba (Nicholl, 2018), a UK physician who was found guilty of
8 manslaughter and gross negligence after a boy died under her care. This legal outcome was
9 disputed by many doctors who stated that a lack of system resources were to blame. Playing
10 *Resilience Challenge* is one way that issues around resources and decision-making may be
11 surfaced and discussed openly.

26 **6.1 Designing the game**

27 Many aspects of the game were effective, such as the creation of a believable storyline and
28 images. Field et al. (2018) found that a lack of realism in a serious game about air
29 ambulances was a hindrance for participants. Great attention was paid to the details of
30 *Resilience Challenge*, and participants reported that it was an accurate portrayal of healthcare
31 and relevant to their work. Hart et al. (2017) described relevance to practice and authenticity
32 as key factors for success in a safety critical game. The current study reinforces the
33 importance of attending to detail and producing believable scenarios and accurate images.

46 **6.1 Elicit reflections**

47 Participants in the current study indicated that the game did help them to reflect on their
48 practice. This supports other studies which have shown that games can elicit reflections,
49 which is deemed worthwhile by players (Mekler et al., 2018), and have the potential to
50 improve patient safety (Aubin et al., 2012). However, Mekler et al. (2018) found that it is rare
51 for participants to experience transformative reflection to enable them to translate ideas from
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 videos games into their lives. Participants in the current study did experience a measure of
2 critical reflection and some suggested that they were going to change aspects of their clinical
3 practice. This could be followed up further in a future evaluation to see if participants did
4 make changes in their practice, and if so, whether these changes were sustained.
5
6
7
8

9 **6.2 Translating ideas**

10 An aim of this study was to design a game to translate the concepts of organisational
11 resilience for clinicians. Responses to open ended questions indicated that some participants
12 interpreted the game as a way to test the accuracy of answers, a response that presupposes
13 that correct responses can be easily identified and judged. The aim of the game was to raise
14 awareness of the difficult challenges faced by clinicians that require flexible adaptation, and
15 this concept was not easily grasped by all participants. It does illustrate the need to change
16 conversations about how safe, quality care is achieved in complex healthcare environments,
17 and about the ubiquity of adaptation in healthcare work.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Organisational resilience was not named throughout the game, which may have limited the
32 clinicians' ability to connect the scenario content with the overarching concept of
33 organisational resilience. In a future iteration of the game, the information about
34 organizational resilience could be made more prominent, to enhance the linkages between the
35 concepts and their role clinical practice. In a formal educational context, this could also be
36 achieved through debriefing where the game is used as a tool to facilitate discussion with a
37 facilitator that ties the experience to key learning points.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 There is increasing recognition of the educational value of serious games for healthcare
49 professionals (Ricciardi and Paolis, 2014; Sipiyaruk et al., 2018). *Resilience Challenge* has
50 potential uses for healthcare staff education. Serious games can be more cost effective than
51 other educational methods (Field et al., 2018; Ricciardi and Paolis, 2014) and are more
52 engaging than other types of digital education tools, like e-learning modules (Dankbaar et al.,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

2017). *Resilience Challenge* could be updated or modified for comparatively low cost, incorporating feedback and improving its effectiveness. The convenience of serious games suggests they could be used as an adjunct to traditional clinical education and to reach staff that do shift work, and may not be able to attend traditional education sessions (Lomas, 2008).

There could be limitations in the extent to which a serious game can teach about new concepts. While it is generally agreed that serious games are more engaging than traditional teaching or e-learning modules (Dankbaar et al., 2017; Field et al., 2018; Sipiyyaruk et al., 2018), the evidence around learning outcomes has been mixed (Sipiyyaruk et al., 2018). Dankbaar et al. (2017) found that students who had played a serious game had higher scores on a patient safety test than controls, but were not statistically different from participants who used an e-learning module. This may indicate that serious games are effective at engaging clinicians and eliciting reflections, but are not necessarily a superior teaching tool. In contrast, Kow et al. (2016) found that a serious game improved medical students' scores regarding patient safety and surgery. More research is needed to understand how serious games may support patient safety education.

6.3 Limitations

There were several limitations of this study. The scenarios in the game were limited to four different professionals (administrator, physician, x-ray technologist, and nurse), and one setting (a hospital). Resilient healthcare has the potential for system-wide application, which was not represented in the game. Further, the nature of the survey meant that it provided limited insight into how the game facilitated reflection, and how participants reached their conclusions. The survey was conducted using non-validated tools, which were used for the first time. Additionally, the participants were a convenience sample, which may not reflect the breadth of healthcare experiences.

6.4 Future work

1
2 There are many opportunities for further development of serious games about resilient
3 healthcare. For example, the game could be expanded to allow for multiple players.
4

5 Collaborative games with multiple players present an opportunity for students to work
6
7 together, and are feasible and effective in medical teaching (Hannig et al., 2012). There could
8
9 be more scenarios created, reflecting different practice settings and different professional
10
11 groups and there could also be applications of the game in different contexts. The game could
12
13 be used more formally as a tool to prompt discussion about patient safety for student learning.
14
15
16
17
18

7 Conclusions

19
20
21 A serious video game proved to be a feasible way of translating theoretical ideas into
22
23 healthcare practice. The design of the game emphasised accuracy, and the complexity of
24
25 everyday clinical work. The game also stimulated reflections on practice by offering players
26
27 ambiguous choices. Serious games can support healthcare professionals to reflect on their
28
29 practice, and help them think about how to adapt safely to pressures. *Resilience Challenge* is
30
31 a promising way to engage with healthcare professionals and potentially improve safety in
32
33 healthcare, and warrants further research. Future studies with serious games could explore
34
35 links between reflection and clinical practices, increasing educational impact, and addressing
36
37 specific safety concerns in healthcare.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

8 References

- 1
2 Anderson, J.E., Ross, A.J., Back, J., Duncan, M., Snell, P., Walsh, K., Jaye, P., 2016a.
3
4 Implementing resilience engineering for healthcare quality improvement using the CARE
5 model: a feasibility study protocol. *Pilot Feasibility Stud* 2, 61.
6
7
8
9 Anderson, J.E., Ross, A.J., Jaye, P., 2016b. Modelling resilience and researching the gap
10 between work as imagined and work as done, in: Braithwaite, J., Wears, R., Hollnagel, E.
11 (Eds.), *Resilience Health Care Volume 3: Reconciling work-as-imagined and work-as-done*.
12 Ashgate, Farnham, UK.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Aubin, D., King, S., Boechler, P., Burden, M., Rockwell, G., Henry, M., Gouglas, S., 2012.
20
21 Serious games for patient safety education. *Medical Teacher* 34, 675-675.
22
23
24
25 Back, J., Ross, A.J., Duncan, M.D., Jaye, P., Henderson, K., Anderson, J.E., 2017.
26
27 Emergency department escalation in theory and practice: a mixed-methods study using a
28 model of organizational resilience. *Annals of emergency medicine*.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Anderson, J.E., Ross, A.J., Back, J., Duncan, M., Snell, P., Walsh, K., Jaye, P., 2016a.
Implementing resilience engineering for healthcare quality improvement using the CARE
model: a feasibility study protocol. *Pilot Feasibility Stud* 2, 61.
- Anderson, J.E., Ross, A.J., Jaye, P., 2016b. Modelling resilience and researching the gap
between work as imagined and work as done, in: Braithwaite, J., Wears, R., Hollnagel, E.
(Eds.), *Resilience Health Care Volume 3: Reconciling work-as-imagined and work-as-done*.
Ashgate, Farnham, UK.
- Aubin, D., King, S., Boechler, P., Burden, M., Rockwell, G., Henry, M., Gouglas, S., 2012.
Serious games for patient safety education. *Medical Teacher* 34, 675-675.
- Back, J., Ross, A.J., Duncan, M.D., Jaye, P., Henderson, K., Anderson, J.E., 2017.
Emergency department escalation in theory and practice: a mixed-methods study using a
model of organizational resilience. *Annals of emergency medicine*.
- Connolly, T.M., Boyle, E.A., MacArthur, E., Hainey, T., Boyle, J.M., 2012. A systematic
literature review of empirical evidence on computer games and serious games. *Computers &
Education* 59, 661-686.
- Cook, R.I., Nemeth, C.P., 2010. "Those found responsible have been sacked": some
observations on the usefulness of error. *Cogn Technol Work* 12, 87-93.
- Dankbaar, M.E., Richters, O., Kalkman, C.J., Prins, G., Ten Cate, O.T., van Merrienboer,
J.J., Schuit, S.C., 2017. Comparative effectiveness of a serious game and an e-module to
support patient safety knowledge and awareness. *BMC Med Educ* 17, 30.
- Fairbanks, R.J., Wears, R.L., Woods, D.D., Hollnagel, E., Plsek, P., Cook, R.I., 2014.
Resilience and resilience engineering in health care. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf* 40, 376-383.

1 Field, V.K., Gale, T., Kalkman, C., Kato, P., Ward, C.T., 2018. A serious game to train
2 patient safety outside the classroom: a pilot study of acceptability. *BMJ Simulation and*
3 *Technology Enhanced Learning*.

4
5
6
7 Gale, N.K., Heath, G., Cameron, E., Rashid, S., Redwood, S., 2013. Using the framework
8 method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Med*
9 *Res Methodol* 13, 117.

10
11
12
13
14 Hannig, A., Kuth, N., Ozman, M., Jonas, S., Spreckelsen, C., 2012. eMedOffice: a web-based
15 collaborative serious game for teaching optimal design of a medical practice. *BMC Med*
16 *Educ* 12, 104.

17
18
19
20
21
22 Hart, J., Iacovides, I., Adams, A., Oliveira, M., Margoudi, M., 2017. Understanding
23 Engagement within the Context of a Safety Critical Game, *Proceedings of the Annual*
24 *Symposium on Computer-Human Interaction in Play*. ACM, pp. 253-264.

25
26
27
28
29 Hollnagel, E., 2014. *Safety-I and Safety-II*. Ashgate, Farnham, UK.

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

99 Hollnagel, E., Wears, R.L., Braithwaite, J., 2015. *From Safety-1 to Safety-2: A White Paper*.
100 The Resilient Health Care Net, Published simultaneously by the University of Southern
101 Denmark, University of Florida, USA, and Macquarie University, Australia.

102 Iacovides, I., Cox, A., Furniss, D., Stawarz, K., Jennett, C., Adams, A., 2019. Supporting
103 engagement in research through a game design competition. *Research for All*, (In Press).

104 Iacovides, I., Cox, A.L., 2015. Moving beyond fun: Evaluating serious experience in digital
105 games, *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing*
106 *Systems*. ACM, pp. 2245-2254.

107 Khaled, R., 2018. Questions over answers: Reflective game design, *Playful Disruption of*
108 *Digital Media*. Springer, pp. 3-27.

1 Kow, A.W.C., Ang, B.L.S., Chong, C.S., Tan, W.B., Menon, K.R., 2016. Innovative Patient
2 Safety Curriculum Using iPad Game (PASSED) Improved Patient Safety Concepts in
3 Undergraduate Medical Students. *World Journal of Surgery* 40, 2571-2580.
4
5 Lomas, C., 2008. Patient safety congress: Nurses taught infection control with video game,
6
7 Nursing Times.
8
9 Lu, A.S., 2013. Serious games for healthcare: Applications and implications. Mary Ann
10 Liebert, Inc. 140 Huguenot Street, 3rd Floor New Rochelle, NY 10801 USA.
11
12 Mekler, E., Iacovides, I., Bopp, J., 2018. A Game that Makes You Question...” Exploring the
13
14 Role of Reflection for the Player Experience, Proceedings of the annual ACM Conference
15
16 CHI Play 2018. ACM.
17
18 Nicholl, D., 2018. Bawa-Garba—From blame culture to just culture. *BMJ Opinion*.
19
20 Ricciardi, F., Paolis, L.T.D., 2014. A comprehensive review of serious games in health
21
22 professions. *International Journal of Computer Games Technology* 2014, 9.
23
24 Ritchie, J., Spencer, L., O’Connor, W., 2003. Carrying out qualitative analysis. *Qualitative
25
26 research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* 1.
27
28 Ross, A., Anderson, J., 2015. Mobilizing resilience by monitoring the right things for the
29
30 right people at the right time, in: Wears, R.L., Hollnagel, E., Braithwaite, J. (Eds.), *Resilient
31
32 health care Volume 2: The resilience of everyday clinical work*. Ashgate, Farnham, Surrey,
33
34 pp. 235-248.
35
36 Sipiaryuk, K., Gallagher, J.E., Hatzipanagos, S., Reynolds, P.A., 2018. A rapid review of
37
38 serious games: From healthcare education to dental education. *Eur J Dent Educ* 22, 243-257.
39
40 Smith, J., Firth, J., 2011. Qualitative data analysis: the framework approach. *Nurse Res* 18,
41
42 52-62.
43
44 Ward, D.J., Furber, C., Tierney, S., Swallow, V., 2013. Using Framework Analysis in nursing
45
46 research: a worked example. *J Adv Nurs* 69, 2423-2431.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Wears, R., Hollnagel, E., Braithwaite, J.E., 2015. Resilient Health Care: The resilience of
2 everyday clinical work. Ashgate, Farnham, UK.
3

4 World Health Organization, 2014. 10 facts on patient safety. World Health Organization,.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65