

Professional and Practice-based Learning

Simon Flandin  
Christine Vidal-Gomel  
Raquel Becerril Ortega *Editors*

# Simulation Training through the Lens of Experience and Activity Analysis

Healthcare, Victim Rescue and  
Population Protection

 Springer

# Professional and Practice-based Learning

Volume 30

## Series Editors

Stephen Billett , Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia

Christian Harteis, University of Paderborn, Paderborn, Germany

Hans Gruber, University of Regensburg, Regensburg, Germany

*Professional and practice-based learning* brings together international research on the individual development of professionals and the organisation of professional life and educational experiences. It complements the Springer journal *Vocations and Learning: Studies in vocational and professional education*.

Professional learning, and the practice-based processes that often support it, are the subject of increased interest and attention in the fields of educational, psychological, sociological, and business management research, and also by governments, employer organisations and unions. This professional learning goes beyond, what is often termed professional education, as it includes learning processes and experiences outside of educational institutions in both the initial and ongoing learning for the professional practice. Changes in these workplaces requirements usually manifest themselves in the everyday work tasks, professional development provisions in educational institution decrease in their salience, and learning and development during professional activities increase in their salience.

There are a range of scientific challenges and important focuses within the field of professional learning. These include:

- understanding and making explicit the complex and massive knowledge that is required for professional practice and identifying ways in which this knowledge can best be initially learnt and developed further throughout professional life.
- analytical explications of those processes that support learning at an individual and an organisational level.
- understanding how learning experiences and educational processes might best be aligned or integrated to support professional learning.

The series integrates research from different disciplines: education, sociology, psychology, amongst others. The series is comprehensive in scope as it not only focuses on professional learning of teachers and those in schools, colleges and universities, but all professional development within organisations.

Please contact Grace Ma at [grace.ma@springer.com](mailto:grace.ma@springer.com) if you wish to discuss a book proposal.

More information about this series at <https://link.springer.com/bookseries/8383>

Simon Flandin • Christine Vidal-Gomel  
Raquel Becerril Ortega  
Editors

# Simulation Training through the Lens of Experience and Activity Analysis

Healthcare, Victim Rescue and Population  
Protection

 Springer

*Editors*

Simon Flandin  
Faculty of Psychology and Educational  
Sciences  
University of Geneva  
Geneva, Switzerland

Christine Vidal-Gomel  
Centre de Recherches en Education  
de Nantes  
University of Nantes  
Nantes, France

Raquel Becerril Ortega  
Adult Education  
University of Lille  
Lille, France

ISSN 2210-5549

ISSN 2210-5557 (electronic)

Professional and Practice-based Learning

ISBN 978-3-030-89566-2

ISBN 978-3-030-89567-9 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89567-9>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2022

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG  
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

# Series Editors' Foreword

A key goal of the Professional and Practice-based Learning book series is to contribute to discussions about and processes for improving the enactment of occupational capacities through practice-based learning experiences for both the initial learning of those capacities and their ongoing development. A related goal is associated with understanding and enhancing the contributions that different kinds of experiences can make to the formation and continuity of those occupational practices and from different conceptual and methodological orientations. To date, the volumes in this series have contributed a range of perspectives, approaches and outcomes to these discussions. This volume continues that tradition through its focus on simulation training and from a Francophone orientation and through detailed and grounded analyses of how simulation experiences can be designed, organised, enacted and engaged with.

The authors argue that the demands of work and work requirements have become more complex, interrelated and, perhaps, less easy to be taught and learnt. However, to date, the focuses on the use of simulation training have been often quite specifically focused and narrow. It follows then that their volume seeks to redress this issue. It does this through providing detailed descriptions of the learning potential of simulation training through considerations of its strengths and limitations; identify how it can be used to achieve strong learning outcomes within occupational preparation and ongoing development, and, also inform further how practice based approaches to learning can be effectively harnessed. Given that the learning of occupations where risk is high to both the practitioners and those who are serviced by them, the ability to provide experiences through simulations but avoid harm to either and offer scenarios, options and ways of representing occupationally based experiences that can be adapted to either performance requirements or learners' needs brings with it enormous potential. The question is how these simulations can be most effectively designed, implemented and experienced by learners.

In responding to these challenges, a particular feature of this volume is that it adopts a Francophone approach that focuses upon activities and experience as an analytical and procedural orientation. This includes engaging the readership in a consideration of ergonomics from a cognitive and activity perspective that is central

to the Francophone approach. In doing so, it draws upon illustrations from and appraisals of simulation training activities occurring within a range of sectors including healthcare, firefighting, security, policing and civil security. The discussion within the volume acknowledges the issues arising from the significant advance in electronic and digital technology that has occurred rapidly and continues to do so thereby opening up a whole range of ways in which experiences can be provided and activities organised and enacted as learning experiences. Within this development is the ongoing focus on addressing fidelity of experiences and validity of their learning potential. The grounded orientation to understanding occupational practice and learning that is central to the Francophone approach is well suited to illuminate and appraise issues of validity and fidelity.

The organisation of the volume is structured in ways that outlined these key concerns and issues within the contributions in the initial part, followed by parts that provide empirical and methodological contributions that explore these facets, with two summarising chapters comprising the final part. In this way, both individually and collectively, the contributions to this volume do much to advance understandings about the conceptual premises through which the design, organisation and enactment of simulation training might progress, and sets of procedural considerations to realise its contributions and secure efficacy.

In these ways, the volume makes a significant contribution to the field of professional practice-based learning and addresses an important gap both conceptually and procedurally about the ways in which experiences can be provided to achieve learning and developmental outcomes that go beyond what would be permissible, could be achievable and possibly engage with by learners, in so doing.

University of Paderborn  
Paderborn, Germany

Christian Harteis

University of Regensburg  
Regensburg, Germany

Hans Gruber

Griffith University  
Brisbane, Australia  
August 2021

Stephen Billett

# Keywords

Simulation-based learning in healthcare  
Psychological validity of training simulations  
Role-playing-games  
Virtual simulation environment  
Training of healthcare professionals in geriatrics  
Situating cognition approaches  
Civil security crisis simulations  
Simulation training and risk management  
Urban fire simulation  
High-intensity simulated training  
Activity-based training design  
Use-of-force simulation-based training  
Decision-making in police training facilities



# Contents

<b>An Introduction to Simulation Training Through the Lens of Experience and Activity Analysis</b> . . . . .	1
Simon Flandin, Christine Vidal-Gomel, and Raquel Becerril Ortega	
<b>Part I Experience and Activity-Based Conceptualizations of Simulation Design and Outcomes</b>	
<b>Simulation-Based Learning for Technical Gestures in Health Care: What Kind of Experience Is Required?</b> . . . . .	27
Lucile Vadcard	
<b>Four Lines of Analysis for Civil Security Crisis Simulations: Insights for Training Design.</b> . . . . .	43
Simon Flandin	
<b>Renewing the Tools for Simulation-Based Training in Medical Education: How Situated Cognition Approaches Can Help Us?</b> . . . . .	61
Zoya Horcik	
<b>The Psychological Validity of Training Simulations: Analysis of a Simulation with Role-Playing Games to Experiment the Gesture of “Relational Touch”</b> . . . . .	81
Christine Vidal-Gomel	
<b>Design Process for a Virtual Simulation Environment for Training Healthcare Professionals in Geriatrics</b> . . . . .	101
Raquel Becerril-Ortega, H�el�ene Vanderstichel, Lucie Petit, Maria Jos�e Urbiolagallegos, Joanne Schoch, S�ebastien Dacunha, Amine Benamara, Brian Ravenet, Jean Zagdoun, and Laurence Chaby	
<b>Ergo-Scripting in Activity-Based Training Design: An Illustration from the Design of a Virtual Environment.</b> . . . . .	129
Vincent Boccara, Renaud Delmas, and Fran�oise Darses	

## **Part II Empirical Lessons from Experience and Activity-Based Approaches to Simulation Training**

<b>Simulation to Experiment and Develop Risk Management in Exceptional Crisis Situations: The Case of the Casualty Extraction Teams</b> .....	153
Laurie-Anna Dubois, Sylvie Vandestrategie, and Agnès Van Daele	
<b>Analyzing the Collective Activity of Firefighters During Urban Fire Simulation</b> .....	173
Cyril Bossard, Magali Prost, Yohann Cardin, and Gilles Kermarrec	
<b>Subjective Evidence Based Ethnography: An Alternative to Debriefing for Large-Scale Simulation-Based Training?</b> .....	195
Sophie Le Bellu, Saadi Lahlou, Joshua M. Phelps, and Jan Aandal	
<b>A Study of Police Cadets' Activity During Use-of-Force Simulation-Based Training: Empirical Lessons and Insights for Training Design</b> .....	219
Rachel Boembeke, Laurane De Carvalho, and Germain Poizat	
<b>How Do Simulated High-Intensity Situations Train Leaders to Maintain Their Ability to Act in Unfamiliar, Unforeseen or Uncertain Environments?</b> .....	237
Hervé De Bisschop and Serge Leblanc	
<b>On Care and the Sensitive Experience of Caregiver Activity in Simulation Situations: A Possible Model for Encounters Between Health Practitioners and Their Patients to Enhance Communication Training</b> .....	259
Elodie Ciccone, Lucie Cuvelier, Anne Bationo-Tillon, Thomas Baugnon, and Françoise Decortis	
<b>Part III Promising Avenues for Simulation Training Design and Research</b>	
<b>New Questions for Interventions and Research in Simulation Training Based on Actors' Activity</b> .....	279
Janine Rogalski	
<b>Simulation in Healthcare, a Resource in Times of Crisis. A Look Back and a Look Forward</b> .....	291
Eliana Escudero	
<b>Index</b> .....	311

# About the Authors

**Simon Flandin** is a researcher in the CRAFT lab in the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences at the University of Geneva. His research consists of analysing the occupational and training activity of professionals in order to determine the best methods of generating transformations that improve performance, health, and development. His research approach is grounded in French-speaking Ergonomics and in Enaction theory, and his main fieldworks are video and simulation uses in various contexts of vocational education and professional development. Since 2016, his research agenda is polarised by safety and crisis management training. In 2019, he was the first educational scientist to obtain a SNSF (Swiss National Science Foundation) Ambizione Fellowship.

**Christine Vidal-Gomel** is Full Professor of Educational and Training Sciences. She is affiliated with the Centre de Recherche en Éducation de Nantes (CREN) at the University of Nantes (France). Her research approach consists of analysing the activity and development of professionals from the theoretical and methodological frameworks of French-speaking Ergonomics and Professional Didactics. She works on the design of ‘enabling’ training situations, integrating professional development and occupational health and safety. She carries out field studies in different domains, such as healthcare, building and civil engineering, and autonomous vehicle driving.

**Raquel Becerril Ortega** is an industrial engineer and Associated Professor of Educational Sciences in the CIREL laboratory (University of Lille, France). Her work consists of analysing occupational and training activity in order to design and develop adult training courses using simulation. She teaches to both academic and professional audiences. Her main interests are theories of adult learning and training, training design, simulation, and occupational activity analysis. In 2018, she obtained a research fellowship from the French National Institute for Research in Digital Science and Technology to contribute to a research and development programme on simulation training at the University of Santiago, Chile.

# An Introduction to Simulation Training Through the Lens of Experience and Activity Analysis



Simon Flandin, Christine Vidal-Gomel, and Raquel Becerril Ortega

**Abstract:** This opening chapter offers an overview of the conditions under which experience and activity can be fruitful objects for examining what occurs in simulation training, understanding participants' learning and development processes, and deriving robust design principles. It is argued that this approach is particularly useful in the field of simulation training, especially when achieving high standards of operational performance is complicated by critical issues (health, safety, security, protection, etc.) and difficult working environments (dynamic, uncertain, high-risk, etc.). We show that this approach is able to integrate authentic, embodied, and embedded practice experiences with domain-related or cross-cutting learning content. We also provide key concepts that can guide readers in understanding how simulation-enhanced learning and development processes are studied and how the different ways of enabling trainees to construct usable knowledge in verisimilar contexts are derived from these studies. The organization of the book sections and chapters are then presented. In sum, this opening chapter introduces the purpose of the book, explains why the research presented here fills an important knowledge gap, and suggests ways that readers might profitably engage with its contents.

**Keywords** Simulation training · Vocational training · Training design · Experience · Activity analysis · Ergonomics

---

S. Flandin (✉)

Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Geneva, Geneva, Switzerland

e-mail: [simon.flandin@unige.ch](mailto:simon.flandin@unige.ch)

C. Vidal-Gomel

Centre de Recherches en Education de Nantes, University of Nantes, Nantes, France

e-mail: [christine.vidal-gomel@univ-nantes.fr](mailto:christine.vidal-gomel@univ-nantes.fr)

R. B. Ortega

Centre Interuniversitaire de Recherche en Éducation de Lille, University of Lille & INRIA [French National Institute for Research in Digital Science and Technology], Lille, France

e-mail: [raquel.becerril-ortega@univ-lille.fr](mailto:raquel.becerril-ortega@univ-lille.fr)

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature

Switzerland AG 2022

S. Flandin et al. (eds.), *Simulation Training through the Lens of Experience and Activity Analysis*, Professional and Practice-based Learning 30,

[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89567-9\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89567-9_1)

# 1 Addressing Major Contemporary Challenges for Vocational Education and Training Through Research-Informed Simulation Practice

In today's world, professionals everywhere are facing rapid and massive technical, social, economic, and organizational changes. The domain of vocational education and training has been impacted, and it is now facing new challenges, with the expectation that it will promote approaches based on good/evidence-based practices and respond to growing demands for training in nontechnical/transversal/soft skills (e.g., leadership, communication, situation awareness, stress management) and the imperative of improved performances in the short term. Simulation training is a highly rated means to quickly reach very specific professional learning objectives. But often and overall, simulation training programs seem to struggle to obtain satisfying, long-lasting, and measurable outcomes. It might be assumed that the main reason for this is that, in these programs, the complex human factors of performance tend to disintegrate into skills that are "extracted" from work for organizational purposes. Yet, although human factors are much more "manageable" as skills units, it then becomes very difficult to "reunify" the skills units into a balanced professionalism.

Nevertheless, dividing professionalism into skills units is an increasingly common way of sequencing what needs to be developed and trained for among professionals. The most common division currently distinguishes the technical skills that relate to a specific type of work and the nontechnical skills that relate to work in general, a professional field, and even all professions. This division has certain advantages for managing, without which it would not have established itself in the cultures of human resources, management, and *education and training*. The popularity of the concept of nontechnical skills/soft skills and its now widespread use in work and training organizations is no coincidence either. By providing a conceptual basis and vocabulary, it fits into a much broader trend that has become essential in the contemporary world of work: the specialization of professional functions. Yet, this trend can be harmful when it generates two deviations in particular. The first is when nontechnical skills become disarticulated from technical skills, as this makes it difficult for professionals to develop the capacity to intervene in ways that integrate all the components of real work. The second is when skills become artificialized, which occurs when the situational anchoring has been forgotten and the risk is thus high that the skills become meaningless.

The specialization of professional functions can nevertheless be beneficial when it facilitates the pooling of advances produced in professional fields showing strong similarities, such as in the fields covered in this book: health care, victim rescue, and civil protection. This pooling can contribute to both enhanced performances and improved ways to help professionals achieve better performances, in particular through *vocational education and training*.

It is important to bear in mind that when skills are considered transversally and are not specific to a type of work, they are difficult to define, operationalize, and

evaluate, and these are crucial tasks of training design and implementation. Defining training objectives in ways that go beyond the classic domain-related approaches is necessary to draw on the cross-cutting principles for training design. However, definition is difficult because if it is too general, the instructional value remains low, and if it is too specific, the cross-cutting outcomes may not be achieved.

How can contemporary organizational and vocational expectations be met without losing instructional ambition? Given that simulation training is a suitable framework for situated, embodied, and embedded experimentation, we are convinced that this type of training has much to offer. The research on simulation training to date has nevertheless mainly focused on understanding performance improvements in very compartmented domains of skills or professions. Educational approaches that focus on experience, activity, learning, development, and practice changes do not appear to be sufficiently integrated. A particular problem is that the research evidence often remains domain-related (medical health care, fire rescue, civil protection, police intervention, military missions, etc.) and offers simulation trainers very few robust inputs to build programs oriented by cross-cutting principles, even though these professional domains share very similar issues and challenges.

The aim of this book is to present a comprehensive account of the various ways in which the analysis of experience and activity in the context of simulation training (i) helps identify learning affordances and obstacles and provides a detailed description of the learning process and outcomes, (ii) points toward promising design orientations for simulation-based vocational education and training, and (iii) contributes to the overall understanding of practice-based professional learning. Accordingly, the objectives of the book are:

- To describe and discuss the theoretical, methodological, and/or practical issues related to trainees' experiences and activities in simulation training
- To provide evidence of how the conditions under which lived experience in simulation can foster or hinder learning
- To identify the conceptual bases and empirical applications and implications of this approach to learning through simulation-based experimentation
- To contribute to both domain-related and generic orientations for simulation design

Herein, we thus present the research on various simulation training programs in the domains of health care, victim rescue, and population protection, involving healthcare workers (5 chapters), firemen (2 chapters), policemen (2 chapters), servicemen (2 chapters), and civil security leaders (1 chapter).

This opening chapter offers an overview of the conditions under which experience and activity can be fruitful objects for examining what occurs in simulation training, understanding participants' learning and development processes, and deriving robust design principles. It is argued that this approach is particularly useful in the field of simulation training, especially when achieving high standards of operational performance is complicated by critical issues (health, safety, security, protection, etc.) and difficult working environments (dynamic, uncertain, high risk, etc.). We show that this approach is able to integrate authentic, embodied, and

embedded practice experiences with domain-related or cross-cutting learning content. We also provide key concepts that can guide readers in understanding how simulation-enhanced learning and development processes are studied and how the different ways of enabling trainees to construct usable knowledge in verisimilar contexts are derived from these studies. The organization of the book sections and chapters is then presented. In sum, this opening chapter introduces the purpose of the book, explains why the research presented here fills an important knowledge gap, and suggests ways that readers might profitably engage with its contents.

## **2 Theoretical Background: A Francophone Research Tradition in Cognitive Ergonomics and Vocational Education and Training**

### ***2.1 Cognitive Ergonomics and Educational Research Traditions in Simulation Training***

The chapters of this book present studies at the interface of several research traditions, notably cognitive ergonomics and “the ergonomics of activity.” Since the 1980s, cognitive ergonomics has focused on the design and improvement of “information technologies” – and more recently on digital resources – by including training in its line of research questions, whereas the ergonomics of activity has been integrated into the sciences of education and training. Much of the research presented here has drawn on these two traditions in particular and sought to contribute to a deeper understanding of simulation as a support for the development of what Chernikova, Heitzmann, Stadler, Holzberger and Seidel (2020) call “complex skills”: “Critical thinking, problem solving, communication, and collaboration seem to be the most relevant skills<sup>1</sup> that [...] should [be acquired], in addition to domain-specific knowledge and skills, to be able to make professional decisions and implement solutions” (op. cit., p. 501). However, unlike these authors, the researchers presented here are not necessarily concerned with initial training or higher education. The studies often focus on a set of professionals from different fields and with different levels of initial training who nevertheless all need to acquire and develop complex skills in order to perform quality work in every day or more exceptional situations.

Simulation training experienced a real boom in the twentieth century with the development of computing resources, computers, and digital technology (Rosen, 2013). Cognitive ergonomics, which first emerged in the 1950s, has been interested in simulation since the 1960s, mainly conducting studies in the fields of the military, nuclear power plants, and maintenance tasks (Patrick, 1992). In the 1980s, with the

---

<sup>1</sup>The notion of skill is used here to highlight the characteristics of the tasks to be performed, and this usage is different from that found later in this introduction.

spread of new computing tools, simulation training expanded to other industrial and at-risk fields (Norros, 1989). During this period, the research focused on the design and improvement of simulators and simulations for teaching, certification, and training. The validity and reliability of the simulators and simulation situations in comparison with “real work” situations have been widely debated, and these issues continue to receive attention (e.g., Drews & Bakdash, 2013; Persson, 2017). At the same time, the research carried out in the sciences of education and training in French-speaking countries since the mid-1990s has tended to focus on the professions of service relations (education and training, health care, etc.) in which the interventions relate to another human (particularly with education, development, and health objectives). In these professional sectors, the contributions of digital technology are more recent than in industry, and some have touted digital resources for training as the means to achieve major improvements. These arguments recall those that Leplat (1989) and Patrick (1992) pointed to concerning other major contributions that were expected to improve the world of work, when in fact some indeed made real contributions and some were revealed to be limited and/or “naive.”

In the 1990s, the debates began to move in other directions. For example, some focused on the interest and limitations of microworlds designed for *in vitro* experiments (Brehmer & Dörner, 1993). These works underscored the complexity of fidelity: Microworlds are artificial situations that are not faithful to “natural” situations, although they retain certain features. Two types of problems were thus raised: that of ecological validity, which can be defined as “the possibility to generalize the conclusion obtained by the study of an artificial situation to a class of natural situation” (Hoc, 2001, p. 284), and that of fidelity. Physical fidelity, or the resemblance to reality (Patrick, 1992), is differentiated from functional fidelity, or “the degree to which a simulator acts like the real equipment” (Grau et al., 1998, p. 370), and from “psychological fidelity,” which refers to the determination of the psychological dimensions mobilized in the simulated situation that are hypothesized to be equivalent to those at work in a “natural” situation (Baker & Marshall, 1989; Patrick, 1992). Patrick reformulated it in these terms: “The simulation has to represent the task to the trainee in such a way that the psychological or skill requirements of the task are not changed significantly. The trainee should have to deploy the same cognitive activities in performing the simulated task as the actual task” (1992, p. 495). It has thus been well established that physical fidelity is not necessary when the objective of training is the acquisition of procedures or the mastery of tasks for which the cognitive dimensions of the activity are important.

Rogalski (1995) suggested that these problems might be better understood and even resolved by analyzing the tasks to be performed at a cognitive and conceptual level and by modeling the development of professional skills<sup>2</sup> (the KEOPS model). This implies designing simulation situations while retaining or transforming “task

---

<sup>2</sup>The notion of professional competence used in French, which is often translated by the term “skill” in English, refers to the dimensions of activity mobilized to carry out tasks, to accomplish a mission. Bainbridge and Ruiz Quintanilla (1989) discussed the different meanings of the term skill in English and French cognitive ergonomics.



functionalities” for a learning and development objective. “The term task functionality refers, on the one hand, to the properties of the deep structure of the task, involving cognitive requirements, and, on the other hand, to the properties of what is often seen as context which are in fact closely tied to the task and have strong effects on operators’ behavior when performing a task” (op. cit., p. 127). From this perspective, the model takes into account the situational and organizational characteristics that affect activity and require the development of specific skills by individuals and groups in order to achieve mastery of these situations and obtain the desired results.

## ***2.2 Simulation Training Through the Lens of Experience and Activity***

The debates on validity and fidelity have continued with one example being in the health sector, which tends to favor high-fidelity simulations, thus creating confusion between fidelity and its many components and the “reproduction of the real.” In the research world, authors like Persson (2017) and Hamstra, Brydges, and Hatala et al. (2014) have suggested dropping the term “fidelity.” Persson (op. cit.) pointed out that this term tends to center the debate on technological advances and a resemblance to “real” situations, rather than on the relevance of simulation for learning. Béguin and Pastré (2002) suggested going beyond questions of validity and fidelity in exploring the functions of the simulated situation by putting the focus on trainees’ activity and the meanings that the simulation takes on for them. This viewpoint is quite close to that of Rogalski (op. cit.) in that it emphasizes the importance of how trainees interpret a situation, and it may be an important dimension of the skills that need to be acquired.

During this period, the issues surrounding simulations for professional training came to the attention of researchers working within the cognitive ergonomic framework (i) regarding the characterization of expertise and “skills” and the development and learning processes, as in Bainbridge and Ruiz Quintanilla’s book (1995) titled “Developing skills with information technology,” and (ii) from a training perspective, as in Patrick’s (1992) work: “Training: Research and practice.” Along the same lines, Hoc, Cacciabue, and Hollnagel’s book (1995) included a section of four chapters that focused on characterizing expertise and its consequences for training, skill development through simulation, and the limits of operational knowledge acquired on the job and by transmission within a group of peers, as well as how it can be completed through training.

This type of research has intensified in high-risk sectors. As studies have highlighted the importance of collective functioning to ensure the efficiency and safety of work systems, this theme has also emerged in research on the use of simulation in training (Salas & Cannon-Bowers, 2001; Salas et al., 2012). In the 2000s, training simulations developed beyond these professional environments in response to

societal demands, notably in healthcare environments where such rules as “never for the first time on a patient” are unquestioned. They also proliferated because the costs of simulation devices have decreased with technological advances (web 2.0, etc.). Yet, despite this growing body of research, it is regrettable that certain aspects of training simulations, such as the activity of trainers – who are crucial to training effectiveness – have been little explored, with few exceptions (Rogalski et al., 2002).

In the 1990s, the education and training sciences of the French-speaking world seized upon a set of theoretical frameworks that mobilized the concept of activity. Fillietaz and Billet (2015) gave a detailed account of this period. Thus, alongside the work in cognitive ergonomics, aspects of which we have noted because of their contributions to simulation training, other orientations developed. This particularly concerned the research carried out from the “ergonomics of activity”<sup>3</sup> perspective, whose researchers have been critical of cognitive psychology, as have “course-of-action” researchers (Durant & Poizat, 2015). These two approaches to “human factors,” for example, can be distinguished from the traditional approaches by the place given to the concept of activity and the systemic point of view that is defended (Daniellou, 2005; Rabardel & Daniellou, 2005; Vidal-Gomel et al., 2019).

Thus, Durand and Poizat (op. cit., p. 223) specified the framework of the “course of action,” which defines activity as “what a given actor does as a living, cultural and reflexive unit engaged in a social practice (in this case, work). A here-and-now activity refers to a time point or state in the history of dynamic exchanges between this living unit and its environment.” This approach integrates contributions from Maturana (1988), particularly by taking into account “the living unit as autopoietic,” which means that the unit of analysis is defined as a unit–environment coupling. The definition of coupling within this research stream differs markedly from that of other approaches to activity: “Activity is, thus, taken to be the set of ongoing interactions of a living unit and its environment, and it is further assumed that these interactions produce the very structure of this unit and its environment and are in no way the mere response of a predetermined unit reacting to stimuli or adapting to constraints from a world that is itself predetermined. During these interactions, the unit and its environment are in a relationship of co-definition. They define each other. But, this co-definition is asymmetric in that only the living unit specifies what in the environment is meaningful for it (and not the reverse)” (op. cit., p. 226).

Other researchers working within the framework of the ergonomics of activity are closer to the community conducting research based on Russian psychology. The cultural–historical activity theory (CHAT) of Leontiev (1978) and Vygotsky (1934/1978) presents some of the best-known ideas from Russian psychology. Engeström’s model (1987), which was built on an interpretation of CHAT, has been widely disseminated. However, other models, such as the model of Norros (2005, 2014), are less well-known, as are a range of other studies based on Russian psychology (Daniellou & Rabardel, 2005). It is notable that the ergonomics of activity

---

<sup>3</sup>Many authors use the term “French-speaking ergonomists” to designate this line of research. In order to avoid overlooking a large part of our colleagues who contribute and enrich this approach, we prefer the term “ergonomics of activity.”

community and the community that has drawn on Russian psychology and its developments continue to interact in events organized regularly for the triennial Congress of the International Ergonomics Association. They are identified under the title “Activity theory for work analysis and design.”

In a historical analysis of the development of activity ergonomics, Daniellou (2005) noted how the translation of Leontiev’s work into French in 1975 influenced researchers in what was not yet called “the ergonomics of activity.” He explained how the concept of activity was incorporated into research that mobilized “psychological analyses of work,” replacing the concept of “conduct” that had been used up to that point. In this regard, Daniellou quotes Leplat and Cuny (1977, in Daniellou, *op. cit.*, p. 411): “the central object of psychological analysis is the worker’s conduct or in other words, the human operator’s conduct. We will sometimes use the word ‘activity’ as being synonymous with conduct. (...) When analyzing work, we must differentiate the analysis of conduct from the analysis of the requirements or conditions to which this conduct is subjected and to which it replies.” This quotation is striking for underlining the reconciliation of the viewpoints of the two communities. Daniellou and Rabardel (2005, p. 355) also recalled a set of viewpoints shared by the ergonomics of activity and Russian psychology-based research on the subject of activity, which we recall here very schematically:

- “Activity is finalized. Activity is object-oriented in order to attain one or more goals, which are not always evident, and which the analyst may have trouble identifying.
- The relation between the subject and object is mediated by technical devices, psychological schemes and organization [...] These activity mediators are socially and culturally constructed as well as historically situated.
- Activity is always unique. It is specific to given subjects in a given context [...].
- Activity bears traces of its past. Activity [...] is affected by the subject’s life experience and is, thus, constantly revised and reinvested [...].
- Activity is not only a relationship between a subject and an object. It is also a relationship with other subjects, who may be physically present or present via instruments and tools, sign systems [...].
- The analyst’s approach to activity is intrinsic: he/she seeks to understand ‘from within’ how the subject constructs his/her activity to attain the object, given the resources and constraints at their disposal [...].
- Activity is integrational. It is constructed at the crossroads of the subject’s motives and goals [...] and several determinants, which may be clearly connected to the workstation layout or apparently unrelated (the subject’s history, the company’s sales policy).”

One of the peculiarities of Francophone ergonomics is precisely its interest in these determinants from a systemic approach, that is, “the point of view that is adopted to jointly take into account a set of dimensions of human activity (biological, psychological, cognitive, social) and that also seeks to highlight a set of determinants of operators’ activity, depending on the problem addressed” (Vidal-Gomel et al., 2019, p. 234). Leplat’s model (1997), which is shared by many researchers in

the ergonomics of activity (Daniellou, 2005), provides a framework for such an analysis. It differentiates:

- The factors that determine activity (characteristics of workers, means of work and tasks)
- The characteristics of the activity in the situations being analyzed
- The effects (in terms of health or skill development) and results (in terms of productive efficiency)
- Last, given the dynamics of the situated action in the short, medium, or longer term, the effects that transform the determining factors in a transitory or more lasting way

This approach has been widely used in the field of professional training, highlighting, for example, (i) the interest of not limiting the scope of activity analysis to the work activities to be trained for; (ii) the need to take into account the work activities of both trainers and trainees and, in some situations, colleagues that are not directly concerned but will have to help new entrants; (iii) the interest of an approach that seeks to understand work situations rather than only the tasks that must be mastered by the end of a training program; and (iv) the importance of subjective engagement at work (Vidal-Gomel et al., op. cit.).

Professional didactics is an heir to both cognitive ergonomics and the ergonomics of activity with regard to understanding work, as well as to a theory of adult cognitive development that considers “conceptualization in action” (Vergnaud, 2009) and seeks to develop a pedagogy of situations for training (Mayen, 2015; Tourmen et al., 2017).

These currents of thought, all based on the concept of activity but sometimes approaching it from different angles, run through this book to varying degrees. We would like to point out that they also share a number of epistemological, theoretical, and methodological orientations. We note the following points:

- The actual work (as it is performed in the situation) is differentiated from the work prescribed by those who order its execution orally or via job descriptions.
- The work expected and planned for by the work organization or the workers themselves is different from the actual work.
- Analyzing work cannot be reduced to analyzing the tasks that need to be done. The analysis must take into account the results of the work (results prescribed, expected, and recognized in the company or institution, as well as the various viewpoints on the results) and the consequences for individuals, collectives, and the work organization. Also, the analysis takes on its full meaning only with the analysis of activity, which starts from the situated action of an individual or a group and is apprehended through its dynamics as the situation unfolds (action carried out or action prevented).
- The activity is understood to depend jointly on the characteristics of the situation and those of the individual.
- Primacy is given to the analysis of in vivo activity and the ecological validity of the results.

- Intervention is an important dimension of the research carried out using these approaches: The research aims to transform work and training environments with the objective of developing the actors.

Among the viewpoints shared by these schools of thought, some relate more specifically to professional training. In particular, it is acknowledged that scientific and technical knowledge is necessary but insufficient to perform work, and it must therefore be supplemented by knowledge about action based on professional experience to ensure optimal preparation for work: “the operator’s knowledge comes from basic education, training, and direct experience in working with the system. Through basic education, the operator learns the physical laws underlying the process, the principles of functioning for the components, and the principles that govern the behavior of complex systems. It is, however, only through training and experience that the operator becomes acquainted with how the plant or the process conducts itself in normal and abnormal conditions” (Hoc et al., 1995, p. 13).

When the initial training involves many years devoted to knowledge acquisition (typically higher education), the confrontation with professional situations or simulation situations leads to a restructuring of this knowledge, as well as its articulation with the characteristics of the encountered situations and the knowledge acquired in the course of processing these situations. Thus, Boshuizen and Schmidt (Schmidt et al., 1988; Boshuizen et al., 1995; Van de Wiel et al., 2000) focused on the initial training of doctors and showed that as doctors acquire experience with the situation of dealing with clinical cases, they develop concepts that encapsulate the theoretical knowledge that they have acquired thus far: “the networks of biomedical knowledge acquired in initial training are included in higher-level clinical concepts,” which means that “the networks of knowledge about the pathophysiological mechanisms linking the causes and consequences of a disease are ‘captured’ [i.e., encapsulated] by clinical concepts” drawn from situated action (Van de Wiel et al., 2000, p. 328). Biomedical knowledge is mobilized when the clinical knowledge is insufficient, and for students with little or no experience, this is often the case, while for more experienced physicians it only occurs in rare or complex situations. Pastré (2005) made a similar observation by examining the activity of engineers learning to operate a nuclear power plant on a simulator after high-level scientific and technical training. He hypothesized that during training on simulators, a “semantics of action” is constituted in the confrontation with the situation. This semantics articulates the indices present in the situation and the concepts (scientific and technical or resulting from action in a simulated situation and interactions with peers) that give them meaning and allow for an interpretation of the situation – and ultimately the categorization of situations. Thus, categories of problems and situations are developed in a process he calls “pragmatization,” wherein theoretical concepts are transformed.

However, such processes do not emphasize the variety and the diversity of knowledge necessary for the work, but rather on central invariant dimensions of these knowledge. A part of this knowledge includes knowledge of particular cases and different types of experience of dealing with risk and the unforeseen events that

punctuate the daily job or constitute exceptional situations – even “crisis situations.” In fact, the types of training that interest us here are non-curricular.

### ***2.3 Applications to Health Care, Victim Rescue, and Population Protection***

Based on this common grounding, the book chapters focus on the use of simulation in training in several areas of activity, particularly the management of typical, deteriorating, or even critical situations in contexts of health and safety. These are areas in which simulation is a necessity because it is impossible and/or unacceptable to learn on the job. It is impossible because of the rarity of crises or disasters and unacceptable because of the risks involved for the professionals and those they serve.

These domains of intervention are all “dynamic environments: It is characteristic of a dynamic system that it may evolve without operator intervention. Thus, even if the operator does not interact with the system, for instance, when he is trying to diagnose or plan, the state of the system may change” (Hoc et al., 1995, p. 4). The situation variables may change at different tempos, and their effects may intersect at possibly different moments. The sequences of reasoning required to understand what is happening and to act may thus progress through “several steps.”

The characteristics of such work situations have consequences for the skills that need to be acquired: “Working with a dynamic system not only means that time may be limited, but it also means that the mental representation of the system must be continuously updated. The choice of a specific action is based on the operator’s understanding of the current state of the system and the expectations of what the action will accomplish. If the understanding is incomplete or incorrect, the actions may fail to achieve their purpose” (op. cit., p. 5).

Among these dynamic work situations, some can immediately be qualified as “crisis management” situations, whereas others drift toward crisis – that is, “an event, in general unexpected, whose consequences may develop with very rapid dynamics, producing significant risks that exceed the pre-existing resources in terms of action procedures” (Rogalski, 2004, p. 531). We might underline that crises have serious consequences. They create “significant and widespread human, material, economic and or environmental losses that exceed the ability of the affected community or society to cope within its own resources [...] The development of events following the sudden onset is so rapid that it exceeds the ability to respond [...] Events often develop in unexpected directions, thus challenging the readiness and resources of the responding organizations” (Hollnagel, 2012<sup>4</sup>).

Crises thus pose recurring problems, but the shift into crisis cannot be analyzed in the same way across these fields of activity: “disasters are ‘normal’ in the activity of firefighters, which is not the case for most other systems. Therefore, a variety of

---

<sup>4</sup>Unpaged document.

resources are already associated with different types of disasters, the organization of which (actors and resources) has been extensively planned for [...] The difference in disaster management by emergency service actors is the relocation of system functions and the overwhelming of pre-existing resources” (Rogalski, 2004, p. 531).

Yet, there are also substantial points in common for these areas of intervention that justify our choice to have brought them together in this book: All these professionals have to deal with risky situations that are not always predictable, despite the planning efforts of their respective professional communities. Thus, in disaster management or at another scale of crisis management, the appropriate response to the situation rarely comes from the application of standardized procedures. They must be at the very least adjusted to the situation, which requires the operators to have a detailed understanding of the situation and the procedures in question. In the field of health care with relationships with patients and caregiving, “care” itself cannot be reduced to techniques and procedures that can be applied systematically. Thus, training is not merely a matter of imitation or reproduction. These are, of course, usable training methods, but they must lead to understanding, the construction of meaning, and conceptualization on individual and collective levels. Moreover, these areas are all affected by uncertainty and surprise, which are therefore important characteristics that operators must be prepared for through training.

These are interesting areas for professional training because learning in these contexts is difficult: It is difficult to relate an action that has been carried out to its effects on the situation, especially with the rapid changes in dynamics and entangled variables; it is impossible to go back and learn by repetition; and it is necessary to anticipate (which constitutes one of the difficulties of beginners) in a situation that is uncertain, poses multiple risks, cannot be fully understood, and presents phenomena that may never before been encountered. Indeed, we do not have sufficient scientific models for these contexts, which also underlines the importance of experiential knowledge even though these fields can be very codified, standardized, and procedural, sometimes leaving little room for the actor’s experience.

Focusing attention on “fields of activity” can contribute to the construction of knowledge about the characteristics of situations and of the activity in these situations, which can facilitate the identification of relevant training situations. Fields of activity in fact call upon sets of activities, objects, and tasks, which, at a certain level, can be defined as characteristics, as having common traits (Rabardel & Samurçay, 2004). Thus, we know that the control of dynamic environments, which are characteristic of these situations, requires anticipation, a characteristic of activity. Activity cannot be reduced to this trait, but it encompasses it. Therefore, characterizing fields of activity can help guide the design of simulation situations.

From this perspective, the jobs of firefighters, police officers, and healthcare professionals fall within fields of activity that differ in terms of the objectives they pursue, the resources they can access, and the organization of the work and value systems.

In these fields, however, although scientific and technical knowledge is necessary, it is insufficient to produce quality work. Knowledge is not always well stabilized, and the knowledge that professionals acquire over the course of their

experience often remains implicit, poorly understood, and little disseminated and discussed. The contributions of the professional community can therefore be important, although they often need to be discussed and debated to identify their limits. The contributions for training can then be distributed among peers and trainers who may differ in their opinions, particularly because there is rarely a single good response to a situation but rather a set of acceptable solutions, which need to be evaluated according to different types of criteria. In the field of health care and crisis management, it may be a question of stabilizing the situation by limiting the consequences of risks according to the resources that are available at time “t.” A debriefing can then provide opportunities for debate to examine the chosen solutions and identify their advantages and limitations (Mollo & Nascimento, 2014). Last, in these fields, the experience acquired by the professionals is not always sufficient as they may need to be prepared for new situations: The interest of simulation is precisely that it offers “the possibility of extrapolating and creating a knowledge base starting from bounded experience” (Hoc et al., 1995, p. 13).

In any case, trainees are not considered as having “received” knowledge transmitted by trainers. Simulation situations are designed to give trainees experience, letting them live an experience that can then be analyzed individually and collectively after the fact. This kind of a posteriori analysis, removed from the heat of the moment, is an opportunity for professional development.

The training simulations presented in this book also suggest a set of ethical questions: Is it acceptable to put professionals in difficulty in front of their colleagues? How far can they be pushed to confront difficult and stressful situations? What are the consequences for them?

### **3 Simulation Training as a Controlled Space for Experimentation in Practice-Based Learning**

Simulations grew out of the demand from work organizations to take real activity into account in training situations (Ughetto et al., 2018) by giving individuals the possibility of experiencing or reliving past or current situations (realized or not) and future situations in order to think or rethink more productively about them and better act in them (Bobillier Chaumon et al., 2018). Simulations can be understood as putting activity into perspective, leading to a form of detachment from reality. In this book, simulation is considered a pedagogical and didactic approach to promote experimentation in training that can be configured in different ways, depending on the objectives noted in the research presented in each chapter.



### 3.1 *Simulation, an Educational Process*

The history of simulation as a method of acquiring professional skills (Singh et al., 2013) sheds light on this educational issue. Simulation training drew inspiration from simulations in avionics safety systems and military training, which were then transposed to other professional systems, such as health care (Rosen, 2013) or civil security. Simulations in avionics focus on error and action and prevention strategies, with a pedagogical corollary being to “do the experiment without causing damage”: without physical damage to self and others, without material damage, and thus without ecological damage. In the military, the simulation tradition aims to make the combat experience more up-close and intimate in order to build the military experience needed for success in theaters of operation (Hill & Tolk, 2017). Here, simulations are used to develop and test action protocols and train soldiers to implement them.

Thus, this educational approach places the person “in a situation” *to experiment* in order to learn or question practices. It is based on experimentation with ordinary, complex, and even critical situations. Different educational configurations can be used, depending on the knowledge targeted, the trainees qualities, the objectives to be achieved (learning, assessment, certification), the technologies available, etc.

On the assumption that experimentation is a continuous elaboration of experience, two cognitive dispositions can be mobilized according to different temporalities. First, regarding the immediacy of action, experimentation is understood as a reworking of the experience *in situ*. This occurs, for example, when a professional in the situation constructs guiding and corrective hypotheses related to action strategies, depending on the context. Second, with regard to long-term experience as a reservoir of available actions inscribed in the biographical or life story, actions are geared toward the success of a project. Experimentation, here understood as a sifting through of experience, is activated to face new situations, thereby contributing to the anticipation and management of future problems.

### 3.2 *Simulation, a Didactic Approach*

The history of simulation also teaches us that its development goes hand in hand with the new possibilities offered by simulators (Rosen, 2013), which are the technical support for simulations (Vadcard, 2022). In the military field, for example, board games were used to develop strategies, then life-size simulations were used to train soldiers (Hill & Tolk, 2017). In the field of medicine, simulation methods can be supported by biological equipment, as in animal experimentation, cadaver use, standardized patients, role plays, etc.; synthetic equipment, like patient or procedural simulators; and electronic equipment, like virtual or augmented reality and 3D environments (Betz et al., 2014).

Thus, beyond the representativeness and fidelity of the simulation to the situation it represents, the didactic approach is concerned with the design of the training situation. Simulators support preconceived simulation situations, most of which are designed from real field situations (military, aviation, clinical cases, etc.). These simulation situations are part of the training system or meet a specific training need. An epistemological vigilance that is specific to this didactic approach consists in identifying the technical constraints that the simulator imposes on the simulation – for example, by limiting the possible actions – and by doing so, it identifies the possibilities of developing new knowledge and skills. This epistemological vigilance also consists in controlling the epistemic network mobilized during the simulation, and not only that of the representation provided by the simulator from the start. Thus, the technical constraints and possibilities of simulations constitute one dimension among others, largely influenced, moreover, by the knowledge and skills brought into play by the trainees and trainers.

Simulation as a didactic approach offers a space for experimentation to elaborate or re-elaborate knowledge. It assumes the elaboration of knowledge from action – on the assumption that this elaboration results in novelty compared to the state of knowledge previously available – and the gradual stabilization of a repertoire of action structures to act effectively and deal with the unforeseen – which presupposes adaptation to the context.

### ***3.3 Simulation, a Controlled Experimentation Space***

In this book, simulation is seen as part of a constructivist perspective on learning, heir to major trends in the psychology of learning and development (Piaget, 1947). It has been grouped by some under the term experiential learning (Yardley et al., 2012), which also includes Vygotsky's socioconstructivist perspective. Dewey, for example, argued that experience implies a connection between the action and its consequence for the subject: if the active phase, action, is separated from the passive phase of experience, the reflection carried on about this action, real meaning is destroyed (Dewey, 1934, p. 298). For Piaget (1947), on the other hand, experience is not a primary fact: it must be organized by the subject and presupposes an activity. It is therefore quite different from a system of exogenous associations. Any experience is an experiment in the sense of the subject's organization of a question posed to nature or a situation in which he or she is engaged, which must respond with yes or no. Experimentation is active and cannot be reduced to experience in the ordinary sense of everyday experience – that is, simple perceptual contact with events taking place in the external environment.

Simulation, as an educational and didactic process, is constituted as a controlled space for experimentation: experimentation with risks, unforeseen events, or the vagaries of new or known situations, in the aim of elaborating or re-elaborating knowledge. Simulation helps to define the dimensions of a context of anticipation and freedom, so that this context can be assumed by professionals during training.

## 4 Introducing the Contributions to Simulation Training

The contributors to this book have empirically or conceptually analyzed the characteristics and effects of simulation training programs, mainly in the dimensions of the activity deployed and/or the experience lived by the trainees, as explained above. Doing so has enabled them to evaluate the design principles that might fruitfully be generalized and/or to improve their effectiveness for both trainers and trainees. These simulation systems involve one or more categories of professionals in the fields of health care, victim rescue, or civil protection, and are all finalized by the improvement of performance, defined through a wide spectrum of generic factors (e.g., crisis management) or factors specific to the field of practice (e.g., a technical nursing act).

The contributions bring together:

- Empirical reports based on the study of programs either designed by the researchers or identified in the field as having characteristics of particular interest (innovative goals, original principles, unprecedented attempts, etc.)
- Conceptual reports based on the analysis of current trends and research results in simulation, underlining and criticizing, promoting, and/or deriving new keys for comprehension or new design principles

This broad scope of analysis has resulted in chapters that describe, analyze, critique, and contribute to improving a vast set of simulation practices in the fields of health care, victim rescue, and population protection and that more broadly offer insights into professional learning by practice in simulation training.

The book is structured into three sections.

### 4.1 *Experience- and Activity-Based Conceptualizations of Simulation Design and Outcomes*

This first section examines activity as unfolding and experience as meaningful lived episodes during contrasted simulation training situations. It contributes to a deeper understanding of simulation design (objectives, format, tasks, animation, perturbations, facilitation, etc.) and outcomes (from very specific technical gestures to wide and multidimensional dispositions).

#### 4.1.1 **Conceptual Contributions for the Design of Activity-Led Simulation Training**

The chapters of this subsection (2–4) provide insights from empirical and conceptual research about simulation training outcomes and design principles in the domains of health care and interprofessional management of civil safety.

Chapter “[Simulation-Based Learning for Technical Gestures in Health Care: What Kind of Experience Is Required?](#)”, authored by Lucile Vadcard, provides an analysis of simulation-based learning in medicine from a wide range of simulation practices, from mock-ups to virtual reality. In this chapter, she explains what type of experience is provided, depending on the learning objectives, and develops the example of technical gestures in surgery and the Socratic method. Vadcard (i) questions the taken-for-granted quest for realism in simulation, (ii) advocates for strong didactic principles to enable the development of the conceptualization processes needed for technical learning, and (iii) proposes a tool for the analysis and design of promising simulation situations.

In Chapter “[Four Lines of Analysis for Civil Security Crisis Simulations: Insights for Training Design](#)”, Simon Flandin also analyzes the conditions under which learning and development can occur through simulation. In his chapter, he describes how civil security leaders develop and reinforce dispositions to act efficiently during crisis management situations through the various features of interprofessional simulation training. Inductively deriving four dimensions for understanding and transforming individual and collective activity, Flandin contributes to the state of knowledge in the fields of collective performance in civil security crisis management and interprofessional simulation design.

This ambition to contribute to a conceptual renewal in the field of simulation training is shared by Zoya Horcik, who explains how a (re-)consideration of the situated cognition approach could prove fruitful for simulation in the medical field. Specifically, she defines three “missed appointments” between medical simulation and situated cognition. Chapter “[Renewing the Tools for Simulation-Based Training in Medical Education: How Situated Cognition Approaches Can Help Us?](#)” thus aims to encourage global reflection on the relationships between theoretical frameworks and design principles by analyzing the links between how learning is conceptualized and how simulation-based training programs are implemented.

#### **4.1.2 Insights from Design-Based Research in Simulation Training**

The chapters of the next subsection (5–7) provide design-based research accounts regarding three simulation programs: care gestures in health care, patient management in geriatrics, and “mass casualty event” management.

Chapter “[The Psychological Validity of Training Simulations: Analysis of a Simulation with Role-Playing Games to Experiment the Gesture of “Relational Touch”](#)”, authored by Christine Vidal-Gomel, addresses the notion of psychological validity by reflecting on the dimensions of work activity that are brought into play in simulation. In this chapter, she analyzes the activity of healthcare professionals in a simulation co-designed by the researcher and a trainer, finalized by the acquisition of a technical gesture: the gesture of “relational touch.” In doing so, Vidal-Gomel contributes to our understanding of the conditions under which simulation promotes the learning of “professional” gestures through practice, here seen (i) as the

“transformation of schemas” and (ii) through the lens of the subjective engagement of actors in situation and with their relationship to the profession.

Also in the field of health care, the research reported by Raquel Becerril Ortega and colleagues was aimed at developing a virtual simulation training tool for caregivers in geriatrics. Chapter “[Design Process for a Virtual Simulation Environment for Training Healthcare Professionals in Geriatrics](#)” thus describes the whole process of developing this tool, from identifying the training needs (through observations and interviews) to analyzing testers’ activity and the “figurations” produced through simulation training. This design-based research account explores innovative avenues for the design of virtual simulation tools addressing difficult healthcare challenges like communicating with patients with Alzheimer’s disease or other forms of dementia.

The last chapter in this subsection, from Vincent Boccara, Renauld Delmas, and Françoise Darses, is also part of the design-based research paradigm. In Chapter “[Ergo-Scripting in Activity-Based Training Design: An Illustration from the Design of a Virtual Environment](#)”, the authors thus promote a methodological approach they call “ergo-scripting.” This method is based on the argument that the design of learning scenarios must be supported by both ergonomic and didactic analyses of work. Boccara and his colleagues explain how to implement this approach and illustrate it through a concrete example: the design of a virtual training environment to train medical leaders as they acquire and develop the skills needed to cope with a mass casualty event (attack, external operation, etc.).

## ***4.2 Empirical Lessons from Experience- and Activity-Based Approaches to Simulation Training***

The second section is devoted to empirical accounts of the activity and experience of professionals through the study of work-as-done in simulation training programs. It informs the field of simulation with original and acute findings on professional engagement and performance in simulation training and offers relevant guidelines for simulation design.

### **4.2.1 Empirical Lessons from the Analysis of Trainees’ Activity in Simulation Training**

The chapters of this subsection (8–10) present activity studies of professionals’ actions, decisions, communications, interactions, and configurations as they deal with urgent and/or critical events (firemen and policemen).

Chapter “[Simulation to Experiment and Develop Risk Management in Exceptional Crisis Situations: The Case of the Casualty Extraction](#)”, authored by Laurie-Anna Dubois, Sylvie Vandestrade, and Agnès Van Daele, presents a study on

how firefighters belonging to a “Casualty Extraction Team” manage and learn to manage high risks in a simulated exceptional crisis situation (post-attack crisis). In this chapter, they analyze the activity of both the trainees and trainers in simulation from audio–video recordings. The relevance of the simulation training under study vis-à-vis the skills targeted for acquisition is assessed through the study of transformations in the trainees’ activity. The results contribute to the state of knowledge on preparing for the management of high-risk relief situations.

The second chapter in this subsection also analyzes the activity of firefighters during full-scale simulated rescue situations. Cyril Bossard, Yohann Cardin, Magali Prost, and Gilles Kermarrec studied the construction of collective meaning in intervention during an urban fire simulation. Using subjective video data and resituating interviews, the analysis presented in Chapter “[Analyzing the Collective Activity of Firefighters During Urban Fire Simulation](#)” allowed them to model six typical collective configurations. This contribution informs both the work of firefighters in this type of intervention and the design of simulation training likely to favor the processes of collective meaning construction, which is a crucial dimension of performance in this type of rescue.

The methods that use subjective video data and resituating interviews are particularly suited to very fine-grained analysis of the activity of professionals, particularly when they are engaged in very intense interventions. Sophie Le Bellu, Saadi Lahlou, Joshua M. Phelps, and Jan Aandal also used these methods in their documentation of the decision-making processes of police officers during training simulations. In Chapter “[Subjective Evidence-Based Ethnography: An Alternative to Debriefing for Large-Scale Simulation-Based Training?](#)”, they propose a method that can be used for both research purposes and training: subjective evidence-based ethnography. This method uses contextualized, constructed, and guided debriefings to make better use of the simulation situation, with benefits to learning and reflexivity for the trainees.

#### **4.2.2 Empirical Lessons from the Analysis of Trainees’ Lived Experience in Simulation Training**

The chapters of this subsection (11–13) present fine-grained explorations of the lived experience, concerns, sensemaking and situational dispositions of individual policemen, servicemen, and healthcare workers facing complex and potentially – physically and mentally – intense simulated occupational configurations.

Chapter “[A Study of Police Cadets’ Activity During Use-of-Force Simulation-Based Training: Empirical Lessons and Insights for Training Design](#)”, authored by Rachel Boembeke, Laurane De Carvalho, and Germain Poizat, examines the full-scale simulation training of police officers in intervention techniques and tactics. In this chapter, they document the lived experience of the trainees, particularly (i) their typical concerns, (ii) the nature of their involvement in the situation, and (iii) their methods of knowledge building. The analyses contribute to a better understanding