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DEBRIEFING
A Critical Reexamination of the
Postexperience Analytic Process with
Implications for Its Effective Use

LINDA COSTIGAN LEDERMAN
Rutgers University

Instructional simulations and games are a time-honored tradition in institutions of higher education. Their hallmark is their capacity to bring learning experiences with “real-world” counterparts into the classroom. Simulations and games allow students to learn about living in the real world within the structural confines of the classroom.

What distinguishes these activities from their real-world counterparts is that (1) they are operating models of reality rather than reality itself, and (2) they are followed in the classroom by analytic sessions, generally referred to as “debriefing sessions,” in which discussion centers on the learning to be derived from what has been experienced. Practitioners who use simulations and games are well aware that effective debriefing is critical to the learning experience. Often, too, they are aware that the instructional objectives and skills required for these sessions differ from those inherent in more traditional modes of instruction. Because little is written about handling these discussions, the problem for the practitioner is learning to guide them.

The purposes of this article are to discuss the postexperience analytic discussion process, to offer a conceptual framework for thinking about it, and to examine the roles taken by students and teachers in relation to one another.
A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR
THE POSTEXPERIENCE ANALYSIS:
The Cognitive Assimilation of Experience

The postexperience analysis that accompanies a simulation or game is commonly referred to as the "debriefing session." Prisoners of war in Korea, for example, were debriefed upon being freed so that their superiors could learn about their experiences. Initially, then, the term implied a connection between experience and a process of learning from that experience after it occurred, in a military context.

Although the early usage of the term "debriefing" was in this military context, in common parlance it came to be used simply to refer to the processing of an experience after the event, thereby deemphasizing the military nature of the experience. Business people used the term to refer to postpresentational sessions or postmeeting analysis; trainers used it to mean postexperience sessions following experienced-based training sessions. After the connotations of the word changed from strictly military, what remained was the implication that debriefing was something that occurred after the event, separate and apart, and, by implication, ancillary to the actual experience. It was viewed as the means for sorting out afterward what had happened during the experience; simply stated, it was a recollection of that experience for the purpose of learning from it.

In the experience-based learning (EBL) classroom, however, the postexperience discussion is not ancillary, nor is it designed as a simple reflection upon what occurred during the experience or the recounting of what occurred for the purpose of allowing those who did not participate (teachers) to learn from the experiences of those who did (students). The emphasis is on learning for those who went through the experience (students). During the experience, the emphasis is on the "doing," on engagement in the activity. In the postexperience discussion, the emphasis is upon what happened and the learning to be derived from what happened. It is this part of the process, central rather than ancillary, that distinguishes the experience-based learning class-
room from the experience of living one’s life outside the classroom: It is a structured, guided method for bringing meaning to the experience and for learning from that meaning. It involves talking about the experiences, analyzing them, evaluating them, and integrating them into one’s cognitive and conscious data base. It is the part of the process in which students reflect upon the experiences, and the implications of those experiences, for the world external to the classroom. It is the part of the process in which what is being created for students is a new way of seeing the world, of perceiving it and making sense of it. The instructor guides; students create for themselves, based on insights, and from this relate what they are seeing now to what they knew or thought before.

Viewed this way, it is inappropriate to label the postexperience discussion a simple debriefing session. Instead, it is a learning process in and of itself. Like other learning processes it involves adding to what one already knows. Those adding to their knowledge are the students; the teachers are there to help them learn from that experience.

In analyzing the experiences students have had, the instructor assists them in refining their knowledge based on their experiences in the simulation or game. As Boulding (1956: 81) points out, however, the problem with the word “knowledge” is that it sounds as if one is talking about something that is true and valid. In fact, much of what one learns is not necessarily “true,” in the objective sense of the word. Instead, as Boulding (1956: 3) says, it is a sort of subjective knowledge, a personalized, individual, and thus idiosyncratic way of knowing. It is, he says, more like an image of reality than an objective reality itself—an image as a way of seeing reality.

This is particularly true of what one learns experientially. Knowledge that is the product of experience is highly subjective; it is the product of the interaction between the individual and the experience. To the extent that no two individuals are ever completely alike, the knowledge one individual gains can never be identical with that subjectively experienced by another. An instructional film popular in communication classrooms, The
Eye of the Beholder, illustrates this principle graphically. Five people have experiences with Michael Gerrard and explain who he is based on those experiences. Five different images of Michael are presented, followed by a sixth, Michael's own interpretation of his behavior. In each instance, the image is a product of the individual's experience and perception based on that experience. Understandably, then, Michael's mother does not have the same image of Michael as does a taxi driver who takes him to work or, for that matter, a maitre d' who seats him in a restaurant. Michael's version of his behavior in interaction with each of these people is also different from their images of his behavior.

The images of reality that Boulding (1956) talks about are referred to by some as "cognitive maps" (Miller et al., 1960), or cognitions that guide the understanding of things people see and hear and do. As the experiences people have change, so, too, do their maps of reality, and the new maps they form guide them as they organize and reorganize, making sense of everything presented to their minds. Students, for example, who see the film mentioned above get an impression of Michael, based in part on the images presented of him by the characters in the film but, more important, based on their own cognitive maps of behavior. When they are presented with further data about Michael, data that support or contradict their earlier impressions, they are placed in the position of having their cognitive maps reaffirmed or reformed, thereby learning on the surface about Michael, but, in reality, about themselves and their own way of thinking. The same is true when they participate in instructional simulations and games. Engagement in the activity is the experience, experience guided by the cognitive maps with which they enter the experience. The consequences of that experience cause them to have those cognitions reaffirmed or reformed. For example, in playing the game Prisoner's Dilemma, the students who are trusting find themselves taken advantage of, and thereby are faced with a new way of thinking about themselves, the experience, and the other people in the game.

In the postexperience analysis, then, the new cognitive maps or images that have been created during the simulation or game
experience are examined and analyzed and, as a consequence, learning occurs. Rather than considering the process a simple debriefing, it is better depicted as the Cognitive Assimilation of Experience (Lederman, 1983), or that part of the methodology in which what the student has experienced is integrated into some cognitive comprehension. As Ruben (1983) has pointed out, instructors should make sure that students are able to articulate a cognitive understanding of the experiential activities in which they have engaged, rather than simply stating that the experiences “felt good,” if experience-based learning is to be pedagogically legitimate.

Reconceptualizing the postexperience analysis as the Cognitive Assimilation of Experience leads to implications in three important areas: (1) the nature of communication in the EBL classroom, (2) relationships between students and teachers, and (3) teaching competencies, strategies, and responsibilities. Each of these will be discussed in the sections that follow.

COMMUNICATION IN THE EXPERIENCE-BASED LEARNING CLASSROOM

From a communication perspective, receiver-centered communication, or communication viewed from the perspective of the processing of information by the receiver, transpires in the experience-based classroom during the cognitive assimilation of the experience. In older models of communication, the process was depicted in a linear fashion, with the emphasis on the sender, thereby being sender centered as a paradigm. As communication theory evolved, the linear paradigm became problematic in that anomalies presented themselves that the paradigm could not explain—anomalies such as the fairly consistent observation that the messages sent did not always equal the messages received. Interactive, nonlinear, receiver-centered ways of conceptualizing communication grew out of the need to explain away that anomaly. By centering on the receiver and the information-processing activities of the receiver, it became possible to explain
why different people presented with the same message could come away with different meanings and images of that message. The receiver orientation reflects Berlo's (1960) postulate that meanings are in people.

To some extent, then, EBL in the form of simulations and games, and the postanalytic processing of them, is an operationalization of the receiver-centered paradigm of communication: The student (information processor) is the focus; his or her message reception and the meanings he or she attaches to the messages in the form of experiences are the focal points of learning in the experience-based classroom. Just as the traditional classroom lecture is an operationalization of the linear paradigm of communication, with the teacher as sender and the process sender centered, the experience-based classroom activity puts into action the nonlinear, interactive, informative-processing notions of communication. In the traditional classroom, the measure of effectiveness of the sender is the amount and accuracy of information transferred to students, and oral and written examinations covering course content are as much a means of evaluating that effectiveness as they are measures of effectiveness in mastering the information presented. In the experience-based classroom these measures are questionable, for differences in processing information and arriving at meanings are part and parcel of any receiver-centered communication endeavor. This does not mean, however, that evaluation is impossible or irrelevant. It means that it is different and requires that the teacher actively assist the learners in developing their own analytic insights, their own abilities to evaluate and assess the veracity of the meanings they draw from their experiences, and the value and validity of the connections they make between the experience and the lessons they draw from it.

Thus, particularly in terms of evaluation and measurement of effectiveness of learning, the postexperience analytic process is critical to learning. It is in the postexperience discussion that the learning is explored and measured, whereas in the traditional classroom it is measured on tests. Different measures apply in that different learning objectives are the outcomes of experience-based and other learning strategies.
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN STUDENTS AND TEACHERS IN THE EXPERIENCE-BASED CLASSROOM

Because the communication paradigm in operation is different from that in the traditional classroom, the relationships between students and instructors in the experience-based classroom are also different. In the traditional classroom, the teacher’s role is that of expert and the student’s role is that of novice. The teacher is there to present; the student is there to learn from what is presented. These are roles with which both students and teachers are familiar, and with which they have had years of experience. They are, therefore, accustomed to engaging in the novice and expert roles.

In the experience-based classroom, however, teachers do not position themselves as experts, but rather as facilitators of learning; as helpers rather than leaders; as resource people rather than judges, evaluators, or testers. They demonstrate their expertise by selecting and providing meaningful experiences, by asking the right questions rather than providing the right answers; by stimulating thinking rather than requiring attention, and by encouraging talking rather than mere listening. Like instructors in the traditional classroom, they are there to provide learning; it is their method that differs and requires that they guide and encourage discovery.

In the experience-based learning classroom, students do not take the same roles they are accustomed to in traditional classrooms either. They are not there as vessels to be filled—to listen and take notes and give the right answers to the questions teachers pose to test for attention and comprehension. Instead, they are there to engage in the simulation or game, and in the postexperience analysis. They are there to raise questions as well as formulate answers to questions regarding the connections between what has been experienced and what can be learned from that experience, to use their experiences to replace old cognitive maps with new ones. They are there to think and to share what they think with their instructors. In the process of doing so, they hope to learn about themselves and the soundness of their own thinking.
Implicit in the distinctions being made about traditional and experience-based learning student-teacher roles are differences in the role relationships. In the traditional mode, the instructor determines the format for learning and measurement and thereby has both the power over and the responsibility for the learning that occurs. In the experience-based classroom, both power and responsibility are shared; both teacher and students determine the ways in which the activity (format) unfolds, and have responsibility for determining its effectiveness (measurement). Instructors are not responsible for providing learning in the experience-based classroom, but they are responsible for provoking it; they cannot assert themselves as omniscient, but must posture themselves as wise enough to ask the right questions and astute enough to assist students in framing worthwhile answers. Students are not responsible for copious note taking and dutiful display of their mastery of the material, but they are responsible for actively engaging in the events that occur, and for actively attempting to learn from that engagement.

Consequently, both students and teachers are faced with a set of problems in the experience-based classroom that differ from those of the traditional classroom. The skills each has had to master to be successful in the traditional classroom (teacher as effective listener, competent content expert, fair evaluator; students as good listeners, dutiful note takers, capable exam takers) are not germane in the experience-based classroom. It is not always easy for student or teacher—for student to refrain from asking for answers from the expert, or for teacher to resist the temptation to act as expert and provide definitive answers. For example, it is not unusual in the experience-based classroom for the teacher to answer a question with a question ("What do you think?"), or for the student to resist answering that question ("How do I know what I think? Why don't you tell me what I should think?"). Nor do students always comprehend the degree of expertise, albeit of a different sort, that goes into the experience-based practitioner's role—asking effective questions is a relatively sophisticated strategy, one that may not on the surface seem quite as demanding as answering questions. Instruc-
tors thereby relinquish some of the behaviors that students have come to perceive as the measure of competence. Students are forced to engage in behaviors either new to them in the context of the classroom or, at the very least, less familiar than other aspects of their repertoire as students.

These differences first present themselves when students are engaged in playing the simulation or game; they come to the surface more in the postexperience analysis, in which students' cognitive assimilation of the experience is the primary focus of the learning experience. Because of the differences in roles and role relationships described above, competencies, strategies, and responsibilities different from those traditionally associated with the teacher role accrue to the teacher in the EBL classroom. Each of these will be discussed in the sections that follow.

**TEACHING COMPETENCIES**

All teachers have a set of skills that are part and parcel of their role in the classroom. These include knowledge of subject, expertise in instructional methodology, skills in testing and measurement, and, finally, skills in classroom management. What may differ from teacher to teacher and subject to subject are the specifics: specific content, methodology, measurement, or classroom management style. This is true for teachers in the experience-based classroom as well.

What differentiates teachers in the experience-based classroom is that they must have a particular set of skills, skills that will be referred to herein as "experience guidance" skills. Figure 1 summarizes these skills.

The first skill listed is **tolerance for ambiguity**. This is critical for the experience-based instructor in that difference and divergence are an integral part of the experience-based classroom. Outcomes of engagement in activities are highly individual and sometimes far less predictable than outcomes in the lecture situation. The ability to tolerate ambiguity is the skill of working with it rather than resisting it. It requires the ability to relinquish control over outcomes—the ability to use what exists for learning rather than forcing end products that may not match the
Ability to: Tolerate Ambiguity
Observe and Interpret Behavior
Form Questions and Listen to Answers
Select Appropriate Directive and Nondirective Postures
Have a Good Sense of Timing
Make Judgment Calls

Figure 1: Experience Guidance Skills

experiences students have. The game *One-Way, Two-Way Communication* is a good case in point. It is designed to illustrate the benefits of feedback. But some participants are so poor in eliciting feedback that the feedback becomes dysfunctional. Tolerance for ambiguity is the capacity to go with what happens and create learning from it even when it is different from what one predicted or desired.

The second skill listed is the *ability to observe and interpret behavior*. In the experience-based classroom, the teachers function as listeners and observers of what is occurring during the students’ engagement in the activity. They need to be able to use their eyes and ears to process the data generated during the experiential activity, and to have conceptual understanding sufficient to interpret those data. In a play of the *Checkerboard Game*, for example, the instructor needs to observe who distributes the supplies, who does the directing, who does the actual creation of the board—everything that participants do becomes the raw data out of which learning about their behaviors in group projects emerges. In this sense, the teacher is like an anthropologist, using observation as part of a methodology of learning.

The third skill listed is the *ability to form questions and listen to answers about behaviors*. Rather than providing interpretations of behaviors, instructors in the experience-based classroom provide probing questions to help students articulate their own understandings; they must have fine-tuned ears to determine the validity of the answers provided. The student, for example, who resists real self-disclosure may indicate this by speaking in high-
level, abstract language. As the questioner, the instructor needs to probe further to elicit meaningful responses.

The fourth teaching skill is the ability to select appropriate directiveness or nondirectiveness in working with students. This is related to question asking and resistance. In the experience-based classroom, the instructor has to know when to push and when to let students seek their own levels, when to force them to confront their own behaviors, and when to allow them time to mull things over. The instructor needs to know when students need more time to deal with questions meaningfully.

The final two skills, a sense of timing and sound judgment calls, are related to the appropriateness of directiveness or nondirectiveness. The teacher needs to be able to know when and how to force issues and when to let them ride. He or she needs to be able to select the right time for a given discussion, and to exercise sound judgment from which students can benefit. Sometimes the instructor has to play the different roles of good cop/bad cop—good cop being the permissive, sensitive, empathetic “I hear you” person, and bad cop being the more aggressive, pushing, and seemingly less sensitive person. To be effective these decisions must be based on the ability to make judgment calls.

Described briefly above are a set of operating skills that are critical for guiding students in their cognitive assimilation of the experience. Whereas any of these skills may have applicability in any classroom, they are a requirement in the EBL classroom. This is particularly true in the intercultural classroom, where students from different cultures or ethnic backgrounds may be working with one another to understand how communication works between people of different cultures. In this context especially, the instructor’s skills in understanding and interpreting behaviors, and in guiding students in their abilities to develop these skills, are of the utmost importance.

TEACHING STRATEGIES:
STRUCTURED DIALOGUE

Teaching strategies can be conceptualized as the operationalization of the instructor’s understanding of the learning process by putting that understanding into action. Lederman and Ruben
(1984) provide a framework for the systemic assessment of communication simulations and games. This framework also has application for the cognitive assimilation of experience, and the teaching strategies therein. The framework consists of three criteria: validity, reliability, and utility. These criteria, originating in statistical analyses, are used to indicate that the same sorts of considerations can be applied in assessing experience-based activities. Taken together, they also offer a method for structuring the postexperience discussion and of putting one's teaching skills into practice.

The framework provided by these criteria allows one to shape the discussion and its objectives. It creates a way for the instructor to assure that all of the critical bases of the experience are touched upon. Figure 2 presents a chart that indicates the assessment criteria and the discussion questions related to each of the criteria. Each will be discussed below.

The first criterion presented by Lederman and Ruben (1984) is validity. Validity consists of two parts: face validity (correspondence with real-world counterparts) and construct validity (correspondence between concepts and the activity designed to present those concepts). Face validity requires that students can actually identify the real-world correspondence with the activity in which they have engaged. If they cannot, the activity loses its meaning and becomes simply a game. Students who engage in the NASA exercise, for example, have to see that there are real-world counterparts to the choices the exercise forces them to make. Construct validity refers to the correspondence between the kinds of decision making that enter into such an activity and the ways in which that decision making reflects concepts about communication.

In helping students process the experience, the instructor determines the extent to which students are capable of making connections, not only between the activity and the real world, but between their behaviors in the activity and their behaviors in the world parallel to that activity. The first steps, then, in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Discussion Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Validity</strong></td>
<td>1. what was this about?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. what is it like in the real world?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. what did you do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. how does it compare with real world behaviors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. what are the implications?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. what are the concepts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>1. what occurred and how was it predictable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. how did it unfold?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. why did it happen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. what did you do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. what are the implications?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility</strong></td>
<td>1. what did you get out of the experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. what did you pay for the experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. how worthwhile was the experience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. how else might you have learned?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2: Assessment Criteria for Guided Discussion*
postexperience analysis include helping students articulate (1) what the experience was about, (2) what correspondence it had with any external reality, (3) what the implications were vis-à-vis concepts, and (4) what the implications are vis-à-vis their own behaviors.

However, as has been discussed above, the hallmark of experience-based learning is that it is receiver centered and, therefore, what the students learn may differ from what the teacher intended. The instructor's responsibility is to determine what students think they have learned and why.

A second criterion has implications here: reliability. "Reliability" refers to either process reliability (a predictable process in which participants engage regardless of the outcomes of that process) or product reliability (a predictable outcome or end product regardless of the process in which participants engage). Testing reliability in the postexperience discussion involves determining the relationship between what occurred and what predictably might have occurred, and examination of that connection. In the use of One-Way, Two-Way Communication, for example, it is predictable that two-way communication results in slower task completion but more accuracy. Testing reliability in the postexperience discussion involves discussing the connection between it and the concepts it involves; or, where this does not occur, attempting to ferret out the critical differences between this group's behavior in the activity and others whose outcomes are predictable.

In processing the experience for reliability, the instructor is guiding students through a review of the activity: how it happened, what they did, and, finally, the implications.

The third and final criterion is utility. Utility is measured by the cost-benefit analysis of the experience—a comparison between engagement costs in terms of time, money, energy, and emotional expenditures versus the outcomes or benefits. This step involves comparison between what went into engagement in the activity and the benefits reaped by that participation. Processing the experience for utility involves questioning expenditures they perceive themselves to have made, the benefits they perceive to
have reaped, and balancing and assessing the two vis-à-vis one another.

These criteria, and the questions that accrue from them, provide a framework for the basic teaching strategy in processing experience-based learning: structured dialogue. Teachers in the experience-based classroom do not lecture; they engage in a structured dialogue with students—a dialogue designed to elicit every possible connection between the experience and its cognitive comprehension. The objective of the postexperience discussion is to provide the learners with mechanisms that encourage self-reflection and that assist them in making connections between experience and cognition. The instructors provide the simulation or game experience with some concrete objectives. Students bring to it their behaviors. In the discussion session, students and teacher work together to make sense of the connections between the activity, the behaviors, and their meanings. Because the design of the activity itself requires validity, reliability, and utility, these form a useful framework that helps students process the activity in the structured dialogue guided by the instructor.

**ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF INSTRUCTORS IN EXPERIENCE-BASED CLASSROOMS**

Simulations and games are powerful tools. Learning from them involves careful usage of the postexperience discussion. Students bring to any experience-based activity a set of behaviors that may at times be self-disclosing. Often, the levels of that disclosure go beyond their conscious awareness. The student who engages in *Prisoner’s Dilemma*, for example, and competes aggressively may have little conscious awareness of that tendency and the ways in which it will be perceived by fellow classmates. Thus the experience-based classroom is a living data base of human behavior and meanings attached to that behavior. It is the
ethical responsibility of the instructor to determine the parameters within which behavior will be encouraged and analyzed, thereby protecting students from experiences that are potentially damaging to their senses of self-worth.

The ethical responsibility of instructors is a complex issue. Strategies for dealing with it are not simple to articulate. One way, however, in which the instructor can meet this obligation is to create a learning climate in which students do not feel threatened; to create a climate in which learners do not feel they are being attacked or overly exposed to confrontation with self. Gibb (1961) refers to this kind of climate as supportive, and contrasts it with an evaluative atmosphere in which feelings of defensiveness are likely to occur in order to protect self-esteem. In a supportive climate, learners feel understanding rather than criticism, listened to rather than talked at. He identifies five characteristics of a supportive climate: (1) description of behavior rather than evaluation of it, (2) problem orientation rather than the exertion of control, (3) spontaneity rather than preimposed structure, (4) empathy, and (5) provisionalism in arriving at meanings rather than certainty (Gibbs, 1961: 141).

In providing a supportive climate, instructors meet their ethical responsibility by creating a learning atmosphere in which students can feel free to express their feelings and share their experiences. They do not have to worry about exposing themselves in ways that go beyond what they can handle intellectually and emotionally. They learn to describe behavior rather than judge it. This posture applies to their own behavior as well as to the behavior of others.

Instructors who use simulations and games are responsible for the learning outcomes of those experiences. They are also responsible for the human outcomes—the feelings that students have about themselves and others as a consequence of engagement in the activity and discussion of that engagement. In providing a supportive atmosphere, the instructor sets a tone and determines responsible parameters within which students interact with one another.
CONCLUSION

The power of simulations and games lies to some extent in the successful use of the postexperience analytic discussion session. More effective use of the discussion session is assured by reconceptualizing that part of the process and by examining the implications for communication in the classroom. Instructors committed to the use of experience-based activities must also dedicate themselves to a thorough examination of their skills in guiding the discussion that follows any experience-based activity.

NOTE

1. The film Eye of the Beholder was produced in 1955 by Stuart Reynolds Productions, Beverly Hills, California. It is held at Penn State University Library.
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