

Karissa Goodman

DQ #3

26 days ago

2 replies



Last 19 days ago



In class, we have learned the seven phases of the critical incident stress debriefing (CISD) model: introductions, facts, thoughts, challenges, meaning, teaching, and transition. The benefits of using this model include helping to diminish symptoms of very high and acute stress, assess the need for any follow-up that may be needed by any specific individuals who experienced the trauma, aids in normalizing any intrusive reactions to the event, as well as provides a safe place for closure. Barboza (2005) and Good Therapy (2015) point out the main criticism of CISD and CISM is that this model has not been seen to reduce post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in survivors of the event and it may be causing more harm than good in this sense. Our textbook mentions some cultural norms that we as mental health professionals and disaster responders must keep in mind. How different cultures handle stress, react to stress, their sense of pride and honor, religious and spiritual backgrounds and beliefs, how they deal with loss and grief, and communication are some key differences that we must be aware of. We must either prepare the client on how to change their environment or help them learn to adapt and live in their current state. When it comes to using this model in other cultures, I would change the first and the last phase. Introductions are crucial in not only introducing a person but their culture and who they truly are. I would expand more on this in the first phase by learning more about the members of the group. The transition and re-entry phase is very important as well. It is imperative that we do not impose our goals and norms on the members. Coping for us looks different to them. Working through this and with the members to see how we can best help them transition while not imposing our ways is what I would do.