Manipulating Reality? Designing and Deploying Virtual Reality in Sensitive Settings
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Abstract
Virtual reality (VR) is now being designed and deployed in diverse sensitive settings, especially for therapeutic purposes. For example, VR experiences are used for diversional therapy in aged care and as therapy for people living with conditions such as phobias and post-traumatic stress. While these uses of VR offer great promise, they also present significant challenges. Given the novelty of VR, its immersive nature, and its impact on the user’s sense of reality, it can be particularly challenging to engage participants in co-design and predict what might go wrong when implementing these technologies in sensitive settings. This workshop provides a forum for researchers working in this emerging space to share stories about their experiences of designing and evaluating VR applications in settings such as aged care or mental health therapy. The workshop will develop a manifesto for good practice, outlining co-design strategies and ethical issues to consider when designing and deploying VR in sensitive settings.
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Background and motivation
Virtual reality (VR) has come of age. According to the
latest Gartner hype cycle, VR now sits on the “slope of
enlightenment” [2]. After decades of being viewed as a
high-tech simulation training and research tool that had
limited broader potential, VR has now emerged as a
promising, affordable consumer technology. In recent
years mobile VR devices such as Google Cardboard and
Samsung GearVR, along with gaming VR headsets such
as the Oculus Rift, HTC Vive, and Playstation VR, have
entered the market, enabling a diverse range of people
to experience immersive, 3D virtual environments.

Alongside its commercial advancement, VR is now
being explored as a therapeutic tool in various
potentially sensitive settings, including aged care [7],
mental health, and clinical rehabilitation [9]. In a
recent review paper, Freeman [1] noted that VR is well-
suited to treating mental illness because of its power to
simulate the environmental conditions that trigger
problems, helping therapists teach patients how to
better deal with these situations. In this way, VR has
been used to treat phobias, post-traumatic stress
disorder, paranoia and social anxiety, and to induce
self-compassion, empathy and pro-sociality [8]. VR has
also been used for pain management: because VR is
immersive, it can be an effective way of distracting
chronic care patients from their experience of pain [3].

In addition, many commercial providers have begun to
offer VR systems for use in aged care (see, for example
http://www.solisvr.com; http://www.tribemix.co.uk),
although there is currently no research evaluating the
effectiveness of these commercial systems. Again, the
immersive quality of VR is beneficial here: VR
experiences can be meditative and calming for people
living with dementia, who often experience anxiety [7].

While therapeutic uses of VR offer great promise, they
also present significant challenges. Many therapeutic
applications are used in sensitive settings – for
example, in hospitals, care facilities, or with people who
have experienced trauma. In addition, VR experiences
may be designed and used to foster empathy for people
living with difficult conditions. Given the immaturity of
research in this area, it is difficult to predict what might
go wrong when implementing VR in these sensitive
settings. This workshop will build on earlier discussions
about “sensitive HCI” [12]. It will critique opportunities
and challenges that VR presents when designed and
used in sensitive settings, including its use to improve
wellbeing and foster empathy among diverse groups.

Workshop themes
The workshop discussions will focus on the following:

Practical challenges
The challenges of implementing VR are manifold. For
example, in aged care, practical challenges include the
cost of implementation and the need for one-on-one
assistance from care staff when residents use VR [7]. A
further practical challenge we have observed in our
work in aged care arises from the fact that VR
hardware (i.e. headset and computer) is expensive and
therefore one headset is likely to be shared among
many. A headset, of course, is worn over the head and
face; it therefore must be cleaned when passed from
one user to another in a setting such as aged care,
where disease control is of paramount concern. These challenges are likely to also be prevalent in other therapeutic settings in which VR is used. A general challenge commonly discussed is the tendency for some users to experience motion sickness when immersed in a virtual environment [4]. The technology has improved greatly in recent years, making this a less prominent concern, but researchers still need to be mindful of this when implementing VR in sensitive settings. These practical challenges are relatively straightforward but nevertheless important; workshop discussions will involve sharing experiences of practical challenges encountered and how they can be addressed.

Co-design and radical novelty
The HCI community is already well aware of the challenges, but also opportunities, inherent when co-designing technologies in sensitive settings. But what new challenges are introduced when we are designing and deploying such radically new technology-based experiences? For people accustomed to two-dimensional touch-screens and desktop interfaces, VR introduces new interaction techniques and metaphors, and best practice is yet to be fully defined. This unfamiliarity adds a layer of complexity for designers aiming to collaborate with their intended users in the design process. How do we ensure our participant-collaborators are aware of the possibilities and constraints that VR provides?

Dystopian perceptions
VR captures the public imagination, partly due to media hype and earlier portrayals of VR in science fiction. Works such as Neuromancer (Gibson, 1984), The Matrix (1999) and Black Mirror (2016) portray dystopian roles for VR. This association was evidenced in the reaction to the 2016 photo of Mark Zuckerberg with a group of tech devotees wearing VR headsets [5]. This may lead to negative perceptions of VR in sensitive settings such as hospitals, mental health clinics, and homes for the aged, resulting in the need to carefully manage people’s expectations about VR.

Ethical challenges
Vines et al described the ethical challenges encountered when using Google Glass with people living with Parkinson’s disease [10]. Some of these challenges were due to the novelty of the technology and things not working as expected, which participants viewed as a sign of “failure” on their part. We need to be cautious about the potential that similar challenges can occur when using VR for therapeutic purposes. In aged care, for example, VR content needs to be carefully designed and tailored to the needs of individual residents. Using VR involves being immersed in an alternate reality. There is therefore great potential for VR experiences to cause confusion, which may be particularly problematic for people living with dementia. VR could also amplify people’s experience of age-related cognitive decline or induce a sense of failure/inadequacy if they find the experience confusing. There is the danger of provoking trauma, especially in immersive VR environments, from which users cannot easily “escape”. An under-water virtual environment might aim to provide a soothing meditative experience, but could be challenging for a person who has had a near-drowning experience in the past. How do we ensure that VR experiences offered in sensitive settings are personalized and appropriate for each individual person? This is an important consideration for all VR being used for therapeutic purposes, especially with people who have experienced past trauma, such as those with PTSD.
Workshop duration and goals
This one-day workshop aims to provide a forum for researchers working in this emerging space to share stories about their experiences of involving vulnerable audiences in the design and evaluation of VR applications and to discuss challenges and opportunities when leveraging these technologies in an effort to improve wellbeing. By opening up this conversation, we aim to develop a shared understanding of good practice, which will inform the future ethical design of VR experiences for the purposes of improving health and wellbeing or fostering empathy.
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