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Objective

Development of a psychosocial model for analysing the usability and ergonomics of virtual environments used in cognitive behavioural psychotherapy within the context of two projects dedicated to VR-supported cognitive behavioral psychotherapy.

VRET (Virtual Reality Exposure Therapy)

Cognitive-Experiential Therapy aims to:

- De-condition fear reactions
- Modify representation of reality and distorted convictions regarding panic-symptoms
- Reduce anxiety-related symptoms

The innovative aspect is the integration of cognitive behavioural techniques with the experiences offered by VR. Recent studies identified pathologies with which VR based cognitive therapy is most effective:

- Panic disorder
- Agoraphobia
Projects

VEPSY UPDATED was an IST European Project - 5th FWP
“Telemedicine and Portable Virtual Environments for Clinical Psychology”.

Main goal of the project was to prove the technical and clinical viability of using portable and shared Virtual Reality systems in clinical psychology.

2001 - 2003

NEUROTIV is a MIUR -FIRB National project
2004-2007

Theoretical framework

Ethnomethodological approach

A perspective that gives evidence of how people in specific social situations succeed in facing and solving complex tasks producing shared meanings and achieving their goals, in order to make their actions successful and understandable by other people involved in interaction
Challenges in the usability evaluation: the VEPSY experience

VEPSY project: main goal was to obtain usability evaluation of processes of VR use as performed by ‘real’ users in ‘real context of use’

- Basic functional evaluation
- Minimum threshold of ergonomic acceptability on the basis of specific guidelines prepared by our research unit
- New method taking into account requirements needed by:
  - Psychotherapists
  - Patients affected by specific psychopathologies
- Integration of results after Large Clinical Trials (comparison and interaction with the clinical group)

VEPSY project: lessons learned

We know

- Users are immersed in a social and goal-driven/oriented context

- The ambiguity inherents to everyday situations (re)presented in VR environments can be used/modulate to substantiate the treatment
VEPSY project: lessons learned

We need

• A more context-situated analysis in order to better understand possible discrepancies between standard clinical protocol and the real use of VR environments during the treatment

• More in-depth analysis about requirements connected with the realism of experience intended as a physical and psychosocial features of VEs

Next step: the NeuroTIV Project

From the usability point of view, the validity of system’s requirements can be significantly different NOT ONLY between patients and non-patients BUT also with reference to the efficacy of the specific therapeutic approach.

The ergonomic evaluation was included in the design process since the very beginning of the project. The attempt to meet clinical and ergonomic requirements are now two aspects of the same design process and cannot be considered separately.
NeuroTIV project: clinical-ergonomic evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Therapist 1</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patients VR</td>
<td>Clinical-ergonomic</td>
<td>Basic VR Modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patients CBT</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patients WL</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therapist 1</td>
<td>Therapist 2</td>
<td>Therapist 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Patients RV</td>
<td>Patients RV</td>
<td>Patients RV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patients CBT</td>
<td>Patients CBT</td>
<td>Patients CBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patients WL</td>
<td>Patients WL</td>
<td>Patients WL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VR Outpatients</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ergonomic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from…

• …the outpatients considered as subjects suitable for user-tests rather than only for video-recorded interaction analysis

• …the panel of therapists considered as “expert users” and reference targets
Ecology of process

From an ecology of state-oriented perspective we attempted to shift the focus to the concept of ecology of process.

VR therapeutic sessions could be analyzed as a psychosocial space.
In order to understand it we need to study:

- Artifact
VR therapeutic sessions could be analyzed as a psychosocial space. In order to understand it we need to study:

- Artifact
- User
- Process
Which processes are involved in VR-based therapy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic process</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction process</td>
<td>Usability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; development process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning process</td>
<td>Psycho-social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience sharing process</td>
<td>(Community of practice)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 2

VR modules - Beta version

- Analysis of the use modality in real context
  - Usability analysis

Phase 3

VR modules - Version 1

- Usability analysis with outpatients and non patients

VR modules - Version 1 mobile

- Usability analysis
guidelines for a psychosocial approach

VR is not only an “addictional” tool

VR is not only an extension of therapeutic setting
VR as an interactional context

VR is a ‘real’ interactional context
- physical
- social
- semiotic
- pragmatical

Before (VE design)

After (Interaction analysis)
using a psychosocial approach

After (Interaction analysis)

– the social ecology of VR-therapy: the “emerging Other”

– Key elements of social presence in VR-based therapy sessions
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